

# PROFILE REPORT BILINGUAL EDUCATION (ENGLISH) IN POLAND

## OVERVIEW OF PRACTICE IN SELECTED SCHOOLS

### Acknowledgements

This project has been initiated and coordinated by the National Centre for Teacher Training and Development (CODN), and has gratefully received support from the British Council Poland.

The report has been produced by David Marsh (University of Jyväskylä, Finland), Marek Zajac (CODN, Poland), and Hanna Gozdawa-Gotębiowska (University of Warsaw, Poland).



Centralny Ośrodek  
Doskonalenia Nauczycieli

**Authors:** Marsh, D., Zając, M., Gozdawa-Gołębiowska, H., Czura, A., Gapińska, A.,  
Majewska, R., Papaja, K., Roda, M., Urbaniak, M., Wróblewska, E.

***Co-financed by the Polish Ministry of Education***

It would not have been possible to complete the report without the core research and data collection team who contributed to the joint production process:

Anna Czura, *University of Wrocław*  
Anna Gapińska, *University of Poznań*  
Renata Majewska, *III LO Gdańsk*  
Katarzyna Papaja, *University of Silesia*  
Magdalena Roda, *III LO Gdynia*  
Magdalena Urbaniak, *University of Wrocław*  
Ewelina Wróblewska, *British Council*

Language consultant: Alisa Masiejczyk

The authors would like to express special thanks to the staff and students of the schools listed in the appendix for contributing to this process.

We would also like to express our gratitude to the following field-based experts, who have provided various forms of insight, advice, and support: Ewelina Wróblewska, Zuzanna Dzięgielewska, Maria Jesús Frigols, Anne Maljers, Peeter Mehisto, and Dieter Wolff.

This report is subject to copyright protection. It may be downloaded, printed and used, if this is done for non-commercial purposes. If this report is reproduced in any form, full acknowledgement should be made of its authorship and source.

The information contained in this report does not necessarily reflect the positions or opinions of any of the organizations involved in the process.

# Table of Contents

**Executive Summary 5**

**Forewords 9**

**Research Approach 13**

1. National Overview 13

2. Operating Curricular Models 13

3. Objectives & Added Value of Bilingual Education (English) 16

4. Selected Schools: Overview of Practice 17

4.1 European & International Dimensions 17

4.2 Outreach actions 18

Schools in Poland

Schools in other countries

Other organizations

4.3 School Development 18

Internal Management Support

External Support from Key Stakeholders

4.4 Teachers 19

Profiles

Teamwork

Professional Development

4.5 Students 25

Selection Procedures

Motivation towards Bilingual Education

Learning of Additional Languages

Access to English Language outside School

4.6 Learning Processes 27

Subjects

Instructional Approaches & Methodologies

Cognitive Load

Language Use & Discourse

Resources & Materials

Synchronization of Curricula & Exams

**Recommendations 38**

**Appendices 41**

List of schools participating in the project

Research Team Biodata

References & Key Bibliographic Sources



# Executive Summary

This report is an initiative by The National Centre for Teacher Training and Development (CODN) and The British Council (Poland) to provide an overview of practices in bilingual education (English) schools in Poland. This is part of a wider process which may further support capacity-building within and among the schools.

Since 1990, there has been considerable interest in the implementation of variants of bilingual education throughout the European Union. In 1994, a methodological basis emerged by which to describe teaching and learning practice. This is termed Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and defined as *a dual-focused educational approach in which an additional language is used for the learning and teaching of both content and language*.

European Union developmental support (1994-2008) has contributed to considerable interest all over Europe in the potential of varieties of what is termed bilingual education (edukacja dwujęzyczna) in Poland. In March 2005, The Luxembourg Presidency delivered recommendations to the Council of the European Union which call for measures supporting the growth of CLIL practice in mainstream educational contexts:

1. There is a need for greater public awareness of the benefits of the CLIL approach and the contribution it could make to enhance individual and societal prosperity and social cohesion.
2. The promotion of CLIL could lead to increasing student and workforce mobility, thus reinforcing European citizenship.
3. Promotional bodies at the national and EU levels would help contribute to the introduction, development, co-ordination and expansion of CLIL throughout the European Union.
4. Specific CLIL training for teachers and educational administrators should be encouraged, including a period of work or study in a country where the target language is generally spoken.
5. Ways of acknowledging the participation of learners in CLIL at different educational levels are to be investigated.

6. A wide range of languages should be promoted as mediums for CLIL initiatives.
7. The exchange of information and scientific evidence about good CLIL practice should be encouraged at the European level.

In 2006, the first major survey of the CLIL approach in the European Union was undertaken by Eurydice: *Content and Language Integrated Learning at School in Europe*. The national report on Poland can be found at [www.eurydice.org](http://www.eurydice.org).

Interest in this educational approach by trans-national bodies such as the European Commission and the Council of Europe is important, as it helps national educational systems fulfill the objectives of Education & Training 2010, and the long-standing objective on multilingualism, namely that “each citizen of the European Union member states has practical skills in at least two languages in addition to his or her mother tongue” (European Commission 2005:4). The rationale for implementing bilingual education in Poland, through English and other languages, can, therefore, be viewed in a broader European context.

The findings in this report identify four functioning curricular models of bilingual education (English) in the schools involved in the study (at the secondary level). These are Model A - Extensive English Language Medium Instruction; Model B - Partial English Language Medium Instruction (code-switching English-Polish); Model C - Limited English Language Medium Instruction (code-switching English-Polish); and Model D - Specific English Language Medium Instruction. Each model encompasses various types. These models result in a range of student learning outcomes, in terms of content and language learning.

There are various reasons why schools opt for bilingual education. The added value which results for all stakeholders incorporates cultural, environmental, language, content and learning dimensions. Therefore, operating principles are multi-faceted, and involve different approaches, which are intended to result in to one or more types of educational outcome.

The findings reveal areas of strength, and potential courses of action for achieving even higher levels of quality assurance. The report collates information gained through questionnaires, interviews, classroom observation, and other procedures, so as to achieve a general overview of practice. This concerns school and teacher outreach, as well as networking actions, ongoing forms of school development, teachers, students, and the teaching and learning processes.

The main recommendations involve the provision of:  
(Systems & Administration)

- A framework curriculum for the Matura examination (English).
- A self-regulatory support service and network for schools to undertake capacity-building and achieve standardization, through sharing experiences and co-developing resources.
- Opportunities for joint curriculum development, in-service professional development for teachers, materials access and development, and materials to support student Matura examination preparation.

(Schools and Teachers)

- Access to professional networks dedicated to forms of bilingual education, especially within Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).
- Access to information on European Union resources which could be used for further support of teachers and students.
- Additional development of teacher work partnerships (content-language; content-content) within schools.
- School partnerships, by which teachers of specific subjects, including English, can share materials and insights into the Matura (English) examination, and participate in student selection procedures.





# Forewords

## CLIL-based bilingual education in Poland

When Europe unites and political barriers fall worldwide communication becomes possible at the price of a local phone call. We make those phone calls, send text messages, and surf the net. We travel abroad to have fun, exchange ideas, settle business deals, make new friends, earn a living, study at universities, learn more about others and about ourselves. We discover alternative cultural patterns and learn to appreciate diversity in human thought and behaviour. A prerequisite to achieving these goals, a *sine qua non* for successful interpersonal communication, is language. The easier it becomes for us to make new contacts outside of our immediate home enclosures, the more desperate our efforts to ensure the smooth and fool-proof flow of information.

