



UNIVERSITÉ
DE GENÈVE

FACULTÉ DES SCIENCES
DE LA SOCIÉTÉ
Département de géographie
et environnement

h e p i a

Haute école du paysage, d'ingénierie
et d'architecture de Genève

Extension to: Monday February 13th 2017

Call for contributions:

DEBATING THE LANDSCAPE.

Didactical issues, learning processes, training.

Summary:

This symposium is meant for students, teachers, trainers, teacher-researchers, researchers, landscape actors involved in training and those interested in issues concerning the landscape. The symposium's main objective is to bring together actors from disparate spheres that rarely intersect: primary and secondary education, landscape schools, universities, management, vocational education structures, environmental education networks, associations, continuing education institutions, consultancy firms, local authorities or protected areas, decision-making or elected bodies, etc. in an effort to discuss this common subject and the educational issues it raises.

This symposium is being organized as part of a research programme funded by the Swiss National Science Foundation (FNS): 'Didactics of the landscape. Sharing of didactical experiences and perspectives on landscape controversies', which brings together an international team of some ten researchers and trainers around the didactical issues concerning the landscape (see web site: <http://www.unige.ch/portail-didactique-paysage/>).

Proposals may take the form of: papers, posters, or presentations of teaching aids, tools or games.

This symposium is dedicated to the memory of Laurent Daune, landscape architect, professor at HEPIA and member of the team, who died suddenly in the summer of 2016.

Dates and location:

25, 26 and 27 October 2017 at Geneva, High School of Landscape, Engineering and Architecture (HEPIA), rue de la Prairie 4, CH-1202 Geneva, Switzerland.

Keywords:

Landscape, Education, Didactics, Learning, Controversy.

Background and context:

Debating the landscape, speaking about the landscape, writing about or representing the landscape, imagining the landscape, raising awareness of the landscape, acting on the landscape, defending the landscape, training in landscape issues, etc.: the ways of involvement with the landscape are numerous and continue to grow. Increasingly diverse actors, from multiple professional backgrounds, are now working on the landscape. This requires knowledge and skills, tools and approaches, and appropriate know-how, requirements that are not always easy to meet.

An observation of the public debate shows that the landscape is being mobilized in several different configurations: it has become the object of public policy at all levels and is frequently mobilized in territorial projects, either as a guiding theme or more marginally. It engenders conflicts and controversies, it is instrumentalized by ideological discourses of all hues and colours and is exploited by territorial marketing. The landscape is therefore, by turn, not only an object, an issue, and a tool, but also a pretext, an excuse, and a diversion. Through these different uses, it is attributed with qualities and values that do not necessarily command a consensus (Bédart 2009; Besse 2009; Collectif 1995; Droz and Mieville-Ott 2005; D'Angio 1997; Fortin et al. 2010; Luginbühl 2012; Rudaz and Sgard 2016).

From a more institutional perspective, the European Landscape Convention (ELC), drafted in 2000 and subsequently ratified by 38 European countries, calls for the promotion of participatory approaches and the implementation of landscape education, since the landscape 'concerns everyone', to cater to both specialists as well as to school and university audiences. The ELC also calls for the introduction of national 'landscape policies' for all landscapes, even the most 'ordinary' ones, by the signatory countries, policies which these countries have subsequently drafted and adopted (Olwig 2007). These recent evolutions in the very concept of the landscape and its place in the political and regulatory frameworks naturally call for an examination of the various ways in which different actors mobilize the theme of the landscape, each in his or her own way, and, consequently, of the diversity of skills and professional practices called upon. What is the significance of landscape education that respects the diversity of actors and their approaches, and what forms can it take?

The multiplication of experiences of raising awareness, landscape mediation, and participatory approaches (Caille-Cattin 2005; Davodeau and Toublanc 2010; Donadieu 2009; Guisepelli et al. 2001; Nogué et al. 2010; Paradis and Lelli 2010) – as also the hindrances, obstacles, and limitations that have emerged – highlight the need to compare these experiences and to cast a reflexive and critical look at these developments, both societal and educational (Donadieu 2007, Dérioz 2008). For what type of citizen are these approaches suitable? Is he or she trained in this civic activity? Who designs these approaches, leads them, uses them? How do they call into question the various landscape professions and, more generally, those of territorial development? This symposium's objective is to throw light on the various educational issues raised by these approaches and to discuss these practices (Partoune et al. 2002; Vergnolle Mainar et al. 2012; Vergnolle Mainar et al. 2014).

