Inclusion and education in European countries

Final report: 8. The Netherlands

George Muskens
Dorothee Peters

Lepelstraat
August 2009

DOCA
BUREAUS

Documentatie
Onderzoek
Coördinatie
Advies

The electronic version of this report is available at:
http://www.docabureaus.nl/INTMEAS.html

Available INTMEAS-reports:

1. Summary/sommaire/Zusamenfassung
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 Neçak Lük, Sonja Novak Lukanovic, leaders Slovenian research team
Mariano Fernándes Enguita, leader Spanish research team
Elena Dingu Kyrklund, leader Swedish research team
Rae Condie, leader UK research team

Inclusion and education in The Netherlands

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

Dutch Final report

George Muskens
Dorothee Peters

May 2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1   Introduction

The Dutch report will respond to the terms of reference of the European Commission, i.e. to:

- ToR 1, Support measures to schools with high drop-out rates,
- ToR 2, Support measures to schools with high scores on other possible indicators of social exclusion,
- ToR 3, Support measures for schools in socio-economically deprived areas,
- ToR 4, Support measures to schools with large populations of pupils with immigrant background,
- ToR 5, Support measures to teachers working in such schools,
- ToR 6, Support measures to schools and teachers to deal with the problem of harassment and bullying,
- ToR 7, Support measures addressed to pupils likely to become early school leavers,
- ToR 8, Support measures for pupils with a physical or mental handicap, and to pupils 'in care',
- ToR 9, Support measures to facilitate school success of pupils of minority background: ethnic, linguistic, religious, regional, etc.,
- ToR 10, Success and failure points in relation to support measures and inclusion,
- ToR 11, Innovative and successful projects.

1.1   Review and assessment

In this frame the initial intention was to collect and review the materials that would be needed to respond to these terms as good as possible, following them in due course. The collected and reported materials and sources have led the rapporteurs to a more or less coherent assessment of Dutch educational policies and measures in practice from the perspective of the inclusion of all pupils or as many pupils as possible in mainstream education. This 'change' was reinforced by the special position of the senior rapporteur in the European comparative assessment of inclusion and education, as the international project leader. Therefore, the overview-like set-up of the earlier interim-report (Muskens & Peters, Inclusion and education in the Netherlands. Preliminary review and assessment of resources as available, 2008 June) and the present final report have led to a conclusive assessment of measures against early school leaving, priority education, safe education, inclusive education and teacher support measures, as well as critical remarks with regard to the claimed uniqueness of education and educational policies in The Netherlands, and with regard to risks of stigmatisation in relation to targeted inclusion measures. The conclusive assessment is meant to be part of the comparative assessment of inclusion measures in Europe as well as a critical, but positive contribution to educational debate in The Netherlands.

1.2   Materials

For this report the team has focussed on materials as available, with special attention to:

- Policy priorities and the further framing of measures that should support inclusion,
- Targeted measures,
- The evaluation of measures and policies,

- Our assessment of the measures.

First challenge was to reframe the national educational and political discourse of the Netherlands in relation to the terms of reference. We made considerable progress, but we did not find the perfect match. Even at the level of the direct translation of Dutch terms some hesitations have remained.

We have organised the materials in the following chapters:
- Frame, measures and assessment of early school leaving (ToR 1 and 7; ToR 4),
- Measures against social, economic and ethnic inequities (T0R 2, 3, 4),
- Measures against ethnic segregation (ToR 2, 4),
- The extended school (ToR 4, 8),
- Support measures for teachers (ToR 5),
- Measures against bullying and harassment, safety protection measures in and around schools (ToR 6),
- Support measures for pupils with special needs, restrictions and challenging behaviour (ToR 8),
- Minority education: religion based school, Frisian schools and immigrant minority language education (ToR 9),
- Success and failure factors in the practice of inclusive measures as well as innovative projects – discussion of three case studies (ToR 10 and 11).

1.3 Remarks

Some remarks concerning current educational policies and practice are to be made in advance. These regard
- The claimed uniqueness and therefore incomparability of important Dutch educational arrangements and practices,
- The amount of political innovation in education in the past decades,
- The definition of effective measures,
- The most complex system of educational governance in the Netherlands,
- The other and higher priorities than those with regard to inclusion measures,
- The priority of quality education,
- The renewed attention for the teachers' perspective,
- Further top-priorities, i.e. free schoolbooks, full-day care for children and minimal number of contact hours in secondary education.

The remarks will be elaborated in the next paragraphs of this introductory chapter.

1.3.1 Incomparable uniqueness?

Referring to partly convincing arguments, Dutch policy-makers may claim that important parts of Dutch education are unique in such an extent that comparison with the education in other Western and European countries is rather obsolete.[1] These part regard among others the so-called pillarisation (free education at private and denominational schools, see chapter 8.1), the education of children with a handicap (appropriate education, see chapter 7), the registration of immigrant

---

[1] The claim is not supported by strong evidence from official publications such as the Eurydice reports on Dutch education (European Commisison–Eurydice, 2009) or by important national or international statements. It regards a more colloquial claim that is often made in the side-line of national and international presentations and statements, further to everybody's claim in international debate that any educational system represents unique features and sides along national or regional lines, to a certain extent.

pupils, e.g. in relation to the so-called weight rules (see chapter 2), and the embedding of measures against bullying and harassment in wider frame of 'safe education' (see chapter 6).

We may agree that Dutch education is unique, to a certain extent, for issues such as these. We do not agree that the uniqueness would make comparative analysis and assessment obsolete, for the following reasons:

- The standpoint might close the eyes for interesting measures, developments, pilots and good or bad practices in other countries and places, although nobody would deny that lessons were to be learnt from these.

- In other countries the attention for measures, developments, pilots and practices in the Netherlands might remain low, however interesting these might be – why should one pay high attention to these, when it is claimed that they are unique, incomparable, and therefore not applicable in other countries and places?

- Further comparative assessment and analysis may reveal that uniqueness and incomparability might be exaggerated. In the preliminary theoretical and comparative analysis and assessment of the ten national reports we have revealed issues and points with regard to e.g. the freedom of education, the education of children with a handicap, the registration of immigrant and minority pupils as well as 'safe education' that deserve comparative attention as well as the implementation of measures at a wider European or international scale, within the frame of national and regional educational governance (Muskens, Theoretical issues and preliminary comparative conclusions with regard to inclusion and education. Internal interim report, 2008 September).

- The national and international interest in comparative analysis and benchmarking in education has received increasing national attention, in the Netherlands and elsewhere. It regards, among others, comparative figures on early school leaving (EUROSTAT), and the achievement level in reading, mathematics and science through PISA, PIRLS and TIMMS. From these projects and their datasets further comparative analysis has been initiated, e.g. with regard to the relation between governance and achievement or between inequities and school achievements (OECD, 2007, pp. 169-282; Heus, Dronkers, & Levels, 2009 January). These analyses will increasingly cover inclusion issues, on the one hand, as well as 'unique' Dutch issues as mentioned above, on the other. The present national report and its embedding in the European assessment of inclusion measures in primary and secondary education were to be seen as a serious step forward in that direction.

1.3.2 Too many political innovations?

Dutch education policies have been subjected to a Parliamentary investigation in 2007-2008 (Parlementaire Enquêtecommissie Onderwijsvernieuwing (Commissie Dijsselbloem) [Parliamentary Investigation Committee on Innovations in Education (Committee Dijsselbloem)], 2008, February 13). The Investigation Committee concluded that most major innovation policies have not contributed to better education, to a certain extend even on the contrary. Reasons were unclear aims, political compromise and conflict, missing backup from the field, restricted resources, short timelines in relation to the Parliamentary time cycle of four years and low attention for implementation tracks. The report of the Committee reinforced current political concern that primary and secon-

dary education should go back to their basics regarding the knowledge of arithmetic's and language, quality education and the individual performance.[2]

The government has accepted the conclusions of the Committee. It agreed that schools, teachers and pupils have not had the best educational opportunities, due to the innovations, their political aims and their weak implementation. As a consequence basic knowledge in arithmetic's and language has diminished and particularly pupils at risk have not received the support they needed. Early school leaving has remained too high. It will be a government's priority to focus on the education of basic knowledge, i.e. arithmetic's and mathematics as well as language. Side issues were to be kept out of the national curriculum. By giving priority to basic knowledge and quality pupils at risk are supposed to receive the best support they need. In this way early school leaving should be diminished (Minister of Education, 2008).

1.3.3 Diminished interest in inclusion measures?

Whether the present political climate is compatible with the object of the present study, i.e. inclusion in education, is not clear. We will show, however, that the authorities and the schools still have their traditional and new attention for issues related to the inclusion of pupils at risk. In this respect, diminishing the number of early school leavers is one of the top-priorities – we will discuss the issue in the first chapter of the report. Besides, the Minister of Education has stated recently that the comparatively early choice of the Dutch children and their parents with regard to streams and tracks of secondary education, were to be reconsidered. He has made the statement in a recent mid-term review of the educational policies of the present government (Minister of Education, 2008, December 4). He argued that the early choice might cause lower performances in secondary education, as was also argued by e.g. the OECD in relation to Dutch PISA-outcomes (OECD, 2007).[3]

However, the attention for inclusion issues might be diminished in general. Would all inclusion issues follow the example of changes with regard to the education of pupils with special needs, serious doubts would certainly be justified (Meijs, 2008). The example refers to the early introduction of 'inclusive education' as the mainstream principle in the nineteen-eighties and –nineties. The implementation of 'inclusive education' stagnated, however, in the course of time. Backpack measures and growing numbers of out-placed pupils, e.g. in relation to

---

[2] The report has not remained without contradiction. Former Minister of Education Jos van Kemenade, who has initiated educational reforms since the 1970-ies, pointed at the weak evidence base of Committee's conclusions with regard to the 'diminished' quality of Dutch education as well as those with regard to comprehensive school reform. He observed major differences between the Committee's conclusions and research reports and assessments that were prepared on assignment of the Committee (Van Kemenade, 2009).

[3] In the Netherlands and elsewhere, many reformers in education have argued, at least since the nineteen-sixties, that postponed choice and keeping pupils together until the age of e.g. 15 or 16 years might be the most promising measure to include as many pupils as possible in mainstream post-primary education and to enhance the chances in education of disadvantaged young people, in relation to class, gender and ethnicity. They were in favour of 'comprehensive' lower secondary education. The PISA-outcomes appeared to prove that countries with comprehensive lower secondary education performed comparatively better than early choice countries such as the Netherlands, e.g. in relation to participation in higher education. The Minister denied in his letter and in immediate comments that he intended to re-open the debate in the Netherlands on comprehensive lower secondary education, as it regards one of the political taboos of the country. The relation between comprehensive lower secondary education and performance is further to be discussed at the synthesising conference in May 2009.

challenging and very challenging behaviour were introduced incrementally. Nowadays the leading principle has shifted from 'inclusive education' to 'appropriate education', i.e. an educational track that would be the best for individual pupils, their parents and the schools. The pupil is then educated 'appropriately' either within or outside the school.[4]

1.3.4 What are effective measures?

One might say that the effective implementation of certain educational and policy aims depends on the quality of the measures: are these effective and efficient? We would like to make two provisional observations in this respect. First is that in relation to many issues it appeared that 'doing something' appears to be appropriate, whereas the real best measure may not exist. Examples regard e.g. measures with regard to safety protection in and around the schools as well as measures against bullying and harassment. The observation followed from 'failed' evaluation research, in which control schools performed as good and as bad as schools that should implement a specific set of intervention measures. Actually, the control schools developed their own sets of measures during the time of the experiment (two years), while all experimental schools deviated from the experimental plan according to their needs and priorities of the day. In the end they all improved their performance with regard to safety protection and diminished bullying and harassment to a certain degree. The same kind of inconclusive evaluation outcomes were obtained in other fields, such as education of pupils in need, as well as priority education, measures against early school leaving or measures encouraging the desegregation of schools.

1.3.5 Most complex educational governance

Next observation is that the authority structure with regard to education and educational governance was already complex in The Netherlands since the beginning of the Twentieth Century. Complexity has even increased incrementally, making the implementation of effective and efficient measures more risky than ever. In raw lines the traditional situation was that of two relevant actors, being the State, on the one hand, and the school boards as the educational authorities, on the other. The State formulated the laws and rules with regard to the aims and resources as available for the school boards, including laws, rules and resources of priority education, inclusive education, etc. The school board took care of applying the rules and using the resources. The State has had the intention to diminish the burden of laws and rules for the schools to a large extend, and to increase the autonomy of the schools. Whether this policy aim was successful or not, is unclear, but the trend is apparently towards a certain withdrawal of state control and initiative. In this 'game' the municipalities have gained a new position. Before, they were the school board and educational authority for the public schools, i.e. the board of one third of the primary schools and a quarter of the secondary schools.[5] Now they still are the official boards of the public schools, although most municipalities have transferred the authority to

---

[4] We intend to discuss the relation between 'inclusive education' and 'appropriate education' in the general frame of the study, e.g. at the synthesising conference in May 2009.

[5] The Dutch school system includes both private and public schools. Both are funded fully. The private schools are established and governed by private Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Islamic etc. boards, while the public schools are governed by public authorities, usually the municipalities (see chapter 9 on the issue of 'pillarisation' and the freedom of education).

non-public or semi-public committees. The municipalities hold now a new position as the conductor of educational orchestras for playing the innovative tunes in their municipalities. So, policy innovations and new measures have been diversified widely among the 400+ municipalities of The Netherlands. So local factors were now to be taken into account, while assessing specific measures with regard to inclusion in education. The latter is usually not done, while national and local evaluation research has been neglected since the state relied more and more on the conducting capacities of the municipalities, e.g. with regard to priority measures.

In the local orchestras the school boards and educational authorities have hold most of their autonomy with regard to the implementation of inclusion measures. So, they can follow these up in their own directions. It's complex, anyway.

1.3.6 Other priorities

We would like to make a critical note with regard to the present interim report on inclusion policies and measures in The Netherlands. The issues that we will discuss only partly reflect the priority issues and top-concerns of educational policies and measures in the country. That is both in relation to 'the field' and to 'The Hague'.

The 'field' consists of schools, with their boards and teachers, who offer 'education' to pupils and their parents. Pupils and their parents hold the almost full and constitutionally secured freedom to chose a specific school from among a certain number of schools operating in the same local or regional 'market'.[6] In response to the national curriculum, the own options of the school and the interests of parents and other stakeholders, the schools' core business is to be attractive on their educational markets and to guide their pupils through their classes and examinations. 'Inclusion' in all its aspects is directly at stake at some points, such as the attractiveness on the educational market, class climate and early school leaving. It may, however, be an issue of lesser importance at first glance at other points, such as priority education, extended school days and education for pupils with special needs, or other measures that might divert the school from its core business.

1.3.6.1 Quality education

According to all recent policy statements, top-priority regards 'quality education' as it is measured internationally for science, mathematics, arithmetic's and language. In response to the small but obvious downfalls in PISA- and PIRLS-outcomes and the continued second best position behind Finland, Korea and some other countries, education should focus more sharply on the performance of the pupils on these and other core subjects. OECD's and PISA's recommendation to follow the comprehensive education system of the 'winning' countries for all pupils aged 12-15 is not followed up in The Netherlands – the 'middle school' has become a political taboo. The report of the Parliamentary Committee has reinforced the taboo by concluding and stating that most major innovations of the educational system in The Netherlands have been contra-productive (Parlementaire Enquêtecommissie Onderwijsvernieuwing (Commissie Dijsselbloem) [Parliamentary Investigation Committee on Innovations in

---

[6] Exceptions and attempts at guided choice, e.g. to prevent ethnic segregation, are discussed in the coming chapters.

Education (Committee Dijsselbloem)], 2008, February 13). Among these were the Dutch variant of the middle school that consisted of a differentiated school system with a joint curriculum for the pupils aged 12 to 15.

1.3.6.2 Teachers' perspectives

Second priority regards the position and perspectives of teachers. The issue is discussed in chapter 6 in detail. It will be discussed that the measures that should improve the position and perspectives of teachers are not directly related to inclusion issues.

1.3.6.3 Further top-priorities

Further top-priorities are:

- Free schoolbooks in secondary education, which is an issue related to family-income policies,[7] and not to the inclusion of pupils at risk. For pupils at socio-economic risk the educational authorities offered already free books and materials since longer times.
- Full-day care for children and the responsibility of schools in this respect. This issue is directly related to the labour market participation of all parents. There is certainly an overlap with extended school policies as discussed in chapter 5, but the argument has moved from the inclusion of disadvantaged children in deprived areas towards the needs of working parents and the labour market.[8]
- The minimal number of contact hours that should be realised in secondary education each year. Since the Ministry started to fine schools for not realising the hours in the school year 2006-2007, schools argued that the norms were infeasible (Walters, 2008). Pupils protested that they were kept in classes as poultry in the times of mouth and claw (Swart, 2007). We will discuss the issue in chapter 6 in relation teacher support measures.[9] A ministerial committee has now reported on the issue (State-Secretary of Education, 2008, December 16). Controversy is apparently going on (Dirks & Gerrits, 2008).
- What to do with obvious 'challenges' in the field of special needs education, i.e. the sharply increased numbers of very challenging pupils, the sharply increased costs of backpack arrangements, waiting lists for special needs education and highly intelligent pupils deserving special attention. These issues are discussed in chapter 9.
- The quality and effectiveness of innovative measures, such as 'new learning' in upper secondary education, both general and vocational. There is some overlap with the measures to be discussed in coming chapters.

---

[7] It regards however a rather serious issue as schoolbooks are comparatively very expensive in the Netherlands.

[8] A new arrangement for full day care introduced in 2006-2007 was that successful that costs and cost estimates have exploded. Therefore, the government has announced cut backs on the arrangement for next year.

[9] In general terms, the issue of contact hours is related to inclusion aims and measures in education. Argument in favour of high numbers of contact hours and well-sequenced time-tables is that it keeps the pupils in school and therefore prevents them from truancy and early school leaving, apart form the argument that high numbers and good time-tables have proved to be good for pupils' performance and achievement. In many schools for secondary education it is apparently rather difficult to realise high numbers of contact hours and a well-sequenced time-table. We will discuss the issue in chapter 5, in relation to the time-table and workload of the teachers, and therefore to teacher management.

Where we discuss these priority points in the coming chapters we do so from the inclusion perspective. It means a different perspective than that of Dutch education and politics, to a certain degree.

2 Measures against early school leaving (ToR1, ToR7)

In this chapter we will first present the statistics on early school leaving in The Netherlands, particularly in secondary education. Then we will discuss the policy aims and measures, profiles of the early school leavers and evaluation research as available. The chapter will be concluded by our provisional assessment of the policies and the measures, stating that the effects of policies and measures have recently turned into promising efforts at the local and regional level and into a promising reduction at the national level.

2.1 Early school leavers: statistics[10]

Among youngsters aged 18-24 early school leavers rated 12.0% in 2007, while the European average was 15.2%. In 1996 the percentage was 17.6% and it has dropped steadily since then (EUROSTAT). The percentage reflects the response to the annual EU Labour Force Survey. It counted those respondents who had not passed ISCED level 3C and respondents who had not received any education in the four weeks preceding the survey. The percentage equals around 150.000 young persons in the age group. Another indirect and very high indicator of early school leaving is included in the data of the National Labour Survey 2006: 235.000 young persons aged 15-25 reported that they had not reached the national labour market start qualification, while not attending school (CBS, 2007).

The Dutch labour market start qualification should reflect the European criterion of ISCED level 3C. It is officially set *beyond* the examination of lower vocational and general education (vmbo), being the Dutch equivalent for education at ISCED level 2 for 12-16 old pupils.[11] It is officially set at two years of upper vocational education (mbo2)[12], or one or two years of general upper education,[13] i.e. passed examination for these levels.

These numbers are at least one third or even double as high compared to the highest national estimate of early school leavers that is referred to in policy statements concerning the urgency of the problem and the measure to be taken against it (see next paragraph). No national or European assessment followed on the numbers, percentages and differences. Most common reference was a number of 70.000 early school leavers in the beginning of the century. The general assessment was that early school leaving was too high, both in the national context and in the comparative European context. In the national presentation of the European statistics it was underlined that the Dutch portion of early school leav-

---

[10] See also the SCP-report of Lex Herweijer (Herweijer, L., 2008 August), who drew rather similar conclusions with regard to school leavers statistics.

[11] Together with three years of education in schools for higher general education (havo) and preparatory scientific education (vwo).

[12] Upper vocational education includes schools for 1 year (mbo1), for 2 years (mbo2) and for 4 years (mbo4), in seven different sectors. Mbo1 is supposed to be insufficient for the labour market start qualification, as is an unfinished mbo2.

[13] For non-adults upper general education includes schools for upper vocational education (mbo1, mbo2 and mbo4 – ISCED level 2C, 3B-C), upper general education (havo, 5 years – ISCED level 3A-B) and preparatory scientific education (vwo, 6 years – ISCED level 3A). Part of the pupils, who finished lower secondary education can be allowed to 'step up' towards upper general education, year 4. So, they will need two years of additional education to finish upper general education and to reach the level of labour market start qualification.

ers was higher than that in surrounding countries, except Spain. The official aim was to bring it back by half, i.e. to 35.000 in 2011 (see below).

On the basis of national surveys and registrations Van der Steeg & Webbink reported around 100.000 early school leavers (old and new cases) in 2003-2004 (Steeg & Webbink, 2006 February). [14] The number of persons that apparently dropped out before reaching ISCED level 3C[15] was one third of the 150.000 referred to above. Van der Steeg & Webbink have traced the number of new cases that dropped out from lower vocational education (examination at ISCED level 2), those from upper vocational education (examination at ISCED level 3A-3C), those from higher general education (examination at ICED level 3A-4 and preparatory scientific education (examination at ISCED level 5), and those, whose dropout record is unknown. These figures are:

- From lower vocational education: 17.000,
- From upper vocational education: 25.000,
- From higher general and preparatory scientific education: 2500,
- Dropout with an unknown dropout record: 13.000.

The dropouts from lower and upper vocational education have attracted highest policy concern. Most measures regard the transition from lower to upper vocational education (see below).

Per 1 October 2006 national education register CFI has registered 54.090 early school leavers under 24 years old, who did not reach the labour market start qualification level. It was 17.000 under the presumed start situation and 18.000 above the level to be reached between 2006 and 2010.[16]

In February 2009 the Ministry reported 48.800 new early school leavers for 2007-2008 (Minister en staatssecretaris van onderwijs [Minister and State-Secretary of Education], 2009 February 10).[17] The ongoing decline was said to be

---

[14] From a survey among five schools for secondary education and five schools for upper vocational training the Audit Service of the Ministry and the Educational Inspectorate concluded that the central registration of truancy is neglected widely in post-compulsory education, notwithstanding legal duties of the schools in this respect. It may distort the registration and statistics with regard to truancy, dropping out and early school leaving from secondary education beyond compulsory education (Audit Service of the Ministry of Education and the education Inspectorate, 2007, October).

[15] In Dutch terms: leaving school before passing the examination for lower secondary education (vmbo), or leaving mbo1-2 before passing the examination or leaving school as a drop-out in year 3-4 of general secondary education.

[16] In its assessment report on early school leavers in 2005 the General Audit Chamber of Parliament showed that the figures are actually quite complex. It re-calculated 57.000 new dropouts in 2005, while there were 46.000 'old cases' of preceding school years. High numbers of dropouts were registered from lower secondary and vocational education (17.000 in 2005) and upper vocational education (25.000 in 2005). At the same time 19.000 new and 11.00 old dropouts were replaced in an appropriate stream or track of education. Two specific problems were to be mentioned, first being the high number of dropouts from upper vocational education, and second the high number of young people that do not register for a place in upper secondary education as all pupils, who have finished a lower vocational school, should do. It may face them with an extra barrier in their educational career. In the schools for upper vocational education pupils have to do practice time, at the risk of being excluded form further education and examination. Usually, they are responsible themselves for finding their practice places. Finding a practice place can cause early school leaving, e.g. among weak seekers as well as young people at ethnic risk. The latter is related to labour market discrimination mechanisms. Further, from successful practice places pupils may be tempted to stay in the company and not to return to school.

[17] These figures are quite reliable, i.e. more reliable than earlier figures. They are based upon a unique registration number of each young person, who is following, may follow or has followed education. A new school leaver is every person, who was registered as following education on October 1[rst] of a year and not on October 1[rst] of the next year, without passing an examination at ISCED-level 3. The data are

in line with the policy aim of a reduction to 35.000 new early school leavers in 2010-2011.

2.2 Urgent policy issue

Early school leavers have been identified as a serious issue in Dutch education and labour market policies since 2002, among others in relation to the Lisbon Declaration that included the aim of reducing early school leavers by 50%. Dutch definitions and official counts of early school leavers have been re-assessed since then, targets have been set and measures have been implemented. The level of early school leaving and persons entering the labour market with insufficient qualification was considered to be too high. Policy papers referred in this respect to the European statistics summarised above, with special attention to comparable figures in the surrounding countries, i.e. Belgium, Denmark, Germany, France, Spain, the United Kingdom and Sweden. All were below the European average in 2004, except Spain, while all were below The Netherlands, except Spain and the United Kingdom (EUROSTAT).

In 2006, the government announced concrete steps and budgets for the reduction of early school leaving (Minister and State Secretary of Education, 2006 April 28; Ministry of Education, 2006 April). The government announced measures that should:

- Approach the problems at the source,
- Make transitions in the educational careers of children and young people as easy as possible,
- Maintain and extend compulsory education up to the age of 18,
- Recognise work and practice as best education,
- Offer probation places and special work place for the re-integration of early school leavers.

For these purposes the government announced additional budgets from 81,0 MEURO in 2006 up to 268,5 MEURO in 2011. First target was the improvement of upper vocational education, i.e. the education of young people, who were at immediate risk of becoming early school leavers. At mid-term measures for early prevention should improve the chances of children in pre-school ages, primary education and lower vocational education. In the Coalition Agreement that was concluded by the Christian Parties and the Social Democrats in 2007, the policy aims of the 'attack on school leaving' were taken up as key issues for the Coalition in the period 2007-2011.

In this context, the national target was the reduction of the number of early school leavers by 50% in 2011.[18] At the same time, the target group of early school leavers was re-defined. According to national figures the number of *new*

---

quite reliable, although still some inflation is included in the data, being those school leavers, who have continued their education at private institutes or abroad, 18[+] illegal residents in the Netherlands (they lose their registration number at the age of 18), and under-qualified school leavers, who found a paid job.

[18] The year in which the reduction should be realised is somewhat flexible. First governments related the reduction to 2012, taking a ten-years term. Then, the European Council stated in its Lisbon Declaration that early school leaving should be cut by half in 2010 in all Member States. The most recent Dutch government concluded a coalition pact for the period 2007-2011. Therefore, the end-year, in which the reduction should be realised, is now 2011. The Dutch aims in numbers are related to national statistics and estimates, while those of the European Commission are related to EUROSTAT and its European Labour Survey.

early school leavers was around 40.000 to 50.000 in years 199-2001. Re-calculations in 2002 showed, however, that the actual number of new early school leavers was 70.000 in 2001-2002. That number has declined to 59.000 in 2004-2005, to 55.000 in 2005-2006, and to 53.000 in 2006-2007 (Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education], 2007 May) (Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education], 2007 May), and to 48.800 in 2007-2008 (see above). The national target was now set to reduce the number of *new* early school leavers to 35.000 per year. Measures were to be taken to keep young people in track as long as they did not achieve the level of labour market start qualification, so keeping the number of 'new cases' low.[19]

2.3 Early school leavers: profiles

In 2007-2008 The Research Centre for Education and Labour Market surveyed 1700 persons, who had left education without diploma in 2005-2006 (ROA Researchcentrum voor Onderwijs en Arbeidsmarkt, 2009 February).[20] Most of these 'early school leavers' were early school leavers for upper vocation schools. Their age was predominantly above that of compulsory education, i.e. 17+, up to 24. The reasons for their early school leaving were first of all related to wrong choices among the many streams and tracks of upper vocational education. For 25% it was with the intention to return to school in another stream or track 'next year'. Next reason for early school leaving is the finding of a pleasant job, while still going to school. With 27% it is particularly relevant among 'white' boys. Third major reason regards personal and family circumstances as health problems marriage or getting a baby (occurring comparatively often among girls of immigrant descent). For getting these 'types' of early school leavers back on track different measures may be appropriate. Wrong choices for stream and tracks were to be prevented by better information and transfer from lower vocational education, and/or by improved school careers and teacher commitment in upper vocational education. Now, getting lost is apparently easy. Finding a fine job may appear to be a rational reason for early school leaving. Optimism is, however. To be tempered as labour market chances on the longer term may prove to be weak, i.e. weaker than those who have finished their upper vocational schools with a diploma. The leaving in relation to health problems, or marriage and babies were to be tackled by appropriate measures for care and cure.

