



DG IV/EDU/HIST (2003)18

**Seminar**

**“New Approaches to Teaching History”**

**Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**18 - 19 November 2003**

**Strasbourg**



Seminar on

“New Approaches to Teaching History”

Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina  
18 - 19 November 2003

Ann LOW-BEER  
United Kingdom

The opinions expressed in this work are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official policy of the Council of Europe.

# CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>II. START OF THE SEMINAR.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>III. THE FORUM OF THE SEMINAR.....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>IV. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OUTSIDE INTERNATIONAL SPECIALISTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>V. WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS .....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>VI. THE FUTURE FOR REFORM OF HISTORY TEACHING IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>VII. THE WAY FORWARD ON THE COMMON CORE CURRICULUM.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>VIII. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>APPENDIX I</b>	
<b>LIST OF PARTICIPANTS .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>APPENDIX II</b>	
<b>PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR .....</b>	<b>20</b>



## I. INTRODUCTION

This was one of a continuing series of seminars initiated by the Council of Europe since 1999 in Bosnia and Herzegovina on various aspects of the teaching of history. Over this period, the situation in the country has gradually changed from that of a society bitterly divided in the immediate aftermath of a savage war, to a society still functioning under the auspices of various international bodies, but beginning now to look more towards the future. A recent major change for education was the passing of the law in 2002 agreeing on the development of a Common Core Curriculum. This has implications for all subjects. A Steering Board for the Common Core Curriculum has been established with 17 subject-specific working groups for each subject area. Local experts from schools, Pedagogical Institutes and the University are on the working groups, with the international community represented by the Council of Europe, OHR and OSCE. There have been many meetings and much discussion on how to compare and harmonise existing syllabi and create a Common Core.

A white paper, for discussion, was produced in October 2003 on ‘A Shared Modernisation Strategy for Primary and General Secondary Education’.

It is not surprising that there are more contentious issues in relation to this exercise in history than in many other subjects. A textbook commission has been working throughout most of the last year attempting to remove offensive and contentious statements from history texts. In relation to the curriculum, agreement has been reached on a Common Core in international history. But, so far, it has proved impossible to achieve in national history. In other countries, curriculum experts have also found that, whatever selection is made of history for school, national history always provokes disagreement and controversy – much more than in other school subjects.

This process of reform inevitably leads to re-consideration of very basic and permeating aspects of the way a subject is taught in schools. Certainly, in history, changes in curricula necessitate a re-thinking of the conceptions behind different presentation of the subject matter. What is the overall interpretation or point of view which informs particular topics and makes sense of the factual material? Changes in textbooks were also urgently needed in Bosnia and Herzegovina – because of the new curricula and because the methodology in the existing textbooks has degenerated, producing texts overloaded with content and often unintelligible to young pupils as well as unattractive to them. The style in which textbooks are written mirrors current teaching styles. So reform of textbooks in Bosnia and Herzegovina inevitably leads to re-considering also the basic methods of teaching.

The intention of this Council of Europe seminar was to present and discuss new approaches to history teaching: methods which are being used in other European countries.

## II. START OF THE SEMINAR

Participants were welcomed by ministers from both entities the Federal Ministry of Education and Science and the Ministry of Education of Republika Srpska. They outlined the current reforms and expressed support for all efforts to push the reforms through into practical changes in classrooms.

Dr Falk Pingel, Head of the Education Department at OSCE, outlined the present finely balanced situation. The idea of a Common Core did not mean that all conceptions and views must be harmonised, what was needed was that the different conceptions existing in Bosnia and Herzegovina should all be acknowledged. It should be possible for all views to be discussed and debated openly in classrooms and elsewhere. Ideas of putting a European dimension into education were circulating, but this did not mean losing national perspectives, but recognising that there were a range and variety of views. History was the subject in the curriculum where different views were the most contested. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, there were for example, three different interpretations of the period of the Ottoman Empire, - was it possible to handle this in classrooms? How practically to do this was a vital issue.

