



**Project Title: TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED
LANGUAGE LEARNING PEDAGOGY (TELLP)**

**Project Number: 134244-2007-UK-COMENIUS-
CMP**

**Sub-programme or KA: COMENIUS
MULTILATERAL PROJECTS**

Progress/Final Report

Public Part

Project information

Project acronym: TELLP

Project title: **TECHNOLOGY-ENHANCED LANGUAGE LEARNING PEDAGOGY (TELLP)**

Project number: **134244-2007-UK-COMENIUS-CMP**

Sub-programme or KA: **COMENIUS MULTILATERAL PROJECTS**

Project website: www.tellp.org

Reporting period: From 1/11/2007
To 31/10/2009

Report version: Final

Date of preparation: 15 January 2010

Beneficiary organisation: Manchester Metropolitan University

Project coordinator: Dr Gee Macrory

Project coordinator organisation: Manchester Metropolitan University

Project coordinator telephone number: 0161 247 2337

Project coordinator email address: g.macrory@mmu.ac.uk

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission.

This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

© 2008 Copyright Education, Audiovisual & Culture Executive Agency.

The document may be freely copied and distributed provided that no modifications are made, that the source is acknowledged and that this copyright notice is included.

Executive Summary

This report should be of interest to all those involved in primary languages learning in Europe, at number of levels. It should interest all those who actually teach young children as well as new entrants to the profession; in particular it should be of importance to those involved in teacher training or working in an advisory capacity. In terms of particular aspects of primary languages learning, it involves the teaching and learning of French, Spanish and English as foreign languages to young learners. Crucially, however, it addresses two issues of ever-increasing importance in the field of primary languages. The first of these is a move towards approaches based on content: generally referred to as CLIL (Content and Language Integrated Learning). Such an approach enhances sustainability in the curriculum as well as providing meaning and purpose to children's learning. The second and key issue addressed by our project is that of technology. The surge of interest into primary languages Europe-wide (and for that matter, further afield) has coincided with the availability of new technologies. Key to our project is the use of a learning platform, video-conferencing facilities and related technologies such as digital cameras for children in six schools (two in England, two in France and two in Spain) to learn languages through a shared curriculum mediated by these new technologies. The schools themselves have funding 2006-09 under Comenius 1 for their work with this technology, which provides an invaluable opportunity for training a new generation of primary languages teachers. In summary then, this project had as its central aim the provision of an innovative context for initial teacher training within a technologically-enhanced, holistic, cross-curricular approach to teaching languages in the primary schools of the three countries. The beneficiaries of course include the children they teach as well as the trainees themselves, as well as all the staff they work with and future colleagues once in post.

Both the TELLP project and its associated schools project (The Six Schools Project) form part of an initiative known as The Collaborative Technologies in Languages Initiative (CTLI) jointly funded by the TDA (Teacher Development Agency for Schools) and Microsoft. Further detail can be found at www.tda.gov.uk/ctli. The project aims to ensure that the integration of foreign languages does not create a burden on the existing curriculum, but enriches existing work in all three countries. The TELLP consortium consists of three teacher training institutions (lead institution: Manchester Metropolitan University, in Manchester, UK; the University of Granada in Spain; the Institut Universitaire de Formation des Maîtres in Niort, Poitou-Charentes, France – now Université de Poitiers).

The findings of the TELLP project show a clear impact upon the teacher training of the three institutions as well as providing findings of the impact of the technology itself upon children's language learning.

Table of Contents

1. PROJECT OBJECTIVES.....	5
2. PROJECT APPROACH.....	7
3. PROJECT OUTCOMES & RESULTS.....	17
4. PARTNERSHIPS	21
5. PLANS FOR THE FUTURE	25
6. CONTRIBUTION TO EU POLICIES	28

1. Project Objectives

1.1 This project had as its central aim the provision of an innovative context for initial teacher training within a technologically-enhanced, holistic, cross-curricular approach to teaching languages in the primary schools of the three countries. Although the project aim was to impact onto four groups of people: trainees (language specialists and generalists), in-service teachers, children, teacher trainers, the core focus group of the three universities' project was *teacher trainees*. Our project is innovative in that it offered opportunities to trainees to acquire the skills of planning effective video-conferencing sessions between international classes. The learning implications anticipated were increasing familiarity with primary pedagogy in the partner countries, joint planning with home class teachers and partner countries' class teachers and focussed observation of the impact of the use of technology on children's learning

There were two identified groups of trainees: Group 1- primary language specialists, of whom there are two sub-groups: (a) a small number are placed for their schools experience in the 6 project schools and (b) the larger cohort of primary language trainees. Group 2 - these are primary trainees who are generalist trainees. We intended that as a result of school experience and university input and support, primary trainees would be able to identify and critically evaluate (a) the characteristics of a holistic cross-curricular (CLIL) approach to language teaching and learning and (b) the impact of the technology

- on the processes of children's language learning
- on development of intercultural understanding
- on children's motivation as indicated by their own perceptions
- on the school community
- on the wider school curriculum

Trainees would also reflect on their development as European teachers, identify similarities and differences between systems and identify aspects of these that offer children and colleagues the opportunity to develop intercultural awareness.

At the same time, however, we also set out to describe the emergent pedagogy, a technologically-enhanced teaching and learning pedagogy. Methodologically this was a challenge, as the implementation of new technologies and related methodology is evolving and dynamic, such that it was in many ways through our investigation of the impact of the technologies that the characteristics of an effective pedagogy started to become apparent.

The project has benefited some very specific communities of users: not only have the identified teacher trainees profited from the project, but also the schools themselves. This is the case at a number of levels. First of all, from an institutional point of view the six schools had to be involved in order for there to be an innovative context; thus the training provided was across the school and university contexts, not provided solely by the institutions of higher education. This in turn strengthened the teacher training partnerships in existence. The staff in the six schools also became a community of users, in that as the project progressed we were able to provide training tailored to their needs in relation to the new technologies (see section 3 below). The staff and head teachers of the schools benefited too from the presence of trainee teachers who by the nature of the exchange programmes were also a link to the schools staff in the partner schools. The trainees also contributed to the project in a participative way, for example, by uploading material on to the learning platform, for the benefit of all the users. The children themselves benefitted from the involvement of teacher trainees, both home trainees from their local university teacher training institution and visiting trainees from the other countries involved. As the teachers on placement with them also visited the partner school(s), the trainees were a valuable and visible link that the children could actually see on video-conference screens as well as in their classrooms. The

children also benefit on an ongoing basis from the pedagogic ideas generated by the project (see section 3), as do their parents less directly, by having an innovative school to which to send them. The potential impact on the curriculum, notably the language learning elements of this, is vast; the impact amounts to a transformation in children's experience of schooling that befits the twenty-first century learning context. At the same time, the potential impact upon the teacher training context is a radical change in the same direction, that is, offering a training that genuinely prepares a new generation of primary teachers for the challenges of the twenty-first century classroom. While the project intended impact was on the experiences of ITE (*Initial Teacher Education*), potentially it offers much to the CPD (*Continuing Professional Development*) as well. It is our belief that we have exceeded our original expectations, particularly in the sense that we have not simply described a project and its outcomes as a 'past event' but rather helped to set in train a long-term change in what is seen as effective teaching and learning in primary languages. This in turn may have implications for other sectors, such as the secondary age phase. Importantly, however, that altered view of language learning potentially alters teacher training in a radical way; and it is teacher training that ensures long-term impact.