Eimers has differentiated between three types of early school leavers in The Netherlands (Eimers, 2006). First type regards *rational school leavers*. They leave the school and education for their good reasons. This should be a large portion of all early school leavers, taking into consideration that a considerable portion of (young) people without a labour market start qualification were not faced, apparently, with (long-time) unemployment or other forms of social exclusion in society.[21] Second type regards all *pupils, who cannot do better*. Their intellectual and other capacities are apparently insufficient for a labour market start qualifi-

---

[19] The 'old cases' i.e. the young people without start qualification were to be left to other policy concerns, such as labour market re-integration policies for young jobless people. For young persons under 27 the policy aim is to make a job or education obligatory for most of them (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment 2007, December 21).

[20] It regarded a 28% response on a sample of 5700.

[21] So far, there is no Dutch research on these unproblematic early school leavers. It is assumed that early school leavers at risk outnumber the non-risky early school leavers, but without clear empirical evidence (In 't Veld, R., & others, a., 2006 May).

cation or other educational achievements. They are to be guided through special educational tracks as to bring them on their highest and best level. The third type is faced with a multitude of private and educational *troubles and stress*. So, they do not perform better and they drop out, even if they do not want to.

Key witnesses reported to Winsemius and others in their recent assessment of early school leavers for the Scientific Council of the Government (WRR) that 5-10% of the early school leavers are incapable pupils around the age of 15 (type 2).[22] Their impact on the numbers of early school leavers as reported in the national statistics is presumably negligible as most of them will find a place in secondary special education. That is excluded form the general statistics with regard to secondary education and early school leaving.

Up to three quarters of all early school leavers might be rational early school leavers in the eyes of e.g. policy makers at the Ministry of Education (type 1). They would not need specific attention and measures. Most of them are leavers from upper vocational education, particularly in the highest grades, i.e. leavers beyond the labour market start qualification. They were ready for the labour market, apparently.

Winsemius c.s. estimated that a quarter early school leavers belong to type 3, i.e. the over-stressed young people, at the national level. In the major cities it may regard a much higher percentage in relation to cumulated risks concerning poverty, unemployment, criminality and ethnicity in large the urban neighbourhoods. there, the share is estimated to be 75% of all early school leavers (Winsemius & e.a., 2008; Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy], 2009). The total estimate of 'stressed' early school leavers would add up to 18.000 in 2006-2007, i.e. 7000 in the four major cities and 11.000 in the rest of the country.[23]

Winsemius c.s. focussed on the pupils of the third type, as they are the pupils at risk. The first type is no problem, while the second type regards an issue of inclusive education, special education, special tracks, safeguarded work places, etc. Winsemius c.s. denied that most early school leavers were exclusively or predominantly to be seen as immigrant young people, as was assumed in public discourse for a long time. For them, it regards an urban issue and a poverty issue. As immigrant young people make a major share of the urban youth and as poverty is concentrated in a number of urban areas where they actually are concentrated the issue of early school leaving might appear to be an immigrant youth issue.[24] However, young people from poor urban white families run the same risks in education as their local immigrant fellows. So, Winsemius concluded, measures and action should be targeted at best educational conditions, schools, school leaders and teachers in poor urban areas and not at special target groups of immigrant young people at risk.[25]

---

[22] These and both following estimates represent 'educated guesses', for which no empirical evidence is available. Quantitative research on the types would be rather hard, as the types are not distinguished clearly from each other and are also overlapping in practice.

[23] In January 2009 the National Youth Council published the results of an Internet survey among 627 pupils of its panel of 13 schools. Among the respondents 35% appeared to be 'stressed' and referred to sleeping troubles, caused by pressure of time, too much homework and too short holidays (Nationale Jeugdraad [National Youth Council], 2009).

[24] As e.g. reported by Gijsberts & Herweijer, 2007; Kleiwegt 2007 July 28.

[25] In the frame of integration policies towards young immigrants and young members of the second generation usually the policy aims were formulated the other way around. Special welfare policies and

Herweijer presented in his report for the Social and Cultural Planning Office a number of specified background variables and possible causes of early school leaving (Herweijer, 2008 August). His first remark was that the national secondary school system does not 'explain' the national level of early school leaving. He referred to other countries with a similar stratified system of secondary education as The Netherlands that were comparatively low on early school leaving, such as Austria and Switzerland. And also among the 'comprehensive' countries some were comparatively low (e.g. Sweden and Finland), whereas others were high (e,g. Spain and Italy).[26]

For Herweijer, major stumbling factor in Dutch education is apparently both lower and upper vocational training. Highest dropout occurred in upper vocational educations, on the one hand, and in the lowest tracks of lower vocational education on the other. Pupils, who dropped out, and their teachers referred to low learning capacities, on the one hand, and wrong vocational and track choices, on the other. The influence of low learning capacities might be reinforced by the open access to upper vocational education that was introduced in the frame of the compulsory qualification of all minors, including those of 17-18.

The social and cultural factors that were traced by Herweijer were those that also indicate the educational disadvantages of immigrant, urban and/or poor youth:

- Gender, i.e. male pupils,
- Pupils form one-parent families,[27]
- Pupils from low income families,
- Ethnic minorities, particularly pupils belonging to the first generation of immigrants,[28]
- The educational level of the parents,
- Low exit level in primary education and, therefore, low entrance in secondary education,
- Urban kids at risk
- 'Black' schools,
- Further issues regarding 'weak school climate' as felt by the drop-outs.

2.4 Measures and actions

2.4.1 Official action lines

The Minister of Education has taken action in three directions, i.e. preventive measures, correction measures for dropouts from school, and measures with regard to the improvement of registration. Preventive measures followed from the assessment that schools have undertaken insufficient and inappropriate pre-

integration projects should diminish early school leaving among e.g. young 'Moroccans' or among young 'Antilleans' in Rotterdam, Amsterdam or other cities by X percent in N years (often without 0-level measurement, and therefore with unclear effects).

[26] We will come back to this comparative issue in the comparative analysis and assessment.

[27] Actually most of them are of (mixed) Surinamese and Antillean descent.

[28] For the second generation of Turkish descent in Amsterdam and Rotterdam the percentage of early school leavers is high, compared to that second generation in a number of other European cities, apart perhaps from those in German cities. Most important explanations are, according to the researchers who controlled their data for e.g. family background, structural factors concerning the system of vocational education and training: tracks, levels, diplomas, etc. (Crul, Pasztor, Lelie, Mijs, & Schnell, 2009 May).

ventive inclusion measures. Therefore, improvements could be realised in this respect.

Correction measures were needed because dropouts were hanging around causing troubles. They were also involved in (petty) crime. Educational correction measures included conditional replacement measures of dropouts in their schools, as well as special educational tracks, courses and rebound schools. The correction measures could be obligatory, e.g. in relation to a judicial verdict or measure and social security control. These were part of municipal or judicial safety programmes and the re-integration tracks for young convicts towards society.

The third set of measures, i.e. improved and centralised registration was seen as a necessary pre-condition for early warning procedures, improved co-operation between schools, welfare institutions, judicial authorities and municipalities in their joint measures against early school leaving, petty crime and troubles with young people in the cities.[29]

In addition, the Ministry has launched a scheme of 52 MEURO for 2008-2012. Secondary schools were invited to submit plans that should reduce early school leaving considerably, e.g. in the fields of the transition from lower to upper vocational training or improved job and practice consultation (Ministry of Education, Directorate of Communication [Press release], 2008).

2.4.2 Good practices?

The Ministry has installed a special working group. It also launched a special website, where schools, relevant partners and others may find the information they need, including references to good practices, research, expert advice, etc. (Informatie over voortijdig schoolverlaten [Information on early school leaving]). In 2006 the working group has made an inventory of so-called 'quick wins' and 'good practices' (Werkgroep Good Practices–Quick Wins, 2006).

The inventory included 21 projects. For upper vocational training four local projects were mentioned that should correct and improve the vocational tracks for pupils with learning difficulties, as well as three preventive local projects. These refer to attention for psychological and social problems of pupils as well as their need for personal attention and their difficulties with finding practice

---

[29] The 0-condition for improved registration was rather complex. Teachers appeared not to be ready to keep track of all absentees, certainly not as far as short-time absence was involved. Schools have their own registration systems that are often semi-centralised for larger numbers of schools belonging to a joint educational authority. Schools are responsible for correction measures against absenteeism among their pupils. For compulsory education the municipalities are the legal authority with regard to registration and control measures. So, the school registration should be fed in into the municipal registration systems for pupils at the age of compulsory education, i.e. 4-16 years. Municipalities were to give quicker and improved feedback to schools and other relevant actors with regard to missing pupils. For non-compulsory education (pupils of 16[+]) a system of regional monitoring of early school leavers was set up in the nineties. Its implementation and its coordination with the municipal systems was to be improved as to speed up the feedback on missing 16[+] pupils and as to ensure appropriate action from the side of the relevant partners in schools, judicial authorities, welfare institutions, etc. The new and improved system tried to find best practices and best ict-solutions in this complex field, without actually changing its legal and institutional structure. Even in that frame the ict-challenge appeared to be great and even too great. For the school-year 2008-2009 a new, centralised ict-system is announced. The system will manage all registrations for the municipalities and the regional centres. It will level the administrative burden, but other difficulties may remain unchanged, such as the reluctance of schools to register their absentees early and fully (Gerrits 2008, May 19). A 0-condition assessment was not carried out.

places. Obviously, these measures and actions should keep possible dropouts in school. So, these regard preventive measures, with correction aspects where pupils had already higher non-attendance rates. They face some 40% of the problem, one might say, as early school leaving from schools for upper vocational education explained 43% of the new dropouts of 2005.

Two projects regarded the transition from lower to upper vocational training, where 30% of the problem arose. These regarded improved registration and transfer of portfolios from schools for lower vocational training to schools for upper vocational training.[30]

From within lower vocational education five projects were listed referring to curriculum improvement, parents' participation, mentoring & coaching, as well as correction tracks for unmanageable pupils and pupils with a high absenteeism record. Projects like these have also been introduced in general (upper) secondary education. In numbers the dropouts is much smaller there. In 2005 it regarded 2500 new cases.

Finally, three projects were aiming at the improved registration of dropouts. These projects reflect the national concern with the registration of dropouts, as was explained in the footnote above.[31]

2.4.3 Measures and actions proposed by Winsemius c.s.

Winsemius c.s. proposed several directions for action and measures. The first direction regards 'best secondary education' for stressed pupils and pupils at risk. Measures should regard a clear structure of the schools and their educational practice, internal rules as applied, clear educational aims and targets, hard work and no pretext. Compared to the current image of Dutch education the direction should be in a more strict and severe direction. The stressed pupils and the pupils at risk were to be bound to their schools in this way, with improved school achievements as the outcome. In this frame, the authors rely on American literature such as 'Leave no child behind' (Comer, 2004) and 'Engaging schools (National Research Council, Institute of Medicine, 2004). For the enactment of the measures highly committed and excellent teachers were needed, preferably working as a key team. They were to be supported by appropriate teacher training, on the one side, and internal care teams, on the other.

In the Dutch situation a direct link between schools for lower vocational training and those for upper vocational training should be established, following recent experiments with comprehensive vocational schools during six grades, up to the upper level that reflects the labour market qualification of young technicians.

---

[30] Since recently local experiments have been announced to link lower and upper vocational tracks together in the frame of extended lower vocation education (Kok, 2007, December 14). Pupils should follow vocational education within one school up to the level of mbo2, i.e. up to the level of labour market start qualification. Apparently, the experiments are faced with financial troubles as the financial regime for both sides of vocational educational are rather different, particularly as far as additional money for pupils at risk is concerned. The Education Council has stated that pupils should be allowed to make longer tracks in lower vocational education (NRC Handelsblad 2007, November 27). In March 2009, the State Secretray of Education announced that more than 32 00 pupils will participate in a pilot of non-interrupted vocational education in 2009. The pilot will go on unitl 2013. By then 'evidence based' measures were to be undertaken (Ministry of Education, 2009, March 12).

[31] An interesting side-effect of improved registration was that the number of new cases in 2006-2007 could be lowered by 3400 early school leavers, as they were traced as attending a school abroad (BN/De Stem, 2008, March 20).

A further set of measures would be needed in relation to the concentration of stressed pupils and pupils at risk at certain schools in the larger cities. In case the concentration increased beyond around thirty percent, experts as consulted by Winsemius c.s. expected a reinforced stress and dropout effect. Under thirty percent most schools and teachers are thought to be able to manage their stressed pupils and pupils at risk. So, through measures, including dispersion measures, a concentration beyond thirty is to be prevented and counter-acted.

Further stress reduction and dropout-prevention is expected to follow from the embedding of the schools in their environment and neighbourhoods, and from the participation of parents. The school should be a community centre or should be involved in community action.

For measures such as these, school will need appropriate funding. Practice is often quite different to this point. As far as funding was available it was usually part of temporary funding schemes and projects.[32] Schools that will undertake appropriate action should be assured of structural and long-term funding, among other funding from labour market integration and re-integration schemes. The argument is that dropout prevention will have direct and indirect impact on full and qualified labour market participation.

The measures would need most intensive support of the local and educational authorities in the major cities, as problems of early school leaving, stressed pupils and pupils at risks are extra-ordinary high in these cities and their weaker districts (see above).

Winsemius c.s. included to their recommendations a point that was earlier raised by In 't Veld c.s., namely that actually almost all actions as undertaken are accompanied a positive balance between costs and benefits, certainly if the costs of detention and re-integration in later post-education and adult life are taken into consideration (In 't Veld & others, 2006 May).

2.4.4 Case management and labour market re-integration

Recently, the General Audit Chamber has assessed the measures that should help to re-integrate the resistant hard core among unemployed young persons. It is the rest-category among employed youth of under-qualified persons with a wide variety of personal and social problems, e.g. with regard to debts, housing and mental health.[33] In line with a critical assessment of the re-integration schemes as conducted by sorts of relevant institutions in fields such as education, employment and care, the Audit Chamber advised to reinforce the co-operation between the institutions and to intensify individual counselling of young persons belonging to the 'granite category' by schemes that are often referred to a intensive individual case management (Algemene Rekenkamer [General Audit Chamber], 2008 November).

---

[32] Schools and centres for upper vocational training reported diminished dropout up to 35% in the last three years through temporarily funded projects and additional staff for coaching, remedial teaching, etc. Such funding was to be stopped in 2009, and therefore the additional staff was to be dismissed. Schools and centres expect high dropout rates again (Kooper, 2009).

[33] It regarded 9800 young persons between 15 and 27 by the end of 2007, or 67% of all registered unemployed young persons. In December 2003 it regarded 47% of all registered unemployed young persons. The category is referred to as the 'granite category'. Part of the 'granite category' is currently avoiding registration, as registration does not entitle for social benefits any more. Unemployed young persons should either work or go to school (see above). Besides, registration may be followed by forced employment is the frame of a municipal 'work first scheme'. The approximate number of unregistered unemployed persons, who are not attending school was 49.000 by the end of 2007.

2.4.5 Regional benchmarking and targeting – towards an effective reduction?

In 2008, the Ministry has installed a new directorate for the reduction of early school leaving. The directorate should implement appropriate policies and measures to reduce the percentage of new early school leavers from secondary education from 4,1% (54.090) in 2005-2006 to 2,6% (35.000) in 2011-2012. The directorate is expecting highest effects of clear benchmarking of local and regional reductions as realised, local and regional budget allocations form the national budget of 52 MEURO that was made available by the government for the Cabinet's period 2007-2011, and agreements with local and educational authorities.

For the benchmarking, reliable figures on new early school leavers have been produced, as was explained above. Since 2005-2006 each young person, who follows, may follow or has followed education, is holding a unique education registration number. These numbers are linked to a national educational database. Each year on October 1rst it is measured where each young pupils is following education. Those, who did a year before, but did not on that date, are registered as a new early school leaver, unless he or she has passed an examination for upper secondary education.[34]

The registered new early school leavers can be linked to regional and local indicators such as municipality and place of living, to their present school and school career, and to the individual characteristics of gender and age.[35] Analyses of the Ministry have been focussed on regional differences and differences between schools, streams and tracks. The latter showed that early school leaving is concentrated in the streams and tracks of upper vocational education.

The outcomes are published in a strategic way. That is on a special comparative website (www.voortijdigschoolverlaten.nl/VSV-verkenner). Here local actors, schools and others find their performance with regard to early school leaving and its reduction in the course of time. These outcomes function as regional and school-related benchmarks that apparently will encourage the local actors and the schools to take appropriate action. Consultations of the Ministry with local, regional and school authorities revealed the eagerness of most authorities to improve their performance and to comply with the national target of 2,6% new early school leavers maximally in 2011-2012. The regional impact seems also to be reflected in the case of Amsterdam (see paragraph 10.4) and the regional press e.g. (Sjoukes, 2009).

The encouraging web-based benchmarks are reinforced by agreements of the Ministry with the regional, municipal and school authorities on their targets and budget appropriation. These were concluded in 2008.

---

[34] As said in an earlier footnote, minor inconsistencies and points still to be clarified still inflate the figures lightly.

[35] Via complicated linking further analyses may be possible with regard to the socio-economic position of the parents, ethnicity, and other sociological indicators that are available on the databases of Statistics Netherlands CBS and the Social and Cultural Planning Office SCP. These have not been explored so far.

2.5 Emerging effects?

2.5.1 Unclear effects until 2008

Targeted impact assessment of both Van der Steeg & Webbink and the General Audit Chamber have *revealed that the effectiveness of the measures against early school leaving has remained unclear* (Steeg & Webbink, 2006 February; General Audit Chamber, 2006 May). The Chamber observed that the Ministry had launched new preventive, correction and registration measures in successive blocks of three years, without assessing their effects. In its comment on the Chamber's report the Ministry stated that effect measurement would be too complicated in relation to the many factors involved. The Chamber concluded that for that reason the learning capacity of the Ministry and other policy makers has remained low in the preceding decade. Further, the Chamber asked attention for the imbalance between prevention and correction measures, on the one hand, and registration measures, on the other. The Chamber concluded that the relation between registered early school leaving and the actual number of early school leavers remained unclear, in spite of the attempts at improved registration (see above). Preventive and correction measures as intended may mask actual increases of the numbers, as long as they remain un-assessed with regard to their impact.

According to Van der Steeg & Webbink the assessments consisted predominantly of qualitative studies and process evaluations that could show possible success and failure factors, without revealing their true contribution to the realisation of diminished early school leaving. Most studies they referred to did not apply a control group design or another methodologically sound research design. Most assessments relied on studies in the USA, the UK and Israel with regard to the effective measures against early school leaving.

In 't Veld c.s. have developed a cost-benefit model for four actions against early school leaving. These directions and the expectations of the researchers are:

+ Obligatory education until the labour market start qualification is realised. The Education Council has warned that no lower early school leaving is to be expected from the measure. In 't Veld c.a. expect a possible contribution 10% to the effects of measures against early school leaving, because pupils were to be guided intensively.
+ Improved guidance of the transition form lower to upper vocational education. It is expected that the number of early school leavers during the transition will diminish considerably and that measures in this respect will contribute up to 45% of all measures against early school leaving.
+ Three serious and extended personal tests for each young person at strategic points in time during his or her school career. Expected are less motivation problems, less wrong school choices and appropriate attention for light psychological and social stress, whereas the labour market will be entered two years earlier, on the average, with the same level of qualification. Therefore also these measures are thought to be effective, up to a contribution of 45% of all measures against early school leaving.
+ More and better care for pupils in education, and better co-ordination between care and education. It is expected to result in 10.000 early school leavers less, being 50% of those who are assumed to be care needing early school leavers.

As said above, In 't Veld c.s. concluded that any investment, following one or more of the directions as mentioned, is expected to create the expected relative added value. They recommend huge investments in three of these directions, namely the integration of labour market and education, the transition from lower to upper vocational education and improved care in education, as huge investment will create huge added value in the long run. The appropriate measures can be realised within the existing system of schools and education, e.g. with separate schools for lower and upper vocational education (In 't Veld & others, 2006 May).

The Ministry has called for a pilot assessment of the many possible measures to reduce early school leaving. The report was received in March 2009 (Dunning, et al., 2009 March). The report revealed that professionals form different disciplines assume that all their measures have positive effects on the reduction of early school leaving. Educationalist gave this judgement e.g. for individual school career support and probation place mediation. Local authorities and truancy controllers had this judgement for their measures with regard to systematic and improved registration and transfer of pupils. Professional from 'prevention' made the judgement for their commitment the individual early school leaver. Professionals from cure and care hold positive judgements with regard to all possible interventions based upon tailor-made packages. The meta-conclusion from the pilot assessment might be that most or all measures will have a more or less positive effect, under the condition of 'doing so' with an ethos of high commitment to the reduction of early school leaving and challenging the (possible) early school leavers. This meta-conclusion may refer to management and leadership in education that should encourage and reinforce commitment the reduction of early school leaving and support of (possible) early school leavers. Management and leadership may take an open standpoint vis-à-vis all possible measures as delivered from different professional angles and disciplines. The meta-conclusion with regard to management and leadership was also drawn at a conference of twenty teachers form upper vocational schools, i.e. the schools with the highest rates of early school leaving (Te Loo, 2008).

2.5.2 Promising outcomes from 2008 onwards?

The Ministry is expecting full results of the new measures to reduce early school leaving in The Netherlands that was initiated in 2006-2007. By 2011-2012 the percentage of new early school leavers is expected to decline to 2,6%. For its expectation the Ministry is referring to the following indicators:

- The decline until 2007-2008 was in pace with expectation. Between 2005-2006 and that school year was from 4,1 to 3,7%.
- The government has made available a special budget of 52 MEURO for regional, local and school measures to reduce early school leaving for the Cabinet period from 2007 till 2011.
- Binding agreements have been concluded with all regional, local and school authorities, in which their targets and responsibilities with regard to the reduction of early school leaving were specified.
- The knowledge base with regard to the issue has been improved in recent years. The numbers of new early school leavers are reliable, validated and comparable at all levels: region, municipalities, wards and schools. The information streams between the relevant actors were intensified and support is delivered by an easy

web-site that gives specific information on progress and results per region, place and school. The theory and evidence concerning the reasons and occurrence of early school leaving as well as that concerning types of early school leavers has been improves and is increasingly useful in the practice of taking measures at the collective scale and on that of individual guidance and intervention.

- The meta-conclusion is emerging that most important is active management and leadership on behalf of the relevant actors, with the aim to find the most appropriate and tailor-made package of measures, both in individual cases and in the collective setting of e.g. upper vocational schools and education, where early school leaving is concentrated.
- In line with the meta-conclusion is the assumed easiness of reduced early school leaving in a considerable number of cases. It appears to regard e.g. young persons, who would be kept in school or would return 'immediately' to school would the schools be better organised: clear streams and tracks, not too much self-reliance for the pupils, committed teachers and further staff such as probation place mediators and school counsellors, etc. Before only the 'granite block' is left the targets may have been reached or passed already.
- Feedback from municipalities such as that from Amsterdam (see above) and from the regional press (e.g. Sjoukes, 2009) indicates a rising competiveness between regional, local and school actors to reach the best performance possible with regard to the reduction as realised.

It appears to be a promising outcome.

3 Priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities (ToR2, 3, 4)

National discourse – some terms

- **Achterstand**

A literal translation of the Dutch '*achterstand*' is backwardness. But in The Netherlands, the connotation of this concept is not that strong. That is why we use the term deficiency. The level of deficiency is determined by linguistic deficiency (in Dutch: *taalachterstand*) and arithmetic deficiency (in Dutch: *rekenachterstand*). This is measured by a national cohort study, named PRIMA (primary education cohort).

- **Onderwijsachterstandenbeleid**

The measures to fight deficiency are referred to as priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities.

- **Achterstandsleerling**

An *achterstandsleerling* is referred to as a (disadvantaged) pupil from a deprived family. The central term in the *Onderwijsachterstandenbeleid* (priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities) is *achterstandsleerling*. This is a pupil with parents, who were low on education, i.e. did not pass any level of secondary education. The idea is that their children have low opportunities in education without priority measures. Till August 2006 a distinction was made between immigrant and indigenous parents, while policymakers thought that ethnicity has specific and more severe effects in this frame.

3.1 Inequity statistics

In The Netherlands, over 1.5 million children visit primary education. In 2007-2008 280.000 children or 18% were entitled to priority education because of social, economic or ethnic inequities (CBS, 2008).[36] This number has decreased from 580.000 or 39% in 1996, to the present number of 280.000 or 18%. Among the latter were 213.000 children or three quarters belonging to ethnic minorities. In 1996 197.000 children belonging to ethnic minorities were entitled to priority education. In contrast to the general decline, priority education for children belonging to ethnic minorities has increased.

Secondary education[37] is attended by approximately 900.000 students (CBS, 2008). In 2006/'07 in the four main cities of The Netherlands (Amsterdam, Rotterdam, Den Haag, Utrecht) 44 percent of the students in secondary education had a non-western immigrant background. In the rest of The Netherlands this was 11 percent. 46 Percent of the secondary schools in these main cities had over 50 percent non-western immigrant students and more than half of these

---

[36] Until 2006-2007 the indicators for priority education were both ethnicity and the educational level of the parents. From 2009-2010 onwards only the educational level of the parents will be applied as an indicator. 2007-2009 is an transition period.

[37] Secondary education includes the following streams and tracks: vwo, havo, mbo, mavo, vmbo (inclusief lwoo), vbo, svo and praktijkonderwijs

schools had over 80 percent students with a non-western immigrant background (CBS, 2008).

3.2 History: measures since the early seventies

In The Netherlands priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities exist for a long time. The current policy is the result of a policy development during many years. The main developments are listed below (based on: Turkenburg M. , 1999, Tweede Kamer, 2004c and Tesser, Dugteren, & Merens, 1996).

1974: *Beleidsplan voor het onderwijs aan groepen in onderwijsachterstandssituaties* (Ministry of Education, 1974) (Translation: White paper on education of groups in situations of inequity). The targeted priority measures proposed in the white paper were called *onderwijsstimuleringsbeleid* (translation: Policy on promoting targeted education). The aim of this policy was to help children from the working class to take full advantage of education, whie they entered school from a deprived position, with deficiencies. One of the measures was OETC: *onderwijs in eigen taal en cultuur* (translation: education in the original language and culture) in primary education[38]. According to Mens and Van Calcar (Mens & Calcar, 1981) the policy of priority education was a very large-scale and differentiated policy, with a lot of participants and goals. Besides, they notice that the policy was characterized by a diffuse start. According to Mens and Van Calcar (idem) the traditional education goals have been degraded.

1981: *Beleidsplan culturele minderheden* (Ministry of Education, 1981) (Translation: White paper on cultural minorities). The targeted priority measures were called *minderhedenbeleid.* The priority measures proposed in the paper were aimed to improve the position of minorities and minority people permanently. Through this policy, it was the first time that the government paid special attention to the original language and culture of the children and to intercultural education. For example, the OETC focused more on the self-image of the immigrant children and the use of the Dutch language. Returning back to the original country was no longer the most important issue of OETC and integration of OETC in the main education program was the purpose. The similarities with the position of children from the working class were recognized. In secondary education, international insertion classes were installed to teach the Dutch language and to realize education using the home language and culture of pupils.

1985: *Onderwijsvoorrangsbeleid* (Translation: Priority education policy). This is a combination of the both policy lines mentioned above: it regards both priority education and minority education. The purpose was to bring groups and classes forward that started an educational career from a deprived position (which are the result of economic, social and cultural characteristics). The policy was to be executed in priority zones and districts (*onder-*

---

[38] Several years later, this measure was called OALT: onderwijs in allochtone levende talen, i.e. education in living immigrant languages, see chapter 9.

wijsvoorrangsgebieden)[39]. The main principles were laid down in a white paper on priority education (*onderwijsvoorrangsplan*). During this period, a weight system was implemented (*gewichtenregeling*). The aim of this system was to arrange extra personnel and resources for primary schools that were dealing with disadvantaged immigrant and indigenous children starting from a deprived position (see c. *gewichtenregeling*). A systematic evaluation started in 1986. But that was not easy, because goals did not exist. These goals were implemented in the National Policy Frame (see below). The evaluation of the Priority Education Policy was part of the national evaluation of Priority Education Policy (*Landelijke Evaluatie Onderwijsvoorrangsbeleid – LEO)*. In 1992, the evaluation showed that the policy did not reach the expected success. The evaluation commission designated the connection of priority measures for disadvantaged immigrant pupils from deprived families (*achterstandsleerling*) and disadvantaged indigenous pupils from deprived families as remarkable. Because, from several studies became clear that *achterstand* did not coincide with specific ethnically cultural characteristics.[40] In 1996 Mulder concluded that the formulation of the goals of the Priority Education Policy was not clear and conflicting with each other (Mulder L. , 1996). Besides, a thorough analysis of the problem did not exist. According to Mulder (idem), there was no decrease of language and arithmetic skills in the period from 1998 to 1992. This conclusion was supported by an evaluation study of the LEO-program (Meijnen, 2003).

