



Brussels, 17 December 2002
EAC.B.4/PB/pl D(2002)

REPORT ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EUROPEAN LABEL FOR INNOVATIVE PROJECTS IN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND LEARNING 1999-2001

Introduction This document provides an overview of the implementation of the European Label for innovative projects in language teaching and learning by the European Commission, the Member States and EEA countries during 1999-2001. This report, containing general reflections, forms part of a dissemination strategy at European level. Within that strategy a public database will shortly be made available describing all the projects which have received the Label in the past three years.

The document is structured as follows:

- a general introduction to the purposes of the European Label and its history;
- a description of each step of the Label campaign in chronological order (i.e. the call for projects comes before the award ceremony and the dissemination process), providing factual information for each country and each year of implementation. Where relevant, comparable data are shown in a table at the end of every paragraph.

The management of the European Label is decentralised at national level. Data provided in this report are mainly based upon final reports of activities and information materials on the Label that are sent by the participating countries to the Commission every year.

*What is the
European
Label?*

The European Label for innovative projects in language teaching and learning was created following the recommendations of the White Paper (1995, *Teaching and Learning in the knowledge society*, Objective 4: Innovative ways to learn languages). It is intended to highlight and reward local or national innovative initiatives in the field of language teaching and learning as best practice to be further disseminated at European level. The European Label concerns every level of education and training.

Every year (every second year for some smaller countries) a public call for projects (“Label Campaign”) is advertised at national level, to award a “European Label” to current projects showing innovation in language teaching and learning. Projects awarded are selected against common criteria agreed at European level (i.e. innovation, transferability, their European dimension, active involvement of

learners) plus national priorities (i.e. focus on specific foreign languages, learning methodologies, specific target groups or educational sectors). In concrete terms, the European Label consists of a certificate signed by the Commissioner for Education and by the relevant Minister in the participating country, which is awarded during a public ceremony involving the press and bodies who can further disseminate the innovative action. Projects that are awarded the Label can mention the certificate, the year of the award and the Label logo in their current activities.

Up to 2002, only EU Member States and EEA countries had implemented the European Label. As of 2002, the European Label entered a new phase with the opening to pre-accession countries. This brings the number of participating countries up from 18 to 30.

*The Label
implementa-
tion*

The method by which the European Label is implemented was first set up in 1997 by a working group of MS and EEA delegates and the European Commission. 1998 was a pilot year for implementation in the majority of participating countries. An evaluation study reported on that phase and outlined recommendations for the following years, which were taken into account in the subsequent guidelines for implementation. At the end of the pilot phase, on 25 March 1999, a European event was held in Brussels, bringing together projects that had been awarded the Label and national juries. At the same time, a brochure was published to disseminate the achievements of these projects.¹

Between 1999 and 2001 the European Label was implemented regularly by the participating countries. At least once a year the Label working group, composed of the implementing bodies in the participating countries, met in Brussels to exchange information on the national campaigns and fine-tune the implementation. Early in 2000 that group approved the “Guidelines for implementation from January 2001 onwards”², which took into account the recommendations made by the evaluation study and best practices in the participating countries. The guidelines were designed to ensure a common approach across the participating countries without going into detail on implementation strategies or administrative arrangements, as these should be left entirely to the discretion of the countries (“commonality without uniformity”).

The general principles laid down in the guidelines include, among others,:

- the Label is open to general, vocational and adult education;
- the Label is awarded through an open call;
- at least one member of the jury must come from another participating country;

¹ “Stimulating language learning: the European Label” Directorate-General XXII – Education, Training and Youth 1999. <http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/language/label.html>

² “European Label for innovative initiatives in language teaching and learning – Guidelines for implementation from January 2001 onwards”. The guidelines were acted by both Socrates (SOC/COM/00/035) and Leonardo da Vinci (CL/40/2000) Committees

- national priorities may be added to the common European ones;
- the European Commission contributes to the Label by giving a grant and by co-ordinating the exchange of information at European level.

The guidelines set the common European criteria for successful projects. They should:

- be **comprehensive** (learners, teachers, methods and materials involved should contribute to ensuring that the needs of the learners are identified and met);
- provide **added value** in their national context;
- provide **motivation** for learners and/or teachers;
- be **original and creative**;
- have a **European dimension**; and
- be **transferable**.

These rules have already largely been applied by participating countries since 1999, as this report shows.

