

# Inclusion and education in European countries

---

INTMEAS Report for contract –2007-2094/001 TRA-TRSP0

Final report: 14. Experts and PLA



George Muskens

Lepelstraat  
August 2009

This is an independent report commissioned by the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the official position of the European Commission.

Drafts of this report benefited from comments and advice from the consortium's reference group members and from other experts in this field.

Reproduction is authorised provided the source is acknowledged.

The electronic version of this report is available at:

<http://www.docabureaus.nl/INTMEAS.html>

[Available INTMEAS-reports:](#)

1. Summary/sommaire/Zusammenfassung
2. Comparative conclusions
3. Discussion and recommendations
4. France
5. Germany
6. Hungary
7. Italy
8. The Netherlands
9. Poland
10. Slovenia
11. Spain
12. Sweden
13. UK
14. Experts and PLA

#### INTMEAS Reference Group

George Muskens, project leader

Jaap Dronkers, expert adviser

José Ramón Flecha, expert adviser

Jill Bourne, expert adviser

Danielle Zay, leader French research team

Ingrid Gogolin, leader German research team

Pál Tamás, leader Hungarian research team

Francesca Gobbo, leader Italian research team

Michał Federowicz, leader Polish research team

Albina Nečak Lük, Sonja Novak Lukanovic, leaders Slovenian research team

Mariano Fernández Enguita, leader Spanish research team

Elena Dingu Kyrklund, leader Swedish research team

Rae Condie, leader UK research team

# **Inclusion measures in ‘further’ European countries and educational regions**

**INTMEAS Report for contract –2007-2094/001 TRA-  
TRSP0**

**Report of the expert survey and national examples as presented at  
Peer Learning Activities**



**George Muskens**

Lepelstraat, May 2009

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>AIMS .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>RESPONSE TO THE EXPERT SURVEY .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>REPORTS OF THE PEER LEARNING ACTIVITIES PLAS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>MEASURES FOR KEEPING EARLY SCHOOL LEAVERS ABOARD.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>PRIORITY MEASURES .....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>INCLUSIVE EDUCATION MEASURES .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>SAFE EDUCATION MEASURES, MEASURES AGAINST BULLYING AND HARASSMENT .....</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>8</b>	<b>CONCLUSIONS, SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>11</b>
8.1	MEASURES TO REDUCE EARLY SCHOOL LEAVING:.....	12
8.2	PRIORITY MEASURES .....	12
8.3	INCLUSIVE EDUCATION MEASURES .....	13
8.4	SAFE EDUCATION MEASURES .....	14

# 1 Aims

In the EU-Member States that were not covered by our ten national research teams we have carried out an expert survey on inclusion measures in education, and we have added examples as presented at Peer Learning Activities. Therefore, the materials in the present report are additional to the main comparative assessment of inclusion measures in ten Member States. Additional information was welcome for two major reasons, being:

- ✚ Most reliable knowledge on inclusion measures regards qualitative knowledge, certainly as far as implementation, effects and wider applicability is concerned. Nothing or only a few things are really sure and evidence based policies and practice. In this respect, the wider and richer our knowledge base would be the better. It would mean: more cases and enriched assessment. Therefore, we wanted to extend the scope of the project by expert reports on cases and countries that were not represented among the ten countries.
- ✚ The ten countries should not be seen as a representative sample of all EU-Member States. They are a collection of ten countries, with different educational arrangements and policies. For the wider interpretation of the outcomes additional information from the other Member States would be welcome and needed.

After the first phase of the project we have concluded that all terms of reference of the project were to be focussed on six major frames of inclusion measures in mainstream education. These frames were:

- ✚ How to keep early school leavers aboard or how to reintegrate them after leaving the school too early?
- ✚ What priority measures are set out and applied in schools for target groups of pupils at risk?
- ✚ What inclusive measures are set out and applied for pupils with handicaps, disabilities and special needs?
- ✚ What measures should ensure safe education for all pupils, and particularly for pupils at risk of bullying and harassment?
- ✚ What measures should support schools and staff?

For the expert survey and PLA-analysis the last focus was dropped, as it might cover a too wide range of possible measures or regard the implicit effects of measures that are not directly aiming at the inclusion of pupils at risk in mainstream education. Therefore, we have asked the experts and checked the PLA-reports for measures as undertaken, on the importance of the measures and on evaluation research as available concerning four issues, namely:

- ✚ Measures to reduce early school leaving.
- ✚ Measures to improve the chances of disadvantaged pupils,
- ✚ Measures to include pupils with a handicap, with restrictions and/or special needs in mainstream education,
- ✚ Measures against bullying and harassment.