1998: *Wet gemeentelijk onderwijsachterstandenbeleid* (Abbreviation: *GOA*. Translation: Law on the municipal priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities). In the past, the national government and the schools were responsible for the implementation of priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities. Since 1998 the responsibility for this policy, abbreviated with GOA, is laid in the hands of the municipalities (local government), to a certain extend. The aim of GOA is to remove obstructions for children who need to be prioritized in relation to their social, economic or ethnic inequities. GOA provided the priority measures to give a fair start to children from a deprived position taking into consideration local circumstances. So the measures were to be embedded in a frame of local co-operation between schools, institutions and other stakeholders. The national GOA objectives are laid down in the *Landelijk beleidskader* (abbreviation: *LBK*. Translation: *National Policy Frame*). This is a practical elaboration of the law. The national priorities areas are: a. pre-school education and early-years education (*voor- en vroegschoolse educatie*) at the age of 2,5-5[41]), b. command of the national language, c. decrease of outplacement in special education (see chapter 8), d. decrease of early school leaving (see chapter 2), e. proportional school participation of children in the target group and f. monitoring. In addition to the national

---

[39] In general, there was a large disappointment on de results of large government operations. Therefore, decentralization became a new and leading principle in educational policies, including those related to priority measures.

[40] This should be caused by the same factor as for indigenous children. A deficient in language skills should strengthen the *achterstand*.

[41] Obligatory primary education starts at the age of 4.

priorities of the LBK, municipalities were allowed to develop their own aims. In 2001 the Scientific Council of Government Policy (*Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid,* abbreviation: WRR) argued that the educational achievement of immigrant children did not make progress. In its reaction, the government established that the *leerwinst* (positive impact on the educational targets) has been improved, but that language deficiency among immigrant children at the start of their school career was still very high. This should have caused early school leaving and lower percentages of passing the exams in secondary education.

In 2000 the ministry launched a supplement to the municipal priority measures: *Onderwijskansenbeleid* (Translation: Education Chances Policy). Schools with many immigrant students were entitled to receive extra resources. In this period, the discussion about black schools has been started.

2002: *Wet gemeentelijk onderwijsachterstandenbeleid* (*GOA*) with the second *Landelijk beleidskader* (*LBK2*). The LBK 2 showed small differences compared with LBK 1. During this period scientists mentioned that LBK 1 was not evaluated thoroughly by the municipalities, if evaluated at all (Karsten, Derriks, Emmelot, Felix, Ledoux, & Fleurke, 2004). A national evaluation was never performed. According to the national Audit Chamber (*Algemene Rekenkamer*) the outcomes of the targeted priority measures were still not measureable quite well.

2006: *Onderwijsachterstandenbeleid* (*OAB*) (Translation: targeted priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities). The targeted priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities are a revision of *GOA*. In *OAB* the *Lokale Educatieve Agenda* (see below) and responsibility structures are new in compared to GOA.

3.3 Policy: aim and measures

According to Van Haalen (Van Haalen, 2007) targeted priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities have actually been used to bridge different gaps. In the beginning, it should bridge the gap between rich and poor, later the one between 'black' and 'white' and now again between rich and poor (social economic class). The purpose of every type of targeted priority measure is to offer equal chances, indifferent of the social or ethnical background of the children. Every child should have the same opportunities in education. Disadvantaged children are to be supported by the measures to reach the best in education. To a certain extent this should be possible (Dronkers, 2008).[42]

The most important measures are:

---

[42] Dronkers proposed measures in the following directions:
1. Investment in early ability development,
2. Achieve a balance in area and educational segregation,
3. Ensure equal teaching conditions in all schools,
4. Promote joint management of schools by teachers and parents,
5. Require the central and public assessment of final results,
6. Combine differentiation and transfer,
7. Provide inexpensive loans for tertiary education.

3.3.1 Measures for pre-school education and early-years education (*Vroeg- en voorschoolse educatie* VVE)

The aim of measures for pre-education and early-years education is to overcome deficiencies in language skills and development of young children from immigrant families using other languages than Dutch at home. The national aim of the policy during the LBK 2 (see above) was a 50 percent participation to pre-education and early-years education of the target group. The most recent aim is a participation degree of 70 percent for pre-school education respectively early-years education.

Pre-school education consists of a language program, taught in special Ensure equal playgrounds (*vve-peuterspeelzaal*) for children aged 2,5 to 4. This program is continued during first two years of primary education (*doorlopende leerlijn*). These are the targeted compensatory measures for the pre-school education and early-years education. It is said that the best conditions to execute these measures are: a high quality of pre-education and early-years programs (*vve-programma's*), well-structured didactics and qualified teachers. But the desired effect of the measures cannot be proved unambiguously.

The majority of the children who follow pre-education and early-years education programs are children with an immigrant background. As mentioned above, pre-education schools (playgrounds) teach a specific education program (for example '*Piramide*' of '*Opstap*'[43]). This program will be continued in the first two years of primary education. To be sure that the pre-education playgrounds and primary schools teach the same program, primary schools recruit in a selection of playgrounds. This linkage of pre-education playgrounds to primary schools often causes ethnical school segregation (see h. measures against ethnical segregation in education). According to Ledoux early-years education does not have much to do with choices of schools; the intention is that children go to a primary school that is connected to the pre-education playground (Tweede Kamer [Parliament], 2004c). This is a negative side effect of this policy. The desired effect of the measures cannot be proved unambiguously. In general, it is assumed that the measures have a positive effect on the development and linguistic competence of the children. From 2007 a consulting agency specialized in educational issues monitors pre-school education and early-years education, with a focus on reach and process. Impact measurement is not listed as the objective of coming research.

3.3.2 Insertion classes (*Schakelklassen*)

When children perform obviously below their level because of deficient language skills, the level can be brushed up with an intensive language course in primary education. During one school year, the students can follow a language course in Dutch in special school classes. These are called insertion classes. The purpose of the insertion classes is a better moving on through their school career.

During the school year of 2005/2006 pilots with insertion classes were held. The next year, these classes were given a legal basis. The national aim is to set up 600 insertion classes, in which at least 9.000 students will participate each year. The

---

[43] The program '*Opstap*' evolved out of welfare sector (Ministry of Public Health, Welfare and Sports) and concerns family oriented measures. On the contrary, Piramide is an education program of the Ministry of Education.

insertion classes can be fulltime, part-time during school hours and part-time after school hours[44].

This measure is relatively new. During the pilot year 2005-2006, a method of investigation was developed and tested[45]. The results of the 20 pilot cases were encouraging, particularly for progress with regard to language learning[46] (Mulder, Hoeven, & Ledoux, De opbrengsten van de pilot-schakelklassen [Results of the pilot insertion classes], 2007). The research is conducted in a test-group and the control-group. In total, 217 students participated in the initial measurement. 75 percent of these students belonged to the group of immigrant students of the first or second generation with at least one immigrant parent. So, insertion classes offer a promising measure against language deficiencies.

The promising effect was confirmed in a recent study on 115 insertion classes with 1250 pupils in 2006-2007 (Mulder, et al., 2008).[47]

3.3.3 Weight rules (Gewichtenregeling)

In relation to the number of priority pupils (*achterstandsleerlingen*) schools receive additional resources with which they can spend on extra teachers or offer remedial teaching and other methods and counselling as appropriate. Until August 2006 ethnicity of the students was the most important weight rule, being a multiplier of 1.9 per pupil. For indigenous students with uneducated or low-educated parents (see above), the weight rule was 1.25[48].

Since the beginning of the school year in 2006, the weight rules were changed, as ethnicity appeared not be a strong predictor of school career. The strongest pre-

---

[44] Reference: *Informatie over schakelklassen [Information on insertion classes]*. (n.d.). Retrieved from http://www.schakel-klassen.nli

[45] Part of the policy of insertion classes is to realize a process evaluation, a effect measurement and an investigation to the wellbeing of the students. Participation in the research will be on a voluntary basis.

[46] Probably there is also a progress for arithmetic learning, but this progress is less unambiguous than the progress on language learning.

[47] Under the present scheme and legislation, municipalities and schools are encouraged to organise insertion classes for promising pupils with a language deficiency. The pro-active municipalities have re-arranged earlier measures to enhance linguistic skills in Dutch as a second language in the frame of the new scheme for insertion classes. Apart from the 115 insertion classes with 1250 pupils, another number of 61 old insertion classes for 1000 newcomers have also been re-organised as part of the new insertion scheme. The options for the schools and municipalities are regard the whole range of classes in primary education, i.e. from classes for the age groups of 4 and 5 up to insertion classes between primary and secondary education that offer and additional year for promising pupils at the age of twelve before they make their real start in the higher levels of secondary education. Classes can be part-time and full-time as well as full-day or during extended school-hours. International input is predominantly US-based (Mulder, et al., 2008, chapter 8).

A school that we visited for its extra-ordinary gains with regard to 'deficient' immigrant pupils (see paragraph 10.3) has participated as a leading partner in a local insertion pilot, applying its philosophy and measures in the insertion class, particularly by appointing an older top-teacher for that class. It showed an enormous gain as desired in the first year. The results in the following three years were lower than desired and contradictory. Major hindrance was the finding of talents that were only deficient with regard to their Dutch. As the class should have at least 10-15 pupils for a full year, pupils without clear talents and promises, or even pupils with major learning problems and challenges, were admitted. In this way, the insertion class started to function as a rebound arrangement or as a second chance facility for pupils with low scores on their tests. Therefore, the school is considering not to continue its involvement in the insertion pilot in 2009-2010.

[48] The threshold for receiving additional resources is the presence of 9 percent students from the target group. After conversion: schools will reach this threshold sooner for immigrant students than for indigenous students Bosker, R., & Guldemond, H. (2004). *Een herijking van gewichtenregeling [Reassessment of the weight rules]*. Groningen: GION..

dictor appeared to be class, as well as class in combination with ethnicity. Further, the threshold rules worked against poor white families and schools in rural areas (Vogels & Bronneman-Helmers, 2003)[49]. Further, the established weight rules were thought to represent a multicultural ideology that was not longer politically correct in the country. The minister of education used these arguments for changing the *weight rule*. The new measure is formulated as follows (CFI, 2006):

- 1,3: The parent has lower vocational education as a maximum degree[50];
- 2,2: The parent has primary education or (v)so-zmlk as a maximum degree[51].

The budget of the weight rule did not change, with the consequence that rural areas can expect a budget increase at the expense of urban areas.

3.3.4 Plus arrangement in secondary education (*Leerplusarrangement VO*)

The plus arrangement in secondary education is rather new arrangement that allocates additional resources to secondary schools in relation to negative social indicators in their surrounding zip code zone. The negative social indicators are the threshold-percentages of immigrants (7%), people living under the poverty line (15%) and people depending on social benefits (13%). The policy replaced the preceding targeted measures for immigrant pupils in secondary educational double or triple risk, the so-called *cumi-vo-regeling*. In 2003 the target group of the *cumi-vo-regeling* enclosed approximately 3 percent of the students in secondary education (Tweede Kamer [Parliament], 2004a).

In 2003 the State Secretary of education announced a modification of the *cumi-vo-regeling*. The reason for this was not given. The aims of these new measures were: preventing school dropout, providing tailor-made measures for schools and activating an effective language program. To realize these aims, budgets should go to those schools that really would need it and bureaucracy should be reduced as much as possible. The introduction of the new arrangement was prepared by an exploratory study of targeted measures in secondary education and easy allocation mechanisms, e.g. in relation to zip code zones (Vink, Neut, & Vloet, 2008). The researchers concluded that the arrangement might be feasible for lower vocational education. It was, however, applied to all schools of secondary education. In addition, a research institute finished the baseline measurement of the education plus arrangement in secondary education.

Shortly after the start of the plus arrangement in secondary education a negative side effect of this criterion surfaced. A rich school in Amsterdam, with students from wealthy families was receiving a large amount of money, because the school is situated in an area where a lot of poor people live. It proved a pitfall of the zip code zone mechanism.

Part of the plus arrangement in secondary education is *nieuwkomers VO* (translation: newcomer in secondary education) (Ministry of Education, 2006). This part of the plus arrangement in secondary education provides additional resources for the relief of students from foreign countries, who stayed in The Netherlands

---

[49] The performance of 1.25-students (in not urban areas) falls behind when compared to the performance of the 1.0-students, whereas the performance of 1.9-students increases.

[50] In Dutch: lager beroepsonderwijs/voorbereidend beroepsonderwijs, praktijkonderwijs of vmbo basis of kaderberoepsgerichte leerweg

[51] (v)so/zmlk means special education

not longer than 2 years. Schools can prepare these students to regular vocational education.

3.3.5 Measures against early school leaving (*Bestrijden vsv*)

Part of targeted priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities are the measures against early school leaving. These measures are discussed in the preceding chapter.

3.3.6 Measures against ethnic segregation in education

Because of the complexity of this topic, these measures are discussed separately in the next chapter.

3.4 Evaluation: description of evaluative research concerning targeted compensatory measures

An evaluation of targeted priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities (*gemeentelijk onderwijsachterstandenbeleid*) has not yet taken place. Part of the legislation is that local government should arrange the evaluation of their local measures. However, in recent past only 25 percent of the municipalities has carried out an effect-monitor, with major quality differences (Karsten, Derriks, Emmelot, Felix, Ledoux, & Fleurke, 2004). Van Haalen showed that the results of the *priority education* are rather diverse (Van Haalen, 2007). She referred to the following results in relation to national targets: the aims and the results of the *Landelijk Beleidskader 2002-2006* are as follows (idem):

- 50 Percent of the target group were to participate in tested programs of pre-school education and early-years education. This aim is realized, although the results of these programs are still modest, they are hopeful.
- Increase of 4 percent of immigrant pupils and pupils of immigrant descent (second generation) at *havo* and *vwo*. The available results (CBS and ITS) do not cover the whole policy period. That is why the results should be treated carefully. It seems the aims have not been reached.
- A decrease of 30 percent of early school leaving. According to RMC-analyses, this aim is probably not obtained (the decrease is apparently not more than 20 percent). According to another counting system (CBS), the aim is not obtained neither.
- A decrease of 25 percent of deficiency in language skills Because of a lack of information, this point could not be measured.

The meta-assessment on the Dutch integration policy of the Commission Blok showed a lack of power for politicians and policymakers (Tweede Kamer [Parliament], 2004c). This is caused by the freedom of education (see chapter 9), the existence of contradictions between the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Welfare, moving policy goals, slow decision-making and short cycles of policy. The result is that measures change rather fast; some measures were not implemented already or could not show their effect before these were changed. Besides, proper evaluations of the effects of the measures were not possible. The results of evaluation studies were ambiguous, because it was not possible to prove a causal relation between the results and measures. The Commission also shows a shift from reducing class sizes to didactics and coaching of risk students and also a large effort of first line actors, like teachers. In spite of these argu-

ments, the Commission Blok concluded that the integration had actually im-
proved.

In its reaction to the report of the Commission Blok –the integration of many immigrants has been completely or partly succeeded-, the government (cabinet) says that there are also many immigrant whose integration has not been suc-ceeded. The government stated that inequities remained an urgent issue. The priority measures in relation social, economic and ethnic inequities had not showed enough effect. So, the government intended to enlarge the effect signifi-cantly (Tweede Kamer [Parliament], 2004d).

4 Measures to reduce ethnic school segregation (ToR4)

In The Netherlands, the debate on ethnic school segregation is focused on 'white' and 'black' schools for primary education and shifting ethnic choices of parents in relation to the 'white' or 'black' image of a school. In secondary education the debate on segregation has recently started, but still this is not a hot topic. In general, schools for secondary education appear to have different priorities. To deal with segregation in secondary education seems even more problematic than in primary education, as the issue is apparently related to low prestige schools for lower secondary education in poor urban district, on the one side, and high prestige schools for upper secondary education, on the other. This paragraph describes the situation in primary education as well as measures against their 'white' and 'black' segregation.

4.1 Definition

The distinction between black schools and white schools is called ethnic school segregation. In the past, several definitions for a black school or a white school have been used (Pas & Peters, 2004). In the first definitions the share/portion for immigrant pupils in a school were used as the criterion. Determination of this share/portion is quite arbitrary. An absolute criterion shows the number of immigrant pupils in comparison with the number of indigenous pupils. But it does not show the trend that followed a certain threshold of immigrant pupils, being the so-called white flight. That's a reason why relative percentages have been introduced in the debate on ethnic school segregation. The percentage of immigrant or indigenous pupils in a school is compared with the percentage of immigrant or indigenous pupils who live in the district of the school. A school is too black respectively too white if there is a major difference between these two percentages. The relative criterion shows the degree of an unequal dispersion of immigrant and indigenous pupils over a district or a city. This degree is called ethnic school segregation degree. This started as a problem in the largest cities, but smaller cities and some villages also have to deal with it. It regards among others small cities in industrial zones, where large numbers of 'guest workers' have settled since the nineteen-sixties and –seventies, as well as rural places with major asylum centres.

The ethnic school segregation degree has been determined by Wolfgram (2009; p. 9). He compared the school populations with the neighbourhood populations in the 38 largest cities of The Netherlands. On average, the school population of 63 percent of the schools in these cities is reflecting the population of their neighbourhood rather well. 17 Percent is too 'white', compared to the neighbourhood and 20 percent is too 'black'. The largest cities of The Netherlands (The Hague, Utrecht, Amsterdam and Rotterdam) have a segregation degree of at least 40 percent. This means that less than 60 percent of school population is reflecting the population of the neighbourhood. Wolfgram (2009; p. 13) proved that the 'whiter' and the more 'Dutch' the inhabitants of a neighbourhood are, the more schools are reflecting their neighbourhood. Therefore, cities with high numbers of immigrant inhabitants show a higher degree of desegregation.

4.2 Two related problems

Why is ethnic school segregation is a political problem? There are two main rea-
sons: ethnic school segregation would a) reinforce the (linguistic) deficiencies of
immigrant pupils and b) interfere with multicultural integration of children.

4.2.1 Reinforced deprivation?

Ethnic school segregation is said to undermine the learning performances of pu-
pils (especially in primary education), because of deficiency in language skills
and the lack of presence of Dutch classmates to learn from. Bakker et al. (Bakker,
Denessen, Pelzer, Veneman, & Lageweg, 2007) have tested this fear. From their
research the fear is not justified, as a reasonable portion of the 'black' schools
improved the language and arithmetic skills very well, compared to the perform-
ance of the 'white' schools, e.g. in relation to the targeted compensatory meas-
ures they could rely upon (see preceding chapter). Besides, they showed that it is
not said that immigrant pupils do not perform better in white schools than in
black schools. According to Bakker et al. (idem) deficiency is not caused by eth-
nic background, but by the low level of parents' education.

4.2.2 Lack of multicultural integration?

The other argument why ethnic segregation might be a problem regards the lack
of inter-ethnic contact, inter-cultural learning and grass-root multiculturalism.
According to the 'contact hypotheses' of Allport (Allport, 1954) long-lasting con-
tact should result in decreasing ethnic prejudices and it should stimulate recip-
rocal ethnic appreciation. In this case mixed schools should be the best condition
to improve contact between 'coloured' and 'white' pupils. However, Bakker and
his research group did not find convincing proof for this hypothesis (Bakker,
Denessen, Pelzer, Veneman, & Lageweg, 2007). This problem remains an issue of
debate.

4.3 Causes of ethnic school segregation

Ethical school segregation is caused by three factors:

- Composition of the population in the cities/segregated city districts: poor people
  are concentrated in cheap housing areas; the portion of immigrant people
  among the poor people in the cities is high.
- Ethnic school marketing: some schools are apparently better for indigenous pu-
  pils from better families. While others make themselves attractive for immigrant
  pupils (e.g. to attract compensatory measures) or have become the wastebasket
  of the local educational market. According to Pas & Peters (Pas & Peters, 2004)
  these mechanisms can result in the segregation of black schools and white
  schools.
- The choices for schools made by parents – see chapter 9. Parents are almost fully
  free and entitled to choose a school where 'our kind of people' go to and many
  obviously do so. This choice caused the so-called white flight from 'black' com-
  munity schools. In the meantime the flight is followed by an upcoming 'black'
  flight of highly educated and upward mobile people of immigrant descent to bet-
  ter suburban districts and their more attractive schools. Ethnical segregation is
  apparently coinciding with socio-economic segregation.

4.4 Measures to reduce ethnic school segregation

4.4.1 Local consultation

There is no national policy taking measures against ethnic school segregation. But in August 2006, the government introduced a new policy line in co-operation with the municipalities and the educational authorities, called the Local Education Agenda (*Lokale Educatieve Agenda. Abbreviation: LEA*). The municipalities and the educational authorities were to come to binding agreements on measures against ethnic school segregation and should hold consultations on the issue. Ethnic school segregation is one of the consultation issues. Several related issues have to be discussed both the educational authorities and the municipalities having their own responsibilities on specific topics of the Local Education Agenda[52].

In November 2007, the Local Education Agenda has been evaluated. Over 90 percent of the municipalities had a Local Education Agenda, or was developing one. Around 66 percent of these municipalities and 50 percent of the educational authorities were satisfied with the consultation (Kruiter, Rijken, & Wit, 2007). In 2006, in 46 percent of the 35 largest cities of The Netherlands the municipalities and educational authorities made binding agreements on measures against ethnic school segregation (Peters, Haest en Walraven 2007). This study has been repeated: in 2008 54 percent of the municipalities had such an agreement (Ledoux, Felix en Elshof 2009).

Since the eighties, only a few municipalities have implemented promising measures against ethnic school segregation. According to Rutten and Peters (Rutten & Peters, 2005) 7 percent of the so-called GOA-municipalities[53] have implemented such measures in 2005. For the few that did the main rationale was to reinforce the integration of immigrant people, in combination with the promotion of inter-ethnic contact (social-economic integration and integration as a citizen) (Pas & Peters, 2004 and Rutten & Peters, 2005). A further reason for measures against ethnic school segregation is to give children the opportunity to carry on in society as an adult, being able to participate in society. In the end, they wanted to realise social integration. But whether the desegregation measures as implemented did have such effects is unclear. Municipalities that carried out desegregation measures did not evaluate them.

The municipalities that carried out desegregation measures tried to change directly the causes of segregation as listed above (Pas & Peters, 2004, Rutten & Peters, 2005, Peters, 2006 and Peters, Haest, & Walraven, 2007). That means:

4.4.2 Measures to change the population in segregated city districts

An ethnically segregated district will have black or white schools. Some municipalities try to manage their social housing measures (for example through renovation and district gentrification) in such a way that the segregation might disappear. Their purpose is to realize socially and economically mixed districts, with expensive owner-occupied houses and rather cheap renting houses. This is

---

[52] For topics, see http://www.delokaleeducatieveagenda.nl.

[53] GOA-municipalities receive financial support of the national government within the framework of the law on the municipal priority measures in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities (see chapter 3.2).

not easy to manage in existing neighbourhoods. It regards a process that takes often several decades and success is not guaranteed, as settlement and departure trends are unpredictable, to a large degree, even not for the most newly build districts around the larger cities – some have already impoverished within one generation.

4.4.3 Changing the choices for schools made by parents

To force changes in the (prejudiced) patterns in which parents choose a school for their children, municipalities and schools should provide appropriate information about the schools, e.g. showing that schools with a black image may provide actually high quality education. The information can be provided at meeting-the-parents conferences, like organized in the municipality of Zaanstad, for example. There, the parents were even forced to participate to these conferences. They were not allowed to register their children for one of the local schools without attending the conferences. In the municipality of Amersfoort, playgrounds and infant welfare centre distributed information materials (brochures, leaflets) made by the municipalities and the local educational authorities/schools. The idea behind providing appropriate information is to make inter-school competition transparent and to help the parents to make the right choices, i.e. choices that not depend on ethnicity and class, but on educational preferences.

Although municipalities did not evaluate the effects, in general it can be said that the providing of appropriate information did not change the parents' choice. The colour of school populations did not change dramatically. According to Peters (Peters, 2006), parents take the opportunity to rely on their almost unrestricted freedom in choosing a school for their children. Other actors can try to exert some influence on their choices, but parents can and will do what they want. They cannot be forced. This is the reason that policymakers and politicians do not rely on force and obligatory dispersion, but on so-called parents' initiatives taken by good-willing 'white' parents. As to assure that their child is not the only 'white pupil' in a 'black' school and classroom, groups of indigenous and often highly educated parents have registered their children as a group for a 'black' school[54]. This should change the population and the image of the school. In most cases parents and the reference school discussed how to manage this group registration. And some parent groups taking the initiative have formulated specific requirements for their registration at the school. An example form practice was that the school should organize more cultural activities in the domain of high culture. This might make a mixed school very popular for indigenous parents, even to the extend that the school population might change from 'black', to 'mixed' into 'white'. 'White' parents who register their children in a 'black' school are often called idealists. In Rotterdam, politicians and schools considered the parents' initiatives to be the best way towards desegregation. The municipality has encouraged the initiatives by setting up a website. Encouraging parent initiatives is part of the national policy against ethnic school segregation (see above, Local Education Agenda).

---

[54] The other way round did not happen yet: immigrant parents did not register their children as a group in a white school.

34

The parental initiative in one of the districts of Amsterdam is included in this report as a special case study – see par. 10.2.

4.4.4 Changing the policy of the schools

The very few municipalities that have developed measures against ethnic school segregation, had to do this in consultation with the schools. In most cases it is the municipality that would prefer positive action and forced dispersion measures. However, school support for positive action forced dispersion measures is low. The schools have a lot of freedom. In general, they can organize their own policy on how to recruit new pupils. They do not have to participate in the implementation of a municipal agreement on measures against ethnic school segregation. But the municipality cannot do anything without the schools. Therefore, if the municipality succeeds in getting support for an agreement, the schools can quit at any time. By the official signing of a voluntary agreement, municipalities have tried to bind the schools to the agreed measures. But as the conditions are changing schools may leave the agreement, like it happened in the municipality of in Gouda in the ninety-eighties. In this middle large city, municipality and schools arranged maximum percentages of immigrant pupils per school. The agreements were officially signed. But the number of immigrant pupils grew during time. Schools did not want to register more immigrant pupils than agreed and in the end they also did not want to increase the percentages. Parents started and won complaint procedures against the bussing system that was set up to transport immigrant pupils to the other 'white' district schools. After winning the complaint procedure the agreement was finished.

Other items seen in agreements between municipalities and schools are:

- The establishing of *natural recruitment zones*. Each school has its *natural recruitment zones*. Children who live in this area can go the schools in their zone, while children who live in another area cannot visit those schools. Several schools are situated in a *natural recruitment zones*. So parents still have the possibility of a (free) choice. But the range of the choice is smaller. In general, parents are not happy with this limitation. But as long as schools execute the measure consequently, it is effective. In Tiel, a middle-large city in the middle of The Netherlands, schools of the ethnic distribution of pupils is now almost equal to the ethnic distribution in *natural recruitment zones*. So, these measures of establishing *natural recruitment zones* are rather effective. The example of the municipality of Tiel is elaborated as a special case study for the rpesent report – see par. 10.1.
- *Fixed moments of registration* (Zaanstad). Indigenous parents have discovered that it is very useful to register their children at the school of their preference very early and years ahead of the first school day, to be sure that there will be a place for their child. On the other hand, immigrant parents are very late with their registration. Because of the early registration by indigenous parents, lately registered immigrant children were actually excluded from the popular 'white' schools. As a prevention measure against this mechanism municipalities and schools have introduced a fixed moment of registration for all. It was agreed that schools were not allowed to accept registration forms before a certain date. However, in Zaanstad, this measure did not result in diminished school segregation, as schools did not keep the appointment.