*National
bodies
implementing
the Label*

There were no substantial changes from the pilot phase in the national bodies implementing the Label: in 6 countries (Belgium - German-speaking Community, Belgium - French Community, Denmark, France, Italy, Spain) the Label was implemented directly by the Ministry of Education. In 10 countries (Austria, Germany, Greece, Finland, Ireland, Norway, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom) the Label was implemented by educational agencies somehow linked to the Ministries of Education or Employment. Those educational agencies already worked in the field of language teaching and learning or innovation in education. In Belgium - Flemish Community and in Iceland the Label was managed by the Socrates National Agency, in Italy, ISFOL, also acting as Leonardo National Agency, managed the Label for the vocational sector. In Germany the Leonardo/Socrates National Agency (BIBB) managed the Label campaign during even years and a regional (Länder) organisation during odd years.

In Belgium - French Community, Iceland, Italy, Germany, Portugal and the United Kingdom, the Label was implemented by a partnership of bodies, which catered for different sectors and/or regions. In Belgium – French Community, the leadership of the partnership was ensured in turn by every member. In Italy the Label was managed in partnership by the Ministries of Education and Employment and by two bodies working in the field of education and vocational training (Scuola Majorana and ISFOL) .

Tabl. – National bodies implementing the Label

Country	Years	Coordinator	Partners
A	1999-2001	Zentrum für Schulentwicklung des Bundesministeriums für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur (Österreichisches Sprachen-Kompetenz-Zentrum)	
B de	2001	Ministerium der Deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft Belgiens	
B fr	2001	Ministère de la Communauté française	CFB; FOREM, Bruxelles Formation
B fr	2000	Bruxelles Formation	Communauté française and Forem.
B fr	1999	Forem (Office Wallon de la Formation professionnelle et de l'Emploi)	Communauté française and Bruxelles Formation
B nl	1999-2001	Socrates NA Vlanderen	
D	1999 / 2001	Staatliches Seminar für Schulpädagogik Tübingen	Sekretariat der Kulturministerkonferenz;
D	2000	BIBB- ; Bildung für Europa – Nationale Agentur beim Bundensinstitut für Berufsbildung	
DK	1999-2001	The National Authority of Education – the Ministry of Education	
E	1999-2000	Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia - Subdirección General de Educación Permanente	
E	2001	Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia -Subdirección General de Programas europeos	
EL	1999-2001	OEEK – Organisation for Vocational Education and Training	
F	1999-2001	Bureau de la valorisation des innovations pédagogiques – Ministère de l'éducation nationale, de la recherche et de la technologie	
FIN	1999-2001	National Board of Education	
I	1999-2001	Ministero della Pubblica Istruzione / Ministero del Lavoro e delle Politiche Sociali	ISFOL, Scuola Media Statale Ettore Majorana
IRL	1999-2001	ITE	
IS	1999-2001	Office of International Education - Socrates NA	Ministry of Education, Science and Culture
L	1999-2001		
LI	1999-2001		
N	1999-2001	National Board of Education	
NL	1999-2001	National Bureau on Modern Languages	
P	1999-2001	Instituto de Inovação Educacional	Direcção-Geral do Emprego e Formação Profissional/Ministério do Trabalho e da Solidariedade
S	1999-2001	National Agency for Education	
UK	1999-2001	CILT- Centre for Information on Language Teaching and Research	Goethe Institut, French Embassy, Instituto Cervantes, BBC, NIACE, DfEE, Mary Glasgow Trust

Recurrence of the Label campaign The majority of countries (12) had a Label Campaign with a call for projects every year, i.e. they had three calls in 1999-2001. Some medium and smaller countries (Belgium – Flemish Community, Belgium – German-speaking Community, Denmark, Ireland) decided to have bi-annual calls, i.e. they had two calls in 1999-2001. In Austria, the year with no call (2001) was devoted to an evaluation of the previous calls and networking activities. Greece had only one call and Luxembourg did not have any Label campaign after 1998. Liechtenstein has not implemented the Label to date.

The jury The Label jury was composed of an average of 10 persons. In most cases, the jury president was a university language teacher/researcher. To ensure the European dimension and facilitate the exchange of practices between countries, jury

presidents were regularly invited to the Label working group meetings.

Every jury had a foreign member who could be a language expert (Austria, Denmark, Germany, Italy), a member of foreign cultural centres and embassies (Austria, Belgium - Flemish Community, Finland, Italy, United Kingdom), or a member of the Label jury of another country (Austria, Belgium – French Community, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden). National members of the jury fell into the following categories: representatives of the relevant ministries (ministries for education, vocational training, employment and social affairs); representatives of the bodies managing the Label; teachers/trainers/inspectors from schools, vocational centres, adult education centres and universities; delegates of language teachers trade unions and associations, social partners, business representatives, regional authorities.