The questions were formulated as open questions in a four-question questionnaire. Further to the questions short explanations have been included in the questionnaire, namely:

- ✚ **Early school leaving** – this regards the full or partial dropout of pupils, not being in the interest of the pupils themselves nor in that of society. For the European societies, the pupils should at least reach a decent labour market qualification at the

level of ISCED 3C, i.e. a level that includes some upper secondary education. Pupils may not be interested in reaching that level because of lost motivation and a multitude of troubles, or because they obviously are unable to pass tests and examinations at the level of ISCED 3C, or because they find their way on the labour market and in society without passing ISCED level 3C. According to the Lisbon Declaration the number of early school leavers is too high in all or most member States of the EU; in 2010 the number should be halved compared to the numbers in 2001.

- ✚ **Improved chances for disadvantaged minorities** – most European countries have set out priority policies and measures to improve the chances of pupils belonging to disadvantaged minorities. It regards disadvantages that follow from inequities in society and that are independent of the individual capacities of the pupils. As a result, the pupils are at risk of exclusion from education and society, whereas talents may get lost. Sources of such inequities may be gender, ethnicity –immigrant and/or indigenous, class, and handicaps. As far as measures are undertaken in your country: for which disadvantaged groups?
- ✚ **Inclusive education for pupils with handicaps, special needs, etc.** – in varying degrees the European countries have implemented inclusive policies and measures in mainstream education for pupils with handicaps, special needs, etc. In this way the exclusion and discrimination of children and young people with handicaps and special needs is to be counter-acted, while at the same time highest effort is to be made to assure ‘appropriate and tailor-made education’ in relation to the handicaps, special needs, etc. In varying degrees, the latter issue has been an argument in favour or against education in special schools and institutions. Please reveal the position of your country in this respect.
- ✚ **Bullying and harassment** – in practice bullied and harassed pupils are at risk of marginalisation and exclusion from schools and classes, while bullies and pupils or staff that has harassed pupils are at risk of severe disciplinary measures, including forced expulsion from school and education. In a wider frame, safe educational conditions for all pupils were to be safeguarded. We should assess the measures that enhance such conditions and that should diminish bullying and harassment in education. We would be helped by your information concerning measures in your country.

## 2 Response to the expert survey

Within the tight conditions of time and budget we have approached 27 selected experts in the seventeen countries. Through the ongoing snowball-method 5 further experts were added to our group, on recommendation of their colleagues. All experts represent the full EU-level 1 or level 2 expertise in the field of primary and secondary education, and/or related fields such as educational policies or youth at risk of exclusion and early school leaving.

Not all were effectively contacted or were able to respond to the questionnaire. We have received valuable response from:

- ✚ Belgium (Flemish Community), Dr. Peter van Puyenbroeck, Antwerp,
- ✚ Belgium (French Community), Dr. Dragana Avramow, CSPC Brussels,
- ✚ Bulgaria, Prof. Krassimira Daskalova, St. Kliment Ohridski University Sofia
- ✚ Czech Republic, Prof. Jan Jirak, Charles University Prague; Prof. Milan Pol, Masaryk University Brno,
- ✚ Cyprus, Dr. Christos Panayotopoulos, Intercollege Nicosia,
- ✚ Denmark, Prof. Niels Egelund, University of Århus,
- ✚ Finland, Prof. Marita Mäkinen, University of Tampere,

- ✚ Greece, Dr. Roman Gerodimos, University of Bournemouth
- ✚ Latvia, Prof. Brigitta Zepa, Baltic Institute of Social Sciences Riga
- ✚ Malta, Dr. Mary Anne Lauri, University of Malta
- ✚ Portugal, Prof. Candida Ferreira, Technical University of Lisbon; Prof. Olga Pombo, University of Lisbon, Prof. Cristina Maria Coimbra Vieira, University of Coimbra, Luisa Marroni, University of Coimbra
- ✚ Slovak Republic, Dr. Gabriel Bianchi, Slovak Academy of Sciences Bratislava

The present report is based upon their response to the questionnaire.

### 3 Reports of the Peer Learning Activities PLAs

EU education and training policy has been given added impetus since the adoption of the Lisbon Strategy in 2000, the EU's overarching programme focusing on growth and jobs (Presidency of the European Council, 2000 March). EU Member States and the European Commission have in recent years strengthened their political cooperation through the Education and Training 2010 work program (European Commission, 2008). There are three overall objectives:

- ✚ Improving the quality and effectiveness of education and training systems;
- ✚ Facilitating access to education and training systems; and
- ✚ Opening up EU education and training systems to the wider world.

The philosophy is that Member States can learn a lot from each other. The Commission organises peer learning activities between member states interested in jointly developing national policies and systems in specific fields. Their main working method is the identification and planning of Peer Learning Activities (PLAs). The PLAs are a process of cooperation at European level whereby policy makers and practitioners from one country learn from the experiences of their counterparts elsewhere in Europe in implementing reforms in areas of shared interest and concern. The following relevant PLAs have taken place since 2007:

- ✚ How can Teacher Education and Training policies prepare teachers to teach effectively in culturally diverse settings? Oslo, 20-05-2007,
- ✚ Validation of non-formal and informal learning for teachers and trainers in vocational education and training, Lisbon, 14-01-2008,
- ✚ Fight against failure at school and inequality in education, Paris, 12-11-2007,
- ✚ (De)segregation in education, Budapest, 25-04-2007,
- ✚ Preventative and compensatory measures to reduce early school leaving, Dublin, 31-01-2007,
- ✚ School integration of immigrant children, positive discrimination measures, support to school drop-outs, Brussels, 09-10-2006.