4.4.5 Measures in secondary education

The measures described above regard primary education. In secondary education only one agreement between the municipalities in an urban zone and schools for secondary education was settled. It regarded the urban zone around Utrecht. The situation was that a lot of indigenous pupils left the city of Utrecht to visit a high prestige school for secondary education in the surrounding villages. Besides, less pupils from the surrounding villages registered in a school in Utrecht. So, the secondary schools in Utrecht became more black and smaller. In the end, some schools had to close their doors. Several municipalities and schools agreed that schools around Utrecht should not register pupils who live in Utrecht. Although the results are not public, it is known that the agreement did not work and did not change the trends. So, the agreement was finished. In February 2009, the town councillor for education in Utrecht and an external task force concluded that forced dispersion measures would be necessary (Huisman C., 2009)

4.4.6 The concept of the friendship schools

Can the measures mentioned above be used in mixed city district to realize desegregation (mixed schools)? Results are not really encouraging so far.

A possible new alternative for schools in black and white districts, where desegregation measures were apparently not effective might follow form the concept of a friendship or magnet school. The concept is that black schools (in black city districts) and white schools (in a white city districts) will organize common activities for their pupils, so that they can meet each other. In one of the biggest cities in The Netherlands, Rotterdam the concept has been applied. [55] It has not been evaluated yet.

4.4.7 National Knowledge Centre Mixed Schools

Since 2007, the Ministry of Education made resources available for a National Knowledge Centre Mixed Schools. The aim of the Knowledge Centre is to circulate knowledge on school segregation between research, policy and practice. To reach that goal the National Knowledge Centre Mixed Schools:

- Is organizing national, regional en local meetings for municipalities, schools and their boards, and parents,
- Is writing and releasing manuals on how to create mixed schools. It started a newsletters,
- It launched the website: www.gemengdescholen.nl, which is giving an overview of news and background information.

Since 2008 several pilots have been established. The ministry has made funds available for the municipalities develop measures to reduce ethnic school segregation. The National Knowledge Centre Mixed Schools is accompanying the municipalities. The pilots are monitored by an independent research unit. The results are expected in 2012.

---

[55] For more information check www.vriendschapsscholen.nl

5 The Extended school as an inclusion strategy

5.1 Description

A comprehensive definition of the extended school (*brede school*) does not exist. That is the reason for Oberon - a prominent research institute in education, which composes the annual report on extended schools – to refer to the development of extended schools. This development has been described as: "extended school development is concerned when schools have a broader function than the function of teaching institute only, and when schools work together structurally with several partners in the field of welfare, care, child care, sports and/or culture" (Kruiter, Oomen, Grinten, Dubbelman, & Zuidam, 2007). This description can be applied to extended schools in primary education, where the concept emerged in the early nineties in the frame of comprehensive strategies with regard to education, care and leisure targeted at disadvantaged children. In addition to this description, a description for the development of extended schools in secondary education, where the extended school concept is now also applied, is added: "An extended school has a broad social function and focuses on the entire development of the child. This is a preparation to function in society, when the child has grown up. This is why schools work together with external institutes that may contribute to the curriculum/educational school program from relevant points concerning society" (Kruiter, Oomen, Grinten, Dubbelman, & Zuidam, 2007).

5.2 Measures

In primary education two variants of extended schools exist. The first type of extended schools was set up in the nineties in deprived areas in cities, to offer chances to disadvantaged children. Another type of extended school was set up several years later in new housing areas. Their purpose was to offer to working parents day programs or full day care (*dagarrangementen*) for their children. According to Sardes - a prominent research institute on education - the difference between extended schools and *day-program* is related to the intention of the institute (Studulski, Kloprogge, Aarssen, Bontje, & Broekhof, 2005). A *dagarrangement* is offered with the purpose to take care of the children after a school day. Moreover, a *dagarrangement* also offers a qualitative part of day-care. It has no manifest educational purposes. The relation to education is restricted to management issues, such as place, time and transport, as well as the recent obligation to schools to take responsibility for the day programs. The other and older variant laid highest emphasis on the interrelationship between education, socialization, leisure and care, during school time and after school time. It was set up as a comprehensive preventive measure against social, economic and ethnic inequities (see preceding chapter). The purpose of this variant of the extended school is to offer development chances to children, enrichment, care and participation/involvement of the parents. Therefore, the chances and enrichment profile fits the extended school best.

Both variants of the extended school have been established either by local government, or by a school.

5.3 Secondary schools with an extended school-day

Some local authorities have established secondary schools with extended schooldays to give pupils a chance to obtain a start qualification. Although effect evaluation has not been realized, such extended schooldays is meant to be an inclusion strategy with regard to high-risk youth.

5.4 Towards sincere evaluation research

In research the different definitions of extended schools have been used without making clear which definition is meant. Unfortunately, this has confused the research results.

In 2007, Oberon counted 1.000 extended schools in primary education (additionally 691 extended schools were in the making) and 350 in secondary education (Kruiter, Oomen, Grinten, Dubbelman, & Zuidam, 2007). It is not clear whether these schools are day-program or extended schools. The effects of extended schools have never been examined. Available were locally based process evaluations and product reviews with data on the attendance with and opinion about the activities. Oberon's annual report on extended schools *Jaarbericht Brede Scholen* is a biennial monitor of extended schools. This study includes the following topics: numbers, goals, offer, cooperation, housing, finance, management, bottlenecks and successes. Besides, Oberon developed an evaluation model for extended schools (Evaluatiemodel Brede Scholen – EBS) (Oberon, 2006). This is a one shot evaluation model without a control group. Therefore, thorough results cannot be expected. Groot, who is the professor Health Economics of the University of Maastricht, has confirmed the lack of appropriate effect measurement (Groot, 2008). He adds that this is not unusual in Dutch education and offers ideas how to set up a sincere assessment. He suggests to analyse the social-economic composition of neighbourhoods, and to compare neighbourhoods with and without extended schools. A pre- and re-measurement should be part of the study. For example a measurement of the cognitive and social-emotional performance of pupils at age 6 and a measurement of the performance of these pupils at age 12. Groot thinks that it is plausible that the extended school might have a positive effect on the chances of disadvantaged pupils in deprived areas, in some degree.

6 Support measures for teachers (ToR 5)

The chapter will first discuss the backgrounds of what has become an urgent political issue in The Netherlands, i.e. the numbers, quality, position and perspectives of professional teachers. In response to the issue certain measures are undertaken en set out that should increase the numbers and ascertain the quality on the basis of a sound professional status and perspective. A profession at risk should turn into a profession of promise. We will conclude the discussion of risks and promises with our provisional assessment of the measures.

6.1 Policies: background and aims

For good education schools need a sufficient number of qualified and motivated teachers. In The Netherlands this basic rule was threatened at least since twenty years, and it has become an issue of highest political concern since 2007.[56] Since fifteen years it has received increasing political attention. The attention started with the report of a committee on the future of professional teaching (Commissie Toekomst Leraarschap [Committee for the Future of Professional Teaching, 1993). It went on by action plans, initiated by the Ministry of Education to improve the image and work of teachers (e.g. Ministry of Education, 1993; Ministry of Education, 1998; Ministry of Education, 2007). In 2007 two reports on the issue received highest national attention, being first a report of the Education Council (Onderwijsraad [Education Council], 2007, September), and second the report 'Teachers!' of a special ministerial committee (Commissie Leraren [Committee Teachers], 2007, September). The reports and public response to them underlined that the issue deserved highest political attention now.

The government welcomed the reports, to a high extend, including the advice to raise the national expenditures for the labour conditions of teachers in primary and secondary education by 1 billion euro in the long run (Minister of Education, 2007). Through its further action plans the government intended to take preventive measures against urgent shortages in the number of qualified teachers in primary and secondary education.

Three action lines were to be followed, being:
- Reinforcement of the profession,
- Professionalization of the schools,
- Better salaries.

In the course of 2008 the plans received the necessary support of Parliament, the relevant actors in the educational province and, in general terms, from the teachers' unions and the school leaders' associations.

6.2 Measures to support a profession at risk

The present action plan revealed that serious problems should be solved and that a number of improvements were needed. Most relevant actors in education and educational policies agreed that teaching is and was a profession at risk. The actors agreed on a limited set of measures to be taken and considerations to be

---

[56] The author was at the time the leader of a national survey on the workload of teachers in secondary education. The average workload of a full-time teacher was around ten percent too high. For the many part-time teachers the workload was usually 25 to 50 % too high. At the time salaries have been cut, while unemployment among teachers and (forced) early retirement was high, although the sign was shortages for mathematics and economics at short run and the danger of wider shortages later on (Muskens and others, 1988). So, the above-mentioned course of events and actions followed.

taken into account. Besides, each actor represented certain interests and preferences that were to be included in the actions to be taken and the considerations to be taken into account.

We first discuss the actions on which all actors and policymakers agreed. Then we shall turn to the specific and more or less conflicting positions of relevant actors such as the teachers and their unions, the government, and consulted experts.

All actors found the image and social esteem of the profession too low. Therefore, the profession was at risk on a competitive labour market. Education would run the risks of shortages and under-qualified personnel. Shortages became evident in the past ten years, both in primary and secondary education. The risk of under-qualification was acknowledged widely, e.g. in relation to apparent low scores on arithmetic's and language among students, who enrolled in teacher training for primary education, and the apparent decreasing attractiveness of teaching in secondary education for academically trained teachers. At points like these the relevant actors widely agreed on appropriate measures.

Since more than thirty years one of the relevant actors, namely the *teachers themselves and their unions* made clear that teachers made too many hours (Muskens & others, Leraar tot (w)elke prijs. [Teacher, at what costs?], 1988).[57] The general feeling of time-pressure and work-overload was confirmed (again) in April 2009, in an internet-survey among 2300 teachers form primary and secondary education (Aalten & Sahadat, 2009). Too many teachers suffered of stress and burnout at early age (Prick, 2006; Prick, 1983). The unions referred to the better teachers' conditions in other European countries (less hours, smaller classes, sometimes better salaries) (EIRO, 2003; Algemene Onderwijsbond [General Teachers' Union], 2007; Antenbrink, Cornet, Rensman, & Webbink, 2005, p. 31). Compared to other occupations at a comparable level of qualification and responsibility the position of teachers hardly improved between 1982 and 2006. Esteem appeared to be fixed at a middle range level with gymnasium teachers at rank 22, teachers in vocational schools ranked at place 34, and the teachers in primary education at place 42 (Status leraren nauwelijks veranderd [Status of the teachers did change hardly], 2007). For teachers and their unions first priority was improved working conditions and payment in line with their responsibilities, qualification and status.

The *government*, being a relevant actor in the game itself, and most politicians in Parliament saw missing career opportunities for good teachers as the most urgent problem. So, government wanted to create additional career opportunities, apart from becoming a school leader and manager. These career opportunities could make the profession more attractive than the perspective of standing forty years in front of the blackboard and the classes, e.g. as counsellor, teachers' trainer, head of department, etc. So, the idea of career opportunities was added to de set of applicable measures and school management as well as school boards were encouraged to implement their career ladders.

---

[57] In autumn 2008 the teachers unions and the educational authorities in secondary education could not settle a new collective agreement for 2009-2010, on the issue of the workload for teachers. In November 2008 actions followed. On 16 December 2008 a collective agreement was concluded without the consent of the largest teachers union. The union did not agree with a reduction of 24 work hours per year per teacher (Bonden oneens over cao leraren [Unions disagree with collective agreement for teachers], 2008).

A special position is represented by a number of reputable *experts, who were consulted by the government and others on the issue*. A number of them proposed new learning strategies, new structures and new pedagogics in the schools, often with the direct support of ministers, state secretaries and political parties. Their proposal involved direct of indirect change of the professional practice and position of the teachers. From the teachers' side objections and even hard objections have emerged against these proposals, while these would harm the professional status and competence of the teachers. In addition, they argued, with the support of other reputable experts, that new learning etc. would not improve educational quality, on the contrary. Since 2005, these objections received increasing political attention and support through the establishment of an Association for Better Education (Verbrugge & Verbrugge, 2006; Meijs, 2008), critical assessments of the quality of non-academic teacher training and critical assessments of the basic quality of arithmetic's and language in non-academic teacher training (Minister of Education, 2006, February 12; Ministry of Education). In early 2007, Parliament decided to start a parliamentary investigation of innovation policies in education, focussing on the above-mentioned issue, among others. The conclusion was that the schools and the teachers have been tempted in the past decades by too many innovations and by innovations that could not be implemented or that were not accompanied by an appropriate timeframe and budget (Parlementaire Enquêtecommissie Onderwijsvernieuwing (Commissie Dijsselbloem) [Parliamentary Investigation Committee on Innovations in Education (Committee Dijsselbloem)], 2008, February 13). Ministers and State Secretaries should be most reluctant in the coming period with regard to innovations. They should focus on national standards for quality in education, leaving the implementation to the schools and the teachers. The advice of the Committee Teachers! and the Ministry's action plan are quite in line with this political assessment and conclusion, in the sense that teachers should do their quality-job under good conditions.

6.3 Assessment

How might the measures with regard to teachers in primary and secondary education be assessed in the frame of inclusion and exclusion mechanisms in education?

6.3.1 Towards the inclusion of teachers

First point is, of course, that the measures are not aiming at the manifest inclusion targets that have been discussed in the other chapters, such as lower numbers of early school leavers, inclusive education for pupils with special needs, and less socio-economic and ethnic segregation in education.

Second point is that the measures should make the profession more attractive, with a direct impact on joining the profession, both in numbers and quality, and with direct impact on prolonged top-quality productive years per teacher, preferably from an early and full start at the age of 22-24, up to the age of 65. So, a direct impact is wanted and expected on the inclusion of good teachers and on the prevention of shortages. From research on the profession (see above) and from the general understanding of competitive labour market mechanisms it is reasonable to assume that the measures will have the intended effect, more or less, in the long run. Both performance and satisfaction among teachers may raise, while relevant actors and stakeholders among parents, school manage-

ment, politicians and public opinion may respond in a positive way. The collective mood might improve considerably, with a positive impact on the individual professionals and incoming professionals.

It is further assumed that the inclusion of good teachers is in the interest of all pupils, who may do and feel better in school in a fine class climate and with strong stimuli for best achievements under the guidance of their excellent teachers. In this frame also pupils at risk of exclusion as caused by e.g. socio-economic or ethnic segregation or as caused by a handicap were to be refrained from dropping out and early school leaving or from under-achievement. So, the teacher measures were to reduce unwanted streams of early school leavers and dropouts from regular education, or loss of talent and potentials in the course of the educational careers of promising pupils.

6.3.2 Who will be a teacher for the pupils at risk?

However valid the assumption might be as a first thought, second thought must be that the teaching of pupils at risk in 'their' schools is an extra burden to the teachers. It is obviously unattractive in a comparative sense. Therefore, the best qualified teachers may not be available for schools in the poor urban districts or in declining rural village schools, while the best might be needed for the schools and pupils involved. Experts have stated at several occasions that the teaching of pupils at risk should be most attractive in terms of salary and other conditions (Ramadan, 2008 april; Winsemius & e.a., 2008; Dronkers, 2008; Dronkers, 2008). The Minister has opened some opportunities for an extra salary increase for teachers in difficult urban and rural districts, however in the margins of the general improvement of salaries and further labour conditions.

A targeted increase in relation to the teaching of pupils at risk appears to be in conflict, however, with an undercurrent argument in the public debate on teacher measures. The undercurrent argument regards the position of academic teachers, who were usually not enrolled in the education of pupils at risk. Their natural field of employment regards upper secondary education, not lower secondary education, special education, inclusive education or primary education. The undercurrent has tempered the political attention for the teaching of pupils at risk. So, the impact of the new measures on teachers, pupils and schools at risk might be less than needed. Other measures appear to be more appropriate for that end. To this end, being a teacher for pupils at risk should be made more attractive, e.g. by a structural salary increase for that work and by diversity management and positive action in teacher training and the personnel management of schools.

6.3.3 Time-tables for teachers and pupils in secondary education

Apart from pupils, who do not like to stay in their 'boring schools and classes', all educational actors agree that a high number of contact hours between teachers and pupils is needed for quality and performance in education. The point is reinforced by the consideration that high numbers of hours and full time-tables in the course the school-day and the school-week may help to reduce truancy and early school leaving, whereas open hours and blocks during the day and the week would invite pupils to stay away at other hours too. In the context of inclusion-enhancing measures and measures that should prevent exclusion, leaks in the time-table of the pupils and low numbers of class-hours might be a truancy-

causing factor or even a dropout-factor in secondary education, i.e. a cause of exclusion of its own. Therefore, it needs our attention.

The point is certainly an issue in secondary education with its discipline-bound teachers and differentiated curricula. The time-table of secondary schools is usually most complex. Complexity is further increased by the part-time appointment of many teachers and the many tasks of teachers outside their class-related tasks.

The author's first confrontation with the time-table issue was during the national assessment of the workload of teachers in the nineteen-eighties (Muskens & others, Leraar tot (w)elke prijs. [Teacher, at what costs?], 1988). One of the findings was that around 25% of the official hours on the time-tables of the schools were not realised, in relation to 'other tasks', meetings, opening and closure of the school year, non-teaching hours before and after examinations and tests, etc. While the official time-table should include 32 class-hours per week during 40 week or 1280 hours per year, actually around 1000 hours were realised. Therefore, 'lessons fall out' became an issue in public debate and Parliament. In 2007, the Inspectorate reported that 20% of the schools did not realise the required number of hours. The State-Secretary of Education therefore fined these schools. Protest followed and, following good national practice with regard to conflict resolution, an expert committee led by a former State-Secretary of Education should propose recommendations with regard to the hours and the time-tables. The committee published its findings and recommendations of 16 December 2008 (State-Secretary of Education, 2008, December 16). Disagreement continued and will be continued, particularly with regard to the committee's proposal to reduce the holiday period in secondary education be one week and to use the time for special days and tasks in the course of the year. Teachers and their unions apparently feared a deterioration of their labour conditions, in which the holiday period of seven weeks is settled.

As far as the author would be able to assess the present situation after the publication of the committee report, the author does not think that the tension between the time-tables and the teachers, the schools and the pupils are settled in a sufficient degree. The committee confirmed the necessity of sufficient class-hours and a full time-table in secondary education. It did not come to an assessment of its own with regard to the basic question with regard to the time-tables and educational quality, on the one hand, and the prevention of truancy and dropout, on the other. It did neither work out differentiated recommendations for the levels, streams and tracks of secondary education, although the age of the pupils as well as streams and tracks might require different numbers of hours and time-tables. At some points interesting out-of-the-box recommendations were made, such as recommendations with regard to e-learning and e-classes. At other points the committee reinforced the controversy by touching upon existing labour conditions (the holidays, see above). Most recommendations appear to regard rather marginal improvements and definitions of tasks and time.

7 Safe schools (ToR6)

This chapter regards the policies and measures undertaken against bullying and harassment in schools, in the wider frame of the measures in the field of safety protection in and around the schools. We will not discuss the relation between safety protection, measures against bullying and harassment, on the one side, and inclusion, on the other. We take the relation for granted in the sense that unsafe schools and severe bullying and harassment are assumed to drive pupils from school.[58] Although the issue is relevant for all schools, highest concern regards the schools for secondary education and their pupils in their challenging phase of life.

First paragraph will discuss this safety frame and the most recent measures, including a provisional assessment. Then we will discuss the measures undertaken against bulling and harassment, with special attention to evaluation research on PRIMA, being a set of measures as developed and promoted in the country. The evaluation was inconclusive. It was one of the points that made us raise the question whether best measures exist and should be aimed at, or that doing something and incremental action should prevail in counter-acting the phenomena.

7.1 Social safety protection in and around educational institutions

7.1.1 The safety protection approach

Since a terrible incident at a school for lower vocational and general education in The Hague in 2002[59] safety protection has become a priority issue for the government, the municipalities, the schools and the educational authorities. In the years until 2007 the government has spend € 90M per year for measures that should improve the safety in and around schools. In a letter to Parliament of November 16th 2007 the State Secretary of Education has reported the state of the affairs with regard to the current measures, her assessment of the safety condition in and around the schools as well as the additional measures deemed necessary (State-Secretary of Education, 2007, November 16). The Inspectorate reported 42 incidents per year in a quarter of the secondary schools that registered and reported the incidents on a voluntary basis. Government and parliament agree that such registration and reporting should become obligatory for all secondary schools (Weeda, 2009).

Current measures the State-Secretary referred to were:

- *Preventive measures*, i.e. a special course as an intervention coach for teachers and other staff, a special course to learn social competencies to pupils[60], and the attention for active citizenship as part of the national curriculum.[61]

---

[58] Incidents in primary schools regard mostly theft, abuse of playgrounds out of school time, aggressive parents, sexual harassment from the side of teachers and principles, etc. However often these incidents may occur it regards 'incidents' in the eyes of the public and politics. 'Incidents' in these fields have also been reported in secondary schools.

[59] An angry pupil has shot the deputy director of a lower vocational school. Before, schools have been a theft object, while verbal and physical harassment and violence have occurred incidentally. But the issue appeared not to need national attention. It could be left to schools and staff to manage safety protection adequately in relation to specific needs and circumstances. First press coverage regarded gate control in urban schools for secondary education (e.g. Luyendijk & Rensman, 1995)

[60] The course is developed by the Central Education Service Group Rotterdam (CED-Rotterdam) and the educational research institute SCO-Kohnstamm of the University of Amsterdam. It is published by

- *Curative measures*, i.e. individual counselling of pupils in primary and secondary education, casework and multidisciplinary care teams in the schools,[62] improved co-operation with youth care institutions as well as consultation bodies and multi-disciplinary case teams together with professionals from youth care and the judiciary. For the latter the Ministry has introduced mobile safety teams that should support schools, on request, with regard to safety quick scans, appropriate measures, and co-operation agreements between schools, their care teams, police, youth care and municipality (Ministry of Education, 2008)
- *Repressive measures*, i.e. rebound and so-called time-out, restart and rebound arrangements[63] for pupils needed a temporary outplacement (Velderman, 2008)[64] and 1000 additional places in special schools for pupils with extremely challenging behaviour.[65]
- *Support measures,* i.e. support by a new centre for school and safety (Centrum School en Veiligheid) and its websites with good practice suggestions for schools, teachers, parents and others, features on 'honour' revenge in the school class (e.g. De Boer, 2008),[66] websites against digital bullying[67] (www.pestweb.nl, www.iksurfveilig.nl), a safety monitor for all levels of primary and secondary education, and measures against gender discrimination as well as the discrimination of homosexuals. Together with other professionals teachers are addressed by national authorities as their eyes and watchmen against Muslim radicalisation as feared and as observed since 0911, the assassination of Theo van

---

the Centre for School and Safety (Centrum School en Veiligheid) on its website www.schoolenveiligheid.nl.

[61] Several expert centres have developed materials for this purpose. Among these were expert centres related to the Catholic and the Protestant pillar in Dutch education as well as the University of Utrecht (see chapter 9), the National Educational Broadcasting Service Teleac/NOT and the expert centre for extended and full-day education (Expertisecentrum Brede School). Obligatory attention for human rights and active citizenship is promoted e.g. by the Council of Europe (Steenhuis & Van Noordwijk, 2008).

[62] For this purpose half the budget of € 90M was reserved.

[63] Time-out arrangements are short-time arrangements of a few weeks to get challenging pupils back on track (Messing, Van Veen, & Wienke, 2004 July). In practice, time is usually too short to do so. Therefore, may pupils, who have been out-placed in a time-out arrangement apparently needed a follow-up in a longer arrangement as offered by rebound places, where they can stay for several months up to one year. Time-out places are offered by youth care institutions, while rebound places are offered by regional co-ordination bodies of secondary schools, municipalities, expert centres with regard to challenging pupils and schools for their special education. Further arrangements regard the programmes Restart and On Track Again. These regard educational a program for pupils, who should follow compulsory education while sitting at home, on the one side, and a program for challenging pupils, without access to a special school for (very) challenging pupils.

[64] A yearly budget of € 20M was allocated to the rebound arrangements for 12^+ pupils

[65] On the basis of a small-scale survey among 122 teachers in classes for very challenging pupils. i.e. pupils who were already out-placed from mainstream education, Velderman concluded that rebound classes might be contra-productive, and therefore very dysfunctional. Schools and teachers, who could rely on a rebound arrangement, were apparently tempted to 'solve' problems with very challenging pupils much more often by (further) outplacement. Schools and colleagues without such arrangements had to deal themselves with their very challenging pupils, and so they did (Velderman, 2008, pp. 51-53).

[66] Worst case was the murder on 7 December 1999 of a young student at technical college by the brother of his girl-friend, under pressure of their father (De Vries, 2000)

[67] It is assumed that 4 of ten children are bullied on the Internet (Van Beek & Creemers, 2008).

Gogh, and other major national incidents (Ministry of Interior, 2007; Buijs, Demant, & Hamdy, 2006).[68]

7.1.2 Assessment of current measures

Process and progress assessments of the current measures were published in three annexes to the letter (State-Secretary of Education, 2007, November 16; Aarsen & Hoffius, 2007, October; Veen, Steenhoven, & Kuijenhoven, 2007).

The State-Secretary formulated the following policy conclusions on behalf of these process and progress assessments:

- It is assumed that society has increasingly hardened with regard to verbal and physical harassment and violence, as shown e.g. by victim surveys. At the same time the feeling of safety has increased among the population. Measures against harassment and violence were apparently appropriate and effective, at least at the level of collective psychology.
- Since 2002 the feeling of safety has improved among pupils and staff, as it did in society at large. Statistics showed that aggression and violence occurred predominantly in the major cities, in schools for special education[69], in lower vocational education and in practice-oriented courses.[70]
- More and more schools have formalised their safety protection arrangements and the registration of safety incidents, although parents and staff reported lack of transparency.
- National surveys showed that intolerance between citizens has increased.

With regard to the measures mentioned above the following outcomes were reported:

- Since 2006, almost 700 teachers and other staff were trained as an intervention coach, and 150 to 200 of them have participated in a return day.
- The effects of the courses to improve social competencies of pupils were unclear. Yet many market parties are apparently ready to publish their (improved) courses on the Web.
- The attention for active citizenship is a very recent new part of the national curriculum. The Inspectorate of Education was unable until now to assess the process and the outcomes. It has recommended that schools should first work out their view on citizenship. Then they should make their curricular choices on behalf of that view. The Inspectorate of Education will monitor a joint project of the national expert centre for curriculum development and an alliance of schools concerning citizenship training.
- The national centre for education and youth care LCOJ has reported that 75% of the schools knew that means are available for casework at school by the end of 2006. Among these schools 78% have attracted at least one staff member for casework and special care. In many schools multidisciplinary care teams were set up. The researchers have recommended improved implementation reports. There has been a considerable increase in the number of schools that dispose of

---

[68] For the issue of unsafeness and violence in schools right-wing radicalisation among 'white' young people might be as relevant (or even more relevant) than Muslim radicalisation, Yet, public attention is diverted from the first and pre-occupied with the latter (Van Donselaar & Rodrigues, 2008).

[69] Among these the fastest growing faculty were the schools for pupils with extremely challenging behaviour, where 1000 additional places were created (see above).

[70] The latter two are seen as the lowest levels of secondary education for pupils, aged 12-16.

a care team between 2003 and 2006. For secondary schools the percentage is now 91%, for primary education 74% and for higher vocational education 72% (Aarsen & Hoffius, 2007, October).

⁜ The Dutch youth institute NJI has evaluated the rebound arrangements since 2006 (Van Veen, Van der Steenhoven, & Kuijvenhoven, 2007 September; Van der Steenhoven & Van Veen, 2008). The number, scope and scale of rebound arrangement has grown rapidly since 2005. In 2007 81 of 84 national bodies for the regional co-operation between schools disposed of rebound schools and classes. Full coverage would be reached soon. The arrangements offered 4000 rebound places for pupils, who were to be out-placed in these arrangements temporarily. Almost 3000 pupils were effectively placed there.

⁜ *It was intended that pupils with very challenging behaviour, for whom 1000 extra places were made available in special education, would return to normal schools for primary education after one years. In 2006, it was observed that one-third re-turned to their own school after a shorter or longer stay at a rebound location. A considerable part of one-third appeared to follow another, unintended route, i.e. that towards special secondary education and away from mainstream secondary education* (Van Veen, Van der Steenhoven, & Kuijvenhoven, 2007 September)*. In 2007, the effects were more in line with the intention. The percentage of pupils, who returned to their old mainstream school, to another mainstream school or a centre for upper vocational training raised by 6%, up to 66% of all rebounded pu-pils.* In a special report, the Educational Inspectorate concluded that half up to three quarters of the 21 arrangements it visited in 2007 offered rebound educa-tion at an acceptable or even good level. Further, it was rather critical on rel-evant issues for a rebound arrangement. It referred to issues such as the reasons why pupils have been placed out in rebound arrangements, double testing and diagnosis, insufficient attention for cognitive development as needed for the re-placement in mainstream education and too much attention for social and emo-tional development, unclear replacement track towards mainstream education and unclear long-term effects, due to missing follow-up. Besides, rules appeared to be vague, e.g. with regard to the target groups, and co-operation between the rebound arrangements and the out-placing schools was not good enough in a number of cases, or was even missing (Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education], 2008 November).