This was a central purpose of the present seminar and it had been the topic of a seminar at the Georg Eckert Institute in Braunschweig in Germany in October. One conclusion was the need for a wider comparative approach to Balkan history. This could begin in schools and might influence academic work in universities too.

Alison Cardwell reminded participants of the long background of work by the Council of Europe in history education which began as a contribution towards the different nations of Europe living peacefully together. Teachers were the central key to such a process since it was they who mediated the curriculum and textbooks to pupils. The Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe had all adopted the *'Recommendation on Teaching History in twenty-first Century Europe'*. Several current projects were working towards these aims: for example the Handbook, by Robert Stradling, on *'Teaching 20th Century European History'* was now translated into the local languages of Bosnia and Herzegovina. There was also a book by the same author on *'Multiperspectivity in History Teaching'*<sup>1</sup> with many useful and practical examples in it. The results of a newly started project on the European dimension in history teaching focusing on key dates and key events which have shaped the recent history of Europe would be available on CD-Rom. Seminars and projects were developing in various parts of the Balkans, for instance (Belgrade, 4 – 5 November) there was a regional workshop on *Developing new history Textbooks*.

## III. THE FORUM OF THE SEMINAR

The seminar was structured around practical workshops and plenary sessions, with input from expert international advisors on the first day, and leaders of educational reform in Bosnia and Herzegovina on the second day. Discussion was much more open and varied than it used to be in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the process of

---

<sup>1</sup> Also translated into all the languages of South East Europe and financed within the Stability Pact.



curriculum reform has led all the national groups into more discussion with each other than was possible even a year ago.

It is simplest to summarise, in this report, the input from international experts and then something of the discussion amongst participants. In practice, there was discussion at the end of talks and some of the in-put came in workshops led by the international specialists.

#### **IV. CONTRIBUTIONS FROM OUTSIDE INTERNATIONAL SPECIALISTS**

On the first day of the seminar, Ann Low-Beer from England presented a paper which discussed issues raised by the relationship of *'Factual truth, multiperspectivity, and new approaches to learning, especially in relation to the teaching of national history in schools'*. There had already been one Council of Europe seminar in June 2002 on 'The Teaching of National History in the Secondary Schools of South-East Europe'. The report of that seminar has been translated for use in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The teaching of national history has changed over the last 20 years in many European countries – and it has changed for reasons which are relevant for Bosnia and Herzegovina too. In fact, some other Balkan countries, Croatia and Bulgaria, for example, have begun to introduce and use modern methods.

The most basic changes in many countries are conceptual.

The teaching of national history in schools developed in the late nineteenth and early 20<sup>th</sup> Centuries – at a time when conceptions of 'the nation' were different from what they are today. Whilst the teaching of national history remains important in schools everywhere, since the late 1980s, there has been much revision of the conceptualisation of national history – not only in the countries where the end of communism led to change but in many western European countries too.

New perspectives which have led to changed perceptions are:

1. A growing awareness that, in democracies, 'the one story of the one nation' was no longer satisfactory. Most nations encompass ethnic, linguistic and religious diversity and contain minorities – they are internally diverse. How was the history of minorities to be included? Nations exist within a region and within Europe – how are regional and European perspectives to be included, especially given the small amount of time in school for history.
2. Conceptions of 'national' history have changed because academic historians developed new studies in social history examining all the different groups which make up a society – the life of the poor and of women for example, not just the history of the leading groups of a nation. At the same time, general perceptions of our place in the world changed because of the increasingly global and inter-communicating world of the late 20th Century – accelerating into the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

3. Surveying modern history, particularly of the 20th Century, there are many controversial and sensitive issues – topics about which there are disputed views. How are these different views to be conveyed to the next generation?

4. Information technology and the modern media are transforming the sources of knowledge available – pupils gain varied knowledge of the world from many sources – not just from what is taught in school. Can schools equip pupils to assess critically these varied sources of historical knowledge?