This symposium proposes to open a space for sharing and discussion around these training experiences, considered in the broadest sense, and to examine the didactical potential of the landscape. The objective is to encourage dialogue between the actors who mobilize or wish to mobilize the landscape theme at any level and at any time in order to question the aims, practices, mechanisms, mediums, expected skills, reference bases, learning processes as well as their difficulties and obstacles.

Three axes of reflection are proposed for papers, posters and presentations of teaching aids, tools or games:

➤ **THEMATIC AXIS 1: The landscape and training of the (future) citizen. The didactical issues involved.**

This thematic axis's aim is to question the consequences and effects of a policy approach to the landscape on training, pedagogical practices, and didactical reflection. The propagation of participatory approaches around the landscape and the proliferation of mediation processes that experiment with other forms of interaction with users, citizens, and inhabitants of all ages call into question the existing professions and training programmes (Bertrand and Briffaud 2008; Bichindaritz 2006; Michelin 2004; Michelin and Joliveau 2005). Do these approaches allow the collective construction, comparison, and circulation of knowledge? Do they facilitate professional or non-professional dialogue between different cultures? How do they challenge existing expertise? This theme invites us to re-read these approaches from a didactical point of view. On the basis of a reflexive and critical analysis of practices and experiences (in the classroom, in the field), it is a matter not only of questioning their history, their genealogy, and the issues raised, and of clarifying the epistemological foundations and the educational purposes, but also of projecting ourselves into the future. Participants are invited to re-examine these approaches through the filter of future issues (uncertainty, sustainability, mobility, the spread of the digital, simulated, or virtual worlds, etc.) that are transforming our relationship with the world. How do these developments translate in terms of learning (Davodeau 2012)?

1.1- Can the landscape be a tool for citizen training? If yes, what sort of learning and to what end? What type of citizenship are we referring to? Are the societal and environmental issues translated in the lessons? If yes, how? What forms does this training take in the classroom, in the group? Are these citizens' aims in competition with other aims, other priorities (biodiversity, environment, sustainability, transition, etc.) or are there convergences?

1.2- Has the European Landscape Convention (ELC) been a driving force for a political approach to the landscape? How does it translate into education systems? At the national level, have the public policies implemented contributed to changes in pedagogical training and practices?

1.3- Is the landscape a lever for training in participation? What does this mean: training to be a participatory citizen, accepting participation, or facilitating participation? How can we also teach the obstacles, the limits, the downsides of participation? Critical feedback on experiences, successes, and failures.

1.4- Is it possible to teach and debate values through the landscape? Is it even desirable or advisable? Which statuses of the landscape to make use of: resource, heritage, identity, common good – for whom and why? What does the term '(shared) culture of the landscape' mean? To who? To do what? Can we think of a 'common citizen base' as it relates to the landscape and its interrelation with differentiated and sometimes competing professional landscape cultures?

1.5- Is the sensory, subjective, and emotional approach to the landscape a resource or an obstacle to learning? How to articulate the sensible and the political?

1.6- Beneath the landscape: are there any unthoughts or blind spots in the teaching of landscape? What about the pitfalls? How to take ideological instrumentalizations into account? Are interpretations of identity for political purposes included in pedagogical strategies?

➤ **THEMATIC AXIS 2: Teaching and the landscape: experiences, innovations, constraints, resistance**

This thematic axis proposes to address didactical issues and pedagogical practices, mechanisms and tools by comparing and combining different contexts, situations and audiences. What does the landscape help us base our sharing on? It is a matter, above all, of a reflexive and critical look at teaching by questioning the landscape's didactical potential. Particular attention needs to be paid to exchanges and collaborations, to transdisciplinary efforts, interdisciplinary cross-fertilization, and their obstacles and limitations (Bonin et al. 2015).

2.1- Questioning our methods: How, when and with what to teach the landscape? What is involved in terms of innovation, resistance, heritage, intra- or interdisciplinary controversies? What are the hindrances, obstacles, conflicts, and inertias preventing a renewal of practices, in all contexts? Are landscape pedagogies the last refuge of 'classical' geography: descriptive and independent of issues? What are the blind spots in the teaching of the landscape?