There are essentially two ways to alleviate the effects of the Tower of Babel syndrome in Europe today: unification and diversification. The former hinges on the growing popularity of English as a lingua franca - by some estimates nearly a half of the world's population will be able to communicate in English by the year 2100. The latter manifests itself in the Council of Europe's declaration that every European citizen should be able to use at least two foreign languages, apart from his or her mother tongue. Here, too, English is in the lead.

Given that English has become the language of science and academic research on the one hand and an obligatory part of many school curricula on the other, the most natural move to make would seem to be combining the two developments, to let the learner take advantage of both at the same time. This is, in essence, the rationale behind CLIL (Content-and-language-integrated-learning). Instead of the tradition-sanctioned scenario of teaching content subjects (say, chemistry) in Polish alongside a few hours a week of English language teaching, we apply the "wash-and-go" principle of teaching chemistry through English. Please note the preposition – it is teaching *through* English rather than, or instead of, teaching it *in* English. The ambitious twofold aim is to do justice to the inherent complexities of chemical analyses while attending to the linguistic needs of L2 learners of English. The cognitive and academic skills required in order to appreciate the scientific study of matter, its compounding and decomposition go hand in hand with basic communicative skills, albeit tailored to the broadly conceived scientific context.

In my personal view, the ideal CLIL provision would have a *triple* focus, instead of the commonly mentioned *dual* focus: we teach the content subject, we teach the language AND we teach about the language. The last proviso has been

implicit in most CLIL-oriented writings. It has to do with reflecting on L2 structure, raising the learners' awareness of their L1, comparing L1 and L2 knowledge and expectations, as well as inductively or deductively arriving at rule formulations of non-trivial predictive power.

It is clear, therefore, that the demands placed on today's CLIL followers are extraordinarily high. There will be, of course, various realizations of the core CLIL insights, some of them more demanding and strenuous than others, from teachers' and students' perspectives. It should not be surprising that CLIL methodology comes in so many different guises and that the search for an optimal CLIL variety is nowhere near being over. The existence of CLIL depends on bilingual education, in some form or another. The diversity of CLIL-related teaching paradigms reflects a whole spectrum of ideas about bilingualism. From the all-or-nothing approach of the early fifties to the capacious intercultural interpretations arising in the recent years, bilingualism has become more of an umbrella term for varying degrees of linguistic and pragmatic competence in a foreign/second language. The model of a bilingual speaker has undergone major modifications over the last decade, as well. It seems that any form of L2 expertise is worth fighting for. It is better to know a handful of expressions in one foreign language than to be a monolingual speaker, it is better to be a B1 user than an A2 user, and so on, and so forth. CLIL offers tools and insights to help in all these educational contexts.

Teachers, students and educational authorities should know what the stakes are, however, before they decide to embrace some specific form of CLIL-driven tuition. And those who have already done some bilingual teaching or learning should be given alternatives to consider, so that every teaching facility may choose the optimal CLIL variant. And that is exactly why the present report on bilingual education in Poland is so important.

It provides an overview of practice in Polish secondary schools which use English to teach content subjects. The aim was to identify operating models, and examine operational features of this type of education. It succeeds admirably. Four operating curricular models of bilingual education have been identified and described. This allows for more precision in any discussion about the boundaries and feature specification of CLIL-related education. The findings reveal areas of strength, and suggest possible courses of action to achieve even better results.

I can only hope that the findings presented in the report will serve as a reference point in the ongoing debate about the future of foreign language education in Poland, and that it will inspire teachers, language educators, as well as textbook authors and publishers to consider CLIL alternatives to standard programmes and to promote awareness of CLIL in their professional environments.

*Warsaw, January 17, 2008*

*Romuald Gozdawa-Gołębiowski*

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) as a pedagogical approach has become a key issue in Europe in recent years. In order to promote multilingualism the European Commission has strongly recommended that its member states integrate this approach into all innovations planned in their school systems.

It is interesting to note that the idea underlying CLIL is not really new. Bilingual education has functioned for many years. In Germany, for example, we have some 50 years of experience; now, CLIL is successfully implemented in more than six hundred schools in our country. The extensive experience we have in Germany with CLIL clearly indicates that it does not only work as a methodological approach to improve foreign language competence, but even more so as a general educational approach to promote academic and professional abilities.

As the Eurydice report shows, many countries in Europe are currently trying to make use of the CLIL approach in their respective school systems. The process of introducing CLIL is gaining momentum everywhere in Europe, although its speed varies considerably [from country to country].

It is understandable that CLIL as a methodological approach has been taken up by so many European countries. Changes in society – the European dimension, globalisation, and new technologies – have created new educational needs which have influenced curricular developments. And in order to do justice to the new curricular needs, we have to call into question our present approaches to teaching and learning in our schools and reflect upon them.

This report tries to initiate such a process. It is an overview of practice in which bilingual education teaching and learning processes are described, as they occur in Polish schools, and opinions of staff and students are collected. The report itself looks at the situation in different schools from an outsider's perspective; it is collaborative, and ends with a series of recommendations which were written to help decision-making and to enact change.

I am sure that this thorough and detailed report will be of great help in the process of reflecting on possible innovations of the CLIL approach in Polish schools.

Wuppertal, November 15, 2007

*Dieter Wolff*



# Research Approach

This report provides an overview of practices in Polish secondary schools which through the medium of English language to a greater or lesser extent. All schools known to be practicing some form of bilingual education were approached at the outset of the process. Nineteen schools, located across the country, responded and allowed a researcher to interview students and staff and to carry out classroom observation.

The purpose of this study was to identify operating models, and examine the operational features of this type of education. The study did not act as an evaluation of the schools, but as an overview of practices which are intended to support ongoing capacity-building within and among the schools.

## 1. National Overview

This will appear as a separate publication of CODN in 2008.

## 2. Operating Curricular Models

Differing approaches to bilingual education (English) are implemented in Polish schools. This study has identified four curricular models.

### Model A:

#### **Extensive English Language Medium Instruction**

(in a given lesson, and throughout the curriculum)

English is used exclusively for teaching and learning. There is limited use of Polish, which is generally used for translation of terminology, or brief recapitulation of learning concepts. Model A is found in two types:

#### **Type A**

Single Focus – This involves an almost exclusive focus on content. There is occasional reference to linguistic features of English or Polish. Reference to English generally concerns the pronunciation or spelling of terms.

#### **Type B**

Dual Focus – This involves a focus on content and on linguistic features of English or Polish. Content is taught with constant attention given to

forms of language support and development in lessons. The degree of focus varies from lesson to lesson, but focus on content is greater overall.

### **Rationale**

To achieve the expected content learning outcomes, while developing and using a very high degree of competence in English. A high degree of fluency in Polish is an assumed competence.

### **Model B:**

#### **Partial English Language Medium Instruction (Code-switching English-Polish)**

(in a given lesson, and within the curriculum)

English and Polish are used for teaching and learning. About 50% of the lesson time is allocated to the use of each language. There is considerable switching between languages (code-switching) for specific functions during the learning and teaching process. Model B is found in two types:

#### **Type A**

Single Focus – This involves an almost exclusive focus on content. English and Polish are used in a variety of ways. Switching between the languages may be swift, and done according to varying functional conventions.

#### **Type B**

Dual Focus – This involves a focus on both content and features of English or Polish. English and Polish are both used in a variety of ways. Switching between the languages may be swift, and done according to different conventions. However, in using these two languages, content is taught with continuous attention given mainly to forms of English language support and development in lessons. The degree of focus varies from lesson to lesson, but focus on content is greater overall.

### **Rationale**

To achieve expected content learning outcomes, while developing and using a very high degree of competence in English. A high degree of fluency in Polish is an assumed competence.