5. Both modern psychology of learning and the methodology of historians suggested new methods of teaching in which pupils could be more active in constructing their own understanding of history, learning how to assess a variety of sources of information, to make judgments and to argue to conclusions. In general, these new methods also provide more interesting ways for pupils to learn some history.

In response to these changes: in perceptions of history, in the use of information technology, and in methods of learning, new approaches to the learning and teaching of history have developed in many countries.

**The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina** was examined in 2001, in a report by Professor Volker Lenhart from the University of Heidelberg in Germany. He suggested that school history in Bosnia and Herzegovina was framed by what he called ‘a nationality-bound monoperspective’ in each of the three curricula. It seemed to outside international observers that this view of history originates, in part, from the Marxist view of history, based on a theory that there was only one ‘scientific/objective’ truth, and that this conception had not been discarded but has passed straight into the nationalist histories developed during the war. European historians no longer accept this concept, of a single interpretive truth for all of history. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, it seems to have been retained and transferred into an ethnic-nationalist view of history which is really highly selective and omits much of the past experience of the people.

**The idea of multiperspectivity** has been developed in relation to school history and fits well with the views of most modern historians that a range of interpretations may exist in history, especially over large and controversial events. This does not mean that any view is ‘true’, good interpretations are always based on the historical evidence. Nor does it mean that any one view is invalid – only that it stands within a context in which there are other views – there is no monopoly.

Multiperspectivity makes it easier to see that different groups of people do indeed see past events differently – and the difference is valid since their historical experience was indeed different. For example, the period of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina was and is for some a period of occupation and suppression (the Serb view), that it was and is for others the good old days when great-grandfather made the fortune on which the family is still living today (the Bosniak view), and that it was and is for some a period of inequality among the nations of the monarchy, but that it was also a kind of civil society with a stable rule of law (the Croat view).

**Multiperspectivity in history teaching is advocated by the Council of Europe**, because history teaching should: ‘promote attitudes which encourage respect for diversity and different cultural values within each country and between neighbouring states’. Furthermore, the Council of Europe suggests that school history should ‘include opportunities for learning and teaching about controversial and sensitive historical issues in an open and frank manner’.

Recognition of multiple views is necessary if textbooks in Bosnia and Herzegovina are to be re-written with meaning. A new overall conception based on multiperspectivity would allow for the complexity and diversity of the real situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina – simply removing offensive terminology will not achieve this. Some understanding of the differing views about the past within Bosnia and Herzegovina is a necessity for fully informed citizens. But each view does not cancel out the others: history curricula can and should foster the ethnic and cultural identity of the constituent nationalities. While elaborating in a historical perspective one’s own cultural values, respect for the diversity of other cultural traditions can be a shared pattern.

There are many European countries which allow for a range of historical perspectives to be taught within the one country. It is what happens in the United Kingdom for example, and also in Belgium, Switzerland, Spain – all of which have curricula which recognise differing views of the past within the one nation.

Factual truth and multiperspectivity are not opposed. Multiperspectivity simply means understanding that there are other points of view, knowing what they are, without necessarily recognising them as ‘mine’.

In October 2001, the Committee of Ministers of the Council of Europe adopted a *Recommendation on History Teaching in Twenty-first Century Europe* which affirms and sets out in detail the principles on which history teaching in a democratic Europe should be based. This Recommendation, which all member states including Bosnia and Herzegovina, have adopted, sets out starkly the misuses of history, and suggests that all reforms of history teaching and the training of history teachers should take account of the positive recommendations, which include developing active thought and learning in pupils and an awareness of multiple perspectives in history.