The reports of the PLAs have been published on a special website, being the knowledge system for lifelong learning, <http://kslll.net>.

Examples of inclusion measures from Member States that were not covered by our ten research teams and the response to the expert survey have been added to the response and the report of the expert survey, as further national examples. These regards examples in:

- ✚ Ireland,

🇹🇷 Turkey.

These examples have been included in the present report.

## 4 Measures for keeping early school leavers aboard

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Belgium, Flemish Community</b>	The transition from insertion classes to mainstream education is to be improved, as to avoid comparatively high numbers of early school leaving among side-instreamers.	Most schools are controlling for truancy effectively.	Time-out projects. Since 2006 budgets are available for local time-out project, short-stay as well as long-stay. Most schools are controlling for truancy effectively. Special position is created to support frequent absentees, i.e. the <b>JoJo</b> . JoJos are young starters on the labour market, who are working as mentors of the absentees, while in the meantime finishing their upper secondary education. Absentees are apparently rather frequently foreign pupils, who have followed insertion classes before. Early school leavers may be found and guided by youth coaches, as in Antwerp.
<b>Belgium, French Community</b>	All measures are actually bottom-up measures in the sense that they follow from active planning and action on behalf of the schools. However, they are underpinned by targeted legislation, e.g. on SAS, which means a space of transition. SAS offers a sort of sabbatical period so as to allow pupils to explore other fields of activities.	The effects of the measures have not been evaluated systematically. With regard to dual courses (school in combination with training on the job), that should keep early school leavers from upper vocational training aboard, the outcome might be contradictory in the sense that only a minority appeared to do jobs in the sector of training. It is common sense knowledge that funding has been too limited.	In the frame of three lines the schools are encouraged to take action against early school leaving. These are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Priority education, e.g. additional funding in relation to apparent deficiencies and disadvantages of pupils,</li> <li>• Special services against school failure, i.e. re-insertion classes and rebound arrangements for dropouts and pupils at risk of dropping out,</li> <li>• Encouragement of dual courses in the streams and tracks of upper vocation training, where the pupils at risk of dropping out are concentrated.</li> </ul>
<b>Bulgaria</b>	In Bulgaria measures are mentioned that should support the groups of pupils at highest risk of exclusion from education, immediately or in a later phase. The Roma children are mentioned as the group at highest risk. The measures are applied in the grades 1-4 of compulsory education. The national program includes measures such as free textbooks and materials, free transportation, free good breakfast.	The measures are supposed to be an effective first step towards the inclusion of target groups at risk.	
<b>Cyprus</b>	Rather low priority, as numbers of early school leavers are moderate Apprentice scheme for dropouts from lower secondary education – dual courses Evening and over-night schools, with 800 dropouts from primary and lower secondary education		
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Numbers of early school leavers are low, apart from target groups as risk, particularly Roma children. Compulsory education up to the age of 15, sanctioned. Curriculum reform.	Roma teaching assistants. No evaluation research but experience showed relatively good results.	School counsellors and other specialised staff.
<b>Denmark</b>	Numbers are moderate. Municipal psychological services. Regional Youth and Career Counselling Services		