### **Model C:**

#### **Limited English Language Medium Instruction (code-switching, English-Polish)**

(in a given lesson)

English and Polish are used for teaching and learning. Lessons are characterized by devoting 10-50% of the time to the use of English. Language switching (code-switching) for specific functions during the learning and teaching process takes place. Model C is found in two types:

#### **Type A**

Single Focus – This involves an almost exclusive focus on content. English is used in a variety of ways, but Polish remains the dominant language of instruction. Switching between the languages may be swift, and done according to various functional conventions.

#### **Type B**

Dual Focus – This involves a focus on both the subject and features of English or Polish. English is used in a variety of ways, but Polish remains the dominant language of instruction. Switching between the languages may be swift, and done according to different conventions. However, in using these two languages, content is taught with limited attention given to English language support and development in lessons. The degree of focus varies from lesson to lesson, but the focus on content is greater overall.

### **Rationale**

To achieve expected content learning outcomes alongside limited use of English. This generally involves activation of existing knowledge, supplementing this with new words, terms and concepts, **and** providing opportunities for cross-linguistic development. A high degree of fluency in Polish is an assumed competence.

#### **Model D:**

#### **Specific English Language medium Instruction**

English and Polish are used for teaching and learning. Lessons are characterized by very limited time devoted to use of English language. This tends to be done for some specific purpose. Model D comprises a range of variant types:

#### **Type A**

A lesson conducted mostly in English which concludes a sequence of lessons conducted in Polish – the aim is to consolidate knowledge rather than to develop English language skills

#### **Type B**

A lesson conducted in Polish based on materials in English.

#### **Type D**

A course which involves project work, possibly in the form of a curricular module, which is prepared and often presented in

English by students. The majority of content will have been learned previously in Polish.

### **Rationale**

To complement courses taught in Polish, and fulfil the expected content learning outcomes by providing opportunities for specific forms of English language usage and development. Decisions made about the introduction of English to these variants often involve enhancing motivation to use English, the consolidation of knowledge and learning in English as a form of added value, and providing alternative platforms for learning. A high degree of fluency in Polish is an assumed competence.

### **3. Objectives & Added Value of Bilingual Education (English)**

Each of the operational models involves different objectives in relation to the English language. These objectives may not always be explicit, and each model may involve multiple objectives and a different emphasis at given points in the curriculum. These objectives constitute the added value which is ultimately gained by students when learning in English through the different models.

The objectives which are viewed as leading to forms of added value are as follows:

#### *1. The Language Dimension*

- To improve overall English language competence
- To develop English oral communication and presentation skills
- To deepen awareness of both Polish and English

#### *2. The Content Dimension*

- To provide opportunities to study content through different perspectives
- To access subject-specific English language terminology
- To prepare for future studies and/or working life

#### *3. The Cultural Dimension*

- To build intercultural knowledge and understanding
- To develop intercultural communication skills

#### *4. The Environmental Dimension*

- To develop a European and international orientation
- To access international certification



- To enhance school profiles (and thus provide students with an enriched learning environment)

#### *5. The Learning Dimension*

- To diversify methods and forms of classroom practice
- To increase learner motivation

#### **Good Practice**

Specifying the objectives of both content learning and language development, at the lesson/activity and course level, helps further improve the achievement of quality outcomes in bilingual education.

### **4. Selected Schools: Overview of Practice**

#### **4.1 European & International Dimensions**

The majority of interviewees report that there are European and international dimensions embedded in their bilingual education model. This applies to all models, and thus may be included to a greater or lesser extent. Some interviewees report that these activities also involve students within the school who receive their education in Polish. Many suggest that it would be advisable to have an increase in time and available resources for such activities.

Interviewees report involvement with projects on multiculturalism and cultural festivals, and those linked to European Union programmes: Youth in Action, Socrates, Comenius, and teacher exchanges facilitated by Axion. Schools may also provide national culture-specific courses, for example those which focus on English-speaking countries, such as the United Kingdom, and others on aspects of interculturalism.

Extra-curricular activities are also carried out to support the overall learning process in a range of schools. This may be in the form of school trips within Poland and abroad, theatre performances, language competitions, special interest groups, participation in culturally-oriented festivals, clubs, extra language lessons in English and languages other than English, and student ‘Olympiads’.

#### **GOOD PRACTICE**

Integrative actions, such as international projects and certain extra-curricular activities open to all school students (e.g. extra-curricular ‘European Stream’) reduce the risk of bilingual education streams becoming a ‘school within a school’, and lead to benefits for the school as a whole.

It is evident that involvement with international activities is time-consuming for teachers, and it is a credit to these staff that so many are involved with facilitating these as extra-curricular activities.

Embedding an international orientation into the curriculum will already be established within Polish medium education to some degree. The availability of a specified curriculum for bilingual education (English) would make it possible to determine if the models involve a greater focus on a European or otherwise international orientation.

## **4.2 Outreach Actions**

### **Schools in Poland**

Some interviewees report having contact with other bilingual education schools in Poland. One type of cooperation reported is through Towarzystwo Szkół Twórczych, which is a network by which schools can share experiences, materials and mock Matura examination sets. Interest in increasing such cooperation was clearly voiced.

### **Schools in other countries**

Some interviewees report cooperation with other bilingual education schools in countries outside Poland. This generally involves using European Union funding. These teachers report positively on the value of such cooperation.

### **Other Organizations**

Some interviewees report that they have links with organizations other than local authorities, such as the British Council and some English language publishers.

Whereas a range of activities are introduced by which to develop a European and international orientation in bilingual education schools, there is relatively little networking with schools in Poland or abroad, and with other organizations.

### **Good Practice**

Outreach experience such as that achieved through networking is not necessary to achieve quality in bilingual education, but it can act as a major source of support and development for schools and their teachers.

## **4.3 School Development**

### **Internal Management Support**

The involvement of management, team formation and coordination are viewed as important aspects for achieving and maintaining quality. In those cases where

school management is actively involved with the bilingual programme, interviewees report positive outcomes.

### **External Support from Key Stakeholders**

Interviewees consider external support to be vital to development. The major external stakeholder is considered to be within the national educational administration.

The types of support suggested by interviewees relate to various capacity-building issues, but focus most on bilingual education curricula and the Matura (English) final examination. The lack of availability of specific items, such as copies of previous examinations, appears to have a washback effect on many aspects of the work done by the teachers involved. Another issue relates to the need for forums by which teachers in the schools could receive training, and have broader opportunities for professional development in this area.

#### **Good Practice**

It is possible for a teacher/a small group of teachers to achieve successful bilingual education without significant help from other people. However, if school/college management offers recognition and support, good long-term performance is more likely.

## **4.4 TEACHERS**

### **Profiles**

Teaching content through the medium of English in a Polish school is a challenging task. It demands the competences of a highly skilled teacher alongside a specific level of fluency in the English language, knowledge about this special educational context, and skills in adapting teaching and learning methods. The content of the program and the language teachers involved can bring about learner outcomes which are specific to bilingual education and not easily achieved in Polish-only contexts.

Interviews and classroom observation enabled the research team to gain insights into teacher profiles, and their attitudes towards teaching through the medium of English using each of the four models.

#### **Good Practice**

Non-native teachers teaching in a second language are by no means second-best. They can, and do, easily out-perform certain types of native speaker teachers.

Most of the content and language teachers interviewed were Polish. Many had experience living and working in English-speaking countries. Some also had teaching experience in countries other than Poland. These teachers had differing reasons for becoming involved with English-medium education, and showed a high degree of commitment towards exploring further professional development. Foreign language teachers also tend to rely on bilingual education programmes in order to teach communicative and cultural aspects of the English language.

Some viewed their involvement with bilingual education as a rewarding form of personal and professional development. Many recognized the importance of managerial understanding and support so as to ensure that suitable levels of quality could be sustained in their teaching work.