In countries where there was more than one jury, catering for different educational sectors (Italy) or linguistic communities (Belgium), the co-ordination was ensured by the reciprocal participation of the jury president as member of the other jury.

In some countries the jury met before the start of the Label campaign to decide on national priorities and on the schedule of the call for projects. In the majority of countries, the relevant ministries set national priorities and the jury met twice to assess the applications received. Some countries (Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom) had a two-phase selection call with a shortlist mechanism. In this case the final decision was often taken after an *in situ* visit (Denmark, Ireland, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom). In addition to the Label certificate, the juries in Finland, Sweden and the Netherlands decided to assign honorary certificates to projects that did not meet all the criteria required to obtain the Label but which were innovative anyway.

At European level in March 2000, a workshop on assessment grids and selection procedures took place with members of the Label working group. Results were reported to all members. Participants considered that the exchange of practices and templates was helpful. The Commission has ensured a regular exchange of these kinds of documents since then.

National priorities

Each country could decide to add national priorities to the common European criteria set out in the guidelines, and most of them did add national priorities. Some countries, especially the Nordic ones, set priorities directly related to language topics. The most commonly chosen themes were:

- vocationally oriented language learning (Austria, Belgium - Flemish Community, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Spain);
- lifelong language learning (Denmark, Portugal, Sweden);
- diversification of the languages on offer (Austria, Belgium - French Community, Finland, Germany, Italy);
- languages and intercultural awareness (Denmark, Norway, Sweden);
- acquisition of partial skills (the Netherlands, Portugal);
- the use of ICTs in language teaching and learning (the Netherlands, Norway,

Sweden);

- content and language integrated learning – CLIL (Denmark, Sweden);
- early language learning (Portugal, Sweden).

Other countries, especially in Southern Europe, added national priorities related to general features of projects like integrated partnerships between schools, companies and local authorities (Italy, Norway) and involvement of disadvantaged areas and disadvantaged target groups (Spain, Italy, Portugal).

Target groups

The majority of the countries had Label campaigns which were open to a very broad public, embracing primary and secondary schools, and vocational and adult education. In some cases, pre-primary schools (Austria, France, Italy, Sweden) and universities (Austria, Germany, Spain, Finland, Italy) were also targeted, as well as teacher training organisations (Austria, Spain, Norway, Sweden), the business sector (Austria, Belgium - French Community, the Netherlands, Norway), regional and local authorities (Austria, Spain) and private language schools (the Netherlands). Some countries decided to target a different educational sector in each call (Denmark, Germany).

The information campaign

The national bodies used a variety of tools and channels to disseminate information about the Label campaign. According to what was agreed at European level in order to reach a basic common level of information, every country had some printed material (leaflets, information brochures, posters) and web pages. In most of the countries (Austria, Germany, Finland, France, Iceland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Finland, United Kingdom) the information material contained descriptions of projects awarded with the Label in the previous year, so as to give examples and disseminate good practices.

Printed materials were disseminated via direct mailing or e-mailing to eligible organisations (Austria, Belgium - French Community, Germany, France, Finland, the Netherlands, Portugal, Sweden, Iceland, Norway), circular notices to school networks and regional/local authorities (Austria, Belgium – French Community, Italy, Spain, Finland, Iceland) and during language seminars, fairs and training courses for language teachers (Belgium - French Community, Portugal, Finland). Some countries started the Label campaign with the Label award ceremony of the previous year (Germany, United Kingdom), while others had launch/information events connected to other language initiatives, especially during the European Year of languages (Italy, Portugal, Sweden, Belgium – German-speaking Community, Portugal, United Kingdom, Iceland).

Other tools of information used were: advertisements and press releases for the national and regional press and television (Austria, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Portugal, Iceland, Norway), advertisements and articles in paper and web magazines and bulletins for schools, vocational and adult education institutions, social partners and language teachers (Sweden, Germany, Finland, Norway, Iceland, Austria), publication in the national official journal (Spain) and posters (Norway, Italy).

Apart from Belgium - Flemish Community and Greece, all the countries had a national Label website that was used for information purposes and interlinked to relevant educational sites. Sometimes the application form was directly downloadable from the website (Belgium – French Community, Italy, Austria,

Germany, Portugal, United Kingdom).

Number of applications received, number of labels awarded

According to the Guidelines the Label was attributed via open calls for proposals, sometimes with a shortlist mechanism (see “the jury” paragraph above).