2. Project Approach

2.1 Methodologies

It is important to clarify the difference between the Six Schools Project and the TELLP (Technologically Enhanced Language Learning Pedagogy) Project: they both form part of the Collaborative Technologies in Languages Initiative (CTLI) project set up by the TDA (Teacher and Development Agency) in England, which brings together six primary schools, three teacher training institutions and local authorities and regional governments in England, France and Spain. Through the use of technology, they are working together on a shared curriculum to improve and develop the teaching and learning of languages in a more cross-curricular and holistic way (see www.tda.gov.uk/ctli). The six schools involved (two in each of the three countries) are supported by the European Union, each school having different identification number:

Project A:

Seymour Park primary school, Manchester: 06-GBR03-S2C01-00231-1

San Miguel primary school, Granada : 06-ESP01-S2C01-01266-1

Ecole élémentaire de Frontenay, Niort: 06-FRA1-S2C01-04926-1

Project B:

King's Road primary school, Manchester: 06-GBR03-S2C01-00588-1

Cristo de la Yedra primary school, Granada: 07-ESP01-C006-01148-2

Ecole élémentaire de La Magné, Niort : 06-FRA-S2C01-04971-1

The TELLP project, however, is essentially a teacher training one, as described in section 1 above, and elaborated in more detail in our Handbook, seeking to provide an innovative teacher training context, establish the impact of the technologies on the children's learning and to articulate the emergent pedagogy. As already noted, the dynamic and evolving nature of the pedagogy was (and remains) a distinctive feature of the project. As such, although the project was as far as possible executed in a linear and sequential way, the way in which findings informed next steps along with the fact that we were of necessity tied into the chronology of the Six Schools Project inevitably meant that there was a synergetic rather than simply incremental element to it. The underlying chronology of the project, however, was as follows.

2.1.i Chronology of project/activities

In the first year of the project, starting from 1 November 2007, university tutors carried out a series of observations in their home countries. These observations were of the video-conferencing session taking place in the schools, as these were the primary focus of their project. These observations were by agreement initially without guiding criteria, in order to ensure that as observers we were as independent as possible. This allowed us all to gain an idea of what visiting trainees would be observing and to begin to consider what the language learning issues might be in regard to the new technology.

On their placements abroad, all visiting trainees follow the same programme over a period of four weeks, whereby they are attached to a 'base' class, but can teach their first language as a foreign language to a range of classes. However, the key characteristic of the placement is the opportunity to experience another education system and learn to work collaboratively with education professionals in other countries. Equally, the opportunity to teach across the curriculum in the target language is an invaluable experience designed to equip trainees better to teach in a cross-curricular way once back in their home country. So, for example, once a Spanish trainee has taught another subject such as science or art in English while on

placement in a Manchester school, s/he is equipped to teach the same subject through English (this time as a foreign language) once back in a classroom in Spain. This is an approach designed to support the holistic, cross-curricular/CLIL model of language teaching. It is thus an ideal starting point for participation in the TELLP project.

The first group of visiting trainees, in January 2008, was a group of Spanish trainees who were placed in schools in the Greater Manchester area for a four-week placement, including two who were placed in the two project schools (ie the two Trafford schools in the Six Schools Project). This permitted those particular trainees to observe and assist in videoconferencing sessions with the partner Spanish primary schools. They were visited by their tutor from Spain, the Spanish partner, José Luis Ortega. They were then allocated to the partner Spanish primary schools on return to Granada, in order to experience the project from the other perspective.

For four weeks in March 2008, English trainees were placed in schools in both the French and Spanish contexts. As was the case with the visiting Spanish trainees on placement in England, two were placed in the Spanish project schools and two in the French project schools. This again enabled them to observe and assist the videoconferencing sessions that took place during the placement, and on their return they were allocated to the linked primary school – eg, the trainee who had been placed in Ecole Magné was allocated to King's Rd Primary School on return. Home university tutors visited the trainees during the placement.

The final visit was of a group of French trainees who came to the Greater Manchester area for a four-week placement in May 2008. Again there were two visiting trainees placed in the two project schools, who were visited both by the local tutor and by the visiting French tutor. On this occasion, the visit overlapped with the final placement of the home trainees, permitting them to work together (see for example, minutes of meeting 15 May 08, on LP).

During this first year of the project, trainees provided valuable feedback through interviews and/or written reports on their experiences, which included the impact on their own development in terms of beginning to feel confident with the technology, and in terms of articulating the impact on the children as they perceived it.

Importantly, we also carried out focus group work ourselves with the children in the six schools to ascertain primarily the impact on the development of their intercultural understanding, their language learning processes and their motivation. Combined with discussions, training sessions and meetings with school staff (see LP), our own observations and the data from the trainees, at the end of the first year we were able to draw up summaries of findings at a partner meeting in Manchester on 7-8 July 2008 (see minutes on LP/website). This then formed the basis of our planning for the second year of the project.

We were thus able to begin the second year of the project informed by preliminary findings. This information was incorporated into a Powerpoint presentation (see LP) which was used to present findings to schools in preparation for the second year of the project (see also photos Oct 08). A similar Powerpoint (see LP) was prepared for use with new groups of trainees to introduce them in groups to the project as a way of broadening participation, as per our remit.

One important issue was that the main focus of the Six Schools project had been on the video-conferencing. This was an understandable trajectory in terms of their development, as acquiring both competence and confidence in the use of new technology is inevitably complex, challenging and time-consuming. The staff in all six schools had by this time invested considerable effort in developing their skills and their pedagogic approach, despite numerous technical difficulties in the area of sound quality, screens 'freezing' and problems with internet connections. They were assisted in this by a TDA appointed consultant (Jo

Clark, appointed from January 2008 – December 2009) who provided training and support on a part-time basis in all three countries. In addition, Tim Arnold from Devon Digital Media Services also provided a consultancy service to the TDA, which was extremely valuable to us all. The mobility meetings allowed by the EU finding for their project also provided valuable opportunities for the school staff to compare approaches and plan teaching. On some occasions, our trainees were able to attend these too. The concentration on the video-conferencing and the concomitant development of their own language skills (bearing in mind that the staff were on the whole neither technology nor language experts), in tandem with navigational difficulties on the learning platform, tended to privilege the video-conferencing activities over the use of the platform. However, the TDA CTLI project was keen to support the latter and the pedagogy we were seeking to articulate was predicated on the use of the learning platform with video-conferencing as a part of it; in order to facilitate this new learning platform was provided and all the staff of the six schools and three universities met in London for a two day meeting 20-21 November 2008 and training on the use of the new platform (see minutes+ photos on LP/website). From this point, the learning platform began to have a higher profile within the project, including from a training perspective. Not only did trainees in all three countries have an introduction to the purpose of the project and the preliminary findings, they were all also provided with a log-in and password for the platform; training sessions included a visit to the platform with an introduction to the communication facilities and the resources. For the remainder of the year, the project focussed its efforts on arranging for larger groups of trainees to see the new technologies in action. This was implemented after the installation of the new platform in order for us to try to present the whole of the new technological approach to trainees, rather than the one element of video-conferencing.

The aim of this year was to introduce groups of trainees to the project. In January 2009, another group of visiting trainees from Spain were placed in schools in the Greater Manchester area for a four-week placement, including two who were placed in the two project schools (ie the two Trafford schools in the Six Schools Project). This permitted those particular trainees to observe and assist in video-conferencing sessions with the partner Spanish primary schools. This time, however, arrangements were made for all the trainees, 15 in total, to visit a school in the Six School Project to observe video-conferencing and use of laptop with webcam. The trainees along with their visiting tutor from Granada and the tutors from MMU then were then brought together in a meeting to provide feedback on their experiences. Equally, groups of home trainees (total 30) were taken to schools to observe similar activity (and some had been to observe in the autumn term) prior to travelling abroad on placement. Once abroad on placement, the same procedures were adhered to, this time extending the opportunities to the trainees actually on placement to a more active role, learning to lead rather than observe and assist with video-conferencing, developing a more CLIL-focussed approach to teaching and beginning to make use of the learning platform, by, for example, uploading photographs taken locally to use later as teaching resources. The placement abroad took place in March-April 09, again for four weeks and in the Spanish schools, all five of the MFL specialists were placed in the two project schools and in France, although only one trainee was placed in each school, the trainees' involvement in the project was enhanced by their participation in the local seminar held in Niort as part of the dissemination of the project. Finally, the English trainees returned home to teach CLIL as part of their placement, and the French trainees arrived for four weeks in May. These trainees all participated in a session using video footage of video conferencing along with presentation of the project, as did larger groups of home trainees, allowing us to collect data related to the aims of the project (see data collection below). We also collected data from a group of visiting German trainees in the same way. A final additional activity for home trainees in England as well as the visiting German trainees involved a training session (see LP) on how to make and edit films on the topic of recycling (central to the schools project); the trainees then spent time in the two project schools the following two days to work with

children making films in Spanish and French, which were subsequently uploaded on to the learning platform. This activity was a very good example of CLIL and technology working together and provided in-service training for the school staff as well as the trainees. While this was an activity only carried out in the English schools, and indeed repeated with another group of undergraduate primary trainees in December 2009 (see website and LP), this was justifiable as the funding for the training input from Tim Arnold and Jo Clark was provided by the TDA; it has also proved to be a valuable element of effective pedagogy and will feature in the future of our project in all three countries (see section 5).