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Ireland</b> source: (Cluster "Access and Social Inclusion in Lifelong Learning")	DEIS – Recent policy plan against educational disadvantages: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Home School Community Liaison</b>, aimed at establishing collaboration between parents and teachers.</li> <li>• <b>School Completion Programme</b>, a positive discrimination measure, targeting those in danger of dropping out. Clusters of school receive extra funding.</li> <li>• <b>YouthReach</b>, second chance education for unemployed early school leavers.</li> <li>• <b>Area Partnerships</b>, since the 90's; specific focus on education.</li> </ul>		
<b>Finland</b>		Comprehensive and compulsory education until the age of 18. The numbers that have not reached the ISCED 3C-level then is very low: 0,3% (EUROSTAT 7,9% in 2007). Rather high numbers are out-placed in special education (almost 8%)	Early support measures and individual tracks for the 55 that may not reach the requested level at age 18.
<b>Greece</b>	Not highest priority: numbers are moderate and declining (under EU-average), while 82% has completed upper secondary education; lower secondary education is compulsory and sanctioned. New measures: intercultural education, additional teaching support, Transition Observatory.	Early school leaving concentrated in male groups at risk. Repressive approach appears not to be effective. Special assessment and progression provisions for pupils from foreign countries. Observed gap between national policy making and the promotion of new measures at the grassroots level of the local communities.	
<b>Latvia</b>		Early school leaving is increasing, by 1000 pupils in six years. Roma children are the most important group at risk. Report: Youth and inter-Ethnic schools (DAPHNE Project)	Possible measures: Involvement of school social workers. Further support personnel for the schools and the teachers (not enough budget). Adapted curricula for pupils at risk and in need Pedagogical correction and re-insertion or rebound classes, up to three years..
<b>Malta</b>	Sanctions of obvious absenteeism.	The issue would be less urgent than (European) statistics appear to suggest. Inefficient court proceedings with regard to sanctions and fines.	Improved registration of absenteeism. In case, intervention by a Social Worker.
<b>Portugal</b>	Compulsory education up to grade 9; sanctions and fines. Sanctions for employers, who employ young people in their compulsory education age. Grants and further support for disadvantaged pupils and families. Increased school autonomy that should improve the pupils' learning processes The Integrated Program of Education and Training intends to prevent children/adolescent from risk situation of child labour Reinforcement and training of teachers in some areas considered as "key areas"	Good results in the 1990s, but no further improvement thereafter.	Further job training opportunities for dropouts. The school is responsible for the implementation for taking measures, with a permanent evaluation of them and of the results. Alternative School Trajectories, if needed Courses of Education and Training for pupils older than 15 years old Territories for priority measures and intervention Individualized teaching or domestic teaching Mobile education for children of itinerant professionals Flexible curriculum management Full-time schools The schools have been indicating a decrease in the number of dropouts

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Slovakia</b>		Strong inter-relationship between early school leaving and disadvantages, particularly in case of Roma children – for measures; see under.	
<b>Turkey (PLA-meeting, see footnote)</b>	In Turkey, the Ministry of Social and the Ministry of Education have launched a program on <i>Reducing Social Risk</i> . The aim is to develop a social aid web in order to support poor children to access basic education services. A financial aid is given to underprivileged families at condition that they bring their children to school and to health services. Additional support is given to girls.		( ), returning to school has been provided to the 10-14 aged children that are out of the education system in the frame of "Compensation Education". The students who become successful in this education system have the chance of continuing to their education by settling them to the classes according to their ages. 640.000 students have taken advantage of this education till the end of 2006.

## 5 Priority measures

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Belgium, Flemish Community</b>	Extension of compulsory education for all 2,5-4 year is considered as to guarantee full participation in pres-school education.	The Flemish authorities have issued legislation with regard to <b>GOK</b> , being priority education for disadvantaged pupils, e.g. in relation to home language use, low cultural capital from home or poverty, other socio-economic disadvantages, or moderate individual disorder. In this frame a GOK-budget is available for the schools with high numbers of disadvantaged pupils.	Schools may use the GOK-budget that is allocated to them for measures, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remedial teaching,</li> <li>• Additional classes and hours,</li> <li>• Language education in Dutch as second language (after language tests),</li> <li>• Intercultural education,</li> <li>• Orientation classes for further education,</li> <li>• Socio-emotional development training,</li> <li>• Participation of pupils and parent.</li> </ul>
<b>Belgium, French Community</b>	Decree on Positive Discrimination Bridge classes for newcomers (French, civic education, math and science)	Bridge classes have proven to be effective; they take one week up to one year. Tutoring has also proven to be useful. Some lack of co-operation from some teachers, who may be reticent towards students entering the school.	Tutoring university and college students, helping disadvantaged pupils in the transition phase from secondary to tertiary education.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Anti-discrimination programme 2006-2015, for the integration of Roma children and other discriminated groups without segregation.  Remaining gender discrimination, especially concerning the content of the textbooks. They continue to perpetuate the old gender stereotypes. Lack of gender sensitivity is a common feature for the whole educational system.	5500 pupils and 300 teachers until 2010	
<b>Cyprus</b>	Zones of Educational Priority, since 2003 on a pilot basis, for zones with high concentrations of ethnic minorities (Turkish Cypriots), immigrants, asylum seekers, among others.  Literacy programme to tackle functional illiteracy at the end of compulsory education,  Special needs education and individualised programmes	Ongoing evaluation research. Permanent working group for the promotion of literacy and school. Nationwide individual assessment of functional illiteracy.	

