CLIL Teacher training at the UPCT: present and future within the EHEA.

Formación CLIL del profesorado en la UPCT: presente y futuro dentro del EEES.

Camino Rea Rizzo

Natalia Carbajosa Palmero

Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, España

Camino Rea Rizzo

Natalia Carbajosa Palmero

Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, España

Abstract

Throughout the last decades of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first, the teaching of English for specific and/or professional and academic purposes has probably constituted one of the most innovative areas in the Spanish University. With the advent of the Bologna reform, the theory and praxis of this dynamic field of knowledge has enhanced its range of activity, so as to include not only students, but also lecturers, whithin its concerns. The result can be measured by the innumerable variety of CLIL (Content Language Integrated Learning) teacher training experiences carried out along the Spanish Tertiary Education geography.

Resumen

The objective of this article is to describe an experimental study about a collaborative learning experience carried out on the Degrees in Pedagogy and Primary School Education at the University of Barcelona (UB). Specifically, we analyze the implementation of "Collaborative Seminars" in two core subjects. The aims of this project were to boost team working skills amongst students at the same time as encouraging acquisition of core contents in both subjects. Firstly, we discuss the theoretical models which motivated the project and underlaid many of the decisions taken by the training team. Secondly, we offer detailed information on the specific

This paper has two main purposes: on one hand, to give the account of the CLIL teacher training at the UPCT (included in the larger frame of teaching innovation programs), under its corresponding theoretical approach and bearing in mind the particular circumstances of the institution. On the other hand, to pose questions about the future perspectives of similar experiences in a teaching context that is becoming more and more complex and `hybrid´ from its very foundations. The partial conclusions of this study depict a global teaching/professional scenario that is both challenging and appealing, which must be seriously dealt with from the Universities and our common European administrative framework alike.

features adopted by the seminars and on how the project developed over one semester. Finally, we describe how data was collected and present the results. To assess the experience we used a variety of information-gathering strategies such as questionnaires, discussion groups and participant observation. Results show, amongst other things, that collaborative seminars contribute to the learning of significant course contents, to the acquisition of various communication skills, to the development of the learning to learn competence, and to the encouragement of personal and interpersonal team working abilities. Lastly, our study reveals the problems and hindrances we came across when implementing the group seminars, and suggests some ideas in order to make future improvements.

Introduction

The adaptation of Spanish universities to the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) has constituted a daunting challenge to transform and improve university teaching in regard not only to the structural reform of curricula, but also as a major methodological change to competence-based teaching. Graduates must respond to the current labour market demands and universities must ensure that graduates obtain both the specific and core competences which enable them to meet such needs. In that respect, the Technical University of Cartagena (UPCT) has been diligently working since 2009 within the framework of teaching innovation projects, in order to develop the most appropriate methodologies for each subject and endow students with the required competences. The teaching innovation projects preceded the creation of research networks on university teaching (Herrero & Pérez, 2011) and, in turn, teacher training courses focused on the following issues: cooperative learning, teaching methodology, competence-based assessment, descriptions of course units, creation of new teaching materials and lecturing in English.

This paper deals with the actions taken in relation to lecturing in English at the UPCT. Concretely, it describes the process of training for the non-language university lecturers who have participated in any stage or modality of the teaching innovation projects undertaken. These can be basically summarized in the pursual of three different objectives: i) introducing part of the content lecture, or some activities related to it, in English in the syllabus; ii) holding a whole session in English; and/or iii) implementing the so-called Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) techniques, which have been channelled into the bilingual program of the Degree in Business Management and Administration by the Faculty of Business and Administration Studies at the UPCT. The first step taken, though, must be a brief view of the initiatives adopted by language lecturers in the Spanish universities prior to the development of the current teaching innovation projects.

The background of the teaching and learning of specialized languages in the Spanish Higher Education, which is nowadays mainly focused on English and, so far, has been widely known as English for Specific Purposes (ESP), is closely connected to a larger movement that involves all the European countries which belong to the EHEA (Fortanet-Gómez & Räisänen, 2008). Particularly, in the two decades prior to the Bologna reform of all the European Higher Education, Spanish universities had already made a great effort, especially in the formation of language specialists –both lecturers and researchers– aimed at the insertion of the ESP within the leading national and international research teams of linguistic innovation (Aguado & Durán, 2001). The outcome of this effort is the current widespread presence of ESP courses practically in all Spanish universities, as well as a sound volume of research in different areas, among which the focus on academic genre studies (Rea & Orts, 2011) and electronic linguistic corpora (Curado, 2001) constitute two major examples.

Another key event which underpins the integration and promotion of English is the strategic alliance of different universities on behalf of internationalization. Specifically, the membership of the UPCT in the Campus Mare Nostrum 37/38 (CMN), the International Excellence Campus for Higher Education and Research, together with the University of Murcia, must be noticed. The Campus Mare Nostrum project sets internationalization as the primary immediate goal that the university shall strive for. Moreover, the programme for innovation, quality teaching and language training is one of the sub-targets constituting the CMN 3.1 objective: teaching excellence, which includes among its actions teaching in a second language and, furthermore, comprehensive training in English in new Bologna degrees (http://www.campusmarenostrum.es).