The teachers were willing and able to articulate their opinions on measures by which to further develop bilingual education in their classes, and schools. This wealth of insight, on challenges and solutions, is reflected throughout this report.

#### **Good Practice**

Successful bilingual education requires not just teaching **in** the target language but **through** the language.

Teaching **in** language x = transmitting information in the target language

Teaching **through** language x = using methods which combine content and language development, and learning skills

This means that the bilingual teacher has to continually consider content, language and learning skills

Finally, the insight gained from interviewing and observing both content and language teachers enables us to build an overall profile of the optimal types of knowledge and skills involved.

<b>ZONE</b>	<b>SPECIFIC COMPETENCE</b>
<b>English Language</b>	Sufficient English language knowledge and pragmatic skill for the bilingual education model followed, so as to be a producer of comprehensible input for learners
	Sufficient knowledge of the levels of English language student competence in writing, reading, speaking and listening
	Sufficient knowledge of the types of language needed to learn certain types of content
<b>Theory</b>	Sufficient understanding of subject-specific cognitive demands and learning skills required for achieving different educational outcomes Knowledge of the differences and similarities between the

ZONE	SPECIFIC COMPETENCE
	concepts of <i>language learning</i> and <i>language acquisition</i> in classroom environments
<b>Methodology</b>	<p>Ability to exploit methodologies which enhance the use of socially- and message-oriented language, thus providing optimal opportunities for learner communication through employing enriched communication strategies</p> <p>Ability to use communication/interaction methods that facilitate the understanding of meaning</p> <p>Ability to identify linguistic difficulties (e.g. with language construction rules) resulting from first/other language interference, or subject conceptualization</p> <p>Ability to use strategies (e.g. echoing, modeling, extension, repetition) for correction and for modeling good language usage</p> <p>Ability to identify and use dual-focused activities which simultaneously cater to content learning and language support</p>
<b>The learning environment</b>	<p>Ability to use different classroom settings in order to provide acquisition-rich learning environments</p> <p>Ability to respond to the preferred learning styles and strategies of students</p> <p>Ability to devise strategies where learning is enhanced by peer interaction and according to principles of learner autonomy</p> <p>Knowledge of the potential of information and communication technology and multi-media to support bilingual learning environments</p>
<b>Materials development</b>	<p>Ability to select materials on a given topic from different media, and utilize these in an integrated framework</p> <p>Ability to adapt and exploit materials, considering semantic (conceptual) features of structure, as well as textual, syntactic and vocabulary features</p>
<b>Interdisciplinary approaches</b>	<p>Ability to identify the conceptual relations between different subjects across the curriculum with a view to making learning interlinked, relevant, easier and effective</p> <p>Ability to identify conceptual/semantic relations between the different languages active in the environment</p>
<b>Assessment</b>	Ability to develop and implement evaluation and assessment tools which complement the bilingual education model implemented
<b>Networking</b>	Ability to cooperate and share knowledge with other bilingual teachers as well as with language and content teachers within the school. Knowledge of appropriate network resources

“Good bilingual teaching is beyond the traditional repertoire of the content teacher, and the language teacher. It is not simply content teaching, or language teaching, but a fusion of both”.

**Researcher**

### **Teamwork**

The interviews reveal that teamwork between teachers is considered an important asset for supporting implementation of the bilingual education models. It is suggested that the demands of one’s working life as a teacher, and other constraints such as time-table complexity, and even the availability of physical space in some schools (*“the teacher’s room is small and crowded”*) can make teamwork difficult.

Interviewees suggested that teamwork has not been a typical characteristic of teaching in Polish schools, and that teachers generally work as experts in relative isolation from each other. However, there was recognition that teamwork could have a positive impact on those working in bilingual education.

There are three significant types of teamwork relationship:

- Subject teacher >< Subject teacher

These tend to be between teachers working in the same discipline (e.g. sciences, humanities, etc.), and are considered rewarding because *“we understand each other’s subjects”*. They are often based on informal, *ad hoc* personal relationships.

- Subject teacher >< English language teacher

These are reportedly less common - *“we don’t usually find time to work together.”*

- Subject teacher & English language teachers >< School administration

These tend to involve one-to-one or small group interaction, with high levels of satisfaction reported by interviewees (*“we need to see how we work as a whole team”*) who received understanding and support from managerial-level staff.

Overall findings indicate that whereas there is informal cooperation between the bilingual education staff, teamwork through certain types of ‘professional partnerships’ (as opposed to the scheduling of full teacher meetings) would be beneficial. Teamwork is one significant means of ensuring that the curriculum is delivered as a coherent whole.

### **Good Practice**

The formation of small teacher teamwork partnerships within a school, and practical recognition and support which enable them to function, can lead to beneficial professional development outcomes.

One major outcome relates to the development of methodologies which draw on good practices from different subject areas.

### **Professional Development**

Teachers report high interest in engaging in forms of continuing professional development. Such development concerns capacity-building in their use of the English language, as well as pedagogical practices. Opportunities for engaging in certain types of courses and seminars have been limited in the past, but there are indications that more initiatives are now underway which would support differing needs and spheres of interest.

There are three inter-related aspects which relate to professional development:

1. The need to create a specific bilingual education (English) curriculum and establish stronger links with the Matura (English) examination process

“My feeling is that when it comes to bilingual classes, there are no rules, no sets of advice available in Poland”.

Content Teacher

“We prepare our students intuitively for the bilingual Matural exams”.

Content Teacher

2. The need for more access to information on bilingual education practices in Poland, or other countries, which could support development

“We could learn so much from visiting teachers teaching in this way in other places”

English Teacher

3. The need for more resources and opportunities to participate in training programmes or symposia, organized within Poland or in other countries.

“Some of us are at a stage where we could learn very much from development programmes and access to ready-made materials used in other countries”

Content Teacher

There is a very significant need to shed light on bilingual education. This is not so much the case with Models C & D, but is very important with regard to Models A & B.

The need for further information on bilingual practice in Poland and other countries has been addressed through various European Union-supported initiatives since the mid-1990s. One way to attend to this need is through international networking. There are various networks operating in Europe from which a range of support can be obtained. There is also a European Commission / Lifelong Learning Programme (LLP)-supported initiative, CCN, which is to form a pan-European Union network of content and language teachers during 2008-2011.

Some of the teachers interviewed had undertaken intensive English language training to be better prepared for teaching through English; few, however, had found access to development opportunities for specialists in this area. A case in point was the opportunity to work alongside other subject-specific teachers involved with bilingual education (e.g. within maths, sciences, etc.). Another pertained to the desire to network and learn from other bilingual education teachers in Poland, or elsewhere, so as to further develop good practices.

Lack of financial resources is a significant problem for the teaching profession in many countries, including Poland. Existing salaries do not easily enable individuals to finance their own development. Thus external support is often essential. European Union Funding is currently available for courses on bilingual education through the LLP of the European Union.

Teachers report that they have benefited from courses and seminars organized by the British Council over the years. Contact with organizations representing major English-speaking countries is very limited.

A few interviewees report on the successes for professional development which result from cooperative ventures with schools in other countries. Cooperation through the Polish Towarzystwo Szkół Twórczych network is also considered valuable by the few teachers who report involvement.