⁜ Support by the centre for school and safety is appreciated as is shown by grow-ing usage of the website and its special pages. Conferences that were organised by the centre attracted good attendance.

⁜ Further aspects are monitored on a regular basis (Aarsen & Hoffius, 2007, October). A second survey among schools for secondary schools is going on.

7.2 New measures, 2007 onwards

The State Secretary has announced that the measures of the preceding period will be continued, with a number of adaptations that followed from the lessons learned with regard to 2002-2007 and from the policy priorities of the left-centre Cabinet that was formed after the elections of November 2006.[71]

---

[71] From 2002-2006 the political colour of the Cabinet was centre-right.

One of the priorities regards the implementation of Centres for Youth and Family in all municipalities and districts if appropriate.[72] Through these the municipal control of youth care and family support are to be co-ordinated and reinforced. As a consequence it is intended to re-incorporate the multidisciplinary care teams of the schools into these Centres for Youth and Family.

Further new and adapted measures regard:

- *Controlled registration* and a registration method that is to be applied by all schools and other parties involved in measures against harassment and violence. Improved registration should support the implementation of measures as appropriate and should improve the monitoring of safety protection policies.[73]
- *Person-oriented prevention measures*, by means of e.g. aggression prevention training, peer mediation and mentoring.
- *Full-impact measures in extended schools*, in the sense that all-day schools should offer the pupils at risk a wide variety of competencies and support.
- Implementation of further Cabinet priorities, such as those related to *safety protection in the public domain*.
- *The sharing of expertise and quality*, i.e. further development of the instruments of the Centre for School and Safety, and quality support teams that will help the schools in implementing their safety protection plans and initiatives.[74]
- *Social safety protection around the schools,* as to be expected from parents, youth care, the judiciary, police, etc., and from the new Centres for Youth and Family (see above).
- *Early recognition programmes with regard to pupils at risk and appropriate action,* which follows more or less from measures with regard to social safety protection around the schools and the co-operation with the judiciary, police, youth care, etc.

The letter of the State Secretary has been discussed in Parliament on February 7th 2008 (Tweede Kamer [Parliament], 2008 February 7). The representatives made remarks on many issues related to schools and safety, political priorities, and the measures as implemented in the schools. The policies as proposed were implicitly accepted.

7.3 Assessment

Although the first aim of safety protection measures in and around the schools is not the continued inclusion of pupils at risk in their schools, it is an obvious side of it. Most preventive and curative measures are framed in relation to the continued inclusion of both the light and curable victims and offenders. One might say that the increased attention for the individual and for person-oriented preventive measures and full-impact measures in extended schools are to be seen as a reinforcement of that frame, explicitly or implicitly. The frame is in line with general practice in the schools that take their responsibility for safe educational condition, for pupils, staff, parents and others. The schools' line is to find the best

---

[72] The centres should improve local and multidisciplinary control and treatment of youth and families at risk. They should improve the co-operation between institutions that are administratively and legally separated, and between professions and professionals with different and sometimes conflicting interests in youth and families at risk.

[73] The national educational number that is allocated to all pupils in the Netherlands since 2006 might be a help for controlled registration.

[74] A budget of € 1.75M has been reserved for the quality support teams.

and most appropriate way towards these conditions within the schools them-selves, without the exclusion of offenders or the loss of victims. State support is claimed, as it is apparently needed. It regards e.g. the necessary knowledge and evidence base (what is actually going on; what do we know about effective measures), the development of effective measures and financial support for new and additional tasks for the schools. Among the latter are changes in the national curriculum, as was the case with the new subject of active citizenship, additional training and costly but necessary adaptations of school buildings, etc. In this sense a positive assessment appears justified, although clear evidence is missing. At two points critical remarks were to be made. The first regards both the re-bound arrangement and the extra places in special education for pupils with ex-tremely challenging behaviour. The second regards the re-incorporation of the care teams of the schools in local Centres for Youth and Family.

The rebound arrangements and the extra places should lead to the return of serious offenders, who had to be dismissed and excluded from their school. The exclusion should be temporarily – for rebound arrangements timeliness and re-turn are expressed in the term itself, while the places in special education were for one year followed by return. It is reported, however, that both measures did not lead to return in most cases, but to further educational careers in special secondary education. The measures might reinforce exclusion mechanisms away from mainstream education, applicable to offending and challenging pupils. It might represent a counter-mechanism against inclusive in mainstream educa-tion.

The evaluation of the multidisciplinary care teams in the schools was rather positive, among others in relation to growing numbers and recent quality im-provements. The challenges and difficulties of multidisciplinary co-operation in teams like these are obvious. In practice, they appeared to be manageable, to a large extent. Now, it is the intention of the government to re-incorporate these teams in the Centres for Youth and Family, together with many more administra-tive layers, institutions and professionals. The re-incorporation is a very complex process and represents therefore a risk in itself for the well-functioning care teams in the schools, as it might do for well-functioning care teams in care insti-tutions, youth detention centres, casework, etc. In the policy documents we have not seen the attention as needed for the risks of complex (re-)incorporation pro-cesses in the professional care sectors.[75] The risk might need further national and comparative attention, because it regards a wider set of issues.

7.4 Measures against bullying

Measures against bullying do not attract the same top-priority of Dutch educa-tional policies as the safe school policies that were discussed in the preceding paragraph. The issue is mentioned among the safety issues. It has attracted re-search attention with regard to prevalence, victims, classroom disturbance and bullies (Veenstra, s.a.; Fekkes, 2005). Actions regard first a number of targeted projects, particularly in relation to the implementation of measures developed by Dan Olweus in the early nineties in Norway (Olweus, s.a.). In The Netherlands

---

[75] One might recommend to the Dutch government to locate extended multidisciplinary care teams for youth at risk aged 12$^+$ in the schools, as extended care teams of the schools. For the schools are the places where the youth at risk is reached in a comparatively easy and effective way, as long as they have not dropped out from school.

it is known as the PRIMA Method (Dorst A. v., Wiefferink, Paulussen, & Crone, 2008; Veenstra, s.a.; Dorst A. v., Wiefferink, Düsseldorp, Galindo Garre, Crone, & Paulussen, 2008, January). Second frame of action is the emergence of chat- and web-sites for victims, parents, schools, teachers and other relevant or interested actors (Jaarverslag 2007 Pestweb [Annual report 2007 Bully-site], 2008; Pestweb [Bully-site]; Pesten.startpagina.nl [Start page bullying])

In a self-evaluation the makers and initiators of the sites were clearly positive with regard to their products and services. They referred for instance to the bully-site Pestweb that was contacted 12.000 time via e-mail, phone, chat-services and other help-lines (p. 4). It regards not, however, tested and controlled interventions, and therefore aims and impact are unclear. We assume that bullied kids, their parents and, in case, professionals feel supported and helped by advice as available on the sites and by mutual support or shared experience.

The PRIMA method is implemented as a school mechanism against bullying. It is supported by the national research organisations TNO that has its origin in the technical sciences, and NICIS. NICIS is a national expert centre for urban issues. NICIS has organised expert conferences in co-operation with researchers of TNO, with good attendance from schools, municipalities and consultants. In reports and presentations the researchers have revealed the aims and procedures of the method. They have carried out evaluation research on the implementation and effects, making use of a field research design with control groups. According to the research report it appeared hard or even undoable to trace the effects of the method. Positive effects (less bullying, improved support for victims, supportive classroom reaction, improved action on behalf of teachers and schools, etc.) were observed both in the schools that were selected for the application of PRIMA and in the control schools that would not implement PRIMA. So, it is unclear whether the effects are directly related to the method or to other factors, such as general attention for bullying. Actually, all or most control schools had implemented own strategies against bullies and bullying, including for instance school rules and reliance on external support services and consultants. In this respect the control schools appeared not be ready to do nothing during the experiment. At the same time, it was observed that no 'experimental' school implemented the PRIMA method fully and in all its details. So, the effects as observed could not be linked to the method as intended (Dorst A. v., Wiefferink, Paulussen, & Crone, 2008; Dorst A. v., Wiefferink, Düsseldorp, Galindo Garre, Crone, & Paulussen, 2008, January).

As positive effects were observed both in the 'experimental' schools and in the control schools that applied their own methods, the 'challenging' conclusion could be that effective bully intervention follows just from giving it appropriate attention at the school level. Every measure beyond doing nothing might be effective, to a certain extend, while the most effective method might not exist. Schools were to encourage teachers and other relevant actors to be on their alert, to keep to some basic rules, to help the victims and to improve the class climate. In case, external consultants and e-consultants are available.

The national institute for care and health NIZG has suggested to the government to apply the PRIMA-method in all schools of primary education in The Netherlands. The State-Secretary of Education has reacted that this would not be in line with the freedom of education in the country. The materials with regard to the method and its effectiveness are to be made widely available via the website of

the expert centre for school and safety protection (Centrum voor School en Veiligheid) (State-Secretary of Education, 2008, April 14).

8 'Appropriate education' for pupils with special needs (ToR8)

This chapter regards the inclusion of pupils with special needs in Dutch schools and education. Their inclusion corresponds with the internationally used concepts of inclusive education, i.e. educational systems and practices that have adapted the system and the practices in such a way that all or most pupils with a disability or special need can and do participate in it. The concept and its Dutch equivalent will be discussed in the chapter. It is, however, not the central issue of the chapter, as in national policies, measures and practices it has lost the priority position it appeared to gain in the nineteen-nineties. These day the concept of 'appropriate education' and a system backpack grants for pupils with medically recognised needs is prevailing, in relation to what is left of 'inclusive education' as well as a full parallel system of special schools for primary and secondary education. We will discuss the concepts and measures of 'appropriate education', 'special education', 'inclusive education', backpack arrangement for pupils with special needs, and the care-structure in education that offers support to the schools, the pupils and the parents.

We will conclude the chapter with a provisional assessment of education for pupils with special needs in The Netherlands.

8.1 The concept of 'appropriate education'

Since 2007 education for pupils with a disability or special need should be 'appropriate', in Dutch: *passend onderwijs*. The policy aims were explained in a letter of the State Secretary of Education to Parliament (State-Secretary of Education, 2007 June 25). Appropriate education refers to all forms of education for pupils with a disability or special need as practiced and as financed by the state, in relation to the most appropriate educational tracks and streams for each individual pupil. In this frame, problems of the existing practices and institutions should be solved, in combination with the highest possible achievements. The problems followed from the evaluation of 'inclusive education' as it was practiced since the early nineties, the introduction of a backpack arrangement for parents and schools in 2003 (Vermaas & Pluim, 2004; Frissen, 2004 December), and audits of schools for primary and secondary special education. These were and still are the four existing forms of education for pupils with a disability or special need, i.e.:

- Schools for special education for children with severe physical handicaps (audio, visual, motion) and/or mental handicaps (the whole spectre). In the last ten years the number of pupils at primary special schools for pupils showing very challenging behaviour and rebound arrangements between institutions and secondary schools has grown rapidly.
- Special primary schools for pupils with 'light' cognitive restrictions, who could not be educated in mainstream education.
- The mainstream practice in primary education of 'inclusive education' since the early nineties, initiated as Together to School Again, in Dutch: Weer Samen naar School. Schools were enabled and encouraged to keep as many pupils with (lighter) disabilities on board. Beyond all practical problems with financial arrangements and the qualification requirements for teachers and specialised staff

the practice represented the philosophy of 'inclusive education' as promoted e.g. by Inclusion Europe.

- Backpack arrangements for parents of children with a physical or mental handicap and their schools.[76] Depending on the medical handicap diagnosis parents could rely on a certain budget to be spent for the primary and secondary education of the child. New were backpack budget for autistic children and highly gifted children attending secondary education. Pupils are to be offered a place in special or mainstream education.

Co-ordination of the four policy lines was problematic, in addition to the ongoing co-ordination problems in Dutch education related to the freedom of education.[77] The relation between 'inclusive education', special primary schools and special needs education was never solved clearly. From their side, the special schools complained that they were neglected and overloaded with extremely challenging pupils, while the normal primary schools were complaining form the other side about unclear diagnosis, insufficient budget and expertise. In secondary education the obvious movement of challenging pupils was obviously downward, i.e. first in the direction of the lowest levels of lower vocational education for pupils aged 12-16, and then towards special schools and rebound arrangements. At the same time the direction was upward for e.g. autistic pupils and highly gifted pupils: for them special arrangements and facilities were to be created in the highest levels of higher secondary education, if necessary as special regional schools.

Appropriate education should solve the ongoing problems by 2012, when the concept should be in operation for the whole country. The State-Secretary mentioned the following aims for appropriate education:

- Parents should easily find a school that is appropriate for the special needs of their child. Schools were to be obliged to make them an offer and to co-operate regionally as to guarantee the offer.
- Quality of education is to be improved in relation to school career plans for all pupils concerned.
- More tailor-made solutions, e.g. through less rules and more fixed regional budgets for appropriate education.

Whether the concept of appropriate education will realise these aims and therefore whether it will improve the education of special needs children and improve

---

[76] Part of the backpack arrangements is financed in the frame of a national insurance system for extraordinary health costs, part by the municipalities in the frame of welfare and participation arrangements for (young) people with disabilities, and part by the Ministry of Education for children with special educational needs. In case a personal coach would accompany a pupil with Down Syndrome in a mainstream class, it would be unclear what authority should cover the costs. Personal coaches of children with a Down Syndrome were covered by the national insurance system until recently, more or less without restrictions, but hardly never accompanied children in mainstream education before. The national insurance system has announced not to continue this practice. In its view, a personal coach does not represent a medical necessity for a child with the Down Syndrome. Therefore, it does not belong to its core tasks and business. The argument is that the coach is supporting 'participation' in society that should be covered by the municipality, or that the coach is supporting the child in mainstream education. In the latter case, it should become an educational backpack. Odd and complex, one might say (Kooijman, 2008, September 6).

[77] See chapter 9. Ongoing problem is that the freedom of education interferes with obligatory regional co-operation as needed with regard to medical diagnosis, specific expertise and the dispersion of pupils. Regional co-ordination between schools is usually 'voluntary', therefore.

their educational achievements is to be seen. The outcome will not be full or almost full inclusive education for special needs children, as the system of parallel structures and systems for mainstream and special education will remain in existence. In the view of the Dutch policymakers the concept of appropriate education and its implementation in a parallel system of mainstream and special needs education should be a national improvement. They might have the implicit ambition to prove that the concept and the parallel system will be superior to inclusive education as practiced in other European countries.

The target is full implementation in 2012, through a process of guided implementation, and adaptations as apparently needed or necessary. Process management is laid in the hands of a special Evaluation and Advisory Commission, and the Educational Inspectorate will report annually on progress in practice. The Ministry has made a rather detailed implementation plan. Since December 2007 the State-Secretary is informing Parliament on process and progress, as in her letters of 5 December 2007 and mid-June 2008. Parliamentary approval did not appear in danger, although critical remarks were made, e.g. with regard to forced regional co-operation and the freedom of education, the ongoing decline of the special schools for pupils with 'light' cognitive restrictions, the growing numbers of very challenging pupils, control on backpack arrangements and regional co-operation and coordination.

8.2 The existing situation

An assessment of the new concept and the related ambitions is premature. For the assessment of Dutch education to children with disabilities we have to rely on evidence and knowledge with regard to the existing situation, i.e. the existing situation in:

- Special education,
- Inclusive education (Together to School Again) in primary education,
- The backpack arrangements,
- The existing care-structure in and for schools and their children with disabilities and special needs.

We will discuss these sides of the exiting structure in the coming sections.

8.2.1 Special schools

8.2.1.1 Streams, tracks and levels

Children with insufficient intellectual or other abilities as needed for mainstream primary education may attend schools for special primary education. Insufficiency is defined in relation to serious or very serious troubles with regard their learning capacities and upbringing. The children are expected to share the basic knowledge and achievements op primary education, but with a possible retardation of two years.

For children with mental or physical disabilities and/or severe learning difficulties there are schools for special education, both at the primary and secondary level. These schools regard four clusters of mental and physical disabilities and special needs, being

- Children with visual disabilities,
- Children with audio and speech disabilities,
- Children with severe learning difficulties and physically disabled children,

- Children showing highest challenging behaviour as well as children with enduring illness or children staying in pedological institutions (Speciaal onderwijs [special education]).

Since 1990 the number of the children in special education has been around 75.000-77.000 (CBS [Statistics Netherlands], 2008).

8.2.1.2 Waiting lists for challenging pupils

However, one trend was appalling. That was the number of pupils in schools and departments of type 4. It has increased by 50 % in the time between 2003 and 2008, i.e. from 10.000 to 15.000 (ibidem). The rise was accompanied by surpassed budgets, worsened teacher-pupil ratios and growing waiting lists that raised considerable political concern (Gerrits R. , 2007; Politieke stilte rond wachtlijsten speciaal onderwijs [Political silence around waiting lists special education], 2006).[78] Research was announced and carried out on trends, causes and remedies (Onderzoek naar wachtlijsten speciaal onderwijs [Research into waiting lists special education], 2006; Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Educa (Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education], 2007 May). Trends and causes appeared to be a mixture of a new type of special education that was apparently applicable to many challenging pupils, the opportunity the backpack offered to parents to claim appropriate education for their challenging children, retarded adaptation of schools and institutions to the trend, lack of expertise at schools, and other causes. For the short run an additional budget was allocated. In the long run the new concept of appropriate education and regional co-operation should solve the increasing numbers of challenging pupils needing special education.

8.2.1.3 Provisional assessment of the special schools

As said, it is intended that pupils of special primary school reach the same level of basic knowledge as the pupils of normal primary schools, maybe with some retardation. In fact, the intention often failed, causing major dissatisfaction among pupils, parents and teachers. Common effect is downgrading towards special education of type 4 and to schools at the lowest levels of secondary education and a school career ending clearly below labour market qualification level.

8.2.2 Inclusive education (Together to School Again) in primary education

8.2.2.1 Background and aims

Since the early nineties the policies with regard to care-needing pupils have been changed, on the basis of inclusion-related arguments. It became the clear policy objective that care-needing pupils should be educated in a mainstream environment, together with other pupils and children. A long-standing policy pro-

---

[78] In December 2008, the Association of civil servants in charge of compulsory education control Ingrado published a research report on 2000 à 3100 'home-sitters' in 2007-2008, i.e. young people, who were not attending a school, mostly for other reasons than truancy and dropping out (Ingrado, 2008). The Director referred to challenging pupils and pupils with a psychiatric disability, i.e. the pupils discussed above (ANP/Novum/NU.nl, 2008). In a reaction to me the Ingrado-researcher specified the number of 'type 4 home-sitters' to 90, i.e. less than 1% (E-mail van Helvoirt, 8-12-08). Some weeks before newspapers reported that a 'type 4 child' was send home from a special school because the school could not protect her against bullying from the side of her peers (Dan blijft autist maar thuis [Then the autistic pupils should stay at home], 2008).

gramme for inclusive education was launched under the name Together To School Again, in Dutch: Weer Samen Naar School (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science). Children should get the personal care and special educational care they needed, while attending mainstream primary schools. Schools were to be facilitated for such care, supported by regional expert centres, specialised teachers and professionals. The school budgets were re-organised for this purpose, although insufficiently in relation to the needs and necessities – according to the schools, the teachers and many parents. In principle, most policy makers and process managers evaluated the programme in a positive way, in relation to its intentions and its appreciation among parents, pupils and teachers, until the last programme assessment that was published in 2004 (Peschar & Meijer, 1997; Meijer, 2004).

8.2.2.2 Trends

In 2012, 16% of the pupils would be pupils, who will need special care, while attending mainstream education (Rijksbegroting 2008 [National Budget Plan 2008], 2008).

8.2.2.3 Provisional assessment

Assessment by the General Audit Chamber in 2005 showed that the programme for inclusive education was actually strongly treatment-driven, while its objectives, target groups and output were officially pupil-oriented. The implementation appeared to cause troubles, e.g. with regard to inter-school and regional co-operation as well as interdisciplinary co-operation for multi-problem pupils (General Audit Chamber, 2005). The Minister of Education announced an in-depth evaluation in 2005 that was not published until now (Minister of Education, 2004) .

The programme for inclusive education is to be incorporated in that for appropriate education in 2012, in terms of aims, organisation and budget (State-Secretary of Education, 2007 June 25). The relation between both concepts for the education for children with disabilities and special needs is still rather unclear.

8.2.3 Backpack arrangements for pupils with a handicap

As a complement to the treatment-driven programme the backpack programme for parents of special needs pupils was launched in 2003.

8.2.3.1 Backpack arrangements in primary and secondary education

A backpack arrangement for parents of special needs children was set up in 2003 for primary education and for the lower streams of vocational education in particular, including streams and tracks that cannot lead to the level needed for labour market qualification. Since 2006, backpack arrangements became also available for pupils attending the highest streams of secondary education. In this respect new special needs have been added to those for which parents and pupils may apply, namely extra-ordinary intelligence and emotional forms of autism that may coincide with the level of intelligence needed for these highest streams.

8.2.3.2 Evaluation research on the backpack arrangement

Researchers of IVA, a research institute related to the University of Tilburg, and the University of Utrecht have published an evaluation of the backpack arrange-

ment in primary and secondary education (Sontag, Kroesbergen, Leseman, Steensel, Ven, & Wolput, 2008, January). Positive points that were observed by the researchers were:

- Most schools in primary and secondary education have accepted pupils with mental or physical disabilities, in relation to their backpack and the available expertise in the school, although part of the schools found the backpacks not sufficient to cover all additional costs. Schools reported to be satisfied with the 'inclusive effects', i.e. the enrichment of the school through the enrolment of the pupils with disabilities and special needs. They were negative with regard to the procedures and administrative burden.
- Schools make their own selection among 'backpack' pupils. Apparently, the pupils must pass a threshold of a certain cognitive level and they must be 'normal' to a certain degree. Until now that has not led to obvious problems, because the applications and admission regarded pupils that were already known to the school before, i.e. from before 'backpack times'. The researchers' comment is that a cognitive threshold and 'normalcy' are not fully in line with the inclusion aims of the backpack arrangement.
- Most parents are satisfied with the care plans for their children, but numbers prove that for part of the children the care plans were not made or implemented.
- 'Backpack' pupils perform better at the cognitive level than comparable disabled pupils in special education did. In primary education their performance is lower than that of 'normal' pupils in mixed classes. In secondary education there is no difference. No difference might be related to mainstream streaming and tracking in secondary education, by which the special needs pupils, certainly those of type 4, end up at the lowest levels of lower vocational education. Social and emotional development scores were lower than those of the normal pupils, particularly in the lowest streams of vocational education. The researchers have interpreted these outcomes in terms of the theory of social comparison and relative deprivation, applied to pupils in mixed classes.

In February 2009, the magazine of the largest teachers' union reported an unforeseen side-effect of the backpack arrangements, as far as these were to be spent on special services of regional expert centres for the support of schools and pupils with special needs. In the past years considerable amounts of money were not spent because the centres appeared to be unable to find sufficient personnel for remedial teaching and other support to schools and pupils. The unspent money was, consequently, added to the reserves of the centres. It was not transferred to the schools or to other professional support, as the centres would lose control in that way. The State-Secretary of Education stated in a first reaction that the available resources were to be spent appropriately, and the centres should find appropriate alternatives, would specialised personnel not be available. It was not the government's intention to feed the reserves of the expert centres (Gerrits R. , Speciaal onderwijs pot miljoenen op [Special education is sititng on millions], 2009).

8.2.3.3 Policy concern

Major concern at the moment is that the number of care-needing pupils is 'exploding', for whatever reason, and that the backpack expenditures would rise much faster than the national budget plan would allow (Kammer & Reerink,

2008). Beyond the critical points that were raised earlier by the National Audit Chamber (see above) two new points of concern have appeared on the national policy agenda, being (1) whether the grants are allocated to the pupils and their parent, who really need special care, and (2) whether the outcomes of the programmes will be in line with the national policy aims of quality in education.

The first point might reveal that 'calculating' parents and institutions collect as much and as high grants as they can, irrespective of real needs. The second point might show that the priority of inclusion-related measures and programmes for care-needing children, such as Together to School Again and the backpacks for care-needing pupils, with the aim to keep them in mainstream schools and classes, will be diminished in the long run.

8.2.4 Towards a new care-structure

8.2.4.1 Policy aim: demand-oriented care

In the frame of appropriate education (see above) schools have to respond 'carefully' to the needs of their pupils. In case and as far as they cannot offer the care that is needed they should respond in the framework of regional co-operation. For their care duties they should implement and maintain an appropriate care-structure. In addition they should rely on regional expert centres. The appropriate care-structure should be an improvement compared to the existing care-structure. In a letter to Parliament of 30 September 2005 the Minister of Education announced drastic changes of the existing care-structure. The new care-structure should be less complex and bureaucratic than the existing one. The new care-structure should be based upon the concepts of care-duty and appropriate education. The position of the parents was to be strengthened (Minister of Education, 2005, September 30; Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2005, September 30; Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2006, September 4).

The structure that was announced should be demand-based, while the existing structure was assessed to be treatment-based. Education should be flexible and able to adapt to the needs of the pupils. In the line of argument parents are the starting point. They will ask for an indication of the special needs of their child. On behalf of the indicated needs a backpack will become available (or not) for their child. Then parents will apply for a place for a child at a certain school. In response to the application the school will be obliged to make an appropriate offer to them, either in the own school or in another school. Disagreement is to be settled by a complaint procedure. Parents can receive support at regional support and expert centres.

In this care-structure the pupils in need will be diagnosed centrally and as objectively as possible. Depending on the diagnosis the school will receive a standardised additional budget related to the specific and indicated needs of the child, with which the school will be able to cover the costs of appropriate education. This backpack will be equally available both for normal schools and for special schools, giving more freedom of choice to the parents. In addition, the regional expert centres will dispose of their own budget for specialised care that exceeds the care that school should be able to offer.

The Minister has excluded light needs, such as e.g. dyslexia and light challenging behaviour, from the list of indicated diagnoses. These are actually seen as regular care for larger groups of children and pupils in education. A budget for regular

care like the care for dyslexia and light challenging behaviour is included in the regular school budget, e.g. in the frame of inclusive education by the way of the programme Together to School Again (see above).

The new care-structure will be rolled out over the whole country, without uncovered areas. The implementation should follow the timeline of the implementation of appropriate education for all, although an earlier new care-structure before 2012 would be welcome. The Educational Inspectorate will monitor the new care-structure.

8.2.4.2 First evaluations of the new care-structure

During the very first phase of the implementation of the new care-structure the research institutes Oberon and Sardes were assignment the evaluation of the double financial lines for the care-structure in secondary education. The double lines were first the backpacks for the schools taking care of pupils in the lowest levels of lower vocational education. Second line regarded the care budgets as allocated to regional support and expert centres and their related schools. The first line should cover the extra expenditures within a school, while the second line should cover costs for specialised care and treatment that a school cannot offer on its own. Both schools and regional units were (rather) satisfied with the double lines and most of them could manage their duties without major trouble. All were rather negative on the bureaucratic burden of double accountancy rules. Representatives of the regional units were most positive (Oberon in co-operation with Sardes, 2006, August).

Researchers of SCO-Kohnstamm Institute (University of Amsterdam) have assessed the feasibility of the new care-structure (Ledoux, Karsten, Breetvelt, Emmelot, Heim, & Zoontjes, 2007). Decisive question regarded the feasibility of the policy assumptions, taking into consideration the evidence base with regard to care and education in practice. First assessment is that most of the assumptions appear to be valid, in the sense that available evidence apparently gives support to the assumptions, i.e. it does not contradict them. Critical remark is, however, that some pieces of evidence are weak, but it is not clear whether that regards decisive elements in the line of argument or not. One might agree or disagree on these points.