There is no doubt that the subsequent step forward for subject-content lecturers should be the progressive adaptation of their own subjects into a bilingual teaching context, so as to incorporate, to a lesser extent, the use of English in the classroom; or, to a full extent, deliver their lectures entirely in English. Nevertheless, it must be taken into account that content lecturers are specialists of their own field, not of language teaching, regardless of how proficient in English they might be. Thus, teacher training becomes a compelling need (Rubio & Hermosín, 2010), as it was first mirrored by content teachers at lower educational levels (Pena et al., 2005) and is being practised in primary and secondary school centers throughout the country.

It is not by chance, therefore, that the incorporation of CLIL methodologies to the teaching and learning of ESP have been so diligent in the Spanish context: the path was already open for it. Moreover, local and regional governments have, in the latest years,

enhanced the use of CLIL in teaching levels below tertiary education, closely following the Council of Europe guidelines on language learning through Eurydice European Unit (Eurydice, 2006). Consequently, the advent of bilingual teaching in our Higher Education system was only a matter of time. In fact, there are already numerous examples available and from distant centers all around our geography. According to Dafouz and Núñez (2009), more than thirty institutions, at the time of publication, were offering bilingual programs in degrees like Business, Tourism, Law, Telecommunication and Humanities. Additionally, we may highlight, among others, recent experiences from the University of Alicante (Carrió & Perry, 2010), the University of the Basque Country (Lagasabaster, 2011) and the University of Cádiz (Rubio, 2012).

In most of the cases quoted, the implementation of CLIL methodology and courses upon an already existing teaching context of ESP follows basically models C2 and C3 from Coyle, Hood and Marsh's classification (2010: 24-25), that is, "Adjunt CLIL" and "Language-embedded content courses". Model C1, "Plurilingual education", is not so easy to implant in the Spanish context of tertiary education, which still rests mainly on a network of universities financed with regional public budgets. Due to the complicated economic situation in which our institutions, as the rest of the country, are immersed, an intelligent application of C2 and C3 models, which will be further explained in relation with the UPCT, seems utterly advisable, since it does not perforce entail an extra investment on human resources and technologies. In contrast, after an initial effort of the already existing staff on interdisciplinary formation, an extended application of CLIL methodology in our degrees allows for higher motivation and better teaching environments, both for lecturers and students.

Teaching innovation: First approach to lecturing in English

Lecturing in English is the name given to the work group created under the umbrella of the teaching innovation project at the UPCT in 2009, intended to improve the quality of education and adaptation to the EHEA with respect to English. The team consisted of two lecturers of English, one from the university's Language Center and the other from the university's Department of English, who coordinated the group. The rest of attendants were lecturers from several centers: Agriculture, Industrial, Telecommunications and Civil Engineering, who contributed with their general needs, but pointed at the controversial matters of the initiative as well, in relation with the task of lecturing in English. As a starting point to work with, we considered some premises on the role of English, the characteristics of the lecturer, and the realistic goal of this novel approach.

At the initial stage of the Project, the real point of this teaching praxis consisted in introducing a selection of activities, tasks and exercises in English within the general subject syllabus, together with the corresponding reflection on the final qualification. This way, it was argued, students could become familiarized with Academic English as an effective communication tool (Swales, 1990), in the same way as they currently use technological and computer resources at almost expert level.

As for the lecturers, we did not have in mind an 'ideal' lecturer who, apart from the knowledge of his/her own field, would be completely proficient in English, i.e., able to conduct a whole subject in this language. There are certainly some lecturers with international projection who could fit in this model, but obviously, there are more lecturers whose level of English, however apt for scientific research, does not reach the

necessary expertise for continuous employment in tuition. Even if the previous premise were positively fulfilled, most lecturers agreed that the purpose of introducing English in class was not to wipe entirely out the presence of Spanish –what would involve an unnecessary loss of a high register of the native language, as has been detected recently, for example, in Swedish major academic environments (Ferguson, 2007). Not to speak of the dubious expectations on the students' required level of English for the purposes of a full lecture in that language. Experience shows us that, notwithstanding the proliferation of bilingual programs in Primary and Secondary education, not all students are capable of facing complicated content subjects at University in a language other than their native one.

All in all, this introduction of English in the content class had to be planned in such a way that lecturers were not required to make use of a 'deficient' version of the English language, i.e., by using materials and sources already available (be it audiovisual, written, etc), as well as by letting students make their own contributions both in oral and written form; furthermore, the whole process had to be closely assisted by lecturers on English in terms of design, development and evaluation.