**Luisa Black from Portugal** conveyed to the group her own experience of major change in the ways of teaching history after the revolution in Portugal in 1974. The previous regime had lasted for a long time and had established in schools the ‘one true version of the nation’s story’. The fall of the regime led at first to a period of considerable confusion, all national history teaching was stopped and for many years there were no exams. It was, in some ways, an exciting and interesting time for those who were young, but it was difficult within schools to know what to do or what to teach – all the previous certainties were lost. She suggested that she herself belonged to what she called the ‘generation of transition’, those who really had to re-think ideas. Work with other countries through the European Union greatly helped the development of new ideas on how to teach history – but the whole process took quite a long time. Perhaps it was only now, after 20 years, that it was possible to look back and understand what was involved in re-thinking the whole basis of teaching history. Perhaps the most basic change was that the new teaching requires the pupils to do

more of the work – they do not just listen and take notes. The way the teacher structures work is important, but pupils must do more thinking for themselves.

**From Scotland, Ian McKellar** conveyed a different experience. Major curricular changes were gradually developed after much discussion but change in methods of teaching was accelerated by changes in methods of examining introduced 10 years ago.

Participants also learnt from many practical examples of the use of visual material in schools, and the use of modern technology. Mr McKellar showed particularly examples of cartoons, – many of which came from his own personal collection which he had gathered from textbooks of different nations.

When asked about how to find and develop visual sources Mr McKellar described how, 20 years ago, the need to develop a data bank and share resources for teaching had been a major reason for establishing SATH - the Scottish Association of Teachers of History. He stressed the importance of teachers setting up a similar independent, non-governmental organisation in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

## V. WORKSHOP DISCUSSIONS

Participants divided for workshops led by Luisa Black and Ian McKellar – both demonstrating new methods of teaching history using a range of material and resources including visual resources, but also covering a wider range of history – social and cultural change in the past.

Workshops set out to demonstrate methods in relation to three topics in the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina: Feudalism, the late 19th Century, and World War 11.

Both generated much discussion. It was notable that there is now much more open and frank discussion of all of the issues in history education than there used to be in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The whole process of textbook revision and curricular reform, though still incomplete, has already accelerated discussion of new approaches.

It is also clear that there are teachers who are already well aware of new methods and have learnt much from previous seminars. Several suggested that the teachers were capable of development, problems in coordinating change were more because ‘too much politics hovers over our heads’.

Certain issues recurred in discussion on both days and in the final plenary session and are worth summarising here.

1. How far should history teaching attempt to deal with events over the last 10 years – especially after a bitterly divisive war? Participants were interested to hear that, in Scotland, events in the last 10 years are not within the history curriculum – but are taught in *Modern Studies*. This is a Scottish curricula development – but recent history could be taught within citizenship. No conclusions were reached, but the issue was of interest.

2. There were several examples of concern about the use of language. The use of particular terms to describe or refer to past events can itself imply a critical and hostile, or a neutral, or an approving interpretation. Language conveys attitudes: is this an uprising or a national liberation struggle? What language should be used when discussing Gavrilo Princip? Should all three views of him be conveyed? How could it be done?

Luisa Black gave examples of how, in Portugal, there had been a deliberate effort to find neutral terms, which were now accepted. For example, to refer to a set of events as 'the Spanish Period' rather than 'the Spanish Occupation'. There was a direct parallel with problems raised over a period of 'Serb Occupation' or just a 'Change of Administration.'

More work of this kind on such issues in the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina could be useful, although it might generate heat and opposition – as happened at times in this seminar. There are clearly certain events, even long ago, over which there are strongly contested interpretations.

3. Teaching about religion in the feudal and the Ottoman period was often difficult. There are disputed interpretations of the role of the church and the advent of Islam. Examples were shared from Scotland and Portugal of how religion was tackled in a historical context – especially setting pupils simple investigative questions. It was felt that teachers should have more freedom to mediate topics, to decide how their pupils could best approach such issues.

4. Teachers at primary schools and of less able pupils were concerned at the lack of suitably simplified books and teaching materials and interested in how simplification was done elsewhere. Existing textbooks in Bosnia and Herzegovina were not useful for such pupils. There was criticism because teachers had not been sufficiently consulted over some new primary school books. Is this a suitable topic for pupils of this age? "But no one asks us."