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Applicable laws with regard to special needs children, including "socially disadvantaged" children	Obviously not effective, particularly among/for Roma children children. These are labelled as being "unadaptable".  Linking the Roma families and the schools are potentially very promising.  The local centres for the integration of minorities are viewed as being effective.	Roma school assistants Preparatory and insertion classes. Linking the Roma families and the schools. Local centres for the integration of minorities.
<b>Denmark</b>	Enforced language screening for proficiency in Danish, at the age of 3 and 6. In case of need, supplementary language stimulation will take place (from 2009 onwards).  1975-2002 mother tongue education for bilingual children.		
<b>Finland</b>	Debate on (new) immigration and education is going on.  Offered is preparatory education (insertion classes) for newcomers.	Teaching for Lappish children at Lappish language schools.  The own culture of the Romanie people is taken into account.	
<b>Greece</b>	Implementation of programmes and curricula for intercultural education (Roma, Muslims).	Quite effective minimum framework over the last ten years (Support Centres, Intercultural Education).  However: remaining low school participation in secondary education of Roma children.  However too: latent discrimination and stigmatisation in the national curriculum (e.g. predominance of the Greek-Orthodox Christian religion).	Support programmes for disadvantaged pupils, particularly pupils with a handicap – developed by national expert centres.  Reliance on the national ombudsman (Children's Advocate) in case of discrimination
<b>Latvia</b>	Bilingual classes for the Russian etc. minorities, as to ensure the learning of Latvian.	The Latvian knowledge has increased among minority children.  Attitudes towards Latvia and Latvian remained negative, and reform was evaluated controversially.	
<b>Malta</b>	None		Training of staff in multicultural knowledge and skills.  Own school projects and initiatives.
<b>Portugal</b>	Entitlement for social insertion revenues (very moderate).  Expert centres for the relevant handicaps, to support inclusive education	No decrease of the poor population.  Immigrants from Latin America (Brazil) and Africa (former colonies).  Strong rhetorical discourse on multicultural society.  Mother-tongue education if appropriate	Social housing programs  Goodwill and scarce measures in some schools  School for children of travelling people Mobile School Full-time schools Individualized/domestic teaching Specialised professionals

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Slovakia</b>	<p>The School Act of 2008 has formalised the rights of the child and students and has banned all forms of discrimination and segregation in education.</p> <p>Governmental definition of a socially disadvantaged environment, with financial benefits for socially disadvantaged children: smaller classes, special 'zero'-classes (preparatory classes)</p> <p>Government resolutions on the education of Roma children, since 2003.</p> <p>Obligatory pre-school education, from age 4 onwards.</p> <p>Consultation with Amnesty International and the Minority Council of the Government on special Roma school, and Roma in special education.</p> <p>National priority with regard to the inclusion of Roma.</p>	<p>Roma educational expert centre in Presov.</p> <p>Several proposed measures remained unused, such as 'individual education' – reasons: missing training and skills of teachers, missing materials and equipment, missing standards.</p> <p>Many further obstacles in practice.</p> <p>Control mechanisms in hands of regional educational authorities, and the State School Inspectorate.</p>	<p>Assistant teachers.</p> <p>Improved curricula.</p> <p>National pilot project in the Presov region.</p> <p>Co-operation with parents.</p> <p>Public relations and public awareness campaigns.</p> <p>PHARE-supported projects for the integration of Roma children.</p> <p>Opportunities for Roma language education.</p> <p>National Guidance and Decree on Special School Enrolment Procedures.</p>

## 6 Inclusive education measures

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Belgium, Flemish Community</b>		<p>National budgets are available for specific GON-support, i.e. support of pupils with an indication in the autism spectre.</p> <p>Further 'difficult' pupils are to be managed in the frame of priority education, if applicable.</p> <p>The model of inclusive education was introduced rather lately in the Flemish Community.</p>	<p>Support by GON-guides, often being specialist pedagogues.</p> <p>Special programmes: TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication handicapped Children), STICORDI (stimulating, compensating, remedial teaching, dispensating).</p> <p>Inclusive education usually regards the following successive steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual plan,</li> <li>• Empowering learning environment as created by the teachers themselves,</li> <li>• Additional care as offered by GOK- or GIN-teachers, in case of need,</li> <li>• Further individual measures, if needed.</li> </ul>
<b>Belgium, French Community</b>	Centres for Psychological, Medical and Social Services give support to the mainstream schools in relation to pupils with special needs.	<p>50% of the children with special needs and disabilities are receiving education in mainstream schools.</p> <p>No comprehensive evaluation</p>	
<b>Bulgaria</b>		The number of included pupils in mainstream education has risen from 700 to around 5500 in three years time.	90 projects for improved architectural access of 55 schools, with state funding
<b>Cyprus</b>	Inclusive education, since 1999, in mainstream classes or in special classes of mainstream schools. Only pupils with severe difficulties are educated in special schools.		<p>Programmes for special education.</p> <p>550 specialised support staff.</p> <p>In-service training.</p> <p>N.B. Not enough, with problems related to steps from primary to secondary education.</p>
<b>Czech Republic</b>	New legislation underway, allocating track money for the inclusive education of handicapped etc. pupils.	Effective measures for the full integration.	<p>Any programs for the full integration of handicapped pupils in mainstream education.</p> <p>Expert support centres and specialised staff</p>