Main outcome

Adhering to the indications from the team, in terms of needs, difficulties and expectations, the two lecturers on English designed a piece of material which has been further used in several teaching innovation projects and lecturers' training courses at the UPCT as a first stage towards CLIL practice. Such material was the core, indeed, of a preliminary course for lecturers with simple proposals for introducing English activities in the content class, always in relation to the four basic language skills: speaking and interaction, reading comprehension, listening comprehension and writing expression (Rea & Carbajosa, 2011). In all cases, the proposals offered examples for different levels of difficulty, showed sources available, asked the attendants to the course for further sources in relation to their own fields of knowledge, and discussed the ways of implementing such activities without taking extra time or effort in the –normally already tight enough– course syllabuses.

The description of the suggested activities were summarised and presented in a brief guide, introduced by a few lines encouraging lectures to try and share their results, suggest improvements, delve further into aspects such as the assessment of the new activities, the emphasis on permanent training, etc. The referred proposals for the inclusion of activities in English in the content subjects are as follows:

A. Activities on reading comprehension and writing.

- Bibliography search and commentary. All lecturers offer bibliography in English to the students at the beginning of the course. We propose, in this regard, the following activity: students must read a specific source (an article, a chapter in book) and write a summary of the content in English. If you want the activity to be further directed, you can give students a few basic guidelines: summary of the main topic, keywords list, a briefly developed scheme of the structure of the article, etc. It is advisable to give references to dictionaries online, both technical and general, as well as lists of academic vocabulary.

- Vocabulary. This is a very basic activity in which students must look up the meaning of a list of words or concepts in English. We will not ask for the

translation of these concepts but for the definition. This forces them to use monolingual dictionaries and to use the minimum grammatical structures with which a definition is built. A very interesting variant of the previous activity would be to give them a text with the subject or unit keywords wiped out (with gaps), and ask them to place them on their site. There are computer tools that allow us to break texts in this way by levels of difficulty.

• Problems. Some teachers provide the students with the formulation of the problem in English. The task here would be to ask them to write the solution in English as well. There are reference materials that explain how to express mathematical formulae, units of measure, etc., which can be helpful, as well as online examples of in-process problems.

• Laboratory practice. The lab practice must be handed in English and students must complete it, of course, in English. Also in this case there are online methods on technical writing, with simple explanations, which students may revise as a first step.

B. Activities on listening comprehension and oral expression.

• Videos. Working with videos is an excellent choice for listening comprehension. The amount of videos available on the network on any academic subject (lectures, case studies, many of them captioned) is huge. Once you have chosen one, you can work with it in several ways. The most common practice is using it at the end of a unit, when the students have already assimilated the main concepts. Ten final minutes of a class, watching a video related to what they already know, can be a rewarding activity. In addition to watching it, if you want students to work with it, prepare a script with questions they must answer, gaps they must fill with relevant information, etc. If the video is too complex for the average language level of the class, you can work previously with transcription. Whenever possible, it is preferable that videos be heard individually, with earphones, so that we may give them the option to stop the video and listen again. Language labs are meant for that.

• Conferences or videoconferences. Take advantage of every possible opportunity to listen to an entire lesson taught in English by an expert (for example if an international conference is held) and, if possible, encourage students to ask questions. If the topic of the paper is complex, it is a good idea to work previously with the script and prepare questions in advance. There are materials online on how to take notes and make the most of the received information.

• Oral presentations. If students handle bibliography mainly in English, it is only logical that oral presentation exercises should also be prepared and delivered in English. Again, there are very helpful tools, such as pronunciation dictionaries and concise methods on how to prepare, deliver and evaluate an oral presentation.

• Peer-to-peer talk. This is undoubtedly the most difficult activity to carry out. If students are not in the English class, they find it very artificial to use that language among them. We propose, however, that if you have an acceptable number of foreign students in class, from Erasmus programs or others, you can

organize group discussions where the common ground should be a technical topic in English.

All these activities are revisited every time the course is run, which is still bound to be delivered to other groups of lecturers. Its first version is constantly updated and improved through the already existing contributions from the first groups, as well as from the academic materials specifically designed by several publishers who have certainly identified the need in different Spanish universities (Garnet is, for the time being, a pioneering publishing initiative in this sense).

Even though the course revolves around these activities, they are combined and supported with an extensive review on academic English (See table 1). Attendants receive five sessions on the characteristic of the academic English in the classroom; the formulation of questions; pronunciation; the Academic Word List (Coxhead, 2000); and listening strategies. Then, as the level of English of the attendants is usually heterogeneous, they are separated into two groups: intermediate/B1 and upper-intermediate/B2 to receive some instruction on delivering effective lectures at the corresponding level. For such purpose, Lecture Ready series (Frazier et al., 2007) present a fairly comprehensive program to train academic skills for students. Even though the contents are designed for students, the focus can be tactically switched and approached from the teacher's perspective. Likewise, such change creates an ideal opportunity for lectures to reflect on what students would expect to find, in terms of language, to be able to follow the lecture in English, and on what they should never miss. Finally, attendants are asked to put the theory into practice by choosing an activity and developing it as they would do it in their own content class.