As part of the project training has also been provided for the teachers in the project schools, through meetings, presentations and training sessions at the universities (see LP and website for minutes, agendas, presentations and training materials). The first year focussed more on teaching approaches, including CLIL; the second year of the project in particular highlighted training in the teaching of communication strategies (see LP and website) and use of the target language. Again, in England, there was a slight variation in that we were able to carry out a skills audit to identify teachers' needs (see LP) ; this will provide a useful model for further training in the schools in the other countries. Different patterns of availability of staff in the different countries meant that training was carried out slightly differently: for example, teachers in the French schools were released on a weekly basis, whereas in England special arrangements had to be made to release staff or university staff went into the schools. In Spain, also special arrangements had to be done to release university staff and have them at schools. In some other occasions, school teachers came to the university with a special permission from the local authorities. Their job was shadowed by other colleagues at schools.

2.1 ii Data collection

The activities outlined above allowed us to develop, share and use a range of data collection techniques. In addition to our own observations, we developed a data collection pro-forma for trainees to use when observing sessions involving the technology (see LP and website), either in reality or via video footage; we also developed a questionnaire for use when observing the latter (see LP and website). This allowed us to collect data from more generalist trainees as well as specialist. Also, this was a way of collecting data about the impact of the technology on children's learning, at the same time as informing our understanding of the characteristics of effective pedagogy and also informing our appreciation of the impact of the project on the trainees in terms of innovation. Thus, the data we collected from the trainees was to throw light on all the key elements of the research. This was supplemented by interview data from the trainees on placement in the schools (see LP and website for copy of questions).

We also collected data from groups of children themselves in all three countries in both years of the project. Focus groups gave the children the opportunity to talk openly about their experiences in a group situation. Questions are available on LP. This data provided further insight into the impact upon the children.

In the schools, the teachers involved in the project and the head teachers were also interviewed, and data was collected also from parents, either directly through a focus group(England) or report data from teachers in the schools (France and Spain). Again, this provided additional insights into the impact on the children, but it was also to provide data about the impact on the wider school curriculum and the school community as a whole. In some case (the teachers in the English schools) the interviews were filmed (see LP) to provide footage for a planned DVD (see also section 5). These interviews were also held in Spain but not recorded as requested by families; in the case of pupils, these were recorded but only for the research use and not to be published.

Finally, all three partners, including the project manager were interviewed and filmed, discussing their experience of the project. These are available on the LP and are intended both to serve as data and to contribute the planned DVD.

The data collection procedures were the result of a collaborative process, that meant that proformas, questionnaires and interview/focus group question schedules were instigated by the project manager, and then reviewed and modified by the French and Spanish partners, before a final agreed version was then translated into Spanish and French as appropriate (see also 2.3 below).

2.1. iii Working of project

Contact by email, phone and in person were key to the successful execution of the Project at all levels. First of all, the university partners needed to keep in close touch, organised by the project manager. Over the course of the project, there were formal partner meetings in July 2008 in Manchester, and October 2009 in Manchester (minutes all available on LP and website). However, these were supplemented by more informal meetings that took place between tutors during all placement visits and at the time of the July 09 conference (see 2.4) and by CTLI meetings organised by the TDA, in Niort in June, 2008, November 2008 in London and again in January 2009 through video conferencing. All of the TDA organised events permitted all of the personnel involved to come together, that is, school and university staff. Frequent and regular contact took place by email and by phone. Thus we developed a very effective and close working relationship.

Equally important to the Project was the collaboration *within* countries between (a) different academic university teams (b) academics and school staff and (c) liaison with administrative staff

- (a) in England, the university team works very closely, as there are tutors designated for each language and tutors' rooms are in the same corridor, facilitating communication and making informal meetings a regular feature of daily professional life; nevertheless all tutors were also kept informed by email; tutors of different languages liaised with academics in other countries, eg Pura Ariza, the Spanish tutor at MMU liaised with José Luis Ortega in Granada, welcoming his trainees to Manchester and visiting the Manchester trainees on placement in Granada; in Spain, José Luis Ortega welcomed the English trainees and also worked with the Spanish ones, Pura Ariza and Gee Macrory in a seminar held in Manchester
- (b) academics maintained close contact with school staff through email and telephone; in all cases schools are also situated relatively close to the university which makes informal contact possible
- (c) liaising with administrative staff was also very important; the key administrative staff at the lead university (MMU) were in CIE (Centre for Innovation and Enterprise), and they liaised not just with the Project manager on site (very accessible as the office is in the same building) but also directly with the partners in the Spanish and French universities. This was done by email.

2.2 Added value

The added value of this Project is immense. What is unique about the Project is introducing trainees to *radically* different way of learning languages. This is evident in a number of ways:

- firstly, the use of ICT in language learning at primary level is significant. In France and Spain, the use of an Interactive whiteboard (IWB) was in itself an innovation as

these are less widely available there than in England, and this was particularly the case at the beginning of the project; however, for all three countries in the Project, the use of the new technologies to link up primary aged children in real time face – to face situations is a very rare phenomenon and provided academics and trainees with an invaluable opportunity to investigate issues of appropriate pedagogy as well as the impact upon learning of this particular technology. It is the only project of this kind (involving video-conferencing and a learning platform) that we are aware of, certainly for primary aged children; as such it is a hugely valuable opportunity for all concerned.

- related to the technology is that of the increased exposure to authentic language that it brings, and the novelty of this at primary level ; in conventional classrooms, the opportunities for encountering native speakers – especially children of the same age – are very limited indeed; this is also an issue of inclusion, as opportunities for visiting other countries and meeting children of other nationalities would otherwise be a function of family circumstances, privileging children from economically advantaged backgrounds who can afford foreign travel; a further issue relating to inclusion is that this Project has brought together children from different religious and social backgrounds that might not otherwise have met, even if financial circumstances permitted it. This in turn has provided for the children and all concerned a real value added element in terms of intercultural understanding (see chapter on Findings in handbook). From a linguistic point of view, this connection with other children has affected the language learning experience enormously (see Project findings) This Project therefore represents a very novel experience for all concerned.
- The use of language for real purposes allowed by the Project and the positive response that this has met with by trainees, teachers and children alike has underlined the important role that a CLIL approach can play in language learning, and embedded this in our teacher training approach
- in parallel with considering the *radically* different experience that the emerging pedagogy offers to trainees, we should also note also the *participatory* approach to teacher training ; our experience of the Project over a period of two years was that our role as teacher trainers shifted greatly in the direction of encouraging trainee ideas and perspectives, rather than in some way ‘transmitting’ our ideas to them. Our trainees also gained the sense of being a European teacher; we cannot overestimate the importance of how they are a new generation of teachers gaining understanding of a shared curriculum and a holistic cross-curricular approach to primary languages; importantly the foundations for future learning by successive generations of trainees have now been laid In fact, one of the roles that the Spanish trainees most liked was that of cultural ambassadors having prepared beforehand materials and resources to use with the English pupils and classteachers.
- the added value has also been in the realm of university tutors working so closely together. Of particular benefit has been the opportunity to develop our approach to CLIL through working with and learning from each other. There is also no doubt that our relationships are closer and better articulated than they would have been otherwise as we have had to discuss, resolve and implement so much together; as a point of comparison MMU is also linked with Germany who have not been part of the Project (although please see section 5); similar developments have not been evident in this partnership as it largely proceeds on conventional grounds. There is little doubt that as teacher trainers/academics we also feel much more European in outlook,

evidenced by our continued commitment to work together and to expand our partnership (see section 5 below)

2.3 Evaluation strategy

First of all, there were strong internal evaluation procedures in place from the outset, consisting of:

- the circulation of all documents for comment/modification/approval, such as the questionnaires for data collection, the interview questions, the observation schedule for trainees and pedagogic strategies and materials (eg the good communicator checklist)
- the use of partner meetings, formal and informal, to update and share progress
- email requests from Project manager for updates on progress in other countries
- a collaborative approach to conference, to agree speakers, order of events, advertising flyers and invitees
- liaison with *schools* by tutors in all three countries also supported internal evaluation, as comments were invited from school staff on documents relating to placements, observation pro-formas, data collection procedures; schools were also consulted and involved in the International conference in July 2009.