Data show a decreasing trend of the received applications in most countries, except some bigger ones (United Kingdom, Italy, France) and Austria. In 2001, in particular, the numbers of applications decreased significantly. For this reason, some countries³ were considering a shift to bi-annual Label campaigns to ensure the sustainability of the initiative. It should be noted, though, that 2001 may have been an exceptional year. One might have expected that during the European Year of Languages there would have been more applications for the Label, but it seems there was a “competition effect” between the initiatives and projects undertaken in the framework of the EYL and the Label, which received less attention.

As for the Labels that have been awarded, the guidelines state that “each participating country will determine the number of Labels it shall award in any given year, taking account of the need to keep this number within reasonable limits in order to maintain the prestige of the award”. Different strategies were applied to comply with this: some countries set out in advance the maximum number of Labels they wanted to award (Germany, Austria, Italy, Norway), others (the Netherlands, Sweden, Finland) gave few Label certificates and also had honorary certificates for innovative projects that could not meet all the Label criteria.

All in all, the selection rate has been quite severe, with nearly a sixth of the submitted applications receiving awards. Nevertheless, in the past three years, 300 labels have been awarded all over Europe.

Tab.2. – Number of applications received

Years	A	B	D	DK	E	EL	F	FIN	I	IRL	IS	N	NL	P	S	UK	Total
1999	77	63	50	5	51		33	40	180	17	12	15	25	18	58	64	708
2000	90	25	71		24	17	3	24	225	0	4	3	14	20	63	99	682
2001		30	27	1	19		22	24	300	15	4	5	12	5	25		489
Total	167	118	148	6	94	17	58	88	705	32	20	23	51	43	146	163	1879

Tab.3. – Number of Labels awarded

	A	B	D	DK	E	F	FIN	I	IRL	IS	N	NL	P	S	UK	Total
1999	14	9	6	3	5	31	3	20	9	3	2	5	2	5	12	129
2000	13	6	9		5	3	1	17		1	1	4	2	4	15	81
2001		10	6	1	4	21	3	20	5	1	1	3		3	12	90
Total	27	25	21	4	14	55	7	57	14	5	4	12	4	12	39	300

³ See minutes of the meeting held on 6/12/2001 of the Label working group.

As stated in the guidelines, the Label campaign may cover a calendar year or an academic year, but the Label ceremony should be held between September and November, so as to bring all participating countries into line and have comparable data at the same time. Apart from Ireland and Belgium - German-speaking Community and French Community, all participating countries awarded the Labels in a public ceremony held between September and December in the year of the Label call. Some countries (Finland, Norway) brought their schedule into line during the period under consideration.

In most cases, the Label certificates were awarded by the relevant Minister (or by his/her representative) of Education, Employment or Vocational Training, according to the governmental structure of each country, in a national ceremony to which multipliers were invited (teachers' associations and trade unions, headmasters, teachers and trainers, educational staff, local/regional authorities) and which attracted some media coverage. Sometimes the Label ceremony took place as part of seminars about innovation in language teaching and learning (Germany, Italy). During 2001, the European Year of Languages (EYL), some countries combined the Label ceremony with a EYL event (the Day of Languages in the United Kingdom, the EYL conference in Sweden and in the Netherlands). To strengthen the European dimension of the Label, some countries held the Label ceremony in a foreign embassy (United Kingdom) or in the European Commission Office in the country (Germany).

National Label ceremonies took place at the end of every call in all countries except France, where in 2000 Labels were awarded at regional level by directors of the "académies" network, and Denmark, where Label ceremonies took place locally in the city of the projects receiving awards. Local/regional environment should not be neglected, even though a national event is often necessary to ensure a better dissemination of the results of initiatives that have received awards.

Tab.4. – Timetable of the Label ceremony

Country	Years	Label event
A	1999-2000	December
B de	2001	Spring 2002
B fr	1999-2001	November
B nl	1999-2001	December / January 2002
D	1999-2001	November or December
DK	1999 / 2001	September (for 1999), subsequently November
E	1999-2001	December
EL		
F	1999-2001	November
FIN	1999-2001	January 2000 (for 1999), subsequently November / December
I	1999-2001	November/December
IRL	1999-2001	January
IS	1999-2001	October/November
L		
LI		
N	1999-2001	February 2001 (2000), December 2001
NL	1999-2001	December
P	1999-2001	December/January
S	1999-2001	October/December
UK	1999-2001	September

*other
national
incentives*

Ireland, Sweden, the Netherlands, United Kingdom), a financial prize was given to successful projects every year or only during some Label campaign: the amount of the prize could vary from 1000 Swedish crowns (110 EUR) to 1000 British pounds. The prize was made available by private sponsors (language foundations, publishers) or by the state.