Cómo preparar tu asignatura en inglés *(Strategies for academic listening, note-taking and discussion)* *Delivering effective lectures in English*
1. Characteristics of the Academic English in the ESL classroom. 2. Questions. 3. Phonetics: English sounds, transcribed words, regular verbs. 4. Headwords of the Academic Word List. 5. Listening strategies. 6. Proposals for the inclusion of activities in English in the content subjects. (Intermediate/B1) 7. Chapter 1: The first day in social psychology class. 8. Chapter 3: Business innovation. 9. Chapter 10: Architecture: form or function? (Upper-intermediate/B2) 10. Chapter 1: New trends in marketing research. 11. Chapter 6: Intelligent machines. 12. Language resources. 13. References.

Fuente: Elaboración propia

Table 1. First course for teacher training.

A longer-term objective would be to keep a constant program of lecturer training which, throughout the academic year, could instruct practitioners in short, intensive courses on each specific skills separately, always within the context of Professional and Academic English.

The description of some of the early experiences carried out introducing English in the content subject at the UPCT is recorded in the proceedings of the first International Conference on Teaching Innovation celebrated in Cartagena in 2011. The experiences ranged from the explicit insertion of terminology in the lecture in addition to slides and some audio-visual documents in English (López, 2001), to the restructuring and detailed planning of a subject on Spanish Law so as to be delivered through the medium of English with the exception of those contents which are bound to norms and principles of the Spanish Law (Escuin, 2011).

Theoretical foundations for CLIL at the UPCT

The first attempts to use CLIL methodology in our center have propitiated a relevant shift in the terminology of language teaching itself: together with ESP, language lecturers started to incorporate the notion of Academic and Professional English to their running courses and subjects (Carbajosa 2012; Rea & Carbajosa 2011), as it had been defined years earlier by professor Alcaraz (2000). Although ESP and Academic English coincide partly in their aims and contents, we, the teaching staff at the Area of English Studies, soon realized that the courses we designed for lecturers of all disciplines at the UPCT other than English had a different focus altogether from the subjects for our Engineering students. Where, for example in Telecommunications Engineering, we focused our teaching on the acquisition of specialized vocabulary, both by means of traditional skill practicing exercises (reading, listening) and the use of our own electronic linguistic corpora (Carbajosa & Rea 2010), in our Academic English courses for lecturers, we placed the emphasis on the acquisition of a common academic meta-language and typical academic functions (how to deliver an oral presentation, how to write a technical report, etc.). Furthermore, we realized that, embedded in language teaching, we were including teaching methodology. In other words, we were teaching how to teach… in English.

It must be noticed that, parallel to the CLIL courses that we designed and put into practice, the content lecturers who would attend them were receiving General English courses from the University Language Service, in order to achieve an acceptable level for their own use in their classes. Particularly, the aim of the whole of this linguistic support was to favor the transition of the level of these lecturers from a minimum B2 to a C1, according to the European Language Framework.

The changes we introduced, consequently, in our Academic English courses, with the purpose of transforming them into 'real' CLIL courses, led us to a course pattern that runs as shown in table 2:

<div style="border:1px solid black; padding:1em;">

Integrating English in the Content Subject Within the EHEA Framework:
A Theoretical and Practical Course

This course is specifically designed for the UPCT lecturer's needs in terms of the use of English in their content classes, within the new EEES teaching frame. The course has a seminar format, this means that it will be very demanding in what concerns students' participation both in class and through the completion of the assignments proposed.

The course duration is 20 hours, distributed in 2-hour sessions along 2 weeks. The course syllabus is as follows:

BLOCK I: THEORY

1. What do we want to do with English?
2. Resources on Academic English

BLOCK II: FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

3. Scaffolding the class
4. Lecture practice (I)
5. Lecture practice (II)
6. Academic writing practice (I)
7. Academic writing practice (II)
8. Academic discussion

BLOCK III: PRACTICE

9. Preparing your lecture
10. Delivering your lecture

</div>

Fuente: Elaboración propia

Table 2. Second course for teacher training.

Throughout this course, lecturers underwent an ambivalent situation: they were our 'students', but at the same time they could never forget their condition of 'lecturers', as the aim of the course was to prepare a lecture on Business, or Electronics, or Agriculture, but in English. The materials and activities designed fulfilled the two conditions of Coyle, Hood and Marsh's C2 and C3 models. These materials were mainly published texts, both from CLIL methodology (Langé, 2002) and academic practice (Manning & Nukui, 2011), complemented with the elaboration of private materials from the part of the instructors.

Model C2 is defined as Adjunct CLIL where "language teaching runs parallel to content teaching with specific focus on developing the knowledge and skills to use the language so as to achieve higher-order thinking" (Coyle et al., 2010); whereas in model C3, called Language-embedded content courses, "content programmes are designed from the outset with language development objectives. Teaching is carried out by content and language specialists" (ibid).

