

Consultant's annual report 2008

Consultant	Isabel Landsiedler
Project title and acronym	Guidelines for University Language Testing (GULT) Medium term project 2008-2011
Give a brief summary of the year's activities.	 17-18 January: Expert meeting – fixing framework and tasks and defining the overall structure Several informal meetings and contacts of the project team throughout the year. Development of guidelines for LSP testing and task-based testing. Draft guidelines have been developed. Structure for a GULT-exam has been developed.
What do you consider to be the main achievements of the year?	The development of the draft guidelines for LSP testing and the structure of GULT-exam are the major achievements of the year, as these two developments are the basis for future work in the project.
How effectively have the achievements been communicated (on the website and elsewhere)?	The achievements have been communicated very actively through conferences and meetings and informal exchange (e.g. UNIcert workshop, CercleS Conference in Seville, QualiDaF Workshop in Jyväskylä, plenary at an external UNIcert workshop). The dissemination via the website could and should be improved as the information on work and achievements was uploaded very late during the year.
Do you see opportunities for synergy with other projects in the strand?	Synergies can be developed with other projects in the strand, like ECEP, CEFESTIM, and RelEx.
Evaluative comments	The project team has been very active although the start was a bit delayed. Concerning content and first draft documents good progress has been made. The co-operation with UNIcert has turned out to be very positive. Extra meetings and intensive work has led to products that look very







EMPOWERING LANGUAGE PROFESSIONALS VALORISER LES PROFESSIONNELS EN LANGUES SPRACHLEHRENDE IN IHRER ROLLE STÄRKEN

ECML-CELV-EFSZ 2008-2011

	promising and are the basis for future work. One point that should be improved is documentation and keeping deadlines: as there was very little documentation it seemed that little work was carried out. Documentation is important and should be improved, as firstly there is high interest in the project and secondly one could get a wrong picture of the project.
Suggestions for the coordinator and the team	I would suggest using the website more intensively and regularly as it is highly important to inform other experts and the wider public on the achievements.