The measures outlined above all served together to ensure that there was constant scrutiny of the development of the Project by all the participants ; this in turn influenced the development of the Project by adding new ideas, such as the suggestion that our Communications checklist for children should become a classroom poster in all three languages (see LP); the idea to obtain video-footage came from the French and Spanish Partners and became a key element in solving the problem of gaining access to observations in classrooms.

The Project manager at MMU also sought out colleagues at MMU with relevant expertise, such as Maureen Haldane, Senior Learning and Teaching Fellow with responsibility for e-learning in the Institute of Education (IOE) and convenor of ELTAG (E-Learning and Teaching Action Group) as well as Transformative Learning Technologies Centre Director (see www.ioe.mmu.ac.uk/business); this involvement has resulted in a request for the Project manager to be a 'lead practitioner' for the IOE in the area of video-conferencing and learning platforms, which also has implications for dissemination. The project manager also joined a research group within the Education and Social Research Group (ESRI), known as CREATE: digital cultures, emerging technologies and educational change and led by Professor [Keri Facer](#) (see www.mmu.ioe.mmu.ac.uk/esri). Joining such groups has been immensely helpful in situating the project in other developments in the use of technology in education. Professor Keri Facer was a keynote speaker at our international conference (see LP).

We also requested an evaluation of the project from internal and external sources. The first of these was from Dr Cathy Lewin, a Senior Research Fellow within ESRI and Deputy Director of the CREATE research group (see www.esri.mmu.ac.uk/resstaff). From an external source we requested an evaluation from Dr Gary Motteram, Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Manchester and Senior Lecturer, Course director of the MA in Educational Technology and TESOL, and Co-ordinator of the IATEFL (International Association of Teachers of English as a Foreign Language) Special Interest Group on Learning Technologies.

We asked our evaluators (a) to provide feedback on the following:

- implementation and execution of project overall
- the data collection and findings of impact on children's learning
- the impact on teacher education
- the potential value of the pedagogic approach
- dissemination

and (b) to provide advice about how best to embed, consolidate and extend the project, including ideas for further dissemination

(reports available on LP)

While we welcome comment and advice very much about the implementation of the project, are particularly keen to find the best ways forward for our project as we see it as a way of implementing long-term change rather than a single project with a defined life.

2.4 Dissemination and exploitation strategy and activities

The dissemination and exploitation strategy has consisted of several elements:

- website
- presentations to schools within the Project
- presentations to Groups of trainees
- presentations to other academics in our universities
- local seminars (Niort, April 09; Granada, May 09; Manchester, Nov 09)
- International conference (July 09, Manchester)
- Presentations at other conferences
- Publications

Central to our strategy has been a view of what we are disseminating and who are target audiences are. A key issue here has been the fact that other schools and training institutions cannot easily replicate the learning platform and the video conferencing facilities. This is an issue that the academics in the project have given much thought to. While we have a handbook and exemplar material, we are essentially disseminating an approach and a concept. As established partners already, we have been able to articulate and discuss the approaches we deem central to the successful development of linguistic and cultural competence. Our shared commitment to the development of content and language integrated approaches to language learning is underpinned by a belief that language develops when used for real purposes in real contexts. The technology used on this project is allowing us to push forward the boundaries in terms of the communication activities they make available to children and their teachers. Having said this, we are also highly motivated to ensure that pedagogy rather than technology has the leading edge. As these new technologies become more widely available, it is imperative that effective pedagogies are also available to gain maximum benefit for learning..

It has been necessary to consider different kinds of audiences: on the one hand the findings with regard to the impact of the technology on children's learning and the school as a whole have wide reaching implications, hence the presentation at BERA (British Educational Research Association); the findings also have implications at the level of linguistics, so for example, BAAL (British Association for Applied Linguistics) was targeted, in particular the Special Interest Group on Language Learning and Teaching; teacher education was specifically targeted at a conference on ITE (Initial Teacher Education) at CILT's annual conference in September 2008. Wider dissemination at a European level included the

presentations at Ankara and Athens and the forthcoming (accepted) conference presentations in Gerona and in Dubrovnik (see section 5 below). All presentations are available on the LP.

At university level, it has been important to disseminate to colleagues in order for trainees not to be involved in innovative practice in isolation and for us to build links with colleagues in other subject areas, thus beginning to adopt ourselves the cross-in curricular approach to training that we are exploring in the primary classroom itself. In England, one avenue was the Faculty Teaching and Learning conference in June 09 (see LP and website); another which included colleagues and teachers from schools was the Primary Partnership conference in June 09. In Spain, the Local Conference held in Granada was useful to bring together to academics and teachers from non-linguistic areas who were really interested in the development of this new pedagogy.,

The European conference that took place in July 09 in Manchester provided an opportunity to disseminate to colleagues and academics from France, Spain, Germany and Turkey as well as to numerous local stakeholders such as head teachers, advisory teachers, academics from other UK universities as well as some trainees. The keynote presentations from Prof Keri Facer and Prof Marie-Noelle Lamay were complemented by presentations from French and Spanish staff involved in the project, head teachers and trainees involved and also children from both the local schools (film of conference available on website and on LP). Presentations were supported by simultaneous translation.

The local seminars in all three countries were an opportunity to disseminate to colleagues in the university and to school teachers, advisors and so on. These seminars took place in Spring in both France and Spain: programmes, presentations and related information (publication of an article in the local press) are available on the LP and website. The local seminar in England was originally scheduled for April 09, but this was the date that we were in Turkey and it was postponed until November 09. However, by this time we were in a position to suggest ways of exploitation that were very well received (see also section 5 below), that are summarised in a document 'Application in other contexts' available on LP and website.

Exploitation is for us a key issue; as noted above, schools are not in a position to replicate directly our experience. Hence our strategy included coming up with ideas for how to use what we had learned in less technologically privileged contexts and this is outlined in the handbook and in section 5 below. Essentially, involving other school partnerships with more trainees in order for them to explore the pedagogic ideas is integral to exploiting our findings. Our extension of this work in the first instance to Germany we hope is a first step towards involving other countries (again, see section 5 below).

Further exploitation has been the development of the content of teacher training programmes, including in Manchester: the second course for undergraduates on making, editing and uploading films on to the learning platform in December 09; the changed content of yr 3 undergraduate specialism primary MFL course, PGCE Primary MFL and generalist courses, inclusion in our PGCE Sec MFL course and also the inclusion of the TELLP approach in our Primary MFL CPD course and a newly validated CPD module on Primary and secondary CLIL (see website/LP).

A further issue to consider is the role of publications in our dissemination strategy. Publications in refereed journals typically require 12-18 months from submission to publication so such outputs are beyond the eligibility period of the current project. However, one such publication is prepared in draft as a result of the presentation to BERA (see website/LP) and will be completed and sent to a refereed journal (see section 5); other, non-refereed outputs are available, including an article in LINKS, the teacher training bulletin of CILT (National Centre for Languages) (copy provided with this report), publications of the

local conferences in Niort and Granada and a publication in MMU Partnership Matters in summer 09.

Finally, raising the profile of our project overall is an ongoing consideration. In Manchester, there are links to www.tellp.org on the ESRI website (see www.esri.mmu.ac.uk/resprojects/index.php), information about the project has been included in the 'Partnership Offer', a publication designed to highlight the strengths of the IOE (see LP/website) and disseminated to all partnership schools. Post-it notes advertising the project are available to distribute to any meeting and sufficient produced for all three countries. The folders for the European conference were customised to the project (one included with this report).

In summary, therefore, our dissemination and exploitation strategy thus far has been to identify what we are disseminating and to whom, in order to reach a range of audiences and to tailor our dissemination accordingly. As our key driver is the need to ensure not just sustainability of the project, but also continuing development, it has been important to devise ways of enabling other schools to make use of our findings independently in their own context and to modify the content of the teacher training course we offer in order to develop new and different skills as language teachers. Our more specific plans are set out in section 5 below.

3. Project Outcomes & Results

Please note that there is a fuller account of what follows in our handbook (available on the LP) (work in progress see section 5).