In order to make our 'students' aware of the first concept (adjunct CLIL), we showed them parallel exercises –one regarding content, another one regarding language– of the same activity: for example, for a video on optical fiber, we elaborated two lists of listening comprehension exercises, one in which we enquiried on technical data, and another one in which attendants had to fill in the gaps with the corresponding preposition, word ending, etc. In other cases, such as the elaboration of a technical report, we provided them with the most used academic expressions, which they had to apply to their respective knowledge fields. Likewise, for evaluation purposes, we elaborated two

checklists and two rubrics in each case. Where, for example, in relation to the technical report, the 'content' rubric was interested in the accuracy of the results section, the 'language' rubric would look for the correct use of verbal tenses –especially the passive form– in the same section.

Once our students learnt about this duality of teaching, we asked them to design teaching activities –and their corresponding evaluation tools– where both elements of bilingual learning had a specific presence, and in their corresponding percentages. In other words, we made them responsible for the 'language-embedding' stage. Thus, we made them conscious of the importance of using the correct expression –English language– and register –Academic English– for successful communication in any Academic area. In linguistic terms, it could be affirmed that they understood to what extent the means also forms part of the message.

From theory to praxis: Bilingual education at the UPCT

In the academic course 2011/2012, the School of Economics at the UPCT started to offer a bilingual Degree on Business and Administration Studies. Among the already existing teaching staff, those who were fluent in English were committed to conduct their subjects in English. A proportion of teaching in English was fixed: at least 2 out of 4 obligatory subjects per term. Besides, the rest of lecturers would contemplate the possibility of introducing activities, materials and, of course, bibliography in English within their Spanish-speaking class sessions.

A tailor-made course was designed for the lecturers involved in the bilingual degree adding a section specifically devoted to the theory and practice of CLIL (Table 3). This third course was backed up by the experience gained throughout the previous courses imparted and, moreover, the lecturers had a very clear and specific objective.

SUPPORTING TEACHING IN ENGLISH (B2)
Content and Language Integrating Learning (CLIL)
1. Characteristics of the Academic English in the ESL classroom.   2. Resources on academic English: References and the Academic Word List.   3. Academic style I: Features of academic writing.   4. First day class: dealing with content and language resources.   5. Academic style II: Oral academic skills.   6. Academic style III: Academic vocabulary and collocations.   7. Getting started: Proposals for the inclusion of activities in English in the content subjects.   8. The CLIL tool kit: transforming theory into practice.

Fuente: Elaboración propia

Table 3. Third course for teacher training.

First of all, CLIL approach demanded a change of mind with respect to teaching methodology. Arguably, it entailed a challenge and a total rethink of content subjects, as lecturers initially believed that they only had to translate their lectures into English – in contrast, most teachers had to design or readapt materials after the CLIL course class for their own next CLIL class.

Even though the contents of the course might seem unbalanced for the number of units devoted to Academic English, the actual extension of the course adjusted its proportions. The sessions on academic English were devised to boost lecturers' self-confidence in the language, whereas they were learning how to convey in English their linguistic routines as teachers. Likewise, throughout the course, some key notions about CLIL were introduced, so as to raise the attendants' awareness about the issues to be explicitly discussed in the end.

Lecturers were asked to submit two specific assignments related to the academic English part. The outcome of these assignments would be modeled into authentic pieces of information to be used as real materials for their subjects, starting with the information available on the webpage of the subjects, and the description of the course unit – the so-called 'guía docente' in Spanish. Such written documents were also verbalized as oral practice in class.

Regarding the theoretical tenets of CLIL, we closely followed Coyle, Hood and Marsh´s (2010) description of the approach based on their own experience in primary and secondary education. Moreover, thanks to their valuable CLIL Tool Kit, we tried to transfer the theory into practice in a higher education level. The Tool Kit is process-oriented and recommends going through a reflexive process of six stages.

Stages 1 and 2 entail a discussion among the stakeholders on the particular situation, so as to create first what the authors call 'a shared vision for CLIL' which leads to the analysis and personalization of the CLIL context. In our case, subject-content teachers, the academic coordinator of the bilingual program and the teachers of English agreed on a set of realistic global goals that could be attained, considering the circumstances of the whole situation, as well as including the requirements established by the CMN project (Campus Mare Nostrum) for funding bilingual programs.

The next stage, 'Stage 3: Planning a unit,' is fully tackled with the subject-content lecturers. This stage is crucial for the success of the approach, because our teachers come to grips with the core concepts of CLIL, thus completing the total change of perception towards teaching. Therefore, this stage allows lecturers to adopt a different approach to their subjects and in turn, prepare their unit (Stage 4) in a way more aligned with CLIL.