In other countries, successful projects received some language tool like dictionaries or language books (Iceland, Belgium - German-speaking Community), or a symbolic gift like artistic plates (Belgium – French Community). Denmark gave successful projects free publicity via the Ministry's website.

Even though a financial prize may play a role in raising interest in applying for the European Label, other incentives also worked effectively, such as free publicity for the successful school, or receiving recognition for teachers, trainers or headmasters involved in projects.

*Educational
sectors of the
successful
projects*

Coming to the educational sectors covered by the selected projects, the most striking data, in spite of some national differences, is the massive presence of secondary education establishments, which account for more than half of the selected projects. If we sort the educational sectors by age group, thus putting together secondary education and initial vocational training the numbers are even more striking. All in all, the age group of 13-18 years old has by far the highest participation rate in projects that have been awarded the Label.

Looking at the other sectors and age groups, primary and pre-primary schools come second. Adult education and continuous vocational training are fairly well represented, while teacher training, tertiary education and universities are at the bottom of the scale.

If we abstract from the peculiarities of every sector and country and look for some global explanation for those participation rates, we may fairly assume that the spread of successful projects across the educational sectors is mainly dependent on three factors (in decreasing order of importance) :

1. Degree of language provision in the different educational sectors;
2. National priorities, which may have excluded a priori some sector in a given year
3. Efficiency of the information campaign / varying success rate in reaching a given educational sector

Secondary schools were a privileged target because languages are mostly taught at this level in all participating countries. All Label campaigns targeted secondary schools, while other sectors were not equally targeted (i.e. vocational and adult education in France) or were not targeted every year (i.e. Denmark); secondary schools are also strongly networked and easier to reach by a central information point, while primary, vocational and adult education are more often decentralised at regional/local level. Initial vocational education follows a similar pattern.

The fact that primary schools come second is very interesting. Language provision at primary level is increasing but is still far from being widespread. The relatively high presence of primary schools receiving the Label shows that, on the one hand this is considered a strategic development area at national level (national priorities, targeted information campaign), while on the other hand, primary schools are on

average more innovative at language teaching. Primary school projects receiving the Label usually operated in a flexible environment, with no curriculum constraints, emphasising the play dimension of language learning and awareness of other cultures. Their projects may be a reservoir of innovative ideas to tap into when introducing language learning in primary schools. Pre-primary schools were targeted only by a few countries (B,F,I,IRL,UK) and they follow the same trend as primary schools.

While adult education and continuous vocational training cater for a remarkably large part of language provision, those sectors have not been equally targeted and awarded in every country, probably because they are harder to reach. By nature more fragmented, locally rooted, not so connected to mainstream education, they often do not deliver official certifications (non-formal). Nevertheless, a number of adult education and continuous vocational training projects were awarded with the Label and they were highly innovative, especially in matching local language needs by mobilising unconventional resources (i.e. partnerships with cultural associations, the business community, migrants, minority organisations, etc.). If we look at the distribution pattern by country, we discover that countries who covered those sectors better (D, DK, E,I,IRL,UK) had targeted them as a national priority and their information campaigns were better attuned to that public.

The involvement of teacher training organisations is patchy: only some countries targeted them. The presence of universities and tertiary education establishments although not negligible, does not reflect the extent of their language provision. They may have suffered from less attention at national level (no national priorities) or, possibly, less innovative practices come from those sectors. This question deserves further attention.

Tab.5. – Establishments involved in successful Label projects between 1999 and 2001 by educational sector

	A	B	D	DK	E	F	FIN	I	IRL	IS	N	NL	P	S	UK	Total
Secondary	18	11	16	2	7	45	3	35	3	3	4	6	1	6	27	186
Primary	3	11	1	0	3	6	3	11	3	0	0	1	1	5	10	57
Initial vocational training	9	0	7	1	2	10	1	7	2	1	0	4	0	0	3	47
Adult education	6	5	3	1	1	0	0	13	3	2	3	0	0	1	7	44
Teacher training	7	2	2	0	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	21
Tertiary education	1	3	0	0	2	4	0	5	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	18
Continuous vocational training	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	15
Pre-Primary	0	6	0	0	0	2	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	12
University	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	8
Total	45	38	33	6	23	70	9	75	16	7	7	16	4	12	51	408

