

Marjatta Huhta

## Introduction to CEF Professional Profiles and their Experimentation Reports

The profiles describe the sociocultural environment of communication and its context in a professional field. The Profile is an inventory of typical communication events in a specific field, not for example one single profession. Therefore a Profile may seem fairly general and superficial, but they have been found to be fairly sufficient for the purpose of designing language/communication skills courses. It is also worth noting that Profiles produced in this project vary in length and amount of detail as they are made in different countries and different circumstances; they vary between 6-36 pages. More in-depth reasons can be found in the Profiles themselves.

## Selection of Profiles

Here you can find profiles representing four fields: Technology, Business, Health Care and Law.

ICT, Mechanical Engineering and Structural Engineering represent higher education in Technology; Metalwork and Machinery deal with professionals on secondary level. In the field of Business, profiles for Office Workers and Export and Sales have been made for secondary education in Germany. Business Administration and International Business describe positions in higher education, produced in Finland. Professions in Health Care and Law described both concern higher education level. The profile on Law was produced in Poland and the Profile for Registered Nursing in Finland.

Two profiles in Technology have been experimented and documented for 60-70 hour language courses; they are the profiles of Mechanical Engineering and Structural Engineering, both experimented in Finland. One of the Business profiles, Business Administration, was experimented in Poland. The language and communication of Registered Nurses in the field of Health Care was experimented in a course of three credit points in Finland.

## The Profile Production Process

The Profiles have been created as follows:

1. The Helsinki meeting screened the previous models and decided on amendments. The common Profile grid was agreed upon and distributed. Interview questions were decided on.
2. Data were collected using qualitative methods of needs analysis as described above.
3. The first versions of Profiles were shared and evaluated. An evaluator was nominated for each profile.
4. Revision of Profiles. The Varna meeting decided on unifying the Profiles to a certain extent and making shorter six-page versions of some of them for printed book publication.

5. Experimentations took place depending on possible course availabilities in partner institutions. A common framework was decided on for the experimentation reports.

Interpretation and contextualization of the conditions by the institution, particular course, teacher and students.

#### Course Design

- How was the profile used to design the course?
- What principles were used to design the course?
- What items/content areas were selected for course content? Why? How?
- Course plan

#### Implementation (teaching and learning)

- What teaching/learning activities were used for different content areas?

Experimentation reports were produced, reviewed by nominated commentators and amended.