The conceptual framework of CLIL is based on its four major components, shortened as the '4Cs Framework', that is, *C*ontent, *C*ommunication, *C*ognition and *C*ulture. In addition, at this stage one can learn how those components are used in four different planning steps: i) Considering content, ii) Connecting content and cognition, iii) Communication – defining language learning and using, and iv) Developing cultural awareness and opportunities. Such concepts and steps are developed during several sessions of the course by asking the lecturers to expound and illustrate them with the content of their own subjects. Thus, teachers provide the content which conduct the global structure along the learning route and set out the cognitive process involved – Anderson and Krathwohl's (2001) taxonomy is recommended to guide planning for cognitive challenge. As in the case of step 3, communication, language teachers play a plum role, so as to help content teachers identify, and sometimes supply, the language 'of' learning, language 'for' learning, and language 'through' learning – three more key concepts in CLIL. As defined by Coyle et al. (2010), language of learning "explores what language learners will need to access new knowledge and understanding when dealing with the content" (ibid); language for learning "makes transparent the language needed

by learners to operate in a learning environment where the medium is not their first language" (ibid); and language through learning refers to any incidental language which might emerge and has not been planned for. In spite of the stress on language, the emphasis lays on accessibility of language in order to learn as content learning prevails.

Regarding 'Stage 4: Developing cultural awareness and opportunities', it must be pointed out that this is probably the most difficult stage to go through with our lecturers, depending significantly on the kind of subject. Raising cultural awareness in applied Mathematics may not be as easy as in International Law. Finally, stages 5 and 6, that is, 'monitoring and evaluating CLIL in action', and 'towards inquiry-based professional learning communities', were still beyond our scope at the time the course was imparted. However, those two steps were specifically imparted by a colleague who was employed, precisely, to take the instruction of bilingual teaching to its most specifically linguistic – and practical – extreme.

All in all, as expressed by Coyle et al. (2010:55-56) "CLIL integrates language learning and content learning at cognitive and cultural levels appropriate to the learners. It is this integration which results in new learning scenarios which are different from regular language or content lessons."

Final remarks

The outset of this bilingual degree has served, for us the language lecturers regarded as CLIL instructors, as an invaluable opportunity to implement and assess the changes which the CLIL methodology imposes upon the teaching and learning of foreign languages. In this regard, our participation in such an exciting experiment could be termed as a kind of 'accompaniment', in two specific senses:

- Towards the professors who imparted the totality of part of their subjects in English: the Language Service provides them with general English courses throughout the year. There is a deadline, for those professors who already have acquired a B2 level of the Common European Framework for Languages, to reach the following C1 level: June 2014. Parallel to this, CLIL instructors offer a permanent service of support, where the involved professors may deal with concrete aspects of their teaching (e.g. which is the best way to use a video in class, how should such or such activity be evaluated, etc).

- Towards the students who take the bilingual degree: at the beginning of the course, the Language Service assesses their starting level of English. They all must start with a minimum level of B1 and, throughout the first and second year, they receive General English classes, so that at the end of the second one they all must be able to credit a consolidated level of B2. At the same time, and in different periods during the degree, students are required to take short, intensive courses on academic skills: how to prepare and deliver an oral presentation, how to write an academic essay, etc. These courses are again under the influence of the CLIL methodology, as their purpose is not to teach English, but to teach communicative functions performed through English.

In reference to the professors of this degree, moreover, it must be emphasized that they are making great efforts in the elaboration of a 'bank' of teaching materials, working in teams and sharing their experiences with professionals from other Higher Education institutions in which similar processes and changes are taking place.

However, this lecturer training process which started four years ago is already facing new challenges, to such an extent that assumptions valid for prior stages must be once more revisited. Concretely, the Faculty of Business and Administration Studies at the UPCT has decided to include in all its Master's Degrees, both as regular subjects and as complementary sessions, intensive modules on Academic and Professional English, oral and written. And this is where we come across a completely new teaching scenario: the students who enrole on MBA and similar Master's Degrees do have, in a wide majority, a professional profile – they are managers and/or entrepreneurs in companies from the industrial area of our town, Cartagena. Moreover, in our sessions, they mix with another particular profile of attendants: their own lecturers from other subjects on the same degree. Consequently, and almost by chance – that is: without the intervention of outer organizing programs –, an unexpected profile of 'students' is emerging, and has to be dealt with accordingly.

The first measure adopted, obviously, has been a preliminary needs analysis, with eloquent results. On one hand, all attendants to these sessions must be instructed on advanced research skills in English (a significant part of the students have as a future aim the completion of their Ph.D; whereas, concerning lecturers, they want to improve their international projection as scholars by way of enhancing their oral and written academic register); on the other hand, they show a crucial need for improving professional communication skills in a highly competitive and international environment (most of them come from tourist companies that conform the great potential of economic growth in our region, and operate in distant markets where English is, obviously, the main form of communication). Basically, what lecturers do in these sessions, is to signal for all of them useful samples, resources and techniques, taken from published and created materials both from Academic and Business English, through which they can improve their oral and written competence for high-level, multifaceted specific contexts.

