



Study visit group report

Group No	24
Title of the visit	How to develop the European Dimension through the Curriculum
Topic	Language teaching and learning
City, country	Vienna, Austria
Type of visit	General Education
Dates of visit	17. – 21. 5.2010
Group reporter	

Dear participants,

The purpose of a study visit is to generate an exchange of experience and good practice between the country you visit and the countries you all come from. Thus, participating in a study visit can be an exciting experience and an important learning tool for you.

During the visit you are invited to prepare a group report summarising your discussions and learning. This will help Cedefop disseminate what you have learnt to others, who share your interest but did not participate in this particular study visit.

On the first day of the visit, you are to select a reporter who will be responsible for preparing the final report and submitting it to Cedefop. Everybody should contribute to the report by sharing their views, knowledge, and practices in their respective countries. Please start working on the report from the first day of the visit.

You will, of course, be taking your own notes during presentations and field visits; but the group report should highlight the result of the group's reflections on what was seen and learnt during the entire visit and the different perspectives brought by the different countries and participants. The report should **NOT** read as a travel diary, describing every day and every session or visit.

Cedefop will publish extracts of your reports on its website and make them available to experts in education and vocational training. When writing the report, please keep this readership in mind: make your report clear, interesting, and detailed enough to be useful to colleagues throughout Europe.

By attaching any photos to the report, you agree to Cedefop's right to use them in its publications on study visits and on its website.

Please prepare the report in the working language of the group.
Please do not include the programme or list of participants.

I. Findings

This section summarises the findings of the group while visiting host institutions, discussing issues with the hosts and within the group. You will be reflecting on what you learnt every day. But to put them together and give an overall picture, you need to devote a special session to prepare the final report on the last day of the visit.

In this section, it is important that you describe not only things you learnt about the host country but also what you learnt about the countries represented by group members.

1. One of the objectives of the study visits programme is to exchange examples of good practice among hosts and participants. Cedefop will select well-described projects/programmes/initiatives and disseminate them to former participants and a wider public, including potential partners for future projects. Therefore it is important that you identify and describe all aspects that, in your view, make these projects/programmes/initiatives successful and worth exploring.

Describe each of the good practices you learnt about during the visit (both from the hosts and from one another) indicating the following:

title of the project/programme/initiative	country	name of the institution that implements it (if possible, provide a website)	contact person (if possible) who presented the programme to the group	whom the project/programme/initiative addresses	what features of the project/programme/initiative make it an example of good practice
Modern language instruction policy	France	Ministère de L'Education Nationale www.education.gouv.fr	Angela Blazy angela.blazy@ac-clermont.fr Marie-Pierre Degeorges marie-pierre.degeorges@wanadoo.fr	All school learners in France	Use of CLIL in language instruction (in middle and upper and vocational schools) Plans for language instruction from grade 1
Global Education Primary Programme	Vienna, Austria	Global Education Primary School Zeltgasse 7 tel.:01/406 88 80-111	Dir. Peter Siebert	German speakers/diverse backgrounds with no prior exposure to English	Astute integration of co-teaching in instruction – a native speaker of English is paired with a German-speaking colleague one hour per day
Dual Language Programme	Vienna, Austria		Stuart Simpson, stuart.simpso	German speakers/diverse	CLIL but not just English, also the languages of neighbouring countries, for

			n@ssr-wien.gv.at	backgrounds with no prior exposure to English	example, Hungarian, Czech, & Slovak. Flexibility in terms of periods of time involved and subject matter.
European Regional College	Vienna, Austria	www.edgate.eu.com	Stuart Simpson, stuart.simpson@ssr-wien.gv.at	German speakers/ diverse backgrounds	Celebration of diversity, given a certificate upon completion, concept of regional learning/international understanding, focus on mobility of communication and interaction
NESSIE Native English Speaker Support in Education	Vienna, Austria		Stuart Simpson, stuart.simpson@ssr-wien.gv.at	German speakers/ diverse backgrounds	Native speaker works with grade 4 pupils at various schools for a week at a time 1. Making friends 2. The world around us
European Studies Programme	Vienna, Austria	European Middle School 1070 Neustiftgasse 100	Christine Schiller	German speakers /diverse backgrounds/ special needs (19 mother tongues & 25 special needs)	European studies: 6 hrs. per week in English, a mixture of biology, history, culture, art, music. Every unit ends with a presentation for parents and for other classes. History books are supposed to encompass multiple viewpoints – checked by an expert committee from neighbouring countries
Language instruction	Lodz, Poland (& France)		Lukasz Gaszewski; l_gaszewski@02.pl	Polish (& in France, French pupils)	Senior secondary schools: screening of language pupils, placement in small (10-15 pupils) skill level groups.
European studies in Portugal	Portugal		Filomena Santos Antonio; filomena.antonio@ciejdt	Portuguese pupils.	EU issues are inbedded in the centralized curriculum in history, geography, and language instruction. Schools have flexibility especially in curricular enrichment areas e.g. English, sports, music, arts, chosen by the schools.
	Denmark		Conrad Kisch; Conrad.kisch@ofir.dk		Tertiary education is completely free – no fees. All students aged 18 and over receive gov't. Stipends of approximately 500 € per month.
	France, Austria				Teachers in primary and lower secondary school are paid by the state and not by local authorities. Local authorities not tempted to save money by not hiring teachers.