Further assessment regarded the risks of side effects and other courses of action in practice. The researchers underlined the risks, because the policies are to be implemented by other actors and stakeholders than the policy maker. The latter is the Minister of Education and Parliament, in consultation with relevant actors in the field. But implementation is to be realised by these relevant actors, stakeholders and others in the field. In this frame the following risks were mentioned, among others:

- Insufficient regional and multi-disciplinary co-operation in practice, leading to an unwanted number of outplacements of pupils in special care institutions.
- Therefore, possibly the unwanted further growth of special education and special schools.
- The latter might be reinforced by the pressure to exclude pupils with special needs, exerted by parents of children without special needs and disabilities – they might have objections to the attention paid to appropriate education for children in need.
- Regional differences.

- Best chances for assertive parents compared to those of amenable parents.
- Exaggerated claims, on behalf of parents, schools, centres and institutions.[79]
- Insufficient control and auditing in case the system would follow the worst risk scenario.
- Questionable support on behalf of relevant actors and stakeholders. Now it does not directly appear to be a problem, as the concept and the implementation are still rather open. However, support is not guaranteed with ongoing and further implementation.

So, the researchers have warned for risks at all levels of the feasibility and the implementation of the new care-structure.

8.3 Appropriate education and its inclusiveness: provisional assessment

The following points are our provisional assessment of 'appropriate education' for pupils with disabilities and special needs in The Netherlands, in relation to their inclusion or not in mainstream education.

- Education for children with special needs and disabilities was developed and implemented in a mixed and double system, i.e. inclusive education for pupils with light disabilities and special needs, on the one side, and special education for pupils with severe recognised physical, intellectual or mental handicaps, on the other.
- Push factor for the alternative were and still are additional budget appropriations and concerted expertise in and around schools for special education.
- The mixed and double system has evolved in the direction of backpack arrangements for individual pupils and their parents, as well as the new concept of appropriate education. These have now full political support and priority.
- *At present, there is no further or new political attention for the concept of inclusive education – it will remain the concept for pupils with light disabilities and special needs, as manageable in mainstream education.*
- Appropriate education will be inclusive education in as far as children with disabilities and special needs want to make and will make their educational career in mainstream schools. This is possible. The backpack can be used there, under the condition that the schools can make and will make an appropriate offer, in case in a regional framework and with external support. So, inclusiveness will depend both on individual parental and pupils' choice, on the hand, and on the response of schools to these, on the other.
- A pilot with guidelines concerning 'multilevel contextual learning theory' was assessed positively in 2005 (Mooij & Smeets, 2006). So, the guidelines may help to keep special need pupils in mainstream education, while designing psychologically appropriate learning processes and motivating educational, organisational, and managerial characteristics and procedures for all pupils. Initial findings resulted in the development of a pedagogical-didactic kernel or competence structure and a prototype of Internet-based software.

---

[79] Not mentioned was the adverse risk of non-take-up by part of the amenable parents, due to language troubles, lack of understanding, fear of bureaucracy, fear of labelling and discrimination, etc. As far as we have retrieved the field until now we have not found attention for non-take-up, neither among policy makers nor in research publications..

- Risk factors for inclusive education may arise in this sense: parental pressure against care-needing children, non-take-up of the backpack arrangements, attractiveness of special education and special schools, treatment-oriented undercurrents where demand-orientation would be appropriate.
- Further risk factors are related to new rules and bureaucracy, management troubles, competition between new and old actors, diminishing public support, etc.
- Uncontrolled and limitless expenditures for backpack arrangements as to be expected with an open-end budget scheme (Kam, Koning, Minne, & Mot, 2009).

9 Minorities and education (ToR9)

The issues to be discussed in this chapter regard to inclusion of cultural minorities in education. We follow the points mentioned in ToR9 of the study, i.e. religious minorities, regional minorities, linguistic minorities, immigrant minorities, ethnic minorities, etc. Major issue is that the Dutch educational system was based upon the recognition of religious and other minorities. Minorities and groups were given the constitutional right to establish and maintain their own private schools and further educational institutions. Such schools were to be financed from the state budget under the same conditions as public schools and educational institutions (state-run or municipality-run). Apart from the preservation of the 'pillarised' educational system that was founded after the First World War the issue is still highly relevant. It offers the constitutional right to groups of e.g. parents to establish their own private schools (within the limits of certain conditions and rules with regard to quality and numbers), and it has paved the way towards a highly controversial issue, being the establishment of Islamic schools. This major issue is discussed and provisionally assessed in the first paragraph.

Two further minority issues are discussed in this chapter too. First regards education in the regional language of Frisian as spoken by the inhabitants of the province of Frysia. The other regards the status of immigrant minority languages in education. Both minority issues hold a rather marginal position in The Netherlands, certainly since 'Dutch-only' has become the dominant ideology here in 2002.

9.1 Religious minorities: pillarised education

In this paragraph we will discuss the freedom of education as constitutionally arranged in The Netherlands and its possible impact on inclusion and exclusion mechanisms. At points the impact is more an imaginary impact related to political rhetoric, ideological positions and untouchable mark-stones than evidence based assessment of processes, trends and impact. However loaded the issues and the debate may be, we will try to assess it as clear as possible and to ascertain whether the major issues related to the freedom of education have an impact on ongoing inclusion and exclusion mechanisms, intended or unintended.

Here, inclusion and exclusion are terms referring to inequities in school choices and educational careers related to class, gender, ethnicity, and, in case, disabilities and special needs. In this respect, it refers to unrealised potentials at the level of pupils and to schools that do not admit certain pupils.[80]

Since ten years a certain relationship with immigrant minority education has emerged. Some Muslim immigrants have taken their constitutional freedom to establish their Islamic schools. These Islamic schools have become an object of concern for Dutch groups and parties, mostly at the right side of the political spectre, with regard to possible Muslim isolation and segregation. For that reason the liberal party VVD would like to introduce severe restriction with regard

---

[80] It is to be taken into consideration that the terminology of social inclusion is also used in another way in Dutch debate concerning the freedom of education. It regards the possible feeling of belongingness that may keep schools, parents and their children together as members of an imaginary community within Dutch society, such as the imaginary community of Catholic people, Protestant people, etc. It was the original ideological foundation of 'pillarisation' and it is the actual argument in favour of education for people 'like us'.

to the freedom to establish a school, and the more radical right wing would prefer to forbid them immediately, as they would not represent the national Christian-Humanist-Jewish beliefs and traditions. Besides, Islamic schools are schools that attract high numbers of deficient pupils, for which the schools receive additional means (see chapter 3 on inequities). In that sense points as discussed in that chapter may play a role here too, directly or indirectly.

9.1.1 The constitutional freedom of education

Since the time of the First World War education in The Netherlands is constitutionally free. People are free to establish schools and to send their children to the school of their choice. They cannot be forced to send their children to public schools or to community schools, whereas private schools are to be financed from the state budget at equal terms with public schools. The role of the government is restricted and regards three major issues:

- To guarantee education for all children and pupils and to establish schools under its own authority or that of municipalities for all, whenever and where-ever necessary,
- To set rules for the establishment of private schools, with regard to the minimal number of pupils that is required, and with regard to the quality of education,
- To guarantee equal financial conditions for public schools and private schools that are all fully financed by the state.

For a long time, the arrangement was rather unique in Europe, where in most states either the state or regional educational authorities were responsible for education, and where private schools were usually fully of partly dependent of school fees.

9.1.2 Pillarisation

The system is based upon a constitutional arrangement settled in 1917 between contesting blocks and parties in the country. It is known as the educational pacification[81] and it has laid ground to the Dutch pillarised society (Lijphardt, 1968). Since then, Catholic and Protestant schools have been established as well as schools related to other religious denominations or pedagogic philosophies such as Montessori, Dalton, Boeke, anthroposophy, and others. Together with the public schools, these private schools were forming the local and regional educational markets, where parents could make their choice and make their choice. Until the late sixties the choice was predominantly dependent on religious identity (Catholic, Protestant) and for a minor number of parents on their pedagogic preferences. The successful emancipation of Catholics and Protestant minorities in the first half of the twentieth Century was highly influenced by the 'own' educational institutions, stretching from kindergarten up to universities such Amsterdam Free University (Protestant) and the Universities of Nymegen and Tilburg (Catholic).

Public schools attracted the children of the growing number of non-believers in the urban areas since the nineteen-thirties (Thurlings, 1979) as well as children attending local prestige gymnasiums that were governed by the municipalities.

---

[81] The deal regarded general franchise as required e.g. by the social-democrats on he one side and state finances for Catholic and Protestant schools as promoted by Christian factions and parties on the other.

For good reasons it was assumed that the bond between schools, parents and pupils was high and that they belonged to the same imagined community.[82]

9.1.3 'De-pillarisation' since the mid-sixties?

Although the bond diminished obviously and quickly since the late sixties, the pillarised school system was not changed. The rules for the establishment of schools were not changed and the financial guarantees remained the same. However, the system became more and more an open market system, where schools were competing for new pupils. In the course of time it became clear that parents were choosing on other grounds than denomination. The choice became a mixture of arguments with regard to quality or imagined quality, class and ethnicity, both in primary and secondary education.

Apparently, there was no support in Dutch politics and public opinion for an institutional 'de-pillarisation' in education. The existing institutions have kept their leading role in the establishment and governance of schools, whereas parents kept their free choice on the educational markets. Only a few opinion makers, either belonging to the (left-wing) Association of Public Education (Vereniging van Openbaar Onderwijs) or some liberal writers argued that the time of pillarised education had gone. Actual change on behalf of many schools of the Christian denominations was that they did not insist any longer on the adherence of parents, pupils and staff to their denomination, as long as they would not act against the basic philosophy of the school. Non-believers or adherents of other denominations were accepted as pupils and staff.[83]

At the side of the public schools the tendency was that they became increasingly independent of their educational authorities, either being the state or the municipalities. At first the State followed a policy of increasing the financial autonomy of schools since the eighties, with consequences both for the private schools and for the public schools. At second, in the nineties the state transferred its public schools to the municipalities were they were founded. As a consequence there were no longer schools that were directly run by the Ministry. At third, many municipalities agreed to establish (semi-)independent local educational committees and boards that ruled their schools in name of the municipality. Besides, municipalities agreed with mergers between their schools and private schools, either under the umbrella of the private school board or under that of (semi-)independent local boards.

9.1.4 Islamic schools

We have discussed earlier that since the mid-nineties of the last century the identification of 'white' and 'black' schools has become a current political issue. It was caused by mass immigration from former colonies and from Mediterranean countries in the seventies and eighties, and their concentrated settlement in the poor urban zones. The schools in those zones became black schools for disadvantaged pupils, many of them being of immigrant descent. It became clear that the issue needed careful political attention.

---

[82] But form time to time the pillarised system was also attacked and debated because of segregation and isolation mechanisms in society, and the lack of inter-relations between Catholic, Protestant, etc. children and young people.

[83] There remained a number of 'orthodox' schools that did not follow this change. Others did so with 'ups and downs', referring to tides of 're-pillarisation'. In combination with the maintenance of norms, values and rules this has become a marketing argument for a number of schools.

Points to be considered were whether admittance rules of private schools and parental free choice in the frame of 'pillarisation' were related to class and ethnicity.

With regard to admittance rules the situation was that schools had the constitutional right to refuse admittance of pupils, who did not share the school's identity. As immigrants and their children were usually not Catholic or Protestant they could be refused by the schools. So, the schools would not need to adapt themselves to these pupils, their culture and their disadvantages. They would leave the burden to local public schools. It has never been proved clearly that many private schools have operated in this way. Most of them functioned at the time as community schools, just like their public counter-parts. Only in a limited number of cases clear pre-selection and severe admittance control of e.g. Muslim children was observed. At the same time it appeared rather difficult to organise local consultation mechanisms between school directors and school boards where the best 'burden sharing' with regard to 'disadvantaged pupils' were to be settled (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2008, p. 2).[84]

With regard to parental freedom of choice the situation is much more complex. The national condition that was labelled as the segregation between 'black' and 'white' schools in the country since the mid-nineties is obviously related to parental freedom of choice and the practice of native parents to send their children to the schools of their choice and kind (Kartsen, Roeleveld, Ledoux, Felix, & Elshof, 2002). Peters, Haest and Walraven have revealed that it is apparently very difficult to change the trends in this respect (Peters, Haest, & Walraven, 2007). However, neither the Education Council nor the government have concluded so far that segregation was actually fostered by the freedom of choice. Therefore, there was no reason to abandon or restrict the freedom (Onderwijsraad [Education Council], 2002 July; Minister of Education, 2004).[85]

Another point of high concern was that Islamic groups wanted to establish Muslim schools of their denomination. Since the eighties around 40-50 Muslim schools have been established, attended by a small share of all children from Muslim families.[86] Major points in favour of these schools were that this

---

[84] See also the case reports on de-segregation practices in the next chapter.

[85] Close reading might reveal that both the Council and the government cannot deny the relation between freedom of choice and segregation trends in Dutch education. For them, for most major parties represented in Parliament and for the stakeholders of the Educational Province the issue is actually an almost absolute political taboo. Actions and measures are usually not clearly appropriate but remain in the margins of political engineering.

[86] In 2003 there were 41 Islamic primary schools and two secondary schools. It regarded 0.6% of all primary schools. In 2003, the number of pupils was 8366 or 0.54% of all pupils in primary education (Minster of Education, Culture and Science 2004, April 23). In 2006 there were 46 primary schools and two secondary schools. These schools had lost 5% of their pupils, particularly at schools that showed low performances (NRC Handelsblad 2008, February 4). An Islamic secondary school in Rotterdam was fined for unacceptable expenditures (NRC Handelblad 2008, February 12). Two board members of a local Islamic school have been dismissed for mismanagement by a court decision (Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Audit Service of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science], 2007 February 28; NRC Handelsblad 2008, January 31). The State-Secretaries of Education charged the Educational Inspectorate to control the governance and finances of the Islamic schools. They reported that 86% of these schools abused public funding and that half was weak in terms of governance and educational practice. They announced measures, including the pay back of abused funding, severe control on governance and educational quality, and the possible closure of schools that would remain too weak in the near future (NRC Handelsblad, 2008; State-Secretaries of education, 2008, November 13; Educational

denominational group should not be denied its constitutional right, as far as the establishment would suit with the rules, and that denominational education might strongly contribute to Muslim emancipation in The Netherlands as it had done for Catholics and Protestants in the first half of the twentieth century (Lijphardt, 1968; Thurlings, 1979).

The establishment of Islamic schools aroused serious trouble in public opinion. In part of the public opinion these schools were feared to suffer of mismanagement, to encourage non-integration and segregation in society and to foster Islamic extremism, including Islamic terrorism. Both the report of the National Education Council and the letter of the Minister on Education, focussed on the changes that have accompanied the immigration of Turkish and Moroccan people, most of them being Muslims. They have stated that Islamic groups should have and do have the same freedom with regard to the establishment of their schools. They insisted both on targeted quality control and control with regard to the democratic principles and the state of law. As measures at short run the government intended to implement rules with regard to religious education and to encourage further management training among Islamic board members. As a general measure the government announced to make 'active citizenship' an obligatory aim and subject for schools of all levels. The Educational Inspectorate should control the implementation of this law, particulary at Islamic schools (Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, 2008, p. 12).

Recently, Ahmed Marcouch, who is the Moroccan-Dutch district-major of one of the 'Islamic' districts of Amsterdam, has argued in a different way, namely not to forbid Islamic schools or to hinder them by severe controls. He has pleaded for improved and attractive public education for all young people in Amsterdam and in his district, and to *compete with Islamic schools* in this way. As far as the believing parents of believing children would raise demands for religious education as permitted by the law and as far as they would behave 'differently' without breaking a law and acceptable school rules, these were to accepted (Marcouch, 2009).

9.1.5 Assessment?

The assessment of the constitutional freedom of education by the Education Council has not revealed clear weaknesses of the system nor a clear relation with segregation tendencies or the unwanted and dysfunctional exclusion of pupils. Clear revelations on these points are not to be expected in The Netherlands, because the evidence base is weak. Besides, most political parties and the religion-based in particular (Christian Democrat and more orthodox Protestant parties) do not want far-reaching changes. Since 2002 the Parliamentary majority has been dependent on them, and therefore the freedom is fostered strongly. However, also other coalition parties do not make a strong point against it, on the contrary.

In paragraph 3.3 the relation was discussed between the segregation of 'white' and 'black' schools, parental freedom and the reluctance to counter-act it on behalf of school boards and local authorities (Peters, Haest, & Walraven, 2007).

It should be noted that Islamic education still regards a marginal phenomenon in Dutch education: less than one percent of the schools and the pupils. Most Mus-

---

Inspectorate, 2008, November). The Association of Islamic Schools reacted by the announcement of a moratorium on new Islamic schools for three years (NRC Handelsblad, 2008).

lim children in The Netherlands are not attending Islamic schools. They are dispersed over other schools that function as local community schools in their underprivileged districts. Sharper quality control and administrative control should be applied as measures against mismanagement and weak schools.

9.2 Measures to support indigenous linguistic minority children, i.e. Frisian speaking children (ToR 9.2)

In The Netherlands, three regional languages have acquired a recognised status as a minority language. These are Frisian as predominantly spoken in the province of Frisia/Friesland/Fryslân, Limburghian as predominantly spoken in the province of Limburg, and Lower-Saxonian as predominantly spoken in the North-Eastern regions of the country.[87] The recognition of Frisian as an indigenous minority language dates back since almost 100 years, whereas both other languages have been recognised more recently, i.e. some ten years ago. For the promotion and education of Frisian a rather fixed sum of 1.8 MEURO is reserved annually on the national budget,[88] to be supplemented by provincial and local budget allocations. Both other indigenous minority languages are supported by provincial and local budget allocations.[89]

Since the ninety-seventies Frisian has been a compulsory subject in primary education and a school subject in secondary education (Mercator-Education, 2007; Over Friese taal en cultuur [On Frisian language and culture], 2004). Although it is assumed that the measure has been in favour of the children's linguistic capacities and biculturalism and that it has contributed to the strong position of Frisian as a formal and informal regional language, specific effects are unclear. Most schools and teachers do not test their proficiency in Frisian, and Frisian is not part of the national tests at the end of primary education. As far as teacher training is concerned, teachers need and usually obtain a certificate for teaching Frisian, but this does not always imply a satisfactory command of the Frisian language.

In secondary education, six out of ten Frisian teachers test their students. There is a national final exam for Frisian, for students that choose Frisian as a subject in higher grades (Jager & Meer, 2007, p. 44).

Independent experts, who have assessed indigenous minority education in Europe, evaluated Frisian language education as being insufficiently fulfilled in pre-primary, primary and secondary education, in relation to the European standards with regard to minority language education (ibidem).

---

[87] Actually, all or most regions and places foster local dialects and language variants. Experts have made vocabularies, writers have used the dialects and variants as the language of their novels and poems, local spelling competitions have been organised, etc. However, such language practice goes without official national, provincial or local recognition, because recognition would have lead to retribution claims with regard to education. That would be too expensive, also because the national authorities do not support such indigenous language action, apart from the longstanding support of Frisian education and language action.

[88] 1.4 MEURO is reserved for language education and 0.4 MEURO for cultural action and language promotion.

[89] There is no evaluation research on these languages in education since their recognition as indigenous minority languages. Therefore, we have restricted the issue to Frisian in education.

9.3 Measures to support immigrant languages

9.3.1 Immigrant languages in primary education

Since 2004 immigrant languages have lost their place in the school curricula. Since then, immigrant languages are offered by private institution and immigrant organisations to children and parents, who are apparently interested in learning the language that is spoken at home and in the family, in the mosque, and other places. The participation in private classes and courses offered by immigrant organisations can be subsidised e.g. by municipalities, private funds, the European Commission, etc. State finances are no longer available for them (Extra & Yagmur, 2006, p. 55).

Until 2004, the immigrant languages have shifted from full curriculum status in the nineteen-seventies to extra-curricular subjects in the nineteen-nineties (Extra & Yagmur, 2006, pp. 54-56). In the nineteen-seventies school with considerable numbers of immigrant pupils could offer to them the subject of 'own language and culture'. Later the culture was left off and in 1998 the name of the subject changed into immigrant living languages. It was offered as an extra-curricular option for the schools and their pupils. Teachers were part of the staff and their salaries were covered by the school budget.

It has often been stated later that the subject should prepare the children for re-migration, together with their parents, who were supposed to return to their country of origin after a limited number of working years in The Netherlands. As research has proved, the subject functioned actually as an enrichment program for children, who grew up in a bi- or multilingual environment: language learning in general and learning Dutch was improved compared to Dutch-only schools and pupils (Avoird, Broeder, Extra, & Yagmur, 2003; Vallen, 2003).

Major reason for the abolishment of the subject in 2004 was forced by mainstream politics and its focus on integration with strong assimilation tones and 'Dutch-only' in education. As said, the subject was abolished and the 1400 (part-time) teachers of living immigrant languages were dismissed. First inventories in 2006 showed that local plans for institutionalised education in living immigrant languages outside the schools were not yet enacted, even not in the major cities (Extra & Yagmur, 2006, p. 56).

9.3.2 Immigrant languages in secondary education

Compared to the former status of immigrant languages in primary education immigrant languages have not had any status in secondary education for a long time. Not until 1987 there was no provision in Dutch educational legislation to offer immigrant languages as a subject in secondary education. Since then, schools have had the opportunity to offer additional foreign language courses, in addition to the fixed three that have been offered since ages: English, French and German (Extra & Yagmur, 2006, pp. 56-58). Other languages can now be chosen instead of French and German, including examination. These languages are: Arabic, Russian, Spanish and Turkish.[90] Spanish is most popular with 1500 exams for upper secondary education in 2005. For the other languages there were less than 100 examinations.

Beyond these 'examination languages' courses and classes in languages such as Chinese, modern Greek, Hindi, Papiamentu, and Portuguese are offered too.

---

[90] And Frisian, see above.

9.3.3 Assessment

The incorporation of immigrant languages could be a push factor with regard to the inclusion of immigrant children in the schools, although the positive effect is questioned for several reasons. Part of the reasons is related to national identity and the need of a clear Dutch-only profile in education and society. Part of it is related to educational arguments. Bilingual education would not be in the interest of the children concerned, as they would become insufficiently proficient both in their home language and in the national language. Debate is continued, but The Netherlands has clearly opted out the opportunities for bilingual education in primary education for their immigrant pupils.

At a limited number of schools for upper secondary education pupils have the opportunity to chose other foreign languages than French and German, even as their examination subjects. Their actual number is restricted, however, apart perhaps from Spanish, being one of the European languages of wider diffusion.

10 Four cases (ToR 10 and 11)

In this chapter we will discuss four cases of enhanced inclusion in Dutch schools. Two cases regard local initiatives and attempts to change the increasing segregation between 'white' and 'black' schools that are actually situated in a mixed urban environment (see chapter 4). In contrast to the doubts we raised with regard to the effects of desegregation measures and policies, these cases showed that such effects may follow, under certain conditions of e.g. parental pressure, commitment on behalf of the school staff and targeted policies and actions of local authorities.

The third case will show the extra-ordinary success of a school in opening up best educational opportunities for disadvantaged pupils, i.e. in realising the aims of priority education in relation to social, economic and ethnic inequities (see chapter 3). In contrast to the doubts we raised with regard to the effects of priority measures and policies, the case showed that such effects may follow, under e.g. the condition of full commitment of the school staff, parental involvement and permanent monitoring of individual achievements as well as school achievements.

The fourth case regards the policies and measures of the municipality of Amsterdam and its office for compulsory education plus to reduce early school leaving, in co-operation with the schools. The case is interesting because the municipality reported a reduction of 21% in three years.

10.1 Parental initiative in Amsterdam at primary school Sint Jan

10.1.1 Background

De Baarsjes is a city district of Amsterdam with a high number of immigrant inhabitants. Indicator is the percentage of immigrant minority people, adding up to 35.8% per 01-01-07 (Stadsdeel De Baarsjes [City district De Baarsjes], 2008). The percentage has been higher in the past, but since the renovation of the city district, the population was more diversified. A number of years ago most primary schools in De Baarsjes were so-called black schools that were predominantly attended by children with an immigrant background. Most native Dutch parents who lived in De Baarsjes brought their children to so-called white schools or mixed schools in other parts of Amsterdam, with no or lower numbers of 'immigrant' children.

In 2002, two native Dutch middle class neighbours wanted to undertake action, because they found the distinction between immigrant and native Dutch in De Baarsjes undesirable. They decided to register their children at the nearest primary school 'Sint Jan'. This was a black school with 75% pupils of immigrant descent. It was located next door in their street. The school was to be ranked as a 'quality school' in relation to the achievements of its pupils and the assessment of the educational inspectorate. So, the two parents wondered why other native Dutch parents brought their children to other, i.e. white schools in other parts of the city. The neighbourhood around the school is ethnically and culturally mixed, which gives an excellent opportunity to create a mixed school. The two parents and the school thought this to be important for the children and their development. They were to become acquainted with different ethnic backgrounds and cultural lifestyles. And for all parents, it would also create an opportunity for

meeting each other. So the school and the 'initiative-parents' decided to recruit of a considerable number of native Dutch children and so to transform a black school into a mixed one.

10.1.2 The parents' initiative

The two parents asked the headmaster what he would think of becoming a mixed school and what actions parents, headmaster and staff could undertake to do so. They volunteered to recruit more native Dutch children. But, for the intended change further changes and investments of the school would be needed. The headmaster decided to inform some key figures and institutions in his school. They all responded in a positive way on the possible change from a black school into a mixed school.

The two parents and the school staff produced a leaflet that should inform other 'white-middle class' parents in the vicinity of the school about the school and the initiative. The two parents handed it over in person to other parents with young children. The locations to do this were for example playgrounds and crèches in the neighbourhood, or supermarkets where they met other parents with young children. The leaflet included an invitation for an information evening in the school. Parents who were interested could see the school, feel the atmosphere in the school and meet with each other. Local media and local authorities provided serious publicity. The promoting activities took effect. The result of the initiative was the registration of native Dutch middle-class pupils, although in a rather dripped way.

Together with these new children, a new group of parents entered the school. They have their own ideas and opinions on what is good for their children, different from the existing curriculum, practices and physical conditions of the school. A remarkable issue that offered new opportunities for new school curricula and practices regarded the field of (fine) art and (high) culture. Therefore, as to become more attractive for native Dutch middle-class children and their parents, the school started with new activities in the field of (fine) art and (high) culture. The native Dutch parents as well as the immigrant parents were invited to help to organise these activities. As to enhance the promotion effects of the activities, the local media were invited for special events, like the opening of an arts and culture route. As intended, it produced considerable publicity for the school. At the same time the teachers introduced new issues in the school's curriculum. This produced extra publicity too. As an attractive school building is important for parents, the school board invested in the maintenance of the building and the school square. During the initiative, the two parents created several newsletters about the initiative to inform parents with young children about the initiative and its result so far.

All these activities took the intended effect. Three years after the start of the activities, the lowest grades showed a mixed population of pupils (50 – 50 percent). The school is still investing in mixing the school population, by organizing activities and the targeted recruitment of new pupils, both native and immigrant. Because of the change in population the school received less financial support from the government. This is a reason why some black schools do not want to have a mixed population. But according to the headmaster of Sint Jan, this is not a problem. At least not for primary school Sint Jan: since the school is a mixed school the population increased from 210 pupils in 2006 to 280 pupils in 2008.

As a result, the school received more money. Besides, the school also received a special grant for the transition from a black school to a mixed school. So Sint Jan did not experience any negative financial consequences.

10.1.3 Evaluation

10.1.3.1 Ideas & aims, the good intentions

The two parents started their initiative in 2002 by registering their children at primary school Sint Jan (at that moment a so called black school, situated in a mixed neighbourhood) and proposing actions towards mixing the school population. The parents distributed leaflets on the initiative and together with the school they organized a meeting. The school arranged attractive changes of the school curriculum and invested in the physical appearance and the maintenance of the school building. At strategically chosen occasions, the school arranged publicity and presented itself as a school of interest. This is a process continuing until today.

10.1.3.2 Implementation, process and effects

According to the evaluation studies that were carried out, the actors dealt with factors of success and failure (pull-factors) in particular and interesting ways:

- Large and goal-oriented effort of the two parents who took the initiative, the headmaster and the teachers,
- The school and the parents worked together in a most cooperative way,
- Parents who had to choose a school for their children were not forced to do this in a particular way; the municipality neither the school told the parents what to do, but the two parents invited them to consider a visit of the Sint Jan,
- Interesting and binding activities for different groups of parents and their children; a strong team of teachers to take care of a new group of pupils,
- Positive media attention and word-of-mouth advertising. Parents were confronted with the Sint Jan in several ways,
- Arranging preconditions, like the physical appearance and maintenance of the school building and the renovation and rehabilitation of the surrounding city district attracting people from higher socio-economic classes,
- Sint Jan was a quality school already.