Trying to accommodate such diverging, however connected demands, the lecturers from the Area of English Studies have designed an all-purpose course, based on a similar subject offered in a Master's Degree at the Deparment of Social Sciences of Northumbria University, imparted by lecturers Nicole Robertson and Henry Knight (profiting form a Teaching Mobility Staff program, one of the authors of this article had the chance to attend some teaching sessions there in January 2012 and, further, adapt and apply the praxis learnt at the UPCT). The all-purpose activity that defines the course consists in the preparation and celebration of a conference that, from the part of the students, involves: i) elaboration and delivery of papers related with their research and/or professional activity; ii) a written essay based on the paper delivered; and iii) active, task-based involvement on the conference preparation: program and chairs, poster design, venue and equipments, publicity, search for private financing, and so on.

Although CLIL theory is not explicitly included in the activities mentioned in the previous paragraph, the practical demands and expected outcomes of the first experience of this kind, whose results will be analyzed during the second term of the academic year 2013/2014, seem in logical accord with CLIL teaching praxis; a language teaching method, in fact, that has already trespassed traditional boundaries like those existing

between teacher and student, academic and professional, theory and praxis, first and second language, local and global. In Pérez-Vidal's words, "The growth of multilingual programmes in Europe, reflecting both social policies and an increasing social interest in languages has only begun. No matter how well the rationale for those programmes is established, and how carefully programmes are designed and implemented, there is a need to turn previous experience in other contexts to learn the lessons they can teach us" (2007: 49-50).

So far, the conclusions extracted from this experience of Master's teaching can only be partial and subjected to further reflection. However, looking at it in perspective and in contrast with the previous sheer CLIL accounts, several points must be acknowledged:

- CLIL-based lecturer teaching for further implementation in content subjects in Tertiary Education is a complex process that, in the Spanish context of public Universities, can be effectively developed through models C2 and C3 by Coyle and following the steps assigned to each model. The successful experiences carried out at the UPCT corroborate this statement.

- The new, unexpected teaching-learning contexts that arise in the domain of academics and professionals who demand bilingual instruction must be regarded as an opportunity for language instructors to rethink and readapt the use of CLIL methodology.

- As a desirable 'side-effect', English lecturers are progressively detecting how both the creation of CLIL teaching environments at the Spanish University and the search for new modes of implementing CLIL in non-traditional teaching contexts are giving birth to a new mentality among its practitioners, be it as lecturers or students. The intellectual effort they must face, unlike the ones they usually deal with in their respective fields of knowledge, release unknown domains of mental flexibility that find a practical reflection in their daily professional praxis. All in all, this may be a contribution, however humble, to a more effective way of teaching, conducting businesses or solving any of the current financial and social problems that haunt us as a nation. The challenge is difficult and appealing in similar terms. As Susan Sontag affirmed, "There are ways of thinking that we don't know about. Nothing could be more important or precious than that knowledge, however unborn".

Sontag's statement seems more than appropriate under the circumstances. Furthermore, the present study has focused on a particular institution (UPCT) within a national context (Spanish Tertiary Education), but transnational implications are more than obvious. Clearly, if all the actions taken so far and bound to take from now on are placed in the larger frame of the EHEA, this means that a translational, European share of actions and values must be enhanced. As Kruse argues, "International projects and a transfer of teaching approaches seem a good way of learning from each other" (2013: 53). It is only by an effective transfer of teaching experiences that common objectives will be achieved, and unexplored boundaries of knowledge will be conquered, both for academic/professional purposes and as a step towards an authentic common intellectual identity.

References

Aguado, G. & Durán, P. (2001). *La Investigación en Lenguas Aplicadas: Enfoque Multidisciplinar*. Madrid: Fundación Gómez-Pardo: UPM.

Aguilar, M. & Rodríguez, R. (2012). Lecturer and student perceptions on CLIL at a Spanish university. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*, 15 (2), 183-197.

Alcaraz, E. (2000). *El inglés profesional y académico*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial.

Anderson. L.W. & Krathwohl, D. R. (Eds.) (2001). *A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching, and Assessing: A Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives*. New York: Longman.

Carbajosa, N. (2012). El ingles académico en el marco del EEES: un ejemplo de los equipos docentes en la Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena (UPCT). *Aula: Revista de Pedagogía de la Universidad de Salamanca,* 18, 43-56.

Carbajosa, N. & Rea, C. (2010). *Technical English for Telecommunications*. UPCT.

Campus Mare Nostrum. (2011). *Plan director*. Recuperado de http://www.campus-marenostrum.es [15/09/2013]

Carrió Pastor, M.L., & Perry, D. (2010). The Collaborative Approach in Content and Language Integrated Learning. *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses,* 23, 69-81.

Coxhead, A. (2000). A New Academic Word List. *TESOL Quarterly,* 34 (2), 213-238.

Coyle, D., Hood, P. & Marsh, M. (2010). *Content and Language Integrated Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Curado Fuentes, A. (2001). Lexical behavious in academic and technical corpora: Implications for ESP development. *Language and Learning Technology,* 5(3), 106-129.

Dafouz, E. & Núñez, B. (2009). CLIL in higher education: Devising a new learning landscape. In Dafouz, E. & Guerrini, M. C. (Eds): *CLIL across educational levels*. Madrid: Richmond Publishing.