<i>Country</i>	<i>Top-down measures as to be applied</i>	<i>Top-down measures as effectively applied</i>	<i>Bottom-up measures</i>
<b>Denmark</b>	Inclusive if possible	3.8% of all pupils is educated in special schools. Increased segregation since twenty years, particularly in the field of ADHD, autism, Asperger, and social or emotional problems.	
<b>Finland</b>	New legislation and implementation of 'appropriate education' for special needs pupils, based upon their individual troubles and capacities. Public debate on pupils' welfare and stress.		
<b>Greece</b>	Implementation of Special Education Act and extension of special schools.	Longstanding exclusion, discrimination and marginalisation of handicapped etc. children/pupils. Improvements since some 10 years (e.g. legal framework for non-discrimination). Investments needed in architecture, facilities and equipment. Need to include disabled students into mainstream education. Insufficient teacher training.	Online resources and civil society websites. Expert support and diagnostics centres. Need for cultural change.
<b>Latvia</b>	Recent changes are introduced in the direction of inclusive education.	Soviet history: institutionalised treatment of handicapped etc. children/pupils. Still prevalent model. Still insufficient teacher training	Parental support programs. European funding (ESF) Individualised education and home education, if possible and wanted.
<b>Malta</b>	Inclusive Education Act 2000, Inclusive and Special Education Act 2005.	Only few pupils in special schools.	Expert support centres (former special schools) Teacher training materials and support staff; upgraded qualification.
<b>Portugal</b>	Inclusive education is promoted. The Ministry of Education has developed measures related to the training and stability of teachers in schools, to the enlargement of timetable, to the maintenance of a "full time school", and by disseminating the "good practices" The classes for SEN-pupils are <b>shorter</b> (maximum of 20) and the per class is <b>limited</b> (maximum of 2) Evaluation of 'inclusive education' is in the making	But not easy to get the necessary additional human resources. Portugal is not yet able to assure a true appropriate educative regime for handicapped etc. pupils.	SEN-pupils have the right to be recognized in their specificity and to benefit from the availability of appropriate educative answers Adapted materials and equipment. Teacher training. Parents complain that they prefer special education for their children.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Special schools for children with a health disadvantage. Inclusive education (or better 'integration-oriented' education) in mainstream schools, in special classes or in mixed classes. 'Integration' means: adaptation of the handicapped etc. pupils to the requirements of the schools, and not vice versa: schools should adapt to the special needs of the pupils.		Assistant teachers Special textbooks Special equipment, Right of using sign language, Braille writing, etc.

## 7 Safe education measures, measures against bullying and harassment

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Belgium, Flemish Community</b>			<p>No-Blame approach – child-oriented approach of bullies; apparently and evidence-based successful as underlined at national expert conferences and at the Flemish Consultation Platform concerning Bullying.</p> <p>Key person: school co-ordinator (often the remedial teacher).</p> <p>Seven steps, i.e.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Meeting with the victim,</li> <li>• Bringing all together, who were involved,</li> <li>• Explanation of the problem(s),</li> <li>• Shared responsibilities,</li> <li>• Groups proposals for improvement,</li> <li>• Group takes action,</li> <li>• Meeting with each child individually.</li> </ul>
<b>Belgium, French Community</b>		<p>Violence is a general characteristic of schools with a high concentration of children from low socio-economic background and immigrant children.</p> <p>Mediators should be effective for children who are apparently unable to cope with their high emotions.</p>	<p>Mediators, who are to facilitate communication</p> <p>Mobile mediation teams, intervening at the request of the head of an educational establishment</p>
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No state measures.	Permanent media coverage on violence in schools, etc.	
<b>Cyprus</b>		<p>Educational Psychology Services: preventive programmes.</p> <p>European DAFNI-program.</p> <p>Evaluation of the 11 pilots.</p> <p>Lack of official numbers with regard to bullying and harassment.</p> <p>Anecdotal evidence.</p> <p>Small scale studies.</p>	Pilots of the Ministry in 11 schools.
<b>Czech Republic</b>		<p>Public discussion.</p> <p>New: attention for cyber-bullying.</p>	<p>In-service training of teachers and staff.</p> <p>Protection of teachers.</p> <p>Measures taken by the principal.</p> <p>Teachers can confiscate mobile telephones.</p> <p>Defensive reactions of parents against 'repressive' teachers and schools.</p>
<b>Denmark</b>		<p>Research project (1 million euro).</p> <p>Public attention.</p> <p>Children's Council.</p> <p>Centre for Environmental Issues (around the school)</p>	Schools should deal with the issue.
<b>Finland</b>	Multi-professional forms of collaboration which surpass administrative boundaries have been developed. The regulations concerning professional confidentiality are being changed to the effect that an organiser of education will have better access to necessary information for the benefit of the children concerned.	Most schools are involved in the project called "Nice School", which intends to find practical ways of preventing bullying in the whole of Finland. The most recent results show that this consistent and long-lasting programme has helped to decrease bullying considerably.	