* You can describe as many good practices as you find necessary. You can add rows to the table.

2. The study visits programme aims to promote and support policy development and cooperation in lifelong learning. That is why it is important to know what you learnt about such policies and their implementation during your visit. You are invited to describe your findings concerning the following:

2.1. Approaches taken by participating countries (both host and participants') regarding the theme of the visit. Are there any similar approaches/measures in participating countries? What aspects are similar and why? What aspects are different and why?

Common approaches:

- Common European Framework is used as standard measure of competences;
- Each countries seems to consider the command of foreign languages as a key competence;
- In most countries English is considered as the most important foreign language;
- The countries try to teach two foreign languages, one at least to the A2-level at the end of compulsory schooling;
- Almost all countries try to work on CLIL-programs;
- Each country considers self-assessment (+ teachers' and parents' assessment) as an important tool.
- Transparency of aims/outcomes seems to become more important (e.g. parents have access to information about standards etc.)
- The first foreign language is usually started no later than for 8-year-olds

Differences:

- There are differences in the length of compulsory schooling;
- The variety of second foreign languages differs;
- The popularity of the foreign languages differs (e.g. Italian is very popular in some regions of France, Latin is very popular in Germany as the second foreign language);
- The progress in CLIL programs differs from country to country; the same goes for the involvement of native speakers in teaching
- Teachers are paid very differently in the various states
- Nursery school is not always compulsory

2.2. Challenges faced by participating countries (including host) in their efforts to implement policies related to the theme of the visit. What are the challenges? Are they common challenges? If so, why? If not, why not?

Challenges:

- Are there enough teachers who are qualified in language teaching and teaching a certain subject?
- Are the teachers familiar with the necessary methods?
- Funding is a big challenge everywhere because the programs can be costly;
- The authorities are not always as supportive as they should be???
- More European projects are desirable;
- Money invested in education can help the societies (Vienna example/10th district → about 50% of the municipality's money is given to the schools);

- Supporting a school community independent of the students' cultural backgrounds is important → this is intended to make the community safer
- The combination of vocational training and language training seems to make sense
- Hands-on work (at school as well as in internship) can be very important for the individual student to detect and develop skills/competences; also it is a good way to check the future career plans → the students can develop a better awareness concerning their future
- CERNET-materials should be used more

2.3. Name and describe effective and innovative solutions you have identified that participating countries (both host and participants) apply to address the challenges mentioned in question 2.2. Please mention specific country examples.

- A very positive approach is the Vienna model of working with the neighbour countries' languages, students, staff as well as the IRC program (e.g. the idea of sending students to the neighbour countries to experience the neighbors' cultures)
- The idea to educate the Vienna students with the aim/philosophy of creating a peaceful society.
- Other countries should use their potentials (e.g. migrant cultures or border countries) to start innovative projects. Each country must consider/find out the specific conditions of the different societies.
- A common challenge is the shortage of money and the discussion as to how to define priorities.
- The implementation of team teaching would be supportive.
- A common challenge is the definition of the position native speakers could have in the national school systems.
- The way of integrating students with special needs is a common challenge, the way it was presented at the EMS/Vienna seemed to be very positive. It was extremely impressive that the special needs students were not automatically excluded from foreign language learning or European classes.

2.4. Assessment of the transferability of policies and practices. Could any examples of good practice presented in this report be applied and transferred to other countries? If so, why? If not, why not?

3. Creating networks of experts, building partnerships for future projects is another important objective of the study visit programme.

Please state whether and which ideas for future cooperation have evolved during meetings and discussions.

We have tackled this aspect in two different ways:

- Focusing it on the side of the group having undergone the same experience here. We will keep in contact mainly by **electronic mail** which is the most common and quick way to communicate. In order not to bother Martha so much we can e-mail our own **presentation** to the rest of the people. We might also share **impressions** about the study visit and exchange **pictures** of the study visit;
- Regarding responsible people for education in our home countries, we will prepare a **route sheet** in which we will describe the activities during this week together with the purpose of the visit and a thorough view of the educative system in Austria. We will explain the visit to them through a **pps presentation** which is more prompting for those who are interesting in contacting European Schools and sharing knowledge and materials;
- Considering the educative centres which are the ultimate reason we have come to Vienna for, we will also disseminate the experience we've gone through **informal direct talks** to other teachers who we think might be interested in applying for different kinds of partnerships with European schools;