Escuin, I. (2011). Propuesta de impartición de la asignatura derecho mercantil en inglés. Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Innovación Docente. Campus Mare Nostrum. Cartagena.

Eurydice (2006). *Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) at School in Europe*. Brussels: Eurydice European Unit.

Ferguson, G. (2007). The global spread of English, scientific communication and ESP: questions of equity, access and domain loss. *Ibérica*, 13, 7-38.

Fortanet, I., & Räisänen, C. A. (2008). *ESP in European Higher Education. Integrating language and content.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Frazier, L., Leeming, S., Sarosy, P., & Sherak, K. (2007). *Lecture ready: strategies for academic listening, note-taking, and discussion.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Herrero, R. & Pérez, J. (2011). Introducción. Equipos docentes: Una nueva apuesta en el EEES. En Vicerrectorado de Ordenación Académica (Ed.). Equipos docentes: Una nueva apuesta en el EEES (pp. 9-31). Cartagena: UPCT.

Kruse, O. (2013). Perspectives on Academic Writing in European Higher Education: Genres, Practices, and Competences. *REDU, Revista de docencia Universitaria,* 11(1), 37-58.

Lagasabaster, D. (2011). English Achievement and student motivation in CLIL and EFL setting. *Innovation in language learning and teaching,* 5, 3-18.

Langé, G. & Bertaux, P. (2002). *TIE-CLIL Professional Development Course*. Milán: TIE-CLIL.

López, J. (2011). Experiencia en el desarrollo de asignaturas de ingeniería en inglés enmarcadas en el Espacio Europeo de Educación Superior (EEES). *Actas del I Congreso Internacional de Innovación Docente.* Campus Mare Nostrum. Cartagena.

Manning, A. & C. Nukui (2011). *Transferable Academic Skills Kit (TASK). English for Academic Purposes Series.* University of Reading: Garnet Education.

Pena, C., Fernández, R., García, A. & Halbach, A. (2005). La implantación de proyectos educativos bilingües en la Comunidad de Madrid. Las expectativas del profesorado antes de iniciar el proyecto. *Porta Linguarum: revista internacional de didáctica de las lenguas extranjeras,* 3, 161-173.

Pérez-Vidal, C. (2007). The need for focus on form (FoF) in content and language integrated approaches: An exploratory study. *Revista Española de Lingüística Aplicada (RESLA)*, Volumen monográfico, 39-54.

Rea, C. & Carbajosa, N. (2011). Towards a new concept of lecturers' and students' language training: English as a transversal competence at the UPCT degrees. In M. L. Carrió, J. Contreras, F. Olmo, H. Skorczynska, I. Tamarit, & D. Westall (Eds.), *La investigación y la enseñanza aplicadas a las lenguas de especialidad y a la tecnología* (pp. 393-400). Valencia: Universitat Politècnica de València.

Rea, C. & Orts, M. A. (Eds.) 2011. New and Further Approaches to ESP Discourse: Genre Study in Focus. *International Journal of English Studies*. Vol 11, No 1.

Rubio, F. & Hermosín, M. (2010). Implantación de un programa de plurilingüismo en el espacio europeo de educación superior: Análisis de contexto y detección de necesidades. *XXI, Revista de Educación*, 12, 107-128.

Rubio Cuenca, F. (2012). Communication as a Teaching/Learning Strategy in Bilingual Education. *Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences,* 12(5), 1781-1789.

Swales, J. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Camino Rea Rizzo

Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena
Servicio de Idiomas

Mail: Camino.rea@upct.es

Dr. Camino Rea Rizzo has been a full-time teacher in the Language Centre at the Technical University of Cartagena since 1999 and an Adjunct Professor in the Department of English Studies at the University of Murcia since 2007. Her main research area is centred on corpus-driven description of specialized languages, with a special interest in vocabulary teaching and learning in the field of Telecommunication Engineering English. She is a member of LACELL research group (Lingüística Aplicada Computacional, Enseñanza de Lenguas y Lexicología). She is involved in several teaching innovation projects aimed at the introduction of English as a vehicular language of teaching at the UPCT.

Natalia Carbajosa Palmero

Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena
Área de Filología Inglesa
Unidad Predepartamental de Tecnología Naval

Mail: natalia.carbajosa@rec.upct.es

Dr. Natalia Carbajosa Palmero is an Associate Professor at the Technical University of Cartagena (UPCT), where she teaches Professional and Academic English in Bologna Degrees and Masters. She is also involved in teaching innovation projects related with CLIL teacher training at the same institution. As a researcher, she belongs to research projects and groups from the Department of English Studies by the University of Salamanca, where she works on modernist and contemporary Angloamerican poetry. She is also the author of annotated translations into Spanish of British and American poets like H.D. (2008), Scott Hightower (2012) and Kathleen Raine (2013), published in Spain, plus a bilingual anthology on contemporary US women poets called Women Rowing and published in Mexico (2012).