Here we report on the development of a new pedagogy, the innovative teacher training context and findings relating to the impact of the new technologies on children's learning and the school.

Pedagogy

A major achievement of the reporting period is the **development of a new pedagogy**. We need again to make a distinction between the schools project (Six Schools) and the TELLP university project.

The schools were of course the architects of the shared curriculum that is fundamental to their project and which was designed through a series of mobility meetings as well as ongoing collaboration throughout the life of their project. This involved them, for example, in designing and sharing lesson plans for video-conferencing and of course carrying these out; they increasingly made use of the learning platform – for example, children putting up identity cards to share with their partners in the other countries; they also uploaded materials such as examples of photos/photo-stories. The TDA consultant, Jo Clark, played a key role in liaising and managing the learning platform as do Shirelands Learning from a technical point of view (<https://shirelandlearning.slmlg.net>).

The role of the universities in the TELLP project was a complementary one. It is worth restating, we believe, the importance of the involvement of higher education and teacher training in such projects as the Six Schools project. Without this kind of involvement, the opportunities not only to research and write up new developments may be missed, but the possibility of generating a wider impact through the training of a new generation of teachers (and through in-service work) is likely to be limited or absent. Clearly, without the schools project, we would have had no basis upon which to build. Thus the two projects have worked very well together.

The role of the university project was in articulating the pedagogic underpinning of this new technologically enhanced approach through a number of routes. Firstly, as outlined in section 2, our observations and our exploring of the impact on children through focus group work together permitted us to begin to articulate what the pedagogic issues might consist of.

Our observations allowed us to see what actually happens in class, so that we were able to make connections between what children were telling us, what trainees were saying and what we ourselves had observed. For example, we all became aware that there was some tension between spontaneity of language produced in video-conferencing sessions and the need for preparation; this led our thinking in a particular direction, and one of the issues thrown up by focus group work with the children was a desire for less scripted exchanges. This in turn led to us providing ideas for use of communication strategies and resources (see communication strategies *teaching* ideas on LP and website), in other words ideas for teachers to use with children. These in turn led to the production of *training* materials, such as lesson plan template incorporating the identification of the communication strategies and technology tools (these materials of course available for use in all 3 languages). Also available are interviews and video footage of video-conferencing as well as film of the

conference, although these are still in the process of being edited with a view to a DVD/training manual (see section 5 below). Please see enclosed CDs.

It is important to note that this took time to evolve. As already stated, the description of the new pedagogy was a challenge as it was through our investigation of the impact of the technologies themselves that the characteristics of an effective pedagogy started to become apparent. This was an organic and evolving process, rather than one of designating the pedagogy, implementing it and only then evaluating its impact. We should also underline the fact that while in a description of a pedagogy, we recognise the importance of exemplar material, we also believe that schools need to develop their own ideas working from the issues we have distilled in order to develop autonomy.

What makes the pedagogy novel? Our description first of all offers a review of what we believe to be the language learning and teaching issues: classroom management and organisation; linguistic issues of choice of language, receptive and productive skills, code-mixing and code-switching, impact upon first language, oral and written codes, purpose, audience and register; the role of content in language learning and the place of CLIL, and related issues concerning the balance of form and meaning; approaches to error; developing autonomy and the roles of teachers and learners; the place of communication strategies. It then provides exemplar material relating to planning for video-conferencing as well as the learning platform, including planning documentation as noted above. It offers teachers a step-by-step guide to implementing this pedagogic approach with whatever limited technology they have available (see website/LP). This latter was well received at the local seminar in Manchester in November 2009 and specifically referred to in evaluations.

In summary thus far, we believe that the articulation of the new pedagogy and the training materials related to this that we have begun to build up is a genuine achievement. It is a real achievement to have succeeded in building upon the excellent work of the schools themselves to articulate some issues and principles that we hope will in turn assist schools in setting up similar ventures. The opportunity to pursue this over the two year period has been invaluable. From having little idea in the autumn of 2007 as to what the pedagogic implications of this new technology might be, we are now in a position to set out in a principled way what we believe the issues are that should guide planning, teaching and ultimately assessment of attainment. We recognise that there is much more to be done, but believe that we have put in train something that is very innovative in the field of primary languages teaching and learning. The ability to do this arises from the research work we undertook in parallel, in order to determine the impact of the developing pedagogy and the technologies upon children's learning. This is set out in our draft handbook (see LP) in some detail.

Innovative teacher training context

Our key aim was to create an innovative teacher training context, in order to create a new generation of primary languages teachers – we believe that this is what has happened, this being a further major outcome of the project, and of course one which will endure, as the changes are built into future training. What we have been able to offer trainees in terms of innovation is twofold: innovative content and an innovative approach.

The content of initial teacher education has been innovative, but did this innovation consist of? Firstly, for Group 1- primary language specialists, of whom there are two sub-groups: (a) a small number are placed for their schools experience in the 6 project schools and (b) the larger cohort of primary language trainees, there has been direct experience of the project both in terms of presentation of the project (in year 2, as noted in section 2, this was supplemented by findings of the first year – see LP/website). For group (a) clearly the actual

placements that took place in the project schools were a very different and innovative experience, as this was a novel opportunity to observe, assist and learn how to use new technologies from a practical and pedagogic point of view. For group (b) real time or videoed observation experiences were a novel element in teacher training. For Group 2, that is, the wider group of non-specialists, the dissemination of the new approach to them formed a novel modification of their training experience (see LP/website).

In terms of approach, this was also innovative, as this very much encouraged a participatory and 'hands on' approach to teacher training, both in demonstrating at all levels the participatory approach to teaching in the primary classroom and in the replication of this as far as possible in the *training* context. While the 'hands on' approach to this was inevitably most prominent in the case of Group 1 (a), it was also true of (b) in its invitation to observe, discuss, critique, evaluate and provide feedback to university tutors. To a lesser degree, university sessions that are more traditional nevertheless use this as an opportunity to encourage a critical and evaluative approach to innovation. The very positive and engaged reaction we have had with trainees (English, Spanish and French alike) has not only been encouraging in itself, but has made us as teacher trainers much more aware of how much they have to offer. This is evident too in the schools, where teachers realise what trainees can bring to a school context. Far from being a transmission model of teacher training whereby teacher trainers convey ideas to trainees, the approach that we have developed is based on mutual appreciation of what tutors and trainees can offer each other.

While this project had as its focus initial teacher education, it has also had an impact on CPD (Continuing Professional Development). As noted in Section 2, this has entailed the inclusion of the TELLP approach in our Primary MFL CPD course and a newly validated CPD module on Primary and secondary CLIL (see website/LP). In Spain, a series of meetings as a part of the CPD program have been programmed with the schools involved for the second term of 2010.

Impact upon children's learning and the school

This takes us to what we consider a **further major achievement has been: the ability to report some very interesting findings** across children in three countries as to the impact of the technologies on

- on the processes of children's language learning
- on development of intercultural understanding
- on children's motivation as indicated by their own perceptions
- on the school community
- on the wider school curriculum

While this is an interesting and important matter in its own right, it also provides highly important contextual information for the pedagogy outlined above. Any new pedagogy requires a rationale for the suggestions and claims it might make; while we are by no means suggesting that we have a comprehensive and fully justified pedagogic approach for the new technologies in question, we are able to locate our conclusions in data realign to the impact of the technologies so far; furthermore, as indicated in section 2 above, this is data drawn from trainees, staff and from the children themselves, ensuring that findings are as robust as possible. However, the data does not simply exist as presentations for academic conferences, but is also an important element in terms of training materials. This needs to be used in training, as teachers and trainees are keen (and arguably need) to know what effect the new technologies have had already within the context of their own project. Although we stress the importance of schools new to this kind of technology developing autonomy and

being creative within their own context, it nevertheless is a very good basis to have the opportunity to be informed about the experience of others further along the road.