#### **Good Practice**

Engaging in professional development through:

Cross-disciplinary workshops

Subject-specific workshops

Shadowing in bilingual schools

Immersion in English-speaking environments

Internet-based networking & cooperation

Teacher exchange

Teacher/Student school visits

Trans-national school projects

Using bilingual education materials resource-banks

Seminars organized by local providers



## 4.5 STUDENTS

### Selection Procedures

The recruitment process for bilingual classes in lower and higher secondary schools is specified by each particular school. Students are generally enrolled on the basis of a specific test (either one or a combination of tests, as below):

- Aptitude test (consisting of exercises based on both modern as well as classical and artificial languages, checking ability to make associations, draw analogies, make hypothesis etc.). The test is prepared either by universities or internally by teachers.
- Written language test (including reading comprehension and listening comprehension, as well as exercises checking the use of lexical and grammar structures)
- Written language tests with elements of content subjects taught in English in the curriculum.
- Oral exam (in the form of an interview or short dialogues, so as to assess students' vocabulary, intonation, pronunciation, and overall fluency).

### Motivation towards Bilingual Education

Students report the following advantages and disadvantages of studying through English:

#### Advantages

- Preparing for future studies in other countries
- Participating in a prestigious type of education
- Broadening horizons and connecting to the world
- Access to a broader range of topics and extra lessons
- Gaining different perspectives
- Studying in smaller-sized classes than in mainstream education
- Developing intercultural competence
- Participating in international exchanges
- Having greater access to learning resources (Internet)

#### Disadvantages

- Requires more effort
- Large number of classes per week

- Subject learning perceived as not being as thorough as in mainstream classes
- Traditional classroom teaching
- Code-switching (Polish-English) is not systematic
- Objectives for learning through English unclear
- Lack of suitable English language materials
- English Matura perceived as not providing credit for Polish university entrance

### **Learning Additional Languages**

Interviewees report that students who study through the medium of English are also often interested in the learning of other languages, mainly French, German and Italian. This implies that the experience of learning through English is related to motivation towards developing plurilingual competence. In such cases, approaches used to learn languages other than English could benefit from examining good practice found in learning through the medium of English. In this way, cross-linguistic cooperation between teachers could improve overall language learning outcomes within a given school or locality.

**“Sometimes the students get blasé about knowing English, so they are keen to develop another foreign language”**  
English Teacher

### **Access to the English Language outside School**

Every school classroom is a microcosm of the wider society, and this is particularly relevant in terms of the impact of new technology and students’ exposure to the English language. On the basis of the interview data, appraisal was made of the extent to which students read and communicate through the Internet using English outside school hours. This is estimated at about 15-20 hours of exposure per week.

This not only has implications for the levels of English language competence the students will have at given ages, but also for the types of skills that they develop alongside their bilingual education content and language courses.

The remit of this study does not enable us to determine how such high exposure to English through new technology impacts students’ linguistic and cognitive development. Teachers recognize, however, that students currently participating in bilingual education programmes do differ, to some extent, from the pre-internet generations. This has implications for how English is taught and how

content learning is adjusted to accommodate ensuing linguistic and content-based knowledge and skills.

Teachers report that in addition to extensive use of the Internet, some students also take extra English lessons (privately arranged) at some point during their school years.

**“Generation Y (born 1982-2001) has a mindset focused on immediacy - learning as you use, using as you learn - not learn now for use later. This impacts their preferred learning styles and strategies”  
Researcher**

## **4.6 Learning Processes**

### **Subjects**

The most common subjects taught through bilingual education in the selected and examined schools are (ranked in order):

Biology

Geography

Mathematics

Physics

Chemistry

History

Teaching is also reported in a few cases for citizenship, technical, and computer (ICT) education. English language teaching is carried out alongside all of these other content subjects.

Students were asked during interviews if any particular subjects were more difficult than others to study through the medium of English. Frequent reference was made to biology in their answers. However, the interviewees suggest that whilst separate subjects might be ‘difficult’, it is the way the subject is taught and learned which is a key issue, not the subject itself. It is reasonable to suggest that all of these subjects can be challenging in one way or another, but that none emerge as ‘unsuitable’ for bilingual education.

Content teachers clearly consider which topics within a given subject are more appropriate for teaching and learning through the medium of English. This is most common in Models B-D, and reflects a growing trend in Europe where a modular approach is developed for forms of bilingual education.

This trend could have important implications for Polish bilingual education because of the increasing availability of purpose-designed materials by which to teach such modules.

### **Instructional Approaches & Methodologies**

Instructional approaches and the educational systems which they serve differ among countries. For example, the countries which rank highly in PISA (OECD) show no definitive correlation between high performance and specific methodologies.

Ensuring that lessons take place within rich learning environments depends on a range of factors. In bilingual education, one of these involves having opportunities for the students to use English with each other (e.g. in group work) when learning content. This implies using methodologies which support the principles of a participatory view of learning.

During the course of this study, a range of different methodologies were observed in classroom practice. There is significant variation among subjects and classes, and it is not possible to draw conclusions that any specific model of bilingual education is tied to specific approaches. However, it is an interesting area for all teachers involved to reflect on as they examine ways to further refine their work.

The models for content teaching differed slightly:

Model A: Teacher-based instruction with continuous use of student pair/group work tasks

Model B: Mostly teacher-based instruction with limited use of student pair/group work tasks.

Model C: Mostly teacher-based instruction with limited use of student pair/group work tasks

Model D: Variant types do not allow for appraisal

English language teaching was mainly teacher-based across all models.

The language learning needs of bilingual education students will differ considerably from those learning in a Polish medium, due partly to high exposure to English whilst learning other subjects. Thus, the teaching of the English language is adapted to serve the needs of the bilingual education students. There should be a focus on ensuring that they have sufficient subject-specific cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) alongside the basic interpersonal

communication skills (BICS) which they already reportedly possess to a high degree (Models A & B especially).

Over the course of time, the bilingual education students may encounter individualized linguistic weaknesses, often with written texts in English. Good practice is supported when content teachers cooperate with language teachers in identifying these, so that the students can receive explicit support.

The language teachers can thus be considered problem-solving consultants who will, over time, build up a database of specific problems with CALP encountered by the bilingual education students. This is then used to further develop language education suitable for bilingual streams.

To interweave language and non-language teaching within a single bilingual education model is a pre-requisite for achieving the best possible outcomes. The *European Language Portfolio* could be a useful means for facilitating the development of the consultancy role, while giving the students a tool by which to take greater responsibility for their own linguistic and communicative development in the English language.

### **Good Practice**

The European Language Portfolio and Europass Language Passport can both be used to motivate students, and help them become aware of the English language and their individual levels of metacognitive awareness (preferred learning strategies and styles).

It is reported that students of bilingual education classes obtain good final results, overall. This could be due to various factors; one concerns the quality and effectiveness of the methodologies used for subject and English language learning. On the basis of this highly limited sample of classroom visits, it appears that there is significant reliance on 'transactional' communication, with information coming from teachers to students. 'Interactional' communication also takes place, where knowledge is jointly constructed by teacher and students, but this is found less frequently.

Research on forms of bilingual education outside Poland increasingly focuses on the impact of language on cognition and mental processes. These processes are both internal and social. The social processes cannot be reinforced unless students have opportunities to discuss what they are thinking as they learn a given topic. This is why teachers use methodologies which lead to pair and group work, as found in some of the classroom data obtained during the course of this study.

Teachers face questions such as whether to adapt and modify the methodologies they would use in Polish medium education when teaching through English, or

how they ought to do so. Teacher interviews indicate that there is little difference in the use of methodologies.

However, some do speak of the impact which acquiring English language materials can have on the methodologies they use for a given topic. In other words, it may be that even if the teaching and learning process is already successful in the given schools, adaptation of methodologies could lead to even better results. Such adaptation would take place in content areas with their own 'teaching and learning characteristics', and also across certain subject areas. Learning what and how to adapt can be accelerated through allotting time in the school week for bilingual education teachers to engage in forms of dialogue and teamwork.