Target languages of the successful projects. Official languages

Taking into account that one of the objectives of the Label is the diversification of the language offer, there is room for both positive and negative remarks. On the one hand, English comes first but the other four big languages (FR,DE,IT,ES) score well and are proportionally better represented according to their language offer in national curricula. On the other hand, the situation of less widely used and taught languages (LWULT) is less optimistic: all the official languages are represented (except Icelandic) but in very small numbers. One possible reason may be the restricted range of languages offered in the curricula and for which language teachers were available, particularly as more than half of awarded projects came

from secondary and vocational education. The successful projects targeting LWULT may provide inspiration for similar initiatives in other countries to make the most of existing resources to broad the supply of languages taught.

Another interesting feature is the significant evidence in most countries of the national language being taught as second language for migrant populations.

Tab.6. – Official languages targeted by the projects that have been awarded the Label by country

	A	B	D	DK	E	F	FIN	I	IRL	IS	N	NL	P	S	UK	Total
EN	23	11	14	4	14	30	4	45	1	1	2	8	0	12	1	170
FR	11	12	13	0	7	0	5	20	4	2	0	7	2	0	29	112
DE	4	12	8	2	6	22	5	13	4	1	0	7	1	0	17	102
ES	5	4	11	0	13	15	2	7	5	1	0	3	1	0	18	85
Others	14	1	11	0	5	1	2	5	4	0	1	2	0	0	18	66
IT	10	3	6	0	6	4	1	6	1	0	0	1	0	0	11	49
NL	0	16	4	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	27
SV	0	0	2	0	1	0	5	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	11
PT	0	0	2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1	10
DA	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	10
FI	0	0	2	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	9
GA	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	2	8
EL	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5
NO	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	5
LU	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
IS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Target languages of the successful projects. Other languages

An interesting observation arises from the range of “other” (i.e. non official) languages targeted by the successful projects. First comes Russian, followed by other Eastern neighbouring languages (Czech, Polish, Croatian, Hungarian, Slovenian). Migrant languages are also present (Arabic, Urdu, Chinese, Turkish) although only in some countries (mainly UK, D, A). Some projects targeted sign languages (A, IRL) and regional and minority languages (Catalan, Friulan, Occitan, Romany, Sami).

Tab.7. – Other languages targeted by the projects that have been awarded the Label by country (detail of the column “Others” of Tab.6)

	A	B	D	DK	E	F	FIN	I	IRL	IS	N	NL	P	S	UK	Total
Russian	1		1		1		2	1				2			1	9
CZ	3		2													5
Arabic					1										3	4
PL			4													4
Urdu															4	4
Croatian	3															3
HU	1		1					1								3
Latin		1	2													3
SL	2				1											3
Bengali															2	2
Chinese															2	2
Gujarati															2	2
Japanese															2	2
Sign language	1								1							2
Turkish	1		1													2
BG					1											1
Catalan								1								1
Farsi									1							1
Friulano								1								1
Hindi															1	1
Occitan						1										1
Punjabi															1	1
RO									1							1
Romany	1															1
Sami											1					1
Sardinian								1								1
Serbo- Croat									1							1
SK					1											1
Somali															1	1
Swahili															1	1
Ukrainian	1															1
Total	14	1	11	0	5	1	2	5	4	0	1	2	0	0	20	66

Content and methodology elements of the successful projects

This key section provides evidence of the themes and methodologies appearing at grass roots level and considered innovative enough to deserve a Label in the participating countries. It highlights common features of the language policy agendas in Member States.

At first sight, one is struck by the wealth of themes and activities to which the European Label is awarded. The very essence of the Label initiative is to highlight innovation in language teaching and learning, targeted mainly at process innovation, regardless of the environment in which it takes place or the tools/methods that are used. The thematic clusters (see Tab. 8 and 9), elaborated with the help of the Label working group, attempt to reflect this variety.

The most common feature, which cuts across all educational sectors, is that of intercultural awareness in language learning. This cluster brings together a wide range of activities aimed at complementing traditional language teaching with cultural aspects of the language targeted. This is followed by technology-enhanced language learning (TELL), quality of language teaching and exchanges, which are the main themes of secondary schools, and initial vocational training. Content and language integrated learning (CLIL) is well represented in all the compulsory education sectors along with the diversification of the languages on offer. We find similar topics in the teacher training sector. Some absences may be noted too, such as diversification of the languages on offer at university level, although the sample is quite restricted.