Thus we have been able to report, first of all, findings through the children's own eyes, relating to their development of intercultural understanding, motivation and language learning processes. In terms of intercultural understanding, they have clearly benefited hugely from being able to learn about and appreciate differences and similarities in each others' lives, and their sense of learning language within the context of friendship comes through very strongly. Their motivation has been greatly enhanced by the enjoyment and authenticity of the experience. The impact on language learning processes is evident in their ability to articulate a number of issues: the desire to learn that is engendered; the development of confidence as they describe both the nervousness there is at the start and the sense of achievement as they progress, as well as a concomitant decrease in anxiety about error; the reciprocal nature of the language learning experience that arises from an awareness of the needs of the interlocutor as well as their own language use, and the importance of communicating with learners of their own age and stage of language learning; and the implications this way of learning has for roles of teachers and learners, and related to this, the place of autonomy in language learning.

Through the eyes of teachers and trainees we have seen that the views of the children are largely corroborated. The issue of intercultural understanding is emphasised by all as an important one, and the motivational issues are also heavily endorsed. Not surprisingly, of course, cautionary notes were raised about sustainability and the importance of appropriate teaching strategies, observations that helped to inform the pedagogy. The impact on language learning processes drew positive comments from teachers and trainees that echoed those of the children, particularly in terms of the influence of an authentic communicative situation on their language learning. The teachers and trainees also adopted a slightly more nuanced and distanced approach, reflecting their roles as educators, noting the impact both real and potential on actual attainment such as improved pronunciation and listening skills.

Being able to report findings on the impact on the school curriculum and the wider school context is also an achievement. The evidence suggests that there has been an effect within the language curriculum first of all, in terms of privileging oral skills compared to previous practice and also in terms of having a positive effect on the development of first languages. There is very visibly an impact in terms of a more cross-curricular/CLIL approach within the school and this is potentially key to the sustainability of languages in primary schools. There is also a perceived impact on ICT in the curriculum with this gaining a higher and possibly different and enhanced role. Finally, the findings relating to the wider school context suggest a very positive impact from the perspective of parents, although this is an area that merits further attention as the project develops and children make increased use of the technology off-site (see section 5).

In summary, then, we are able to report achievements relevant to our objectives. The richness of the data and the materials so far produced have altered the approach to teacher training immensely. These are supported by a handbook (which is work in progress) and training materials (see section 5).

4. Partnerships

4.1 Added value of partnership

First of all, the nature of the project was dependent on having the three countries involved, given the context of the Six Schools Project. Having said that, the value of being able to compare and contrast the impact in three different countries has been immense. That trainees, teachers and children (and indeed tutors) in three countries report such positive findings lends a robustness to the project and bodes well for the future of it. Some of the nuances that emerge such as the possibility that the balance between linguistic development and the development of intercultural understanding may vary slightly according to context are themselves of interest and start to set the scene for a future research agenda. The exemplar training materials (notably the material relating to the teaching of communication strategies) are available in all three languages as are presentations about the project. The plans for the future (see section 5 below) will address this in more detail. However, we will take forward together as a partnership the development of our teacher training programmes. The implications for future teacher training programmes are very promising: we will be able to introduce future generations of trainees to a *shared* vision of technologically enhanced pedagogy, thus contributing strongly to the notion of a European teacher. We all share a continued commitment to this work and a shared perception of ourselves as European teacher educators. More than this, through a project of this nature, we model to our colleagues at university, to our partnership schools and to our trainees a collaborative approach that extends far beyond the boundaries of the institutions and national contexts in which we work. Indeed, the children themselves experience this intercultural and linguistic communication between us when, for example, they are able to observe us greeting each other over the video-conferencing equipment or in 'real life' when visits are made to schools in other countries. The specific value of the partnership becomes evident in the understanding we have of each other's educational system with regard both to schools and to teacher training. The European teacher competences serve as a pivot around which we can discuss the experiences of our trainees. At a subject level, we have been able to build up a shared notion of what effective language learning and teaching is and establish a growing appreciation of the role that CLIL-based approaches are playing in this. Equally, we have built up a common understanding of the issues that new technologies throw up and have engaged in purposeful discussion of how to address these.

4.2 The experience of working together in a European partnership

This too has been hugely valuable and has happened at a number of levels:

Tutors with tutors from other countries: not only have tutors in all three universities worked together to plan and execute this project, but we have also undertaken joint observations of lessons, using the CRF (Common European Framework). This has contributed greatly to our shared understanding of effective teaching and learning as well as the similarities and differences that exist between different educational systems. In order to carry out joint observations, for example, we have together visited trainees in school, discussed the plans for the lesson beforehand with the trainee and the teacher, engaged in a joint observation and compared notes taken with each other as well as feeding back to the trainee and liaising with the school staff. This kind of activity is a significant step towards breaking down any barriers that might appear to pertain between different countries' training systems. The close relationships that this project has engendered have provided a secure and trusting environment in which to do this. Thus we have been able, for example, to discuss both the

elements of an effective CLIL lesson as well as certain structural differences between systems – for example, in the French system, the PE2 trainees (Prof d'Ecole year 2) are in fact civil servants rather than trainees and are more experienced than the one year PGCE trainees in England and the undergraduate trainees in Spain. There is undoubtedly richness in being able to compare and contrast the teacher training systems that exist elsewhere in Europe and our visits to each other have included of course the experience of each others' working environments in terms of colleagues, administrative arrangements and teaching facilities.

Tutors with trainees from other countries: tutors have had the opportunity to work with trainees in the project, meeting them, presenting to them about project, observing lessons and liaising with staff in placement schools. That the trainees have prior to placement abroad already had briefings from their home tutor reinforces their awareness of the fact that their tutors work closely together and have an established professional relationship.

Tutors and teachers in the project schools: tutors while visiting trainees abroad on placement in the project schools have had the opportunity to liaise with the teachers in the other project schools; they have also worked with the schools staff from the other schools at project meetings such as Niort July 06, London in Nov 08 and

Tutors and children: the project has provided the opportunity for tutors to meet children in the project schools in the other countries and to observe them in connection with the project.

Trainees with trainees from other countries: while on placement in the project schools, trainees have had the opportunity to work with trainees from abroad; this is particularly true of the French trainee visit to England which takes place in the summer term and overlaps with the final home placement for the English trainees. However, in all cases, visiting trainees are brought together at the universities for joint meetings with the home trainees and are 'buddied up' for personal as well as professional reasons.

Trainees working with children : we should not overlook the importance of trainee teachers working with children in the other project schools as this offers a more general introduction to European school life for children as well as the impact of the new technologies upon them. Given the whole school involvement expected of trainees, they have the opportunity to go beyond the technology project and observe and interact with children more generally. This allows them to experience, for example, different playground games; this in turn permits appreciation of the ways in which a learning platform really can be used to promote and share different activities (see playground games on LP/classroom).

Trainees working with teachers: trainees also of course have the opportunity to work with staff in the project schools when abroad on placement, including the opportunity at times to attend mobility meetings. On a more everyday basis, however, they were able to engage in joint planning for video-conferencing, preparing the children for forthcoming sessions and in so doing providing an invaluable source of native speaker target language input for teachers and for children.

4.3 Describe the benefits of partnerships established with groups outside of the direct project/consortium e.g. with target users.

The project has been highly influential in helping us develop other partnerships that are already bringing us benefits and through and with whom we hope to ensure the development and sustainability of the project. First of all, through the mechanism of the Kick Start meeting in Brussels (Feb 08) we have a relationship with the co-ordinator of the CAFT project from the University of Ankara, Turkey, Aslı Özlem Tarakçıoğlu, at whose request the TELLP project manager has provided external evaluation for their project. However, this also led to a request to speak at the CAFT conference in April 08 in Ankara, to take part in a panel discussion and the opportunity to disseminate the TELLP project both informally and formally

through a conference presentation. The co-ordinator, colleagues from MMU and from Portugal met in Ankara to discuss future joint projects, an idea taken up further when the co-ordinator attended our conference in Manchester July 09 and was then introduced to the French and Spanish partners in the TELLP project. On her return, Dr Tarakçioğlu gave a seminar in her university's primary school and in a meeting with their head master and the coordinator, mentioned about our projects and its results and they were very influenced by it. More details about future plans are in section 5 below.