### **Good Practice**

In bilingual education, all teachers -- content and English language -- carry responsibility for English language development, to a greater or lesser extent, in their classes. Ultimately, all teachers carry this dual focus.

Teachers recognise that teaching and learning through the different models (especially A-B) involves more than just a change of language. Bilingual education invites methodological change and adopting methods which are language-supportive. This goes beyond vocabulary items, and involves ensuring that all teachers use methodologies which enable students to use and think in English about the content being taught. In bilingual education, monologue – by teacher or students (e.g. in presentations) is only one type of discourse which ought to be elicited in the learning process.

### **Good Practice**

Principles of the constructivist approach, drawn from largely from cognitive psychology, may be very significant for bilingual education:

Instruction must be concerned with the experiences and contexts that make the student willing and able to learn (readiness).

Instruction must be structured so that it can be easily grasped by the student (spiral organization).

Instruction should be designed to facilitate extrapolation and fill in the gaps (going beyond the information given).

Bruner 1990

### **Cognitive Load**

Learning involves acquiring new concepts and skills. In bilingual education, teachers and students recognize that they approach learning in different ways

when using the Polish or English languages. This difference is viewed as linked to differences in conceptualization in each of the languages.

### **Good Practice**

Code-switching can be beneficial to learning if it is systematic. Changing languages in a predictable way, for specific functions, can support the learning process

The cognitive demands on students who learn through English are viewed as slightly different than those they experience when learning through Polish. This may be one reason why code-switching is common in some classes (particularly in Models B-D). Secondary education in Polish, or English, can be very demanding in terms of learning processes.

Experienced bilingual education teachers understand this and give attention to the types of language needed to learn certain types of content, the learning skills required for achieving different learning outcomes, and the preferred learning styles and strategies which students have for specific subjects. This generally means adapting methodologies so that students can engage in higher-order thinking (Benjamin Bloom, 1956). The shift from lower-order to higher-order thinking is directly linked to methodologies and student engagement in the learning process.

Achieving higher-order thinking means using (and having students use) specific forms of academic English for teaching and learning. It also means having methodologies which activate mental processes within the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). ZPD is the gap between the student's actual level of development and the potential level which can be achieved by working with other people.

### **Good Practice**

Teacher understanding of the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and the related use of 'scaffolding' (Vygotsky), are recognized as key constructs in achieving quality through bilingual education. This can enable students to engage in Higher Order Thinking, e.g. creating, evaluating, analysing, applying, understanding, and remembering. (Bloom)

Lower-order thinking means that students receive information and rarely go beyond the need for basic reproduction of what is being taught and learned. Higher order thinking implies actively manipulating information in order to understand and establish new meanings. This is viewed as demanding in Polish-medium education; it is all the more so when learning through the medium of English. Experienced bilingual teachers elicit higher order thinking, and this is

facilitated through introducing and using English words and discourse which are required in synthesizing information, generalizing, hypothesizing, interpreting, analyzing, and applying information, amongst other functions.

Interviewees report that they are aware of the theoretical constructs of cognition, and that they seek ways to learn further how to accommodate this when teaching through English.

### **Language Use & Discourse**

Classroom observation sessions, interviews and further analysis have provided insights into the characteristics typical of classroom discourse within different schools, subjects and models.

#### **Good Practice**

Research in other countries has shown that some bilingual education teachers tend to talk more than they would in their first language (e.g. increased teacher talking time).

Quality bilingual education requires providing opportunities for students to creatively use language.

Students often use Polish when:

- **Seeking clarification of a new topic**, e.g. “Co to jest *konfiguracja kontynentów i mórz*? Nie rozumiem”, (trans. “What is a *configuration of the continents and seas*?” - geography) “Z czego składa się tkanka? Nie rozumiem tego po angielsku” (trans. “What does tissue consist of? I don’t get it in English” - biology).
- **Asking the teachers questions about content** e.g. “*Triangle to stożek czy trójkąt?*” (trans. “Is a *triangle* a *cone* or a *triangle*?” - mathematics), “*Physical features to cechy fizyczne, czyli to co widzimy?*” (trans. “*Physical features* are those ones which we can see, right?” - chemistry).
- **Seeking information** which is not connected with the topic of the lesson e.g. additional information concerning homework or a test e.g. “*Czy strona piąta jest cała na zadanie?*” (trans. “Is it all of page 5 for homework?” - mathematics).
- **When working in pairs or groups**

Teachers often use Polish:



(Mainly written text)

- **As the language of teaching materials** (possibly due to a lack of access to English language materials).
- **For administering tests and also evaluating content learning.**

(Mainly spoken text)

- **For introducing a new topic** “Napiszcie sobie nowy temat – transport komórkowy” (trans. “Write down a new topic – cell transportation” - biology).
- **For translation of brief sections of teacher monologue** (lecture)
- **When introducing new terms** e.g. “*Land form* to *formy terenu*” (geography), “*nucleus* to *jądro*” (biology), “*Cortex* to *błona*” (biology).
- **When asking for an explanation** e.g. “*Histology* to nauka zajmująca się budową komórki” (trans. “Histology is a science which concerns cell structure” - biology).
- For giving clues following the use of **prompt questions** given in English, e.g. “Could you come to the blackboard and draw the set and explain the term *mutually exclusive*?” <upon receiving no answer from the learner> “OK, zapomnij o angielskim, wszyscy mają to zrozumieć, wytłumacz po polsku” (trans. “OK, forget about English, everybody needs to understand it, explain it in Polish” - mathematics).
- **For classroom management purposes** e.g. “Przeczytajcie tekst ze strony 23”, “Bądźcie cicho” (trans. “Read the text from page 23”, “Be quiet” - history).

#### Good Practice

Student Intake can best be measured by giving opportunities for the teacher to monitor Student Output during the learning process

Teacher input: what a student sees and hears

Student intake: what a student understands

Student output: what a student produces after intake

In summary, we can see that the languages of teaching and learning include both Polish and English. Much of the talking time involves teacher discourse. The students speak when they are nominated by the teacher, or in order to acknowledge comprehension of the teacher's instruction, comment briefly on something they or other learners have said, request clarification or confirmation, or ask for assistance.

Students often rely on formulaic expressions in English, rather than constructed sequences, and often switch to Polish. The frequency of clarification requests, confirmation checks and comprehension checks is reportedly higher than in Polish-medium education. Clarification checks on the part of the student or the teacher often result in a repetition of a previous utterance or translation into Polish.

Student output is generally more elaborate when the learners are requested to talk about their own experiences, express their opinions on the topic at hand, or relate to the outcome of a decision-making activity (group work).

### **Resources & Materials**

A variety of resources and materials are used by teachers implementing all models. These may be in English or Polish, and various sophisticated combinations of these languages are used to support learning.

Good practice in bilingual education frequently requires even greater visualization of terms and concepts than when teaching in Polish. This is related to the 'language load' when learning through an additional language. Not all schools are well-equipped with data projectors and other forms of equipment which would make it easy to develop purpose-designed materials, and use them effectively in the classroom. The use of white/black boards and OHP transparencies is no longer sufficient for achieving quality visualization of all subjects and teaching situations in this type of environment.

Investment in classroom data projectors and portable computers will increasingly become a pre-requisite to achieving standards of excellence in materials and subject learning. This is partly due to the need for teachers to give considerable and ongoing attention to maximizing the quality of their materials. It also relates to enabling greater use of the Internet for students to learn autonomously. Increased use of permanently-equipped, 'dedicated' classrooms could help in this respect. The use of such classrooms (designed primarily for English teaching) was observed during the course of this study. They clearly offer great potential for content teaching in English.

The textual complexity of English language materials, as well as their synchrony with the Polish curriculum, was an issue raised by interviewees. This applies to set class texts, printed handouts, and library resources.