Social exclusion – the question of disadvantaged learners is a separate issue which cuts across the sectors, with a particular emphasis on continuous vocational training and adult education.

Tab.8. – Main themes and methodologies of the projects that have been awarded the Label by country⁴

	A	B	D	DK	E	F	FIN	I	IRL	IS	N	NL	P	S	UK	Total
Intercultural awareness (any language)	10	6	5	2	5	22	5	5	2	1	3	0	2	3	18	89
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	2	2	7	1	4	23	1	14	3	3	1	4	0	2	11	78
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	8	3	4	1	5	8	2	18	0	2	0	0	0	1	10	62
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	8	6	6	0	3	26	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	61
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	6	9	9	2	3	8	0	11	3	0	0	3	0	6	0	60
VOLL - Vocationally oriented language learning	9	0	10	2	0	9	0	5	2	1	1	3	0	0	8	50
Early language learning	3	5	1	0	3	4	1	11	3	0	0	1	1	0	6	39
Teaching of a second language	4	2	0	0	1	0	0	25	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	38
Lifelong language learning	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	22	35
Diversification of the languages on offer	7	2	2	0	0	9	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	29
Multilingual comprehension	2	1	7	1	2	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	29
Learning games	0	7	1	0	3	8	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	3	24
Cultural awareness of regional/minority languages	6	0	0	0	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	0	2	1	3	19
Languages for mobility	5	0	3	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	19
Informal language learning	1	1	1	0	2	4	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	18
Acquisition of partial language skills	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	17
Social exclusion - disadvantaged learners	0	2	2	0	1	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	4	15
ODL - Open and distance learning	1	1	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	10
Cultural awareness of migrant languages	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4
Disabilities and language learning	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	4

⁴ Every project can be listed with a maximum of three themes

Tab.9. – Main themes and methodologies of the projects receiving the Label by educational sector

A. Pre-Primary

Early language learning	7
Learning games	3
Intercultural awareness (any language)	2
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	1
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	1
Lifelong language learning	1
Disabilities and language learning	1

B. Primary

Early language learning	28
Intercultural awareness (any language)	20
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	9
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	8
TELL – Technology enhanced language learning	7
Learning games	6
Teaching of a second language	6
Cultural awareness of regional/minority languages	5
Diversification of the languages on offer	4
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	3
Lifelong language learning	3
Multilingual comprehension	3
Cultural awareness of migrant languages	2
Social exclusion - disadvantaged learners	1
Informal language learning	1
Disabilities and language learning	1

C. Secondary

Intercultural awareness (any language)	57
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	54
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	42
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	39
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	32
Teaching of a second language	29
Diversification of the languages on offer	23
Multilingual comprehension	22
Lifelong language learning	15
VOLL - Vocationally oriented language learning	15
Learning games	13
Informal language learning	12
Acquisition of partial language skills	10
Cultural awareness of regional/minority languages	9
Languages for mobility	8
Social exclusion - disadvantaged learners	7
Early language learning	4
ODL - Open and distance learning	3
Cultural awareness of migrant languages	1
Disabilities and language learning	1

D. Initial vocational training

VOLL - Vocationally oriented language learning	22
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	9
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	7
Languages for mobility	7
Informal language learning	6
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	6
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	5
Cultural awareness of regional/minority languages	3
Multilingual comprehension	3
Social exclusion - disadvantaged learners	3
Acquisition of partial language skills	2
Diversification of the languages on offer	1
Learning games	1
Lifelong language learning	1
ODL - Open and distance learning	1

E. Tertiary education

CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	3
VOLL - Vocationally oriented language learning	3
Acquisition of partial language skills	2
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	2
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	2
Diversification of the languages on offer	1
Informal language learning	1
Languages for mobility	1
Lifelong language learning	1
Multilingual comprehension	1
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	1

F. University

Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	3
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	2
ODL - Open and distance learning	2
Cultural awareness of regional/minority languages	1
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	1
Informal language learning	1
Intercultural awareness (any language)	1
Learning games	1
Lifelong language learning	1
Teaching of a second language	1
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	1

G. Teacher training

Intercultural awareness (any language)	5
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	5
TELL – Technology enhanced language learning	3
Exchanges (virtual, physical)	3
Teaching of a second language	2
Early language learning	1
CLIL – Content and language integrated learning	1
Multilingual comprehension	1
VOLL – Vocationally oriented language learning	1
Lifelong language learning	1
Languages for mobility	1
Cultural awareness of regional/minority languages	1