A key group of potential target users is the German schools we are in partnership with at MMU (located in Sindelfingen, in partnership with the university in Stuttgart). We have a similar TDA funded exchange programme to that which operates in France and Spain, and have already included some of the visiting German trainees in the training related to the project (filmmaking, June 09). We also at MMU are in a video-conferencing project with two schools in Manchester (St John Bosco and Mount Carmel) who are in partnership with two schools in Sindelfingen and who also work closely with their linked secondary school in Manchester, St Matthews Roman Catholic High School where there is an Advanced Skills Teacher (AST) with responsibility for developing primary German. We are very keen to support the development of German as an important European language. It is testimony to the value of the currently EU funded TELLP project, however, that there is a vast difference between what we at MMU have been able to do in terms of researching and evaluating the German video-conferencing project and what we have done in the Six Schools project. The German project does not have any funding for university staff over and above that which there is to organise placements and make the usual visits. What we anticipate now is that what we have learned as a result of the TELLP project can be put to effective use with the German project. We also plan to extend the project to German in other ways (see section 5).

Also, another school in Manchester (Crumpsall Lane Primary School) is now linked up with one of the Spanish schools in the Six Schools project (Cristo de la Yedra) and this partnership already last year organised video-conferencing sessions and accepted trainees on placement (see also section 5).

A further project which is likely to bring benefits to the project is the School Linking Project, again set up by the TDA in England. This has in the year 2008-09 provided funding for staff in MMU to take school teachers in groups to Spain, Germany and France for a two-day visit. The purpose of the visit was to link schools in England with the schools that the staff visited during the two day trip. Linked to this is a commitment from the schools involved that they will take primary languages trainees on placement. There is thus a training element to this arrangement. These partnerships of schools provide excellent contexts for promoting technology enhanced language learning.

In France, a number of new digital project are under way (see http://insight.eun.org/ww/en/pub/insight/policy/policies/last_country_reports_2008.htm). A key project is *1000 visioconférences* aimed at equipping primary schools with videoconference tools to be used for improving foreign language skills; financed by the education department and local authorities, schools involved are committed to experimentation and innovations as well as provision of reports as to the effectiveness of video-conferencing as a language learning tool. This is clearly a potential group of target users for our findings.

In terms of other languages we will aim to build upon our links with the COLT (Community and Lesser Taught Languages) project which is part of the Routes Into Languages programme (www.routesintolanguages.ac.uk/northwest). Gee Macrory is a member of the COLT Steering Committee and we are seeking to promote the teaching and learning of Arabic, Urdu and Mandarin Chinese. Related to this we have also made links with Rei Chen,

China Link Coordinator, Manchester City Council with whom we will be liaising about working with schools in the Manchester authority who have links with China through British Council funding.

In summary, then, the project has brought us all enormous benefits in terms of the partnerships established through it; it has also developed in us a desire to reach out to other groups and to be part of a more European and international picture. The future development of the project is thus of crucial importance.

5. Plans for the Future

Our plans for the future are in the first instance, immediate sustainability and continuation. This is aided by the fact that although the original Six Schools Project finished in August 2009, the schools have received funding for a further two years to carry out a project on sustainability using the new technologies. First and foremost, our trainees will continue to be placed in the project schools. The trainees from Granada begin their placement on 11 January 2010, the English trainees travel to France, Spain (and Germany) on 1 March and the French trainees will carry out a placement in Manchester in May. As in previous years, we will be endeavouring to arrange a visit to one of the two project schools for all of the trainees. At the English end, this should be facilitated by the fact that three of the four trainees placed there last year as part of the project are now employed by the school the fourth already having been appointed to a post prior to the start of the placement). We also plan to develop the trainees' experiences on their placements abroad (see planner 09-10 on LP and website).

We aim further to develop the materials available, including contributions from this year's trainees. We also intend to make use of the film material to produce a DVD which will be available on the website. Interviews with tutors are already available on the website. Interviews with school staff in England have been filmed and are on the CDs enclosed; staff have denied permission for publication on the web until after editing. The film material of video-conferencing involves footage of children which for safeguarding reasons cannot yet be made publicly available. We aim to seek to obtain permission for the material we have got and to obtain additional video footage. Video filming was not part of the original bid but has proved to be a useful tool. Further interviews will be carried out in Spain and France. At the moment the handbook is a work-in-progress and we aim to develop the chapter on pedagogy into a training manual for teachers, that integrates the strategies appropriate to the technology with those that are CLIL focussed. In terms of working in partnership, we aim also to produce shared training materials and courses.

Further dissemination is planned. An abstract has been accepted for the conference ***New Challenges for Multilingualism in Europe*** organized by the LINEE -Network of Excellence which will take place in Dubrovnik (Croatia), 11-15 April, 2010. An abstract and full paper have also been accepted for a International Conference to be held in Gerona -II Congr s Internacional de Did ctiques 2010 (<https://www.conftool.com/congresdidactiques2010/>)- in February 2010. We are planning a conference in Granada that will be held for a total of 40 hours and that will bring together academics, classteachers, trainees, local authorities, inspection services and that will focus on ICTs and language learning. International researchers will give plenary sessions and classteachers will offer different workshops.

Our immediate plan that will be implemented in early 2010 is a new (as yet unfunded) project which we call *TalkTELLP*. As outlined in section 2 above, the issue that the project team has had to grapple with is that the majority of schools do not possess the video-conferencing facilities or access to a learning platform that characterise the Six Schools project. However, as already noted, we are now in a position to offer advice as to how to proceed (see Powerpoint presentation 'Application in other contexts' on LP/website). We have set up three new partnerships: one Anglo-French, one Anglo-Spanish and one Anglo-German.

Gorse Hill Primary School, Trafford	Ecole Champlain, Rochefort 17300
Hurst Knoll St James CE Primary School, Ashton-under-Lyne	Colegio Juan XXIII (Zaidían)
Sankey Valley St James, Warrington	tbc

We aim to equip each of the six schools with: a laptop with built in webcam, a hand held digital Canon camcorder with mini-tripod and a digital hand-held voice recorder. This equipment (10 of each to date) has already been purchased by MMU (and has arrived) with the sanction of our Dean, Mr Andy Jones, who agreed a spend of £11,000 on equipment for us to take this project forward. The schools involved have agreed in principle to participate in order to (a) trial the pedagogy we have described and (b) allow us to research the impact on the children, and (c) take trainees that they will involve in the project, whose perspective we will also research. In place of a learning platform we will introduce the idea of a free Wiki website (see eg www.wetpaint.com) in place of a learning platform. The advantages of using a Wiki as an alternative to a learning platform is that schools, teachers and children can have the same opportunities to exchange and share materials; as access is limited to those invited to join it is a secure environment, and while it does not necessarily have the visual appeal of the learning platform in the Six Schools Project, it can provide a very similar service. While capacity is limited, pre-arranged and systematic 'tidying up' and storing on a regular agreed basis should solve this problem. In order to facilitate a secure safe on-line environment for communication we are in negotiation with Rafi.ki (see www.rafi.ki/site/primaries.php) to provide this for very modest cost for the English schools and free for the schools in Germany, France and Spain. For their presentation, please visit the LP). Related to this initiative we have come up with a training plan for trainees (see LP) and hope over time to extend this to other partnerships. These particular schools were identified in the case of the French and German schools through the School Linking Project (see section 4 above) and in the case of the Spanish partnership, through the school to which the fourth English trainee had been appointed, as both he and the school were very keen to exploit his experience on the project.

We also aim to work more closely with the local schools already using video-conferencing. As noted in section 4, we are working with two schools who have links with Germany. Also, the other school in Manchester (Crumpsall Lane Primary School) which is now linked up with one of the Spanish schools in the Six Schools project (Cristo de la Yedra) is working with a local secondary school, Abraham Moss High School, and we will be seeking to exploit this further. Stretford High School in Trafford, where our TDA consultant, Jo Clark is based, is also engaged in video-conferencing and we will be seeking to exploit this also.

An immediate research issue is application for funding to investigate the impact of these new technologies further, particularly with respect to language learning. We are keen to move beyond the issues of motivation and investigate the impact of these technologies upon language attainment, and plan to apply for research funding to the ESRC (Educational and Social Research Council) to follow up the impact on the children in the new project outlined above, the schools in the Six Schools project and two schools in Devon (Tipton St John and Decoy primary schools) who are involved with a video-conferencing project with French primary schools in Brittany. This is already in hand at the research centre of the IOE at MMU, with Gee Macrory writing the bid with Prof Maggie Maclure. We are also keen to explore the impact of this project in out-of-school learning, following up in more detail

We will be seeking to embed the project beyond the three countries noted above.