The key issue here concerns *readability*, namely whether the materials used have an optimal level of readability which maximizes reading comprehension. This is also related to CALP. Materials in different languages are often constructed according to culturally-bound discourse approaches. For instance, some materials produced for native-speaker learners, such as those deriving from English-speaking countries such as the UK, may not be fully suitable for some bilingual education classes in Poland. The logic of a text in English may differ substantially from that found in Polish, even on the same subject and with the same level of content complexity. It is essential that acquisition of content is not hindered by language barriers, and that students' language acquisition is stimulated through all materials used. This facilitates successful application of the dual-focus theory of bilingual education, which hinges on content learning and language learning/acquisition.

## **Synchronization of Curricula & Exams**

The Central Examination Board

The external examination system is prepared and organized by the Central Examination Board (CKE), a public institution based in Warsaw, in cooperation with eight Regional Examination Boards. The Central Examination Board is responsible for preparing and presenting syllabi with descriptions about the scope of the examinations, sample questions, tasks, tests, and criteria for assessment.

### **Good Practice**

Bilingual education teachers have to be able to assess if materials in English are appropriate to the reading levels of the learners

The Lower Secondary School Exam

The Lower Secondary School Exam is an obligatory written exam which takes place at the end of the lower secondary school. It is a cross-subject exam consisting of two parts: arts and science. Irrespective of the type of lower secondary school, the exam is conducted in Polish only.

In the 2008/09 school year, the Lower Secondary School Exam in a foreign language will be introduced. The students will take the exam in the foreign

language taught at school. The exam is compatible with the Core Curriculum of language teaching in lower secondary school, and reflects an A2+ level of competence (CEFR).

### The Matura Exam

The Matura exam is obligatory for all graduates of secondary schools. It is an external examination which is uniform throughout the country. The Matura is also the basis for admission to university. The exam consists of two parts: an oral exam assessed in the school, and a written part assessed by external examiners.

The students of bilingual schools can take all subjects in Polish or, alternatively, they can decide to take all subjects (except Polish and History and Geography of Poland) in Polish and in a foreign language. Students have a choice of six subjects: Biology, History, Chemistry, Geography, Physics and Mathematics. The Matura exam in English as a foreign language is based on the Core Curriculum for bilingual classes, which is more advanced than the extended version of the Matura for monolingual students. The Bilingual Matura in content subjects is set at a standard level and adheres to the same requirements as the Polish-medium Matura.

### **Key Issues:**

- The Central Examination Board publishes the Matura exam sets from the previous years. However, in case of the bilingual Matura, only the Matura exam in English as a foreign language is provided. Neither teachers nor students have access to the Bilingual Matura exam sets in content subjects.
- The Bilingual Matura in content subjects is considered to be based on the requirements of Polish-medium Matura. There is a need to establish clear requirements which are exclusive to the Bilingual Matura in content subjects.
- Teachers report a need for more information about assessment criteria. The information booklet prepared by the Central Examination Board only contains a short description of task types and a suggested assessment scheme for the tasks included in the sample paper. It does not, however, provide general assessment criteria.
- The Matura Exam has replaced entrance exams to universities, and therefore student results are instrumental to the enrolment process. It is reported that some universities do not take the Bilingual Matura in English as a foreign language into account. Even if it is considered more

demanding than the extended Matura, students are not granted extra points for having taken it. As a result, students sometimes reportedly withdraw from taking the Bilingual Matura.

- Each year, the Central Examination Board arranges mock Matura exams in all subjects. However, a mock Bilingual Matura is not always prepared (neither for English as a foreign language nor for content subjects).
- The Matura Exam is prepared at two levels: standard and extended. However, the Bilingual Matura in content subjects is only offered at the standard level, so students are not able to test their knowledge at the more demanding level.
- Lower secondary school teachers have commented that the Lower Secondary School exam does not accommodate the needs of the bilingual schools. No part of the exam, including the foreign language portion, contains additional tasks for bilingual students. As such, studying content subjects in English does not give the students any additional advantages in the final exam.

#### **GOOD PRACTICE**

These two types of language use help us understand the type of classroom communication we find in bilingual education. Both are important, but CALP leads towards achieving Higher Order Thinking:

**BICS** - basic interactional communication skills (e.g. typical, everyday talk)

**CALP** - cognitive and academic language proficiency (e.g. communication used in professional settings)

# Recommendations

The Recommendations are divided according to the following criteria:

**Practice** (the schools where bilingual education is implemented)

**Systems** (the educational system and its operating agents - Ministries, Teacher Development Agencies, & Examination Boards)

## Practice

- To assist and encourage schools to explicitly state objectives for the implementation of bilingual education (all models) into the curriculum.
- To form teacher work partnerships (content-language; content-content) within schools, and embed team meetings into the timetable.
- To form school partnerships by which teachers of specific subjects, including English, can cooperate on the creation of Polish-specific materials, preparatory tasks for the Matura (English) examination, and tools for student selection procedures.
- To encourage teachers to join international professional networks dedicated to forms of bilingual education, especially within Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL).
- To identify and communicate information on European Union resources which could be further used to support teachers and students.
- To further recognize the workload demands and specialized skills required for teaching through bilingual education, and ensure appropriate forms of remuneration so as to ensure staff retention.
- To identify support structures such as briefings for parents and students, and Learner Contracts which define teacher and student roles and responsibilities throughout the educational process.

- To explore means by which to enable teachers to rank B2 or higher in English language proficiency for all 5 skills areas (Common European Framework of Reference).
- To examine potential use of European Language Portfolio to support integration of student content and language learning.

## **Systems**

- To provide a framework curriculum for Matura (English).
- To provide access to examples of previous Matura (English) examinations.
- To provide resources for establishing a self-regulatory support service and a network for schools which undertake capacity-building, and achieve standardization through sharing experiences and co-developing resources.
- To provide opportunities for joint curriculum development, teacher in-service professional development, materials access and development, and Matura examination preparation.
- To liaise with higher education institutions on granting recognition of secondary level bilingual education studies during student application processes.
- To determine means by which insights and experience from good practice (Models A-D) could be implemented in other Polish mainstream schools.
- To encourage closer links between schools and higher education.





# Appendices

## List of schools participating in the project

1. Gimnazjum Nr 17  
ul. Zofii Nałkowskiej 9  
85-866 Bydgoszcz
2. V LO im. Stefana Żeromskiego  
ul. Polanki 130  
80-322 Gdańsk-Oliwa
3. III LO im. Bohaterów Westerplatte  
ul. Topolowa 7  
80-255 Gdańsk-Wrzeszcz
4. 24 Gimnazjum  
ul. Legionów 27  
81-405 Gdynia
5. III LO im. Marynarki  
Wojennej RP  
ul. Legionów 27  
81-405 Gdynia
6. Zespół Szkół Ogólnokształcących  
nr 12 Gimnazjum Dwujęzyczne  
ul. Płocka 16  
44-164 Gliwice
7. I LO im. B. Nowodworskiego  
Plac na Groblach 9  
31-101 Kraków
8. VI LO im. Adama Mickiewicza  
ul. Wąska 7  
31-057 Kraków
9. Zespół Szkół Ogólnokształcących  
(Publiczne Gimnazjum Nr 9 i  
Publiczne Liceum Ogólnokształcące  
im. Marii Skłodowskiej-Curie)  
ul. Duboisa 28  
45-070 Opole
10. Gimnazjum z Oddziałami  
Dwujęzycznymi  
ul. Kościuszki 41  
44-200 Rybnik
11. II Liceum Ogólnokształcące  
z Oddziałami Dwujęzycznymi  
ul. Mickiewicza 32  
76-200 Słupsk
12. Gimnazjum nr 25 im. Stanisława  
Staszica w Sosnowcu  
Plac Zillingera 1  
Sosnowiec
13. Gimnazjum z oddziałami  
dwujęzycznymi Nr 25  
ul. Zwycięzców 44  
03-938 Warszawa
14. Gimnazjum Nr 58  
ul. Jagiellońska 38  
03-719 Warszawa
15. Gimnazjum nr 123 im. Jana  
Pawła II  
ul. Strumykowa 21  
03-138 Warszawa
16. II Liceum Ogólnokształcące im.  
Stefana Batorego  
ul. Myśliwiecka 6  
00-459 Warszawa
17. XXXIII LO im. Mikołaja  
Kopernika  
ul. Bema 76  
01-225 Warszawa
18. Zespół Szkół Nr 106 Gimnazjum  
nr 122 im. gen. Charles'a de  
Gaulle'a  
ul. Van Gogha 1  
03-188 Warszawa
19. Gimnazjum Nr 2  
ul. 26 Marca 66  
44-300 Wodzisław Śląski
20. Gimnazjum Dwujęzyczne Nr 26  
ul. Grochowa 13  
53-523 Wrocław
21. XIV LO im. Polonii Belgijskiej  
ul. Brucknera 10  
51-410 Wrocław