2.2- Let us open our toolbox for a critical feedback on experiences, successes, failures, perspectives in order to analyze our mechanisms: drawings, maps, photography, moving images, models, narratives, GIS, virtual landscapes, role playing, etc. Let us rank our tools: spent or outdated, innovative, powerful, yet to be developed? Which of them can be considered intermediate objects or boundary objects (Mougenot and Stassart 2008; Vinck 2009)? How to identify them and what purpose do they serve in the teaching of the landscape? Do they help to analyze the construction and circulation of knowledge, to identify modes and stages of negotiation?

2.3- Let us put ourselves in a field situation: What does the direct *in situ* contact contribute? What is the role and place of perceptions, discoveries, senses? How to conceive and accompany the relationship to the landscape, for actors of all ages? How to organize the return from the field, the creation of memories, how to carry the landscape back? What about virtual visualization tools? How to make the landscape a tool for problematization?

2.4- Workshop pedagogy: Would and what sort of a reflective relook at this pedagogy be useful? What does the term 'workshop pedagogy' encompass? What are its legacies, its models, its forms of innovation? What is it based on? What teacher-student relationships are fostered or created? Does the student get empowered or does he need accompaniment?

2.5- What about training design, set-up and reforms? Does the presence of educational references for certain professions help in coordinating, renewing and reshaping occupations? How can we allow and encourage interdisciplinarity, the articulation between teachers and practitioners, between teacher-researchers and participants, between training programmes and territorial actors? How to rethink the function of creativity, imagination, art? What can be the role of research?

2.6- What are the contributions of 'other' noneducator actors (associations, artistic circles, project managers, territorial actors, etc.)? They use the landscape in their professional practices, develop toolkits, experiment, adapt, invent, observe, and build knowledge on and with the landscape. What role can they play in terms of awareness raising, training, emulation and transmission? Are they partners, initiators, disrupters? How can a reflexive analysis be capitalized?

➤ **THEMATIC AXIS 3: The landscape under debate: do the controversies lead to a renewal of the teaching of landscape?**

This thematic axis is focused on examining the didactical implications of the landscape controversy, assuming that the controversy is, at the same time, a situation in which the landscape is debated in the public arena, an object of instruction allowing a political approach to the landscape, and a didactical mechanism of debate (Cefaï and Trom 2001; Kirat and Torre 2008). The controversy should allow us to combine multiple experiences on the when, why, and how to debate on and through the landscape, both in school and outside the educational sphere (Audigier et al. 2011). It is also a matter of identifying the specific contributions of the didactics of various disciplines on the controversies (Albe 2009; Audigier et al. 2015; Legardez and Simmonneaux 2003).

3.1- What didactical mechanisms to design for what learning objectives? The controversial situation can be thought of as an object of teaching: what does it allow and how? Does it promote innovation? What examples to choose and why? It can also be conceived as a means of classroom debate: what does it allow? Does the controversy incite – or even force – a rethink of the teacher’s position and of the pedagogical relationship? Which forms of critical feedback on experiences to draw upon: deconstruction, organized debate, role play, etc.?

3.2- Is the landscape controversy conducive to an education in politics: analysis of the systems of actors, strategies and power games, discourses, words and images, reflection on the conditions for the exercise of democracy, etc.? What does the debate on and through the landscape contribute in terms of collective learning? How to train the future citizen in the political ‘game’ and how to train the future professional to interact with the political world?

3.3 - Controversy as indicator of multiple and potentially contradictory values, tensions between special interests and collective interests, systems of representations, diversity of readings and appropriations. Introducing debate in the group or in the public arena implies an acceptance of all kinds of expressions: how to accommodate and regulate these tensions both in the classroom and in the wider public debate? How to manage disagreements, decipher the modalities of opposition between students or citizens, and lead them to embrace processes of acceptability of visions or the choices of others? How can the teacher/mediator position himself or herself?

3.4- The territory behind the landscape: the landscape controversy can be a point of entry to the territory, to identify its actors and its issues. What can be the contributions of the landscape controversy in a project’s pedagogy? What are the conditions for and issues involved in experimenting with student mediation, between fictitious exercises and actual commands, in the classroom or in the field?

Bibliography:

- ALBE V. (2009). *Enseigner les controverses*, Presses universitaires de Rennes.
- AUDIGIER F., FINK N., FREUDIGER N., HAEBERLI PH. (Ed.) (2011). *L’éducation en vue du développement durable : sciences sociales et élèves en débats*. Geneva: Cahiers de la Section des Sciences de l’Education de l’université de Genève, no. 130.
- AUDIGIER F., TUTIAUX-GUILLON N., SGARD A. (Ed.) (2015). *Sciences de la nature et sciences de la société dans une École en mutation. Fragmentations, recompositions, nouvelles alliances ?*, De Boeck Supérieur, Louvain-la-Neuve, 206 p.
- BEDART M. (Ed.) (2009). *Le paysage. Un projet politique*, coll. Géographie contemporaine, Presses de l’Université du Québec. 330 p.