<b>Country</b>	<b>Top-down measures as to be applied</b>	<b>Top-down measures as effectively applied</b>	<b>Bottom-up measures</b>
<b>Greece</b>		Direct relation with the exclusion of disadvantaged and discriminated pupils. Low on bullying and harassment or low on transparency on the issue? Media attention for 'happy slapping' and other incidents. Ban on mobile telephones in schools?	
<b>Latvia</b>		No data, no measures	
<b>Malta</b>			Victims and perpetrators are referred to school counsellors.
<b>Portugal</b>	Local police intervention, if needed. In last years, several studies refer to an increase in the number of bullying situations in schools, not clarifying if this fact is due to a greater facility of students to explain/complain about the several situations to which they are subjected or if this fact is due to a real increase of bullying in schools.		Intervention strategies can be developed by Services of Psychology and Guidance, in schools or by groups of schools Individualized victim support, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A more private room,</li> <li>• A laptop with internet access,</li> <li>• Teacher of support,</li> <li>• A specialist from the Services of Psychology and Guidance.</li> </ul> Additional human resources and specialists, although financing these is rather demanding. Schools should educate, not punish the pupils, including the 'bullies'. However, teachers are now endowed with several legal means, necessary for the maintenance of their scholar authority. Mobile school Individualized/domestic teaching
<b>Slovakia</b>	Methodical guidance of the Ministry to prevent bullying and harassment in schools. Implementation of OECD-Network.	National webpage. Training of prevention coordinators. Monitoring of the issue in the schools. Sensitising parents, etc.	Reluctant response of the schools and staff (school policies to prevent to be identified as a school where such things happen; keeping the bad news out of the media).

## 8 Conclusions, summary

The response to the expert survey has enriched and extended the knowledge base concerning inclusion and education, and particularly the knowledge base concerning strategies, policies and measures in the frame of:

- ✚ The reduction of early school leaving and the reintegration of early school leavers,
- ✚ Priority education,
- ✚ Inclusive education,
- ✚ Safe education in general and the reduction of bullying and harassment in particular.

The response reconfirmed the rich variety of possible strategies, policies and measures as undertaken in the countries concerned. Many or even most of these appear to be worth further attention of European, national, regional and school-related actors, offering interesting examples and ideas. They were to be incorporated in a European knowledge centre for measures to enhance inclusion in education. Most worthwhile are the bottom-up measures and practices, in general and those that have been evaluated, in particular, i.e. the practices and examples that are listed in column 3 and 4 of the schemes above.

## 8.1 Measures to reduce early school leaving:

- ✚ Truancy control (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Time-out projects (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Mentoring and coaching for early school leavers and job starters (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Re-insertion classes and rebound arrangements (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Priority measures for disadvantaged pupils at risk of early school leaving (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Dual vocational courses (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ School counsellors and other specialised staff (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Comprehensive and compulsory education until the age of 18 (Finland),
- ✚ Early support measures and individual tracks (Finland),
- ✚ Apparently ineffective repression (Greece),
- ✚ Involvement of school social workers (Latvia),
- ✚ Further support personnel for the schools and the teachers (Latvia),
- ✚ Adapted curricula for pupils at risk and in need (Latvia),
- ✚ Pedagogical correction and re-insertion or rebound classes, up to three years (Latvia),
- ✚ Improved registration of absenteeism (Malta),
- ✚ In case, intervention by a Social Worker (Malta),
- ✚ Further job training opportunities for dropouts (Portugal),
- ✚ Alternative School Trajectories, if needed (Portugal),
- ✚ Individualized teaching or domestic teaching (Portugal),
- ✚ Flexible curriculum management (Portugal),
- ✚ Full-time schools (Portugal),
- ✚ Compensation education (Turkey).

## 8.2 Priority measures

- ✚ A central budget for priority education as available for schools, to be used for:
  - Remedial teaching,
  - Additional classes and hours,
  - Language education in Dutch as second language (after language tests),
  - Intercultural education,
  - Orientation classes for further education,
  - Socio-emotional development training.
- ✚ Participation of pupils and parent (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Tutoring university and college students (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Bridge classes (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Linking Roma families and schools (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Roma school assistants (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Preparatory and insertion classes (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Local integration centres (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Lappish language schools (Finland),
- ✚ Support centres for intercultural education (Greece),
- ✚ Support programmes for disadvantaged pupils, particularly pupils with a handicap – developed by national expert centres (Greece),
- ✚ Reliance on the national ombudsman (Children’s Advocate) in case of discrimination (Greece),
- ✚ Training of staff in multicultural knowledge and skills (Malta),
- ✚ Own school projects and initiatives (Malta),
- ✚ Mother-tongue education (Portugal),
- ✚ Social housing programs (Portugal),
- ✚ Goodwill and scarce measures in some schools (Portugal),
- ✚ School for children of travelling people (Portugal),

- ✚ Mobile School (Portugal),
- ✚ Full-time schools (Portugal),
- ✚ Individualized/domestic teaching (Portugal),
- ✚ Specialised professionals (Portugal),
- ✚ Roma educational expert centre Presov (Slovakia),
- ✚ National pilot project in the Presov region (Slovakia),
- ✚ PHARE-supported projects for the integration of Roma children (Slovakia),
- ✚ Opportunities for Roma language education (Slovakia),
- ✚ Assistant teachers (Slovakia),
- ✚ Improved curricula (Slovakia),
- ✚ Co-operation with parents (Slovakia),
- ✚ Public relations and public awareness campaigns (Slovakia),
- ✚ National Guidance and Decree on Special School Enrolment Procedures (Slovakia).