As outlined in section 4.3 above, we have made links with Turkey; we are hoping to make links with schools working with China; we are also seeking through *TalkTELLP* to develop our links with Germany.

An important issue will be sustainability within each country, although the nature of our project is such that other countries are necessarily involved. In England, local developments arising from the seminar in November are first of all, an approach from Karin Hodge, ICT Coordinator at Manchester Hospital Schools & Home Teaching Service, who attended the seminar and subsequently contacted us to find out what provision exists in France and Spain, a request already forwarded to the French and Spanish partners. The opportunity to connect with students abroad while studying foreign languages while in hospital or ill at home is a highly interesting possibility and a rarely addressed inclusion issue. Another attendee at the seminar was Pat Cliffe, Video Conferencing Leader for Small Oldham Schools (Oldham is a nearby local town within Greater Manchester), who is seeking advice about implementation and who has a meeting with Gee Macrory at MMU on 21 Jan 2010 to take this forward. Local colleagues who attended the July conference will be invited to a follow-up meeting in February 2010 to help them take forward plans for technology in their area, including colleagues from a local authority in Knowsley and teachers from two local secondary schools who wish to develop our ideas at secondary level. Further dissemination *within* England will include targeting primary language advisors who have not attended the seminar or conference, the British Council, the Association for Language Learning and further dissemination via CILT. Jo Clark will on 15th Jan 2-4pm give a talk for Newman (Birmingham) University College KS2/3 PGCE course on session will be based on our communications strategies work and linking that to using either a platform or video-conferencing.

In Spain, Daniel Madrid and José Luis Ortega work together in a Project of the Spanish Ministry of Education on bilingualism, and are planning to disseminate TELLP to the schools involved in Granada, Málaga and Seville from February 2010.

The idea is to show how the Platform works and how useful has been the use of a shared curriculum with schools in England and France.

Publications: publications will be sent to the following refereed journals: *Computers and Education*; *Pedagogy, Technology and Education*; a proposal for one for a special edition of *Education 3-13* (focussing on primary language learning) has already been accepted.

Website: we are committed to maintaining our website indefinitely.

6. Contribution to EU policies

Lisbon Education & Training Progress Indicators

Our project clearly is already addressing H26 (mobility: Inward and outward mobility of teachers and trainers within the LLL programmes), as it has at its centre the exchange programme which places trainees from the UK in Spanish and French schools and welcomes French and Spanish trainees in return. As noted above under 'partnership' we as the trainers concerned are building successfully upon an already existing efficient and informed collaboration.

Lisbon Key Competences

KC2 (Communication in the foreign language), KC4 (Digital competence), KC5 (Learning to learn), KC6 (Interpersonal, intercultural and social competences and civic competences) are all being addressed by our project. For example, our findings outlined above in section 3 and available in more detail on our website (www.tellp.org/projectoutcomes) indicate that all four of these aspects are enhanced by the project.

LLP Horizontal policies

This project is successfully addressing a.1 (linguistic and cultural diversity) in that it has already allowed trainees to develop an understanding of children's personal and learning needs, how they vary/resemble each other and also of how they relate to others.

Complementarity with other policies

KA2 Languages: the evidence so far from our project suggests that the new methodology motivates language learners and enhances their capacity for language learning; in the longer term this should increase the capacity of the learners to compete in a knowledge-based global context. The project has also served to improve intercultural dialogue in Europe among children, teachers, trainee teachers and teacher trainers.

KA3 ICT

We have implemented an innovative use of ICT for several groups of people, including children, teachers, teacher trainees and teacher trainers. It is undoubtedly the case that the potential of ICT for enhancing learning has become much more evident than was the case before.

KA4 Dissemination and exploitation of results

In all three countries in our project, we have already begun to disseminate our activities and results of our project at local and national levels, and also at a European level within the three countries in the project. As noted above, next steps will include other European audiences. We are engaged in various networks that permit exploitation of results, such as the CILT (National Centre for Languages) Advisory Group for Initial Teacher Training in England. Also in England, our close co-operation with the TDA (Teacher Development Agency for Schools) allows our work to influence policy. Our project website is available to promote the project and to make results available to all interested parties.

Co-ordination with national education programmes

In England, the project coheres extremely well with the National Languages Strategy, published in 2002, that has as its cornerstone the introduction of primary languages to all children in Key Stage 2 (age 7 and above) from 2010. In addition, we are addressing the messages of the 2007 Languages Review by Lord Dearing in our focus on content (paragraphs 3.34, 3.39), on technology (paragraph 3.53) and on successful approaches to language learning (appendix 2, paragraph 4). More broadly, the current curriculum innovations evident in the Primary National Strategy and indeed the Secondary National Strategy are also reflected in our project as they include a focus on creativity, enjoyment, ICT and cross-curricular approaches to teaching and learning.

In France, this project is particularly well-adapted to the objectives set by the Ministry of Education to provide all children with a living knowledge of languages in order to open them up to the reality of their time and prepare them to live in a global world. Official national language curricula for Primary and Secondary Education are related to la Loi d'Orientation et de Programme pour l'Avenir de l'Ecole, 2005 and the Common Base of Knowledge and Skills. Concretely the "Plan de [Rénovation de l'enseignement des langues vivantes étrangères](#)", issued in 2006 integrates the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (Cadre Européen Commun de Référence pour les Langues (CECRL). It reasserts the necessity of introducing a foreign language to all primary children aged 7 and even before if possible (CP classes, children aged 6). It also encourages changes in the pedagogy currently used in France. The focus is put on the Actional Approach ("Approche Actionnelle"), and on content-based language teaching (CLIL / EMILE, more European Secondary sections : SELO) and on oral skills which are key elements in the TELLP. Finally, the French Minister, Xavier Darcos, launched a huge innovative plan called « 1000 Visioconférences pour l'Ecole » to support the teaching of Foreign Languages in January 2008: the use of ICT and new technology to develop cultural understanding through direct communication. The EU Insight reports most recent series for 2008 (Last country reports from 2008 series: Switzerland and France in focus) (<http://insight.eun.org/ww/en/pub/insight/policy/policies.htm>) is a series of the. The annual update, compiled with the help of policy makers in the 31 member countries of EUN, aims to present ICT trends in school education. We believe our findings are relevant to this. More generally, we believe our work is consistent with the work being carried out in the STEPS project: The key findings of the 18-month Study of impact of technology in primary schools (STEPS) were presented at a validation workshop held on 25 June 2009 in the premises of the European Commission (EC) in Brussels.

In Spain, and specially in Andalusia, our Project is well connected with the so-called Plan for the Promotion of Plurilingualism, a linguistic policy for the Andalusian society that is a response to the necessity of the Andalusian society of facing the challenge represented by the technological, social and economical changes that have been occurring in the last three decades. Those changes have also produced great expectations about innovation, especially in the educational context. The Ministry of Education has developed a new global linguistic policy for our Autonomous Region, based on the theoretical principles emerging from the European Union and defined in the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, evaluation. The new Bilingual Schools will promote the teaching and learning of some fields of knowledge using two languages at least: the mother tongue and a second instrumental language. Those languages will be used to teach certain curricular areas, using the natural method, based on communication, interaction and the oral practice as the central point. The promotion for the study of foreign languages will be enriched with the inclusion of the co-official foreign languages of the Spanish estate; the teaching of courses for a) teachers and b) adult training; the stress in the fostering of

distance learning; the development of research and innovation projects and the implementation of the European Portfolio for Languages.

Our goal is to create the necessary basis for those schools under this Plan and with its main objective: to provide Andalusian students with plurilingual and pluricultural competences.

Not only the new Spanish Law of Education (LOE) and the RD 1513/06, in which the minimum teaching requirements for the Primary Education are established, but also the Andalusian (Decree 230/07) legal framework give a very big importance to the role played by additional languages as well as to the key role of the new technologies.

The linguistic policy the Andalusian Government has set through the Plan for the Promotion of Plurilingualism will break with the traditional division in the learning/teaching of languages. Our Project is highly linked with this since it proposes a new curricular model, the integrated curriculum, common to all languages (mother tongue or foreign language) and to all the stages and educational modalities, also including the linguistic contents which must appear in the curricula for languages. This is exactly what our pupils are working in six schools, in three countries.