- BERTRAND G., BRIFFAUD S. (Ed.) (2008). *Le paysage. Retour d'expériences entre recherche et projet*. Actes des rencontres de l'abbaye d'Arthous, Centre départemental du patrimoine, 9-10 October 2008, Mont-de-Marsan, Conseil Général des Landes.
- BESSE J.-M. (2009). *Le goût du monde. Exercices de paysage*, Actes sud/ENSP, 232 p.
- BICHINDARITZ F. (Ed.) (2006). *Enseigner le paysage*, Direction de l'architecture et du patrimoine, éd. de l'Espérou, in 2 volumes.
- BONIN S., LHEUREUX S., LEFEBVRE C. (2015). 'Landscape architecture and agronomy: an interdisciplinary teaching experimentation', in Glorio Niin, Himansu Sekhar Mishra (Ed.), *Landscapes in Flux: Book of Proceedings*. European Council of Landscape Architecture Schools, 2015, pp. 330-337.
<http://www.digar.ee/arhiiv/et/raamatud/43664>
- CAILLE-CATTIN C. (2005). *Le paysage, de l'information à l'élaboration d'une culture paysagère. Vers des médiations paysagères au service des acteurs de l'aménagement du territoire*, Doctorate in geography, University of Franche-Comté, 348 p. <http://thema.univfcomte.fr/IMG/pdf/CailleThese1.pdf>
- CEFÄI D., TROM D. (Ed.) (2001). *Les formes de l'action collective. Mobilisation dans des arènes publiques*, Éditions de l'École des hautes études en sciences sociales.
- Collectif (1995). *Paysage au pluriel : Pour une approche ethnologique des paysages*. Paris, Editions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 240 p.
- DAVODEAU H. (2012). « Paysages et médiations, retour d'expériences pédagogiques », in X. GUILLOT (Ed.), *Espace rural / & projet spatial*, pp.161-166/267 p., Presses universitaires de St Etienne.
- DAVODEAU H., TOUBLANC M. (2010). « Le paysage outil, les outils du paysage, Principes et méthodes de la médiation paysagère », *OPDE Outils pour décider ensemble, Aide à la décision et gouvernance*, symposium of 25/26 October at Montpellier, pp. 375-391/436. <https://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00788155/document>
- D'ANGIO R. (1997). «Au secours le paysage revient !», *L'information géographique*, volume 61, no. 3, 1997. pp. 122-128
- DÉRIOZ P. (2008). « L'approche paysagère : un outil polyvalent au service de l'approche opérationnelle et interdisciplinaire des problématiques environnementales », *Actes des Premières Journées Scientifiques ARPEnv « Interdisciplinarité et gestion environnementale : partage d'expériences autour de la psychologie environnementale »*, University of Nîmes, 6-7 June 2008, Cdrom UNimes/ARPEnv/Éco-Psy & available online (<http://halshs.archives-ouvertes.fr/halshs-00363625/fr/>) - 23 p.
- DONADIEU P. (2007). « Le paysage, les paysagistes et le développement durable : quelles perspectives ? », *Économie rurale*, no. 297-298, « Le paysage », pp. 10-22. [Online: <http://economierurale.revues.org/index1923.html>]
- DONADIEU P. (2009). « Petit lexique de géomédiation paysagiste », *Projet de Paysage*, 14 p. http://www.projetsdepaysage.fr/fr/petit_lexique_de_geomediation_paysagiste] published on 24/12/2009
- DROZ Y., MIEVILLE-OTT V. (2005). *La polyphonie du paysage*, Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes, 228 p.
- FORTIN M.-J., PEYRACHE-GADEAU V., SGARD A. (Ed.) (2010). Dossier « Paysage et développement durable », *Développement durable et Territoire*, Vol 1, no. 2.
- GUISEPELLI E., FLEURY P., PAPY F. (2001). *Le paysage, objet et outil de négociation entre acteurs du développement local. Le cas d'un territoire rural de Moyenne Tarentaise (Savoie)*, final report of the research programme « Paysage et Développement Durable 1 », SUACI Montagne GIS Alpes du Nord/INRA Versailles-Grignon, 80 p. http://www.developpement-durable.gouv.fr/IMG/Papy-rapport_final.pdf
- LEGARDEZ A., SIMMONNEAUX L. (Ed.) (2003), *L'école à l'épreuve de l'actualité. Enseigner les questions vives*, Paris: ESF, pp. 19-33.
- KIRAT T., TORRE A. (Ed.), (2008). *Territoires de conflits. Analyse des mutations de l'occupation de l'espace*, L'Harmattan, 324 p.
- LELLI L., SAHUC Ph., LARDON S., GANSINAT J. (2016). « Comment accompagner la mise en oeuvre d'une politique publique du paysage par l'animation territoriale? », in D. VOLLET and A. TORRE (Ed.), *Partenariats pour le développement territorial*, Editions Quae, chapter 13, pp. 209-218.
- LUGINBUHL Y. (2012). *La mise en scène du monde. Construction du paysage européen*, CNRS Ed.