### 8.3 Inclusive education measures

- ✚ National budgets are available for GON-support of pupils with an indication in the autism spectre (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Support by GON-guides, often being specialist pedagogues (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Special programmes: TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication handicapped Children), STICORDI (stimulating, compensating, remedial teaching, dispensating) (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Inclusive education usually regards the following successive steps (Belgium, Flemish Community):
  - Individual plan,
  - Empowering learning environment as created by the teachers themselves,
  - Additional care as offered by GOK- or GIN-teachers, in case of need,
- ✚ Further individual measures, if needed. (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ 90 projects for improved architectural access of 55 schools, with state funding (Bulgaria),
- ✚ Programs for special education (Cyprus),
- ✚ 550 specialised support staff (Cyprus),
- ✚ Specialised in-service training (Cyprus),
- ✚ Programs for the full integration of handicapped pupils in mainstream education (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Expert support centres and specialised staff (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Online resources and civil society websites (Greece),
- ✚ Expert support and diagnostics centres (Greece),
- ✚ Parental support programs (Latvia),
- ✚ European funding (ESF) (Latvia),
- ✚ Individualised education and home education, if possible and wanted (Latvia),
- ✚ Expert support centres (former special schools) (Malta),
- ✚ Teacher training materials and support staff; upgraded qualification (Malta),
- ✚ SEN-pupils have the right to be recognized in their specificity and to benefit from the availability of appropriate educative answers (Portugal),
- ✚ Adapted materials and equipment (Portugal),
- ✚ Specialised teacher training (Portugal),
- ✚ Assistant teachers (Slovakia),
- ✚ Special textbooks (Slovakia),
- ✚ Special equipment (Slovakia),
- ✚ Right of using sign language, Braille writing, etc. (Slovakia).

## 8.4 Safe education measures

- ✚ No-Blame approach – child-oriented approach of bullies; apparently and evidence-based successful as underlined at national expert conferences and at the Flemish Consultation Platform concerning Bullying (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Key person: school co-ordinator (often the remedial teacher) (Belgium, Flemish Community),
- ✚ Seven steps, i.e.
  - Meeting with the victim,
  - Bringing all together, who were involved,
  - Explanation of the problem(s),
  - Shared responsibilities,
  - Groups proposals for improvement,
  - Group takes action,
  - Meeting with each child individually (Belgium, Flemish Community).
- ✚ Apparently effective mediators (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Mediators, who are to facilitate communication (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Mobile mediation teams, intervening at the request of the head of an educational establishment (Belgium, Walloon Community),
- ✚ Pilots of the Ministry in 11 schools (Cyprus),
- ✚ In-service training of teachers and staff (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Protection of teachers (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Measures taken by the principal (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Teachers can confiscate mobile telephones (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Defensive reactions of parents against ‘repressive’ teachers and schools (Czech Republic),
- ✚ Research project (1 million euro) (Denmark),
- ✚ Public attention (Denmark),
- ✚ Children’s Council (Denmark),
- ✚ Centre for Environmental (Denmark),
- ✚ Issues (around the school) (Denmark),
- ✚ Schools should deal with the issue (Denmark),
- ✚ The project “Nice School”, which intends to find practical ways of preventing bullying in the whole of Finland. The most recent results show that this consistent and long-lasting programme has helped to decrease bullying considerably (Finland),
- ✚ Ban on mobile telephones in schools? (Greece),
- ✚ Victims and perpetrators are referred to school counsellors (Malta),
- ✚ Intervention strategies can be developed by Services of Psychology and Guidance, in schools, or groups of schools (Portugal),
- ✚ Individualized victim support, such as:
  - A more private room,
  - A laptop with internet access,
  - Teacher of support,
  - A specialist from the Services of Psychology and Guidance (Portugal).
- ✚ Additional human resources and specialists, although financing these is rather demanding (Portugal),
- ✚ Schools should educate, not punish the pupils, including the ‘bullies’ (Portugal),
- ✚ Teachers are now endowed with several legal means, necessary for the maintenance of their scholar authority (Portugal),
- ✚ Mobile school (Portugal),
- ✚ Individualized/domestic teaching (Portugal),
- ✚ National webpage (Slovakia),
- ✚ Training of prevention coordinators (Slovakia),
- ✚ Monitoring of the issue in the schools (Slovakia),
- ✚ Sensitising parents. (Slovakia).
- ✚ Reluctant response of the schools and staff

The response is further discussed in the final INTMEAS-report “Conclusions and Recommendations”. The present report is an attachment to that report.