David **Marsh** has worked on bilingual education since the mid 1980s. He was part of the team which conducted groundwork leading to the launch of the term Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in 1994. In 2002, he coordinated production of *CLIL - The European Dimension: Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential* for the European Commission (DG EAC). This overview of the situation in Europe was used in the compilation of the *2004-2006 EC Action Plan: Promoting Language Learning & Linguistic Diversity*.

He has extensive experience in teacher development, capacity-building, research and consultancy in a range of different countries in Africa, Europe and Asia. Operating from the University of Jyväskylä (Finland) as an educational specialist, he undertakes advisory and consultancy tasks for international agencies and national governments worldwide. He has published widely on bilingual education methodologies and currently works on integration and curricular development, cognition, and the use of converging technologies in education. During 2007-2010, he acts as Strategic Director for CCN (Europe), and handles various educational development and research initiatives in the European Union & East Asia.

Marek **Zajac** heads the foreign language section at the Warsaw-based Centre for In-Service Teacher Training. He is the author of dictionaries and he publishes in the area of bilingualism and French for special purposes.

Anna **Czura** is a doctoral student at the University of Wrocław, specialising in applied linguistics and methodology of teaching English as a foreign language. Her main areas of interest are bilingual education, autonomy in language learning and assessment in foreign language teaching.

Anna **Gapińska** is a doctoral student at Adam Mickiewicz University, Poznań, where she works as a teacher and teacher trainer. Her research interests comprise second language learning / acquisition and motivation psychology.

Hanna **Gozdawa-Gołębiowska** is a senior lecturer at The University of Warsaw Centre for Foreign Language Teacher Training and European Education. Her research interests include CLIL, British history and culture and intercultural approaches to foreign language teaching and learning.

Renata **Majewska** has been teaching bilingual classes in Secondary School No III in Gdańsk (III LO im. Boh.Westerplatte w Gdańsku) since 1993. She has worked on preparing entrance exams for bilingual classes and is an examiner in

the New Matura system. She also has experience teaching IB (International Baccalaureate Programme) classes.

Katarzyna **Papaja** works at the Institute of English at the University of Silesia. She specializes in methods of teaching English as a foreign language and bilingual education. At the moment, she is completing her PhD on Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) in Secondary Education.

Magda **Roda** has worked in bilingual, IB and MYP schools since the mid-1990s. Her fields of work include English language teaching methodology and psychology. She is working on her doctoral dissertation on cross-cultural aspects of developing reading skills in the first and second/foreign languages.

Magdalena **Urbaniak**, a doctoral student at the University of Wrocław, specialises in methodology of teaching English as a foreign language and in second language acquisition. In her research, she focuses on issues connected with autonomy, alternative assessment, bilingual education, teacher education and the use of Council of Europe documents in teaching and learning foreign languages.

## References & Key Bibliographic Sources

BĘDKOWSKA-OBŁĄK M., (2002), *Efektywność rozwoju kompetencji gramatycznej w nauczaniu dwujęzycznym* // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2002, no. 6, Warszawa: CODN, pp. 95-101.

BLOOM, B.S., (1984), *Taxonomy of Educational Objectives* // Allyn & Bacon: Boston, MA.

BRUNER, J. (1990) *Acts of Meaning* // Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

COMMON EUROPEAN FRAMEWORK OF REFERENCE, (2001) // Cambridge University Press: Cambridge

COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION, (2005) 8392/05 // EDUC 69

DUDEK M., (2002), *Kwalifikacje nauczycieli w nauczaniu bilingwalnym* // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2002, no 6, Warszawa: CODN, pp. 37-40.

EUROPEAN COMMISSION, (2005), Communication from the Commission to the Council, the European Parliament, the Economic and Social Committee, and the Committee of the Regions. *A New Framework Strategy for Multilingualism*, COM(2005) 596 final.

EURYDICE (2006), *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe* // Eurydice: Brussels

GAJO, L. (2005), *Raport ewaluacyjny - sekcje dwujęzyczne z językiem francuskim w Polsce. Założenia i wnioski końcowe* // CODN/Ambasada Francji w Polsce: Warszawa

ILUK, J. (2002), *Nauczanie bilingwalne : modele, koncepcje, założenia metodyczne* / Jan Iluk. - Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2000. - 139, [1] s. - (Academic Papers ; no. 1910).

ILUK J., (2002), *Problemy kształcenia dwujęzycznego w Polsce* // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2002, no. 6, Warszawa: CODN, pp. 27-36.

KACZMARSKI, S., (1988), *Wstęp do bilingwalnego ujęcia nauki języka obcego* / Stanisław Piotr Kaczmarek. - Warszawa : Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne, 1988. - 211, [1] s. - (The Library of the Foreign Language Teachers).

MULTAŃSKA M., (2002), *Szkoły z klasami dwujęzycznymi* // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2002, no. 6, Warszawa: CODN, pp. 91-94.

PIOTROWSKA I., (2006), *Cognitive and application aspects in the bilingual teaching of Geography* // Donert K., Charzyński P., & Podgórski Z., "Teaching in and about Europe", Toruń: Herodot Network with the arrangement of Association of Polish Adult Educators, pp. 50-57.

PISA // [www.pisa.oecd.org](http://www.pisa.oecd.org)

STRACHANOWSKA M., (2002), *Interkulturowi czy bilingwalni?* // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2002, no. 6, Warszawa: CODN, pp.107-113

ŚWIĄTEK A., (2005), *Zjawisko dwujęzyczności, przechowywanie i odzyskiwanie słownictwa u osób dwujęzycznych*. - Bibliogr. // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2005, no. 4, Warszawa: CODN, pp. 3-6.

ZAPARUCHA A., (2006), *How much English teaching in Geography?* // Donert K., Charzyński P., & Podgórski Z., "Teaching in and about Europe", Toruń: Herodot Network with the arrangement of Association of Polish Adult Educators, pp. 68-79.

ZIELONKA, B. (2007), *Poland* // Maljers, A., Marsh, D., & Wolff, D., "Windows on CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning in the European Spotlight", European Platform for Dutch Education (The Hague) & European centre for Modern Languages, Graz: pp. 147-154.

ŻUREK J., (2002), *Nauczanie dwujęzyczne w gimnazjum* // *Języki Obce w Szkole*. - 2002, no. 6, Warszawa: CODN, pp. 120-122.