Besides the success factors, there might also be a boomerang effect. The school has become really very attractive for native Dutch-middle class parents. At this moment the school is a mixed school, but it might turn into a 'white' school in the end, by pushing out lower class immigrant parents and their children.

The case Sint Jan has demonstrated the decisive role of individual parents, who want to initiate change in the field of ethnic school relations. In several other cases of desegregation schemes, the parents were forced by policy makers to subscribe to the one school or another, without reference to their constitutional and educational freedom. In this case parents 'made' and implemented the scheme.

10.1.3.3 Dissemination

The initiative used publicity through the media in a positive way. The local media still visit Sint Jan regularly. And also the national media and other schools make site-visit to the school. Sint Jan is a so-called 'classic' under the parent initiatives.

10.2 Actions against ethnical school segregation in Tiel

10.2.1   Background

Tiel is a middle large municipality in The Netherlands with 41.132 inhabitants in 2008. As in most Dutch 'middletowns' a considerable portion of the population consists of immigrant minority people, in case 13,5%. Half of the ethnic minority people is under the age of 20. So, most of them are attending a school in Tiel. Among the native population a quarter is of that 'school-going' age (CBS Statline).

In terms of school choice many native parents living in mixed city districts appeared to be inclined to register their children at popular 'white' schools in other parts of the city. This process had led to a rather obvious ethnic segregation in Tiel, particularly in primary education: some schools were much more 'black' than the population in the surrounding district and some were too 'white' in this respect. In the early nineties already, the local government and the three local school boards agreed that such segregation was the wrong outcome of the parents' free school choice. With the aim to foster desegregation they have developed and implemented local dispersion schemes. The initial one was apparently in violation with the constitutional freedom of education and legislation against discrimination, in the sense that immigrant children were placed and replaced in schools when maximum percentages were exceeded. Therefore the initial scheme was followed up by an applicable one, named *natural recruitment zones scheme*. In the frame of this scheme, primary schools should be a representation of the neighbourhoods in which they are located. This means that the ethnicity of the children in the schools should be proportionally equal to the population in the neighbourhood of the schools. So, children with different backgrounds would get the opportunity to come together in schools, while they will also meet each other in the neighbourhood. Their parents will meet each other too. This should strengthen the social cohesion in the neighbourhoods.

10.2.2   The natural recruitment scheme and the school districts of Tiel

To realize the goal of desegregation, the school boards in Tiel formed and implemented their natural recruitment zones scheme. These school boards are private Catholic and Protestant as well as public (municipality run in the past). Together they have formed a co-ordinating body for all their schools, called the BCP (Bovenschools Coördinatie Punt). The BCP established the natural recruitment zones in Tiel. Each zone had a mixed population. In each zone there is a Catholic, Protestant and a public school. So, according to the boards and the BCP, parents would have sufficient opportunities to choose a school in relation to their constitutional freedom of education[91]. Children should go to a school in the zone they

---

[91] The natural recruitment zone policy is said to take into account the freedom of parents to choose a school they like, in accordance with the Dutch law. The present local policy with regard to recruitment zones is an alternative and improvement of an earlier experiment with dispersion and recruitment zones. The school boards agreed on maximum percentages of immigrant pupils for each school. During the years, more immigrant pupils entered the schools, so the percentages were exceeded. The support of the schools and the parents for this dispersal scheme evaporated. The Commission of Equal Treatment (Commissie Gelijke Behandeling) judged the scheme as 'discriminating' for immigrant pupils, because of a distinction between pupils based upon race.

live in. This means that schools would not be allowed to admit children from other zones. In case of admittance against this rule, the admitting school would have to explain the scheme and aims to the parents. Then, they should advise them to register their child at a school in the recruitment zone they live in. Although not all the headmasters agreed with this line of action (they were afraid to of losing children, and becoming a smaller school), they promised their board to carry it out appropriately. But they cannot be obliged to do this, in relation to the constitutional and legal framework with regard to school choice. In the first period of the natural recruitment zone scheme the headmaster of the Montessori School in the city centre of Tiel supposed that the scheme was not meant for his school, because the school is a general specific school (*algemeen bijzonder)*. This type of school is rare in the region of Tiel, so pupils from outside the city also visit the school. He continued to recruit pupils from other recruitment zones in Tiel. But under the pressure of the other schools he had to stop this action. Although he still thinks that an exception for his school is desirable, he carries out the natural recruitment scheme. Parents who insist on bringing their child to the Montessori School can ask the BCP for permission. After all, in case parents would insist on registration at a school outside their recruitment zone, parents would be allowed to refer to a special procedure of exception. In a letter to the BCP the parents should explain why they prefer to register their child at a specific school outside their own zone. In relation to the arguments the BCP may give permission to register at that school. The procedure includes an appeal opportunity, in which the BCP should write a final conclusion after hearing the parents.

10.2.3 Evaluation

10.2.3.1 Ideas and aims, the good intentions

The discussion about ethnic school segregation in Tiel started in 1992. The municipality and the school boards intended to counter-act ethic school segregation. Children should live with each other in the neighbourhood and in the school. Therefore the school boards and the municipality developed and implemented desegregation schemes. The timeline of the development of the schemes against this segregation started in 1992:

     1992: Start with the development of the initial dispersal scheme
     1993: Introduction of the dispersal scheme
     2005: Commission of Equal Treatment stated that the dispersal scheme is discriminatory with regard to race
     2006: Introduction of the natural recruitment zone scheme
     2007: Evaluation of the natural recruitment zone scheme

10.2.4 Implementation, process and effects

In the course of time, the schemes in Tiel have been adapted incrementally. Relevant actors, i.e. the municipality, the school boards and the schools formed and reformed the schemes step by step in response of the practice. The schemes were not clearly set out in time limits. So, there was no planning with regard to the targets, nor to that of the evaluation of the schemes. With the change in 2006, the school boards have included a process evaluation in their plans. The municipality is carrying out desk research on the district indicator of the zip-codes of the parent(s) and their children in relation to school choice every two years, as

to report whether schools followed the scheme with regard to the recruitment of their pupils.

As far as evaluation studies have been carried out, these regard process evaluations and case studies. It might be concluded from the case of Tiel that relevant actors have to be sure of full support of the school boards and the schools, when they want to initiate desegregation policies and schemes. In a country as The Netherlands with its constitutional freedom of education, they should also take serious notice of the role of the parents. Besides, actors should also take side-effects and boomerang-effects into account. Some schools lost new pupils, because of the introduction of the school districts. Before, they attracted many children from the whole city, while registrations diminished under the new scheme. The support of the headmasters for the measures may easily diminish in relation to an effect such as this one.

However, the case of Tiel appears to prove that, even under the condition of a high freedom of choice for schools and parents, there are opportunities for desegregation schemes. This success was enhanced and fostered by:

- The mutual agreement between the local actors – i.e. school boards, schools, parents and municipality,
- No fear of discrimination, and
- A high level of parents' participation.

10.2.4.1 Dissemination

In general the case of Tiel has been assessed as a successful example for other municipalities. The dispersal scheme received high media attention, and it attracted the interest of researchers and other municipalities. But since this policy failed, the level of attention dropped. That might be the result of the fact that the policy makers did not give much publicity to the natural recruitment zone policy.

10.3 Best achievements at Mozaiek School, Arnhem

10.3.1 Background

Mozaiek (Mosaic) is a school for primary education with two locations. It showed obvious and remarkable quality achievements in the past years, as will be explained below.

Today, it counts 425 pupils in 23 classes. 98% of the pupils is of immigrant descent, usually being first or second generation immigrants themselves. The school includes 50 staff members. Most of them are tenured, experienced teachers. Three full-time positions regard the school leader and the location leaders, who do not 'have' a class of their own. Two staff members regard pupil advisers. Support staff for special needs pupils is on external assignment. Further staff regards class assistants and trainees. Many staff members hold a part-time position.

The school is a 'black' school, located in the southern districts of Arnhem. Arnhem is a provincial capital in the east of the country. It has almost 150.000 inhabitants, of whom 17% belonged to immigrant minorities in 2007 (CBS, 2008). The schools are located in the city district 'at the other side of the river Rhine'. These are predominantly post-war districts for cheap housing. Therefore, the districts represent the weaker districts of the city, with the highest concentration of immigrant families with many deficient children since the 1970-ties and 1980-ties. In 2008, 62% of the younger children (0-15 years of age) were of immigrant

descent (Gemeente Arnhem, 2009). The districts are to be renewed and reno-vated, at all levels: economically, socially, culturally and in terms of housing and living quality. The school is an important player in the policies and processes targeted at district renewal and renovation, as the school is the place of learning for the children, as it is the natural neighbour of pre-school and day-care ar-rangements, as it is an important community centre for the immigrant parents, and as it is apparently successful.[92] Most parents are low on education and 65% is jobless. Most depend on long-term social security, living in poor or rather poor conditions.

Most local native or 'white' parents and their children have avoided the school since the beginning of mass immigration in the 1970-ties. They may prefer other schools in the vicinity or in nearby districts and villages, although a number have been struck by the obvious quality of the school. As far as motives are known these appear to be related to cultural difference and the company of friends and family in schools and classes. Native or 'white' parents and their children appear to avoid the company of many children and parents that might be 'different', and they prefer to be among their 'equals' and 'friends'.

The school is not focussed on the issue of race and difference, although it may refer to the deep cultural divide in Dutch working class districts. The school is focussed on the performance of its pupils in basic skills as needed for further education and society, and at realising the highest gains in this respect during the eight years of primary education. The measurable performance at this point is obvious and remarkable. Since years, the average scores of the pupils for their final test with regard basic skills in language and arithmetic skills were on or be-yond the local and national average. The gain from an obvious deficient position at early childhood up to that point is very remarkable. Most schools did not suc-ceed to reach an average score beyond expectation and many even showed a score below expectation. At this school the scores were clearly and significantly beyond expectation. Therefore, the school is willing and able to advise a major part of its pupils to proceed to the upper streams and tracks of secondary educa-tion. The usual pattern is the other way around, namely that even the possibly talented boys and girls from 'black' primary schools were to proceed at the lower streams and tracks of secondary education and vocational training.[93]

The school could rely on additional funding on behalf of the weight rules as well as other funds for priority education (see paragraph 3.3).[94] So, the conclusion should be in favour of priority measures as applied at the Mozaiek school.

---

[92] The school is not mentioned in the district renewal plan (Gemeente Arnhem).

[93] Since 2005 it is tried to reset this mechanism through insertion classes (see paragraph 2.3.2) – talents with language deficiencies should receive intensive language training during one year. It should enable them to proceed to the streams and tracks of upper secondary education. Mozaiek has participated as a leading partner in a local insertion pilot, applying its philosophy and measures to the insertion class, particularly by assigning an older top-teacher to that class. The 'class' showed an enormous gain as de-sired in the first year. The results in the following three years were lower than desired and contradic-tory. Major hindrance was the finding of real talents that were only deficient with regard to their profi-ciency in Dutch. As the class should have at least 10-15 pupils for a full year, pupils without clear tal-ents and promises, or even pupils with major learning problems and challenges, were admitted. In this way, the insertion class started to function as a rebound arrangement or as a second chance facility for pupils with low scores on their tests. Therefore, the school is considering not to continue its involve-ment in the insertion pilot in 2009-2010.

[94] The school leaders reported in an interview that the conditions have really been changed since 2007-2008. Since then, priority funding is fully dependent of the level of education of the parents, no longer

10.3.2   What the school has done

10.3.2.1   Ideas and aims, the good intentions

Taken together, the measures that were undertaken look like an applied KISS-principle – Keep It Stupidly Simple. Core business is high quality education. For the school leaders it means: build your team and see your returns on the investments. Teachers must have the ambition and the professional capacities to deliver the required quality.

These core issues in the school's philosophy have been elaborated in the course of time, and they will be adapted to further feedback, experience and understanding. For making the school effective in this respect it needed a clear and targeted structure with:

- Strong, inspiring, demanding and coaching educational leadership,
- Focus on basic skills, being thinking, communication and analysis in good Dutch,
- Monitoring and analysis of the achievements,
- High ambitions and expectations,
- Safe and ordered school climate, clear planning, organisation and management,
- Appropriate and preventive pupils' care.

10.3.2.2   Implementation, process and effects

The children are to be bound and challenged by education and educational demands put on them. School-time is used and managed very strictly, in a challenging and demanding way. From the first moment until the last the children are approached with words and language to be understood and other elements of the basic skills to be learnt, e.g. in the field of arithmetic's, world orientation, study skills, culture, sports, etc. In contrast to most schools, the school-day or the school-week does not start with sitting together, while children may tell about their important recent experiences. The days start with learning and the pupils are challenged to learn step by step all points on the school's curriculum. They are challenged to express their knowledge and experience in good class communication and interaction with their teachers, during the school-day as part of the work to be done, or as part of after-school activities. In addition, pupils may participate in extra hours and lessons after school in presence of their teachers – most teachers stay at school until the end of a normal workday, i.e. until around 17.00H.

The school is safe and ordered. The school leaders thought that it is safer and better ordered than what appears to be the usual atmosphere in Dutch schools. Safety and order are, however, not aims in itself, but are maintained in relation to the educational philosophy and practice. The latter would be hindered by a loose climate, avoidable safety incidents, loud noise, and wild or disturbing interaction between the pupils in the classes and on the playgrounds.

The school is taking care of pupils with special needs and intends to be as 'inclusive' as could be. The school's policy aim is that special needs children should not

---

on ethnicity and immigration. They referred to immigrant parents, being newcomers, who have attended a language school during e.g. one year. They were marked as 'highly educated' not needing priority means for their children, because the language school was affiliated to a local centre for upper vocational training and adult education. Actually, their level remained nearly as low as it was in their country of origin, apart from their learning basic Dutch and basic points on the country. Their level was not strongly improved by only one year at a language school for newcomers. But the Mozaiek school was cut considerably on its priority funding.

be over-demanding in relation to the needs of the other pupils, as all pupils are at risk, anyway. Therefore, remittance of a small portion of indicated special needs children, e.g. in the field of speech difficulties or in that of severe learning difficulties, in unavoidable. However, for a Dutch school the remittance to special education is comparatively low. It has been around 2% in the course of time, while the national average is around 5%.

At the location of the schools also pre-schools have found a location. In recent years the participation of immigrant children from the neighbourhood under 4 years of age has increased considerably, leading to improved preparation of the 'deficient' children for primary education. The pre-schools have chosen and adapted their linguistic didactics in co-operation with Mozaiek. Side-effect of the pre-schools is also a more or less predictable number of well-prepared new pupils. So, the school saw that the declining number of immigrant pupils in the 1990-ties has now turned into considerable growth among these pupils.[95]

The school and the school-leader acknowledged that the philosophy is most demanding for the teachers. Demands are apparently higher than at most other schools. The school relies on an experienced team of teacher, school-leaders, and advisers. The selection of new teachers is sharp. The school-leaders and the team will not appoint a new teacher, who does not fit into the profile, and does not have the required capacities and ambition. In case of need they prefer to fill in the vacancy by taking extra hours instead of appointing a doubted candidate. Further, new candidates and teachers have to participate in a starters track of the school itself, without the usual extra tasks of experienced teachers. Would then the new teacher, nevertheless, appear not to meet with the demands of the schools, he or the will not be tenured after probation time. He or she is to be outplaced from the school.

10.3.3 Evaluation

The evidence of the effectiveness of the Mozaiek schools is offered by the annual analysis and assessment of the pupils' scores for basic subjects at the final test in the last year of primary education, in comparison with the scores of the other Dutch schools and the other schools in Arnhem. PAS, a municipal research and assessment centre, has gathered and analysed these scores since the early 1990-ties. It stated that the scores are fully comparable since 2006 (Burgers & Woudenberg, 2008 June). In the three years since 2006, most scores of the pupils at the Mozaiek schools were almost equal to the national average. After correction for deficiencies and inequities the Mozaiek-scores were significantly higher than the corrected national and local average (Burgers & Woudenberg, 2008 June, p. 28). It is beyond doubt that the intentions of the school have been realised, fully or partly. As a result, a considerable number of pupils was send and admitted to upper streams and tracks of secondary education.[96]

Internally, many tests were scheduled for the eight years of primary education at the Mozaiek schools. Test results are used for individual feedback and adapted plans and measures. They are also used as feedback on teachers' performance,

---

[95] As said above: growth was not realised among (new) native 'white' pupils.
[96] In an interview, the school-leaders expressed considerable doubt about the sustainability of the admittance. Most local schools for upper secondary education do not adhere the educational philosophy of the Mozaiek schools, to which the pupils have become accustomed during their eight years there. On the contrary, the climate appears to be rather loose and unordered while intercultural experience remained low. The Mozaiek pupils with their immigrant background might get lost easily.

e.g. in case pupils make lower scores on the average with a new teacher in their class, in the same grade, etc. In case, teacher counselling, inter- and supervision as well as teacher training might be adapted, while new teachers, who appeared to be unable to meet the high demands of the schools, were to be out-placed.

We may conclude that the Mozaiek school is reflecting a most rational, effective and efficient case of priority education, offering best chances to pupils at social, cultural and ethnic risks. According to the school-leaders their intentions were that good and they have thought that the implementation would need their targeted measures. Until recently they did not know and did not think that they really have been effective, on the average and in individual cases, at least not as much as was proved by the PAS-assessment. They hope to be able to continue their work in line with their educational philosophy, as simple as could be.

10.3.4 Dissemination

The intentions have been published on Mozaiek's website, with reference to earlier prizes and positive publications (mozaiekarnhem.nl). Local attention has remained mixed or even low, among others while the school had the image of being strict, severe and demanding in relation to its personnel. The dominant feeling might have been that primary education should be fun. The State-Secretary of Education showed interest in Mozaiek, however, in the beginning of 2008, in relation to her funding scheme for language pilots in primary schools (see paragraph 3.3.1)

The obvious achievements were reported in the PAS-monitor (see above), and some local and other observers will have noticed the outcomes and the evidence. In December 2008 the national quality daily NRC Handelsblad published a feature on the school and its extra-ordinary accomplishments. Since then, Mozaiek has become one of the leading examples of how to manage quality education.

10.4 Promising measures to reduce early school leaving in Amsterdam

10.4.1 Background

Since two years the municipality of Amsterdam represents an exemplary case of reduced early school leaving. Effectively, the figures showed a reduction of 21% in the period 2005-2008, from 7,8% of the total school population in secondary education[97] down to 6.2%, on a total of 45.000 pupils. The reduction was accompanied and reinforced by municipal policies and measures. It was also accompanied by increased awareness with regard to urgencies and responsibilities for both the level and the reduction among the most relevant actors in education. Most relevant actors are the schools for upper vocational education. Their percentages of early school leavers were beyond 15%.

Amsterdam has two major clusters of schools in this respect, namely the regional clusters for upper vocational education 'Amsterdam' (11.000 pupils) and the regional cluster Amarantis (4000 pupils). The municipality has concluded special agreements with the school boards on taking responsibility for reduced early school leaving and appropriate measures. At the schools the municipality's bureau for Compulsory Education Plus (LeerplichtPlus) has initiated pilots of its new measures at two units belong to each cluster. It is a reasonable conclusion to

---

[97] And primary education, as far as relevant.

relate the reduction of 21% to the agreement between municipality and relevant actors, on the one side, and the measures as carried out, on the other. The piloted measures will be rolled out in the coming school year.

Detailed figures as now available on the national website for early school leaving (www.voortijdigschoolverlaten.nl) showed that the numbers of early school leavers are comparatively high in Amsterdam and other major cities, and that it is occurring predominantly *in upper vocational education beyond the age of compulsory education*. Compulsory education is now up to the age of 18, while it was until 16 with partial compulsion for 17-18. According to recent legislation, young people above 18 remain obliged to reach a start qualification at ISCED-level 3C, up to the age of 23.[98]

10.4.2 Implementation

The measures as applied reflect an atmosphere of control and numbers. They include a combination of reliable and immediate registration, municipal control of the schools and the school leavers, measures targeted at absent pupils and their parents, and measures to reduce the effects of absenteeism and leaving mechanisms. The latter may regard absenteeism among teachers or bad time schedules, on that side, and 'luxury absenteeism' (early and prolonged holidays, shopping days), on the other side. All measures are taken under the condition of good, attractive and challenging education that should reinforce the perspectives of the pupils in the future.

The atmosphere of control and numbers is not surprising, as the Bureau of Compulsory Education Plus's background is the old municipal control agency for compulsory education and the regional co-ordination centre for early school leaving among non-compulsory pupils. Control and numbers are and were the heart of the profession of the officers working there. They relied on the capacities of teachers, school management and school care teams to guarantee good, attractive and challenging education for their pupils, in consultation with parents and experts as far as needed. The officers that were consulted for the present study, however, underlined their commitment to good, attractive and challenging education. It is their intention to support the best educational careers for the pupils by urging them to go to school or to return there, in case of early broken careers. Therefore, they want to know immediately and exactly which pupils are absent and why. They have developed the forms and protocols for clear and easy registration. They have taken direct control on the registration by relating control officers to schools, thus creating direct and easy communication lines. Their number has, therefore, been doubled.

These control officers, the bureau's management and the Councillor of Education in Amsterdam keep in touch with the schools, units and staff, as needed on what is to be done for absent pupils and early school leavers. This regards, among others, immediate contact by phone and in person with absent pupils and their parents, if needed.

---

[98] Officers, both at the Ministry and the municipality of Amsterdam, are convinced that the prolonged age of compulsory education has direct reduction effects on the numbers of early school leavers. It is clear that high numbers and percentages start and started to occur at the end of compulsory education (see chapter 2).

In addition to control and communication the bureau itself has strongly intensified its practice of home-visits to absent and lost pupils.[99] The bureau is supporting its communications with brochures on specific issues and risks of absenteeism and early school leaving, and a general periodical magazine. These are distributed among schools, parents, authorities, and pupils as relevant.

The municipality, the bureau and, increasingly, the schools keep to the principle of "don't let them go". Amsterdam has implemented the principle now by two measures. The one is that no pupils can be out-placed or place them-selves out[100] from school or unit without clear appointments on his or her next school, rebound place, or further track, such as the youth desk of the job centre. The second is that the pupils remain on the school's list and registration record until a new place is assured, even in case of disciplinary out-placement.[101]

With the schools the control is co-ordinated, as to assure that the school and the bureau keep to their responsibilities. In the pilots the practical sides of the reduction of absenteeism and early school leaving were explored, and the tracks were elaborated on who should do what. It was also shown that the schools themselves could and should take measures the reinforce reduction effects, apart from 'severe' registration and control of absenteeism, on the one side, and better, more attractive and more challenging education. Teachers and further school staff can be kept to their responsibility to be in their classes (or other locations as appropriate) at their scheduled hours, and schools can be kept to the responsibility of a full and doable time-schedule for the pupils. In upper vocational education as well as in other streams and tracks of secondary education too flexible classes, teachers and time-schedules appear to reinforce absenteeism among the pupils, while a present teacher and a full time-schedule apparently discourage it.

10.4.3   Encouraging outcome

The encouraging outcome is the highest reduction of early school leaving in the country since regional data were made available in 2005. As said above, the reduction was 21% in two years.

---

[99] Making home-visits is often very time-consuming, because persons may not be there or refuse to answer the doorbell. It would mean that all control officers would consume all or most of their time with making home-visits. The alternative was a new position of assistant control officer for the first contacts.

[100] For instance, in case of longer diseases, difficulties with finding a probation place, wrong choices of stream or track or unit or school, or de-motivation.

[101] Exception might be immediate police custody in case of (assumed) crime and detention.

11 Dutch measures – summary and conclusions

11.1 Materials and methodology

For this report the team has focussed on materials as available, with special attention to:

- Policy priorities and the further framing of measures that should support inclusion,
- Targeted measures,
- The evaluation of measures and policies,
- Our provisional assessment of the measures.

First challenge was to reframe the national educational and political discourse of The Netherlands in relation to the terms of reference. We made considerable progress, but we did not find the perfect match. Even at the level of the direct translation of Dutch terms some hesitations have remained.

In the report we followed the terms of reference of the Commission, giving a review and preliminary assessments of research materials and evaluations as available. For the summary we regrouped the terms of references in line with the five policy frames to be used in the comparative assessment of inclusion measures (Muskens, 2008 September), i.e.:

- Measures to reduce early school leaving and to re-integrate lost pupils (par. 11.2),
- Measures in the frame of priority education in relation to social, economic, cultural etc. inequities and deficiencies (par.11.3),
- Measures in the frame of 'inclusive education' for pupils with a handicap, special needs, etc. (par. 11.4),
- Measures in the frame of safe education (par. 11.5),
- Measures that should support teachers and further staff to keep their pupils aboard (par. 11.6).

Now, we will discuss the outcomes of our review, referring to the general remarks that we formulated in chapter 1 (par. 11.7), as a further step towards the comparative assessment of inclusion measures in European education (par.11.8).

11.2 Early school leaving

Early school leavers have been identified as a serious issue in Dutch education and labour market policies since 2002, among others in relation to the Lisbon Declaration that included the aim of reducing early school leavers by 50%. Dutch definitions and official counts of early school leavers have been re-assessed since then, targets have been set and measures have been implemented. The level of early school leaving and persons entering the labour market with insufficient qualification was considered to be too high. Policy papers referred in this respect to the European statistics, with special attention to comparable figures in the surrounding countries, i.e. Belgium, Denmark, Germany, France, Spain, the United Kingdom and Sweden. All were below the European average in 2004, except Spain, while all were below The Netherlands, except Spain and the United Kingdom (EUROSTAT).

The national target was the reduction of the number of early school leavers by 50% in 2011. At the same time, the target group of early school leavers was re-

defined. The national target was set to reduce the number of *new* early school leavers to 35.000 per year. Measures were to be taken to keep young people in track as long as they did not achieve the labour market start qualification, so keeping the number of 'new cases' low.

The Ministry of Education has taken action in three directions, i.e. preventive measures, correction measures for dropouts from school and measures with regard to the improvement of registration. Preventive measures followed from the assessment that schools have undertaken insufficient and inappropriate preventive inclusion measures. Therefore, improvements could be realised in this respect. Correction measures were needed because dropouts were hanging around causing troubles. Improved and centralised registration was seen as a necessary pre-condition for early warning procedures, improved co-operation between schools, welfare institutions, judicial authorities and municipalities in their joint measures against early school leaving, petty crime and troubles with young people in the cities.

A recent report of the Scientific Council for Government Policy laid highest emphasis upon 'stressed' pupils, who become early school leavers, particularly in the poor districts of the larger cities. The Council proposed better care for these pupils and dispersion measures to reduce the amount of stressed pupils per school or class to a manageable level of around 35% (Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy], 2009).

Targeted impact assessment of both Van der Steeg & Webbink and the General Audit Chamber have *revealed that the effectiveness of the measures against early school leaving has remained unclear* (Steeg & Webbink, 2006 February; General Audit Chamber, 2006 May). The Chamber observed that the Ministry had launched new preventive, correction and registration measures in successive blocks of three years, without assessing their effects.

11.3 Priority education

Priority education has a rather long history in The Netherlands, since the 1960's-1970's. The history has been summarised in chapters 3 with regard to priority measures that should 'empower' deficient pupils, and in chapter 9 with regard to the measures concerning specific religious, linguistic and regional minorities. Here we will summarise the current sets of measures, i.e.:

- Measures that should give the schools the means to 'empower' their deficient pupils (weight rules, (par 11.3.1),
- Insertion classes (par. 11.3.2),
- Local agendas and frames in this respect (Local Agendas, par. 11.3.3),
- Measures that should diminish the segregation between 'white' and 'black' schools (par. 11.3.4),
- Extended schools (pre-school, full-day schools, par. 11.3.5),
- Measures in the frame of minority education (par. 11.3.6).

11.3.1 Weight rules

In relation to the number of priority pupils, schools received additional resources since the late 1970's. The Ministry applied a set of weight rules for deficient pupils. The schools can spend these additional resources for extra teachers and assistants, or to offer remedial teaching and other methods and counselling as appropriate. Until August 2006 ethnicity of the students was the most import-

ant indicator of deficiency, and therefore for the weight rules to be applied, being a multiplier of 1.9 per pupil. For indigenous students with uneducated or lowly educated parents, the weight rule was 1.25.