H. Continuous vocational training

VOLL - Vocationally oriented language learning	6
Lifelong language learning	3
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	3
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	2
Multilingual comprehension	2

Intercultural awareness (any language)	1
Languages for mobility	1
ODL - Open and distance learning	1
Social exclusion - disadvantaged learners	1

I. Adult education

Lifelong language learning	9
CLIL - Content and language integrated learning	4
Intercultural awareness (any language)	4
TELL - Technology enhanced language learning	4
VOLL - Vocationally oriented language learning	4
Acquisition of partial language skills	3
Informal language learning	3
ODL - Open and distance learning	3
Social exclusion - disadvantaged learners	3
Cultural awareness of migrant languages	1
Disabilities and language learning	1
Early language learning	1
Languages for mobility	1
Multilingual comprehension	1
Raising the quality of language teaching/learning	1

The dissemination of information on the successful projects

Projects that were awarded the Label had some media coverage, even though many national implementing bodies reported difficulties in attracting the attention of the media. Local and specialist newspapers and TV stations seemed more receptive than the national press. Press releases for the Label ceremony and articles were the most used means. In Norway and Iceland, the TV interviewed successful projects.

The implementing bodies ensured a durable dissemination of the project results. The majority of countries published paper brochures with descriptions of the successful projects and gave them out during the subsequent Label campaigns. Those brochures were often downloadable from the Label website (Austria, Germany, Italy, United Kingdom). Alternatively, ad hoc project descriptions were provided on the website (Austria, France, Norway, Finland, Germany, Portugal, Sweden, Denmark, Iceland). Italy produced a CD-ROM that allowed more space to be devoted to the methodology used by projects, France asked successful projects to write an article on their innovative methods, while Norway disseminated project results through the European Schoolnet and other virtual networks of schools and teachers.

Evaluation and monitoring

After some years of implementation, some countries decided to undergo an evaluation of the Label campaigns. Austria contracted out in 2001 the evaluation of the previous campaigns with a view to tracking innovation in educational establishments; Portugal, Spain and Sweden had evaluation sessions with the jury every year, while Italy emphasised the monitoring of projects awarded with the Label to see how they evolve over time.

The European website and the European event

The European Commission made available some webpages on the European Label on the Europa site (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/language/label.html>), linked to the website on language teaching and learning in Europe (<http://europa.eu.int/comm/education/languages/lang/languagelearning.html>). The European Label pages provided basic information on the main features and

objectives of the Label, and the catalogue of projects awarded in 1998 was also downloadable. The site was conceived as an entry point to national websites, it was ensured that national contact details and pages were updated to guarantee effective communication. A database of awarded projects during 1999-2001 would be made available there as a result of this report.

To date, except for the pilot phase, no European event to gather projects awarded at national level has taken place, mainly due to lack of resources because of the implementation of the European Year of Languages. This was regretted by the national implementing bodies, which found that the European event could boost the motivation of projects and give a more concrete European dimension to the Label award. Furthermore, such an event could raise the visibility of the Label and disseminate at European level the store of innovation offered by the successful projects. A European event has been planned for early 2003, gathering together a selection of successful projects

Conclusions In the short term, the Label has met its objectives, awarding nationally or regionally based activities to raise them to the “European scene” and acting as a “catalyst” for other national language initiatives. In some countries, the link between the Label and national projects for diversification of languages (i.e. Finland) has been proven to work effectively to raise the profile of both national and European initiatives.

In the long term, there are concerns about the general sustainability of the Label initiative. The risk is that it will gradually run out of innovative activities year after year, especially in smaller countries, unless one or two common European priorities are set every year.

The coming years should bring great opportunities for dissemination of the European Label projects: language learning is in the spotlight after the European Year of Languages (2001) and because of the European and national debates on languages (*Lisbon conclusions*, the *Detailed work programme on the follow-up of the objectives of education and training systems in Europe*⁵). At European level, the Label results will feed into reflections on language policy in Europe and in particular into the Action Plan on language learning and linguistic diversity. At national level, Member States have committed themselves to raise quality standards in language teaching through setting indicators and benchmarks and identifying good practices: the Label provides a wealth of innovative ideas and good practices from which to take inspiration.

Last but not least, the extension of the Label to the pre-accession countries in 2002 will provide new inputs and a larger platform for disseminating its results.

Contact:

Patrizia BARALLI, Telephone:(32-2) 2994633, Fax:(32-2) 2996321,
patrizia.baralli@cec.eu.int

⁵ <http://ue.eu.int/newsroom/related.asp?BID=75&GRP=4280&LANG=1>