## **VI. THE FUTURE FOR REFORM OF HISTORY TEACHING IN BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA**

The second day of the seminar, discussion moved to considering future changes and how best to make the transition to modern methods and approaches to history education. Two speakers introduced the topics.

*Some comments on the conflicting interpretations of history in Bosnia and Herzegovina and suggestions on ways forward* was the title of a talk by **Professor Lovrenovic**. He introduced himself as a historian and a citizen, with children of his own in school. He suggested that much of the real history on the ground in Bosnia and Herzegovina had been hidden by a concentration on the history of others and those who had conquered Bosnia and Herzegovina. The local histories had been smothered under alien regimes and there was a need to find and write up publicly the local experience of the people of the area.

Secondly, he suggested that it would be useful to see their own history within a context of the history of South Slav Peoples generally. As a small state, there was a certain fear of comparison, but he suggested that there were advantages too in being small and on the edge and with a particular experience. Within a wider context, this particularity might be made clearer to themselves, as well as to others.

Finally, he suggested that the Ottoman period should be of particular interest – but much more thought was needed about this whole period, it needed new interpretations. Moreover, the experience of Ottoman rule was shared broadly at least with other Balkan countries and had been somewhat neglected in thinking and teaching about their history.

## **VII. THE WAY FORWARD ON THE COMMON CORE CURRICULUM**

### **Presentation by Dr Falk Pingel, Head of OSCE Education Department**

Dr Pingel began by pointing out that, so far, neither the review of textbooks nor the development towards a common curriculum actually set out to modernise the teaching of history and to change the methods of teaching and learning.

Teachers relied heavily on textbooks and they needed further reform, especially the removal of too much detail and political content – more visual material was needed and inter-active teaching methods could be introduced. It was hoped to set up a new *committee for history and geography* which would produce criteria to guide future authors of textbooks towards a more selective and comparative approach in the writing of texts. The criteria would be intended as guidance and a variety of textbooks would still be possible.

On the curriculum, it seemed likely that separate approaches to national history would remain for the moment. Nevertheless, pressures for real change were growing. There were a number of small experiments and some schools where common teaching was developing, sometimes simply because it was not possible to provide two teachers. In any case, it was becoming increasingly necessary that all pupils should learn something of the different views of the communities in their country, and more classes in fact contained mixed groups than was always acknowledged.

Nevertheless, the problems of developing both a more common history and one within a wider comparative context should not be under-estimated. In a number of European countries, national and international history were taught together, with an emphasis on one or the other from time to time. The link between the two was regional history which, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, was seriously neglected. There was a tendency to look to Western Europe, a far-away goal, and to miss the importance of the local region. Yet, it was vital politically and economically that South-East Europe should develop closer links, the states were individually too small to function well – but together they could join in the European debate at many levels. The whole area could and should contribute a historical and cultural dimension to the concept of Europe. The tendency to think of the past backwards from the present often hid the real historical importance of, for example, the long period of Ottoman influence, or that of

the Austro-Hungarian empire. Much of the reality of the history of the area would be clearer if social and cultural history were studied rather than just political events.

This involved re-thinking the conceptual framework of their history – it would lead to a new model of how to think about the whole of their history. New questions would of course be raised, but new perspectives might transform views in the present as well as about the past.

## **VIII. SUGGESTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Whether to maintain a chronological curriculum and how to reduce the amount of required curriculum content were issues raised several times. They are linked. In Portugal, Scotland and England, content coverage has been cut in part by breaking chronological continuity – sometimes cutting whole periods of history from the school requirements, sometimes by teaching several topics under one broad theme. Another way is to make some topics or themes compulsory but to allow schools then to choose the detail or the examples they would use for teaching. Material is selected. Schools will not all cover exactly the same material.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, there is some criticism of such approaches – a feeling that a miscellany of historical topics will float about un-anchored in a proper chronological place with clear origins.