- MICHELIN Y. (coord.) (2004). « Des paysages pour le développement local. Expériences et recherches innovantes dans le Massif Central », Proceedings of the symposium of Florac, *Revue d'Auvergne*, no. 571, 338p.
- MICHELIN Y., JOLIVEAU T. (2005). « Le paysage au service de démarches participatives et prospectives de développement local : enseignements d'expériences de recherche-action conduites dans le Massif central », *Revue d'Auvergne*, no. 571, May 2005, pp. 233-262.
- MOUGENOT C., STASSART P. (2008). « Les objets éphémères du développement durable », in F. Melart (Ed.), *Ecologisation : objets et concepts intermédiaires*, collection Ecopolis, Presses Interuniversitaires Européennes, pp. 73-96.
- NOGUÉ J., PUIGBERT L., BRETCHA G. (2010). *Paisatge i participació ciutadana*, coll. "Documentació", no. 1, Observatoire du Paysage de Catalogne (Olot) / Direction générale pour la participation citoyenne du Ministère de l'Intérieur, des Relations Institutionnelles et de la Participation du Gouvernement de la Catalogne, 110 p. [online: http://www.catpaisatge.net/fitxers/publicacions/participacio/cat/participacio_ciutadana.pdf]
- OLWIG K. (2007). 'The practice of landscape "Convention" and the just landscape: The case of the European landscape convention', *Landscape Research*, vol. 32, pp. 579-594.
- PARADIS S., LELLI L. (2010). « La médiation paysagère, levier d'un développement territorial durable ? », *Développement Durable et Territoires* (online), vol. 1, no. 2, September 2010, 18 p. <http://developpementdurable.revues.org/index8548.html>
- PARTOUNE, C., ERICX M., PIRENNE M. (2002),. *Les Hyperpaysages panoramiques. Une utilisation pédagogique originale des outils multimédia et de l'Internet*, Ecopedagogic Institute – Laboratory of Methodologies of Geography, University of Liege.
- RUDAZ G., SGARD A. (éd.) (2016). « Les dimensions politiques du paysage », *Géo-Regards*, no. 8, Neuchâtel.
- TOUBLANC M. (2004). *Paysages en herbe. Le paysage et la formation à l'agriculture durable*, Dijon, Ed. Educagri, 292 p.
- VERGNOLLE MAINAR C., CALVET A., EYCHENNE L., MARQUÉ N., MICHINEAU D., THOUZET A. (2012). «Regards disciplinaires croisés sur les paysages ordinaires de proximité: un enjeu pour enrichir le lien des élèves au territoire où ils habitent», *Éducation relative à l'environnement*, no. 10.
- VERGNOLLE MAINAR C., CALVET A., MICHINEAU D. (2014). « Le paysage en collège: entre construction de l'espace et symbolique des territoires », *M@ppemonde*, no. 113, Dossier la géographie scolaire. De l'école élémentaire aux filières universitaires professionnalisantes, online: <http://mappemonde-archive.mgm.fr/num41/articles/art14102.html>
- VINCK D. (2009). « De l'objet intermédiaire à l'objet-frontière. Vers la prise en compte du travail d'équipement », *Revue d'anthropologie des connaissances*, Vol. 3, no. 2009-1, pp. 51-72.

Organizing committee:

BILLEAU Sandrine, geographer. Scientific assistant, Department of Geography and Environment of the University of Geneva (Switzerland).

BONIN Sophie, agronomist and geographer. Lecturer-researcher, National School of Landscape Architecture (LAREP, ENSP) (France).