In order to have all these issues tied up, we propose creating a logo and/or **blog called E2 : EUREKA: EUROPA!** in the net, which is not difficult. Our motto would be "borderless education and training" and our logo would be Within it we will be able to fill in a **chart** (each one will have its own space) in which we might briefly write down the main characteristics of bilingual schools in our countries. We are working on a table in which we could mention: model, application, CLIL methodology, number of pupils per class; human resources, material resources, language assistant, contact with a European country... Each country will have its own space to insert any kind of information regarding their bilingual educational system. Any other country could of course be included afterwards. Any idea concerning different types of partnerships will be welcome: e-twinning, Comenius, Comenius Regio, Grundtvig and Leonardo Da Vinci.

TO SUM UP:

4. What is the most interesting/useful information that the group believes should be communicated to others? To whom, do you think, this information will be of most interest?

--

1. 1. We believe that there are different useful kinds of information to be communicated to others. We may start talking about the use of the CEF for learning foreign languages in most European countries using the common system of competence-based evaluation. The system evaluates the competences that students acquire at the end of each learning level. We also think that a similar system should be applied for other subjects as well.
2. The European Qualification Framework (EQF) is used in some European countries in vocational training and it is extremely important as it opens up new opportunities, giving students perspectives that learners might never encounter otherwise.
3. We emphasize the importance of native teachers in different European educational systems. But sometimes it is not easy for them to work in another country for political and/or administrative reasons. Otherwise their mobility could be easier. It is essential to strengthen the network of mobility of both students and teachers.
4. It is very important that there are two teachers in a language class at the same time: one speaking the foreign language, the other the mother tongue of the students.
5. Acting in a foreign language is a good technique for students to learn the language better.
6. Whenever there are minority students talking in different European languages, it should be useful for all the learners that the minority language should be taught to all the class by the native teacher.

Integration should not be limited to learning the language of the country in which immigrant children are staying, but it should include the knowledge about country's culture, traditions, customs, history etc., as well as of the countries from which the children are from.

II. Organisation of the visit

This part of the report will not be published but it will be made available to the organiser and will be used by national agencies and Cedefop to monitor and improve implementation of the study visits programme.

We recognise the value of ongoing feedback as a way of ensuring that the programme is at all times a responsive and dynamic initiative, meeting the needs of its various participants and target audiences. In this section you are invited to give us your feedback on several factors that, in our opinion, contribute to an effective visit.

1. Discuss within the group and check if you agree or disagree with the following statements. Please mark only **one** box () that expresses most closely the opinion of the entire group. Please use Question 2 of this section to elaborate on your responses, if needed.

		All agree	Most agree	Most disagree	All disagree	Not applicable
e.g.	The size of the group was good.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.1.	The programme of the visit followed the description in the catalogue.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2.	There was a balance between theoretical and practical sessions.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3.	Presentations and field visits were linked in a coherent and complementary manner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.	The topic was presented from the perspectives of the following actors of the education and training system in the host country:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.1.	- government and policy-makers	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.2.	- social partners	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
1.4.3.	- heads of institutions	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.4.	- teachers and trainers	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.5.	- students/trainees	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.4.6.	- users of services	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X
1.5.	There was enough time allocated to participants' presentations.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.6.	The background documentation on the theme provided before the visit helped to prepare for the visit.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.7.	Most of the group received a programme well in advance.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.8.	The information provided before the visit about transportation and accommodation was useful.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

		All agree	Most agree	Most disagree	All disagree	Not applicable
1.9.	The organiser accompanied the group during the entire programme.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.10.	The size of the group was appropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.11.	The group comprised a good mixture of participants with diverse professional backgrounds.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.12.	There were enough opportunities for interaction with representatives of the host organisations.	X	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.13.	There was enough time allocated for discussion within the group.	<input type="checkbox"/>	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.14.	The Cedefop study visits website provided information that helped to prepare for the visit.	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

2. If you have any comments on the items 1.1. – 1.14 above, please write them in the box below.

E-mail connexion among participants before coming to the visit;
Pinpoint key points beforehand;
Internet connexion has been missed;

III. Summary

1. Having summarised all your reflections and impressions, please indicate how satisfied you are with your participation in the study visit. **Indicate the number of participants for each category, e.g.**

Very satisfied

Very satisfied

Satisfied

Somewhat satisfied

Not satisfied

Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied

2. What elements and aspects of the study visits do you think could be changed or improved?

E-mail connexion among participants before coming to the visit;
Pinpoint key points beforehand;
Internet connexion has been missed;

3. If there is anything else you would like to write about that is not included in the above questions, please feel free to write below or attach a separate sheet.

Thank you!

Please submit the report to Cedefop (studyvisits@cedefop.europa.eu) **within one month** after the visit.