It is generally agreed that, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the content required in the curriculum needs to be cut. Examples of practical ways of doing this, used in other countries, could be adopted in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

2. New textbooks have been very welcome in both entities but the timing of their production could be better organised. They do not always coincide with new curricula, and time, money and effort are wasted. In the Federation, there is now a choice of textbooks – some with new methods in them. There was much interest in the examples of these textbooks which were brought to the meeting.

3. There is a need for more training of teachers. Dr Pingel explained that, under the new law, it is hoped to develop a Common Core Curriculum Agency to supervise training at local centres under Institutes of Pedagogy. These centres could also act as centres for teaching resources. Some teachers expressed scepticism about who would do the training and gave instances of suggesting suitable teachers for training who were not offered places. Perhaps trainers should come from amongst teachers who had already tried some of the new methods?

4. The Council of Europe was specifically asked for:

- Seminars and workshops on new approaches to teaching the History of the 20th Century.
- Practical workshops on using the new technologies.

- Further workshops in which to develop materials for teaching multiperspectivity in topics within the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina.



## APPENDIX I

### LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

#### CHAIR

- Ms Alison CARDWELL  
Head of the History Education Section  
Directorate General IV Education, Culture and Heritage, Youth and Sport  
Council of Europe  
67075 Strasbourg Cedex  
France  
Tel: + 33 3 88 41 26 22  
Fax: + 33 3 88 41 27 50  
E-mail: [alison.cardwell@coe.int](mailto:alison.cardwell@coe.int)

#### GENERAL RAPPORTEUR

- Ms Ann LOW-BEER  
24 Portland Place West  
Leamington Spa  
WARWICKSHIRE CV32 5EU  
United Kingdom  
Tel/Fax: + 44 192 683 16 77  
Mobile: + 44 78 55 396 306  
E-mail: [ann@low-beer.com](mailto:ann@low-beer.com)

#### PARTICIPANTS

- Ms Luisa DE BIVAR BLACK  
C/o ERAZAN  
Praca da Carreira 32  
Loja esquerda  
2765 . JOAO DO ESTORIL  
Portugal  
Tel: +351 21 46 72 050/351 91 72 50 771  
Fax: +351 21 46 49 900  
E-mail: [luisablack@mail.telepac.pt](mailto:luisablack@mail.telepac.pt)
  
- Mr Ian McKELLAR  
3 Clydevale  
Bothwell  
GLASGOW G71 8NL  
United Kingdom  
Tel: +44 1698 852 466  
Fax: +44 141 950 3395  
E-mail: [ibac.mckellar@tiscali.co.UK](mailto:ibac.mckellar@tiscali.co.UK)

### **Local participants**

1. Peter **ROSIC**, Banja Luka, Gimnasium
2. Zoran **PEJASINOVIC**, Banja Luka, Gimnasium
3. Slavica **KUPRESANIN**, Banja Luka, Economical High
4. Mira **SOBOT**, Banja Luka, Technical High
5. Dobrila **DJUKANOVIC**, Bijeljina, Gimnasium
6. Slobodan **BERONJA**, S. Kostajnica, Vocational High
7. Milan **VUKOVIC**, Lopare, High School
8. Nenad **MITRIC**, Gradiska, Vocational High
9. Nevenka **CRNCEVIC**, Prijedor, Gimnasium
10. Rajka **GOLIJANIN**, Srbinje, High School
11. Nedjo **ZABEDZIJA**, Trebinje, Technical High
12. Milan **SAKIC**, Derventa, Gimnazija
13. Simo **MAKSIMOVIC**, Doboje, Economical High
14. Edin **RADUSIC**, Sarajevo, Philosophy faculty
15. Seka **BRKLJACA**, History Inst. Sarajevo
16. Sabit **MUHIC**, Fojnica, High School "Zijah Dizdarevic"
17. Toni **POLJAK**, Travnik, Cath. school centre "Petar Barbaric"
18. Jahija **FATIMA**, Donji Vakuf, I Osnovna skola
19. Sabahudin **DURAKOVIC**, Sarajevo, 5<sup>th</sup> gimnasium
20. Kemal **MAHIC**, Sarajevo, Technical High
21. Leonard **VALENTA**, Cath. School Centre Sarajevo
22. Enver **DERVISBEGOVIC**, High School Sarajevo
23. Tatjana Tafro **ZARKOVIC**, II Gimnasium Sarajevo
24. Mladenka **NOSIC**, Bugojno, III Elementary School