DAVODEAU Hervé, geographer. Lecturer-researcher at the Landscape Pedagogical Unit, Agrocampus Ouest Angers centre, UMR ESO 6590 CNRS (France).

DERIOZ Pierre, geographer. Lecturer-researcher at the University of Avignon, UMR Espace-Dev 228 IRD (France).

DIVERNERESSE François, geography PhD student. Department of Geography and Environment of the University of Geneva (Switzerland).

FORTIN Marie-José, landscape architect and geographer. Professor at the Department of Societies, Territories and Development, University of Quebec at Rimouski and Canada Research Chair in Regional and Territorial Development – GRIDEQ/CRDT (Canada).

LELLI Laurent, geographer. Lecturer-researcher at AgroParisTech; UMR Métafort CERAMAC (Territories), Clermont-Ferrand (France).

PARADIS Sylvie, architect-urban planner and geographer. Scientific collaborator, Department of Geography and Environment of the University of Geneva (Switzerland); Research associate UMR Métafort CERAMAC (Territories) (France).

PARTOUNE Christine, geographer. Lecturer-researcher, Institute of Geography, University of Liege, Haute Ecole Libre Mosane (HELMo) and Eco-pedagogic Institute (ASBL), Liege (Belgium).

PERNET Alexis, landscape architect and geographer. Lecturer-researcher, National School of Landscape Architecture at Versailles (LAREP, ENSP) (France).

SGARD Anne, geographer. Professor at Department of Geography and Environment and the University Institute of Teacher Education, University of Geneva (Switzerland).

TOUBLANC Monique, sociologist. Lecturer-researcher, National School of Landscape Architecture at Versailles (LAREP, ENSP) (France).

Scientific committee:

BESSE Jean-Marc, University of Paris 1 Sorbonne (France)

BRANDUINI Paola, Architecture School of Politecnico di Milano (Italy)

BRIFFAUD Serge, ENSAPBx - University of Bordeaux (France)

CASTIGLIONI Benedetta, University of Padoua (Italy)

CONVERCEY Philippe, HEPIA, Geneva (Switzerland)

DEBARBIEUX Bernard, University of Geneva (Switzerland)

DOMON Gérald, University of Montreal, Quebec (Canada)

DONADIEU Pierre, National School of Landscape Architecture at Versailles (France)

FROLOVA Marina, University of Grenada (Spain)

GERMAINE Marie-Anne, University of Paris 10 Nanterre (France)

GOMEZ Mendoza Josefina, University of Madrid (Spain)

GUILLAUMONT Natacha, HEPIA, Geneva (Switzerland)

HAINÉ Michèle, Université libre of Bruxelles (Belgium)

JOLIVEAU Thierry, University of St-Etienne (France)

MATTHEY Laurent, University of Geneva (Switzerland)

NEURAY Claire, Université libre of Bruxelles (Belgium)

RUEGG Jean, University of Lausanne (Switzerland)

RUIZ Julie, University of Quebec in Trois-Rivières, Québec (Canada)

THEMINES Jean-François, University of Caen (France)

VERGNOLLE-MAINAR Christine, ESPE - University of Toulouse 2 (France)

Important dates and contact information:

Proposals for papers (in English or French), posters or presentation of teaching aids, tools or games must be sent via e-mail to all of the following contacts:

- Anne Sgard: Anne.Sgard@unige.ch
- Sylvie Paradis: Sylvie.Paradis@unige.ch
- Sandrine Billeau: Sandrine.Billeau@unige.ch

- ~~5 February 2017~~ **February 13th 2017: Submission of short abstracts** for proposals for papers, posters or teaching aids, tools or games
 - Abstracts of a maximum length of 3000 characters (including spaces) presenting the issue, the methodology and the results
 - A maximum of 10 bibliographical references
 - 5 keywords

- **Late March 2017:** Evaluation and selection by the organizing committee and the scientific council

- **Early April 2017:** The authors will be informed of the decision by the organizing committee

- **17 July 2017: Submission of long abstracts** for proposals for papers. These long abstracts will be published in a brochure.
 - Abstract of a maximum length of 8000 characters (including spaces) developing the issue, the methodology and the results, taking into account the remarks of the organizing committee and the scientific council
 - A maximum of 20 bibliographical references
 - 5 keywords

The work of the symposium will be published in the form of a brochure and distributed at the symposium.

At the end of the symposium, a selection of the papers presented will be published in one or more scientific publications, for which authors will be contacted at the end of 2017.