25. Edin **VELADZIC**, Faculty of Philosophy Sarajevo
26. Severin **MONTINA**, Sarajevo, Federal Ministry of Education and Science
27. Mirsada **BARAKOVIC**, Sarajevo, Pedagogical Institute

## APPENDIX II

### PROGRAMME OF THE SEMINAR

**Tuesday 18 November 2003**

- 10.00 - 10.40      **Plenary Session**
- Chair:            Ms Alison CARDWELL
- Opening of the seminar:
- i.      Mr Zijad PASIC, Minister, Federal Ministry of Education and Science;
  - ii.     A Representative of the Ministry of Education of Republika Srpska;
  - iii.    Dr Falk PINGEL, Head of the Education Department, OSCE Bosnia and Herzegovina;
  - iv.    Ms Alison CARDWELL, Head of the History Education, Council of Europe;
- 10.40 – 11.00      short opening presentations by the Council of Europe experts
- 11.00 - 11.30      Break
- 11.30 - 13.30      Presentation on the situation of history teaching in Bosnia and Herzegovina by Mr Edin RADUSIC, Faculty of Philosophy, History Department, textbook co-writer
- Presentation of new approaches - new experiences, factual truth vs. multiperspectivity and active learning methods in the classrooms by Ms Ann Low-Ber, United Kingdom
- Discussion with all the participants
- 13.30 - 15.00      Lunch
- 15.00 - 16.30      **The participants will be divided into three workshops and each of the three animators invited by the Council of Europe will lead a workshop with a group of local participants who should present what they teach, how they teach it, the dates of each of these periods, age of pupils, testing etc.**
- The groups will choose a rapporteur to report on the outcomes of the discussions

The animators will try to discuss the new methods using three historical periods and the events happening in the region:

- *Feudalism*
- *Late 19<sup>th</sup> century*
- *II World War*

16.30 - 17.00	Break
17.00 - 18.00	<b>Three Parallel Workshops</b>
	Dinner

### **Wednesday 19 November 2003**

09.00 - 10.00	Presentation of the work of the Working groups. 10 minutes presentation by the group rapporteurs with 10 minutes discussion of the results.
10.00 - 10.40	Presentation: <b>“How to overcome separation in history teaching”</b> <b>Chair: Mr Dubravko Lovrenovic</b>
10.40 - 11.00	Break
11:00 - 11:40	<b>Common Core Curriculum – the way forward – by Dr. Falk Pingel, Head of OSCE Education Department</b>
11:40 – 13:00	<b>Round table with all participants</b>  <b>topics: where is the new core curriculum now?</b> <b>Main problems in preparing it and implementing it</b> <b>Has the contents thought been reduced?</b> <b>What about new history textbooks?</b>  <b>Discussions</b>
13.00 - 14.00	<b>Plenary session</b>  i. Comments by the three specialists invited by the Council of Europe on the discussions held in the working groups in which they took part ii. Presentation by the Rapporteurs of the conclusions and recommendations of the Seminar based on the discussions in the working groups  Comments by the participants

**Closing speeches of the Seminar by:**

- i. Ms Alison CARDWELL, Head of the History Education Section, Council of Europe;
- ii. Ms Severin MONTINA, Deputy Federal Minister of Education;
- iii. A representative of the Ministry of Education of Republica Srpska;

Departure of the participants