These rules were assessed to neglect the needs, inequities and deficiencies of culturally poor white families and schools in rural areas (Vogels & Bronneman-Helmers, 2003). Further, the established weight rules were thought to represent a multicultural ideology that was not longer politically correct in the country since '0911'. The minister of education used these arguments for changing the *weight rules*. The new measure is formulated as follows (CFI, 2006):

- 1,3: The parent has lower vocational education as a maximum degree;
- 2,2: The parent has primary education or little more (few years of special secondary education) as a maximum degree.

11.3.2 Insertion classes

When children perform obviously below their level because of deficient language skills, the level can be brushed up with an intensive language course in primary education. During one school year, the students can follow a language course in Dutch in special insertion classes. The purpose of the insertion classes is a better moving on through their school career.

This measure is relatively new. During a pilot year 2005-2006, the results of the 20 pilot cases were encouraging, particularly for progress with regard to language learning (Mulder, Hoeven, & Ledoux, 2007). The promising effect was confirmed in a recent study on 115 insertion classes with 1250 pupils in 2006-2007 (Mulder, et al., 2008).[102]

11.3.3 Local Agendas

The weight rules regard national rules that are applied for all schools in the country. The insertion classes are funded from the national budget on the basis of local applications and plans. Further policies and measures have been decentralised considerably in the past decade. However free and autonomous schools have been since almost 100 years (see chapter 9), most budgets and budget rules were a matter of national rule and authority. However, since ten years schools for primary and secondary education receive a lump-sum budget from which all expenditures and priorities of the school were to be covered – with an increasing number of national exceptions related to national priorities and priority funds, such as insertion classes, rebound classes, quality impulses, national registration systems, etc.

For an increasing number of priority issues the State has done a step backward, in favour of the schools, on the one side, and local or regional policy-making and co-ordination, on the other. Local or regional policy-making and co-ordination were apparently needed, e.g. to assure a certain level of burden-sharing with re-

---

[102] A school that we visited for its extra-ordinary gains with regard to 'deficient' immigrant pupils (see paragraph 10.3) has participated as a leading partner in a local insertion pilot, applying its philosophy and measures in the insertion class, particularly by appointing an older top-teacher for that class. It showed an enormous gain as desired in the first year. The results in the following three years were lower than desired and contradictory. Major hindrance was the finding of talents that were only deficient with regard to their Dutch. As the class should have at least 10-15 pupils for a full year, pupils without clear talents and promises, or even pupils with major learning problems and challenges, were admitted. In this way, the insertion class started to function as a rebound arrangement or as a second chance facility for pupils with low scores on their tests. Therefore, the school is considering not to continue its involvement in the insertion pilot in 2009-2010.

gard to deficient or challenging pupils, and to develop prevention strategies against e.g. early school leaving or ethnic segregation. Therefore, part of the national priority means have been decentralised under the control and authority of the municipalities and/or regional co-ordination centres. Therefore, municipalities and regional centres should develop their programmes and measures, in co-operation with the schools and other local partners as appropriate.

Among the introductory remarks we have asked attention for this rather complex policy and co-ordination model. It regards, among others, policies and measures to diminish the segregation between 'white' and 'black' schools, and those with regard to the extended school. These are summarised below.

11.3.4   De-segregation measures

In The Netherlands, the debate on ethnic school segregation is focused on 'white' and 'black' schools for primary education and shifting ethnic choices of parents in relation to the 'white' or 'black' image of a school. It became a major issue in the largest cities in the 1990's, but smaller cities and some villages also have to deal with it. It regards among others small cities in industrial zones, where large numbers of 'guest workers' have settled since the 1960's and 1970's, as well as rural places with major asylum centres.

Ethical school segregation is caused by three factors:

- Composition of the population in the cities/segregated city districts: poor people are concentrated in cheap housing areas; the portion of immigrant people among the poor people in the cities is high.
- Ethnic school marketing: some schools are apparently attractive for indigenous pupils from well-to-do families. While others make themselves attractive for immigrant pupils (e.g. to attract priority funding) or have become the trash of the local educational market. According to Pas & Peters (Pas & Peters, 2004) these mechanisms can result in the segregation of black schools and white schools.
- The choices for schools made by parents – see chapter 9. Parents are almost fully free and entitled to choose a school for 'our kind of people' and many obviously do so. This choice caused the so-called white flight from 'black' community schools. In the meantime the flight is followed by an upcoming 'black' flight of highly educated and upward mobile people of immigrant descent to better suburban districts and their more attractive schools. Ethnical segregation is apparently coinciding with socio-economic segregation.

There are no national policy-making measures against ethnic school segregation. But in August 2006, the government introduced a new policy line in co-operation with the municipalities and the educational authorities, called the Local Education Agenda. The municipalities and the educational authorities were to come to binding arrangements on measures against ethnic school segregation and they should hold consultations on the issue. In November 2007, the Local Education Agenda has been evaluated. Over 90 percent of the municipalities had a Local Education Agenda, or was developing one. Around 66 percent of these municipalities and 50 percent of the educational authorities were satisfied with the consultation (Kruiter, Rijken, & Wit, 2007).

Since the 1980's, only a few municipalities have implemented promising measures against ethnic school segregation. In chapter 10 we presented two cases of local measures against ethnic school segregation. One case regarded two 'white'

and highly educated parents, who approached, with success, as many other parents of their kind as they could, stimulating them to register their children at the local 'black' school in their neighbourhood. The other case showed the implementation of local dispersion measures that should diminish ethnic segregation between local primary schools. The municipality found a strategy that was more or less acceptable for all schools and most parents, without being in conflict with Dutch legislation. Therefore, it is a promising example.

11.3.5 Extended schools

Mainstream education time of Dutch pupils includes first compulsory education from 4 till 16 years of age, plus years of further upper secondary and tertiary education as needed and as accomplished. Each year includes a number of class hours: around forty weeks during five to seven hours. The education time is extended for many pupils, partly on the initiative of the pupils and their parents themselves (private hours and classes), partly as part of the school curriculum (homework), and partly on behalf of policy consideration. The latter refers to both to pre-school education and to after-school education as offered and financed in the frame of local priority schemes. Pre-school education and after-school education should help and empower deficient pupils in mainstream education, with the emphasis on language learning by immigrant pupils being deficient in this respect.

Participation in pre-school education for deficient children of 2,5-4 years of age is apparently developing well. Presently, 70% of the targeted children do so. Learning programmes are continued in the lowest grades of primary education for the children aged 4-6.

After-school education for deficient pupils represents a variant of full-day education and care that lays highest emphasis on the interrelationship between education, socialization, leisure and care, during school time and after school time. It was set up as a comprehensive preventive measure against social, economic and ethnic inequities in the early 1990's. The purpose of this variant of the extended school is to offer development chances to children, empowerment, care and participation/involvement of the parents. Therefore, the chances and empowerment profile fits the extended school best.

Presently, the attention has shifted towards day-care arrangements for the children of working parents. The educational goals of these arrangements are less important, both in terms of activities and professionals. Activities regard predominantly sports and leisure, not supervised by teachers and other educational professionals. For that reason the assessment of after-school education as a measure in the frame of priority education became rather unclear.

In a recent assessment of Dutch education, the Education Council recommended to give highest priority to 'extended education', i.e. to more years and hours of education, in pre-schools, after-school-hours, summer courses, etc. (Onderwijsraad [Education Council], 2009 February, p. 10)

11.3.6 Minority education

Major issue with regard to minority education in The Netherlands is that the Dutch educational system was based upon the recognition of religious and other minorities. Minorities and groups were given the constitutional right to establish and maintain their own private schools and further educational institutions. Such schools were to be financed from the state budget under the same condi-

tions as public schools and educational institutions (state-run or municipality-run). In this frame, 70% of all schools for primary and secondary education were established as private schools.

Apart from this point, the issue is highly relevant and controversial for another reason too. It has paved the way towards the establishment of Islamic schools, although its actual scope and scale is rather restricted in practice. Since the eighties around 40-50 Muslim schools have been established, attended by a small share of all children from Muslim families. Major points in favour of these schools were that this denominational group should not be denied its constitutional right, as far as the establishment would suit with the rules, and that denominational education might strongly contribute to Muslim emancipation in The Netherlands as it had done for Catholics and Protestants in the first half of the twentieth century (Lijphardt, 1968; Thurlings, 1979). The establishment of these Islamic schools aroused, however, serious trouble in public opinion. In part of the public opinion these schools were feared to suffer of mismanagement, to encourage non-integration and segregation in society and to foster Islamic extremism, including Islamic terrorism.

Two further minority issues are discussed in the chapter on minority education too. First regards education in the regional language of Frisian as spoken by the inhabitants of the province of Friesland. The other regards the status of immigrant minority languages in education. Both minority issues hold a rather marginal position in The Netherlands, certainly since 'Dutch-only' has become the dominant ideology here in 2002.

11.4 Inclusive education?

Chapter 8 of the present report regarded the inclusion of pupils with disabilities or special needs in mainstream schools and education, i.e. 'inclusive education' in its restricted meaning. It was, however, not the central issue of the chapter, as in national policies, measures and practices it has lost the priority position it appeared to gain in the 1990's. These days the concept of 'appropriate education' and a system backpack grants for pupils with medically recognised disabilities is prevailing, in addition to what is left of 'inclusive education', on the one hand, as well as a full parallel system of special schools for primary and secondary education, on the other. We have reviewed the concepts and measures of 'appropriate education', 'special education', 'inclusive education', backpack arrangements for pupils with special needs, and the care-structure in education that offers support to the schools, the pupils and the parents.

The following points are our provisional assessment of 'appropriate education' for pupils with disabilities and special needs in The Netherlands, in relation to their inclusion or not in mainstream education.

- Education for children with special needs and disabilities was developed and implemented in a mixed and double system, i.e. inclusive education for pupils with light disabilities and special needs, on the one side, and special education for pupils with severe recognised physical, intellectual or mental handicaps, on the other.
- Push factor for the alternative were and still are additional budget appropriations and concerted expertise in and around schools for special education.

- The mixed and double system has evolved in the direction of backpack arrangements for individual pupils and their parents, as well as the new concept of appropriate education. These have now full political support and priority.
- *At present, there is no further or new political attention for the concept of inclusive education – it will remain the concept for pupils with light disabilities and special needs, as manageable in mainstream education.*
- Appropriate education will be inclusive education in as far as children with disabilities and special needs want to make and will make their educational career in mainstream schools. This is possible. The backpack can be used there, under the condition that the schools can make and will make an appropriate offer, in case in a regional framework and with external support. So, inclusiveness will depend both on individual parental and pupils' choice, on the hand, and on the response of schools to these, on the other.
- Risk factors for inclusive education may arise in this sense: parental pressure against care-needing children, non-take-up of the backpack arrangements, attractiveness of special education and special schools, treatment-oriented undercurrents where demand-orientation would be appropriate.
- Further risk factors are related to new rules and bureaucracy, management troubles, competition between new and old actors, diminishing public support, etc.

A more general point of discussion regards the possible conflicts between three factors. The first factor is the point that targeted measures might be appropriate in relation to the handicaps, special needs and/or deficiencies of children and young people. The second factor is the necessity to avoid the stigmatisation and discrimination of children and young people with handicaps, special needs and/or deficiencies. The third factor is that outplacement from mainstream education might be an easy mechanism to 'trash' those children and young people, who do not fit into the mainstream.

We will discuss the point further below.

11.5 Safe education

Chapter 6 regarded the policies and measures undertaken against bullying and harassment in schools, in the wider frame of the measures in the field of safety protection in and around the schools. We will not discuss the relation between safety protection, measures against bullying and harassment, on the one side, and inclusion, on the other. We take the relation for granted in the sense that unsafe schools and severe bullying and harassment are assumed to drive pupils from school.

We paid attention to the following current measures:
- *Preventive measures*, i.e. a special course as an intervention coach for teachers and other staff, a special course to learn social competencies to pupils, and the attention for active citizenship as part of the national curriculum.
- *Curative measures*, i.e. individual counselling of pupils in primary and secondary education, casework and multidisciplinary care teams in the schools, improved co-operation with youth care institutions as well as consultation bodies and multi-disciplinary case teams together with professionals from youth care and the judiciary.

- *Repressive measures*, i.e. rebound and so-called time-out, restart and rebound arrangements for pupils 'needing' a temporary outplacement.
- *Support measures,* i.e. support by a new centre for school and safety and its websites with good practice suggestions for schools, teachers, parents and others, features on 'honour' revenge in the school class, websites against digital bullying, a safety monitor for all levels of primary and secondary education, and measures against gender discrimination as well as the discrimination of homosexuals.

With regard to the current measures the following outcomes were reported:
- Since 2006, almost 700 teachers and other staff were trained as an intervention coach, and 150 to 200 of them have participated in a return day.
- The effects of the courses to improve social competencies of pupils were unclear.
- The attention for active citizenship is a very recent new part of the national curriculum. The Inspectorate of Education was unable until now to assess the process and the outcomes.
- 75% of the schools knew that means are available for casework at school by the end of 2006. Among these schools 78% have attracted at least one staff member for casework and special care. In many schools multidisciplinary care teams were set up.
- The number, scope and scale of rebound arrangement has grown rapidly since 2005. In 2007 81 of 84 national bodies for the regional co-operation between schools disposed of rebound schools and classes. The arrangements offered 4000 rebound places for pupils, who were to be out-placed in these arrangements temporarily. Almost 3000 pupils were effectively placed there.
- It was intended that pupils with very challenging behaviour, for whom 1000 extra places were made available in special education, would return to normal schools for primary education after one years. The percentage of pupils, who returned to their old mainstream school, to another mainstream school or a centre for upper vocational training was 66% of all rebounded pupils in 2007. In a special report, the Educational Inspectorate concluded that half up to three quarters of the 21 arrangements it visited in 2007 offered rebound education at an acceptable or even good level. Further, it was rather critical on relevant issues for an educational rebound arrangement.
- A controlled experiment with a standardised anti-bullying package learned that control schools were as effective with regard to their anti-bullying measures as were the experimental schools. Reason was that the control schools had developed their own interventions and measures during the two years of the experiment, while experimental schools changed the interventions and measures in the course of time, in relation to feedback and needs. We might conclude that every measure beyond doing nothing might be effective, to a certain extend, while the most effective method might not exist.

The last point is relevant for further comparative discussion and assessment (see below).

11.6 Teacher support measures

The teaching of pupils at risk is an extra burden to the teachers involved. It is obviously unattractive in a comparative sense. Therefore, the best qualified teach-

ers may not be available for schools in the poor urban districts or in declining rural village schools, while the best might be needed for the schools and pupils involved. Experts have stated at several occasions that the teaching of pupils at risk should be most attractive in terms of salary and other conditions. The Minister has opened some opportunities for an extra salary increase for teachers in difficult urban and rural districts, however in the margins of the general improvement of salaries and further labour conditions.

A targeted increase in relation to the teaching of pupils at risk appears to be in conflict, however, with an undercurrent argument in the public debate on teacher measures. The undercurrent argument regards the position of academic teachers, who were usually not enrolled in the education of pupils at risk. Their natural field of employment regards upper secondary education, not lower secondary education, special education, inclusive education or primary education. The undercurrent has tempered the political attention for the teaching of pupils at risk. So, the impact of the new measures on teachers, pupils and schools at risk might be less than needed. Other measures appear to be more appropriate for that end. To this end, being a teacher for pupils at risk should be made more attractive, e.g. by a structural salary increase for that work and by diversity management and positive action in teacher training and the personnel management of schools.

11.7 Two remarks

In the introductory chapter we have made a number of remarks with regard to Dutch education as reviewed in this report. One of them we should repeat here. It regards the claimed uniqueness and incomparability of Dutch education, to a certain extent.

Then we will make some further remarks on issue raised above with regard to targeted measures, stigmatisation and the trashing of pupils at risk. Both are to be seen as steps towards the comparative analysis and assessment.

11.7.1 Unique and incomparable Dutch features?

Referring to partly convincing arguments, Dutch policy-makers may claim that important parts of Dutch education are unique in such an extent that comparison with the education in other Western and European countries is rather obsolete.[103] These parts regard among others the so-called pillarisation (free education at private and denominational schools, see chapter 8.1), the education of children with a handicap (appropriate education, see chapter 7), the registration of immigrant pupils, e.g. in relation to the so-called weight rules (see chapter 2), and the embedding of measures against bullying and harassment in wider frame of 'safe education' (see chapter 6).

We may agree that Dutch education is unique, to a certain extent, for issues such as these. We do not agree that the uniqueness would make comparative analysis and assessment obsolete, for the following reasons:

---

[103] The claim is not supported by strong evidence from official publications such as the Eurydice reports on Dutch education (European Commisison–Eurydice, 2009) or by important national or international statements. It regards a more colloquial claim that is often made in the side-line of national and international presentations and statements, further to everybody's claim in international debate that any educational system represents unique features and sides along national or regional lines, to a certain extent.

- The standpoint might close the eyes for interesting measures, developments, pilots and good or bad practices in other countries and places, although nobody would deny that lessons were to be learnt from these.
- In other countries the attention for measures, developments, pilots and practices in The Netherlands might remain low, however interesting these might be – why should one pay high attention to these, when it is claimed that they are unique, incomparable, and therefore not applicable in other countries and places?
- Further comparative assessment and analysis may reveal that uniqueness and incomparability might be exaggerated. In the preliminary theoretical and comparative analysis and assessment of the ten national reports we have revealed issues and points with regard to e.g. the freedom of education, the education of children with a handicap, the registration of immigrant and minority pupils as well as 'safe education' that deserve comparative attention as well as the implementation of measures at a wider European or international scale, within the frame of national and regional educational governance (Muskens, Theoretical issues and preliminary comparative conclusions with regard to inclusion and education. Internal interim report, 2008 September; Muskens, Theoretical issues and preliminary comparative conclusions with regard to inclusion and education. Internal interim report, 2008 September).
- The national and international interest in comparative analysis and benchmarking in education has received increasing national attention, in The Netherlands and elsewhere. It regards, among others, comparative figures on early school leaving (EUROSTAT), and the achievement level in reading, mathematics and science through PISA, PIRLS and TIMMS. From these projects and their datasets further comparative analysis has been initiated, e.g. with regard to the relation between governance and achievement or between inequities and school achievements (OECD, 2007, pp. 169-282; Heus, Dronkers, & Levels, 2009 January). These analyses will increasingly cover inclusion issues, on the one hand, as well as 'unique' Dutch issues as mentioned above, on the other. The present national report and its embedding in the European assessment of inclusion measures in primary and secondary education were to be seen as a serious step forward in that direction.

11.7.2   Targeted measures, stigmas and trashed pupils

Above, we referred to the possible conflicts between three factors. The first factor is the point that targeted measures might be appropriate in relation to the handicaps, special needs and/or deficiencies of children and young people. The second factor is the necessity to avoid the stigmatisation and discrimination of children and young people with handicaps, special needs and/or deficiencies. The third factor is that outplacement from mainstream education might be an easy mechanism to 'trash' those children and young people, who do not fit into the mainstream.

For targeted measures as appropriate and necessary the target groups are to be defined – in some cases in raw lines, in other cases with great precision. Such precision might follow from restricted financial and professional capacity, and/or from claims on these capacities, e.g. on behalf of parents, specialists and special schools, etc. The more precision is needed the more the target groups is to be labelled and indicated in clear terms. In The Netherlands it may regard the

immigration history of the family, and parental status and education in relation to priority measures. It further regards medical diagnoses with regard to handicaps, learning difficulties, challenging behaviour, etc. Unavoidably, the target groups and their members are to be labelled and indicated, with the risk of stigmatisation and discrimination processes and mechanisms. White flight and segregation as well as the resistance of certain parents against too many 'troubled pupils' in the classes of their children may represent these processes and mechanisms. However, until now the advantages of better and more targeted measures appeared to outbalance the risk of stigmatisation and discrimination.

Then, we turn to the third factor – are pupils at risk trashed? The point is directly discussed by Heinz Bude in his recent book on the groups that are at risk of exclusion for society. He referred, among others, to young people in lower secondary education, who receive the label of being 'tired of education' in the eyes of their teachers. It regards a generation with no chance in their eyes, and they cannot do much about it (Bude, 2008).

The pupils are certainly not trashed in the literal sense of the word. Nobody would do so, nor intend to do so. The mechanism, however, is that out-placement and downgrading is reinforced by an educational system that offers the opportunities for that. The Dutch system is offering these opportunities widely. First, is includes special schools and institutions for all kinds of handicaps and special needs, both at the level of primary and secondary education. The system and its ideology is not 'inclusive, unless', as in Italy or Scotland. Out-placement in special education is offered as a fine and serious option. However, as far as educational quality is not guaranteed in special education, the special schools would actually mean the downgrading of the children – in that sense they may be 'trashed'. Second, it offers wide opportunities to parents to send their children to the school of their choice and kind, and therefore to reinforce the segregation between 'white' and 'black' schools – 'black' school then becoming proverbial trash-schools. Schools are not primarily community-related as in Germany or France, but market-related. Third, it includes a rather wide variety of schools, streams and tracks in secondary education, both lower and upper. It is not comprehensive, as e.g. the system in France or Sweden. Most parents prefer direct admittance to schools for upper secondary education for their children, while they would not appreciate an advice for a lower secondary school. Such advice is often and easily seen as downgrading and trashing the children, to the regret and astonishment of e.g. its committed staff.

We think that the stigmatisation and that of trashing pupils at risk may occur as a kind of interaction effect, in combination with 'appropriate' measures. Therefore, they should not be neglected in national and international debate.

11.8 Towards comparative assessment

At the end of the preparation of a national report such the present one, we might feel challenged to take position in a number of national debates on educational issues and improvements as needed.

To begin with, we would like to stress that the inclusion issues that were reviewed and assessed in the report should attract more political attention than they do, compared to the other priorities of Dutch educational policies that were mentioned in the introductory chapter: improved quality of education in relation to language and arithmetic's, the attention for the teachers' perspective and

workload, free schoolbooks, full-day care, and the minimal number of contact hours in secondary education. We might like to elaborate upon the national inclusion (and exclusion) issues and measures that were reviewed in the chapters of this report, i.e. those with regard to early school leaving, priority education, de-segregation, teacher support, safe education, inclusive education and minority education. We feel certainly a strong challenge with regard to current issues for which new policies and measures were proposed recently. These regarded e.g.:

- Early school leaving with new proposals made by Herweijer and by the Scientific Council for Government Policy (Herweijer, 2008 August; Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy], 2009),
- Changed weight rules for priority education (see chapter 3),
- The silent leave from 'inclusive education' as the preferred model for the education and integration of children and young people with a handicap and special needs (see chapter 8),
- The Mozaiek example of how to make as much learning gain with deficient pupils as possible,
- The local de-segregation measures that were discussed in chapter 10,
- The local policies and measures to reduce early school leaving that were discussed in chapter 10.

And there were many issues and measures more in the successive chapters that might deserve further national debate and follow-up. With regard to these issues we are ready to be engaged in national debate and policy-making.

Here, however, we should focus on comparative issues and feedback. That means: at what points would the national debate, policies and measures be served with evidence and knowledge on policies and measures in other countries and what is the contribution of Dutch policies and practices 'over-there'. So, we will conclude with a list relevant comparative issues and feedback points.

At first we may refer to three general points. These are:

- The relevance and unavoidability of renewed attention for *comprehensive* lower secondary education and comprehensive vocational education. Comprehensive education should diminish the number of early school leavers as far as early school leaving is an effect of the many different schools, streams and tracks in lower secondary education and in vocational education. The other national reports should reveal whether comprehensive education is keeping the pupils on board better than the differentiated system in The Netherlands. Comprehensive education is further assessed as a quality push in languages, science and mathematics, as the PISA-reports since 2001 revealed. The OECD advised the Dutch authorities to pay attention to this point and the Minister of Education has re-opened future debate on the issue (OECD, 2007; Minister of Education, 2008, December 4).
- Are there *best* practices, measures and intervention strategies? Would these exist, it should be proved by international comparative research. They may, however, not exist. We reviewed the example of a controlled experiment on a package of measures against bullying that showed diminished bullying both in experimental and in control schools. The explaining factor appeared to be that all schools were paying targeted attention to prevalence, prevention and correction of bullying, adapting the measures etc. to their circumstances. Conclusion:

schools must do something good, in relation to needs and circumstances. They may need external help and advice, but there is no evidence for a set of best measures. For the field of measures against bullying and harassment as well as, perhaps, for other fields this conclusion would have direct impact on comparative good and best practices research. The best practice would no longer be an object of hard and controlled comparative research, whereas qualitative research on case studies might reveal interesting options and measures that were to be taken into consideration by active schools and their external advisers. The latter, then, were to be followed up, while hard comparative research on measures might be waste of money and scarce resources.

- For the sake of diminished segregation between 'black' and 'white' schools, on the one hand, the non-stigmatisation and -discrimination of handicapped children and young people, and the risk of trashing children and young people, the educational authorities and policy-makers in The Netherlands should seek the confrontation with other countries where school admission and registration should directly counter-act educational segregation, where the risk of stigmatisation and discrimination is counter-acted by the policy of "inclusion, unless", and where the risk of 'trashing' should be counter-acted by comprehensive schools for lower secondary education. We will give this confrontation a follow-up in the coming comparative analyses.

At all further points that were reviewed for the present report and that were summarised above we will review the comparative evidence with regard to measures undertaken in the other countries. It may regard the confrontation with different systems and ideologies such as those of inclusive or those of comprehensive education. But it may also regard 'comparative good practices'. Further to the summarised issues above it will regard the following points:

- Early school leaving: care for 'stressed' pupils in other countries, comprehensive education that should keep the pupils on board.
- Priority education, i.e. weight rules: what funds and rules are available in the countries for priority education.
- Priority education, i.e. insertion classes: particularly high priority in France – what measures, practices and effects?
- Priority education, i.e. local agendas: what local and regional co-ordination models are applied; what results?
- Priority education, i.e. de-segregation measures: see above.
- Priority education, i.e. extended schools: what measures and practices, and what effects?
- Appropriate or inclusive education: see above.
- Safe education: what measures and practices, and what effects?
- Teacher support measures: what measures and practices, and what effects?

In this way we expect to get the best results from our Dutch review for the European assessment of inclusion measures, and, vice versa, to get as much as possible from the other countries.

Bibliography

Inspectorate of Education. (2008, November). *Bestuurlijke praktijken in het islamitisch onderwijs [Governance practices in Islamic education].* The Hague.

Aalten, T. v., & Sahadat, I. (2009, April 18). Docent heeft geen tijd voor ontwikkeling [Teacher has no time for development]. *Volkskrant* .

Aarsen, E. v., & Hoffius, R. (2007, October). *Monitor sociale veiligheid in het onderwijs [Monitor social safety in education].* In opdracht van het ministerie van OCW. Leyden: Research voor het Beleid.

Algemene Onderwijsbond [General Teachers' Union]. (2007). *Ambitie & belonen. Voorstel voor upgrading van het leraarsberoep, kwaliteitsverbetering van het onderwijs en een betere salarisstructuur in het onderwijs [Ambition & Reward. Proposal fdor the upgrading of the teacher's profession, quality imrpovement in education and a better salary structure in education].* Utrecht: Aob.

Algemene Rekenkamer [General Audit Chamber]. (2008 November). *Aanpak harde kern jeugdwerklozen; begeleiding van bij CWI geregistreerde jongeren [Measures for the hard core of unemployed youth; counselling of the registered young persons].* The Hague.

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

ANP/Novum/NU.nl. (2008, December 4). *Zeker tweeduizend kinderen thuis zonder onderwijs [Certainly 2000 children at home without education].* From nu.nl.

Antenbrink, P., Cornet, M., Rensman, M., & Webbink, D. (2005). *Nederlands onderwijs en onderzoek in internationaal perspectief [Dutch education and research in international comparison].* The Hague: CPB.

Avoird, T. V., Broeder, P., Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2003, January). *Lopend onderzoek, 'De status van minderheidstalen in internationaal vergelijkend perspectief' [Current research, 'The status of minority languages in international comparative persepctive'].* Retrieved April 16, 2008 from Evaluatieonderzoeken GOA:
www.goa.nl/Handboek%20GOA/Inhoud%20Handboek%20GOA/4.2.4.beheersi ngnederlandsetaal.html#de%20status%20van%20minderheidstalen

Bakker, J., Denessen, E., Pelzer, B., Veneman, M., & Lageweg, S. (2007, June 6-8). De houding jegens klasgenoten: etnisch gekleurd? [The attitude towards class mates: ethnically biassed?]. *Onderwijs Research Dagen 2007* , 1-19. Groningen: Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen.

Blaay, N. d., Leijenhorst, J. v., El Khetabi, Z., Grinten, M. v., Marlet, G., & Larsen, V. (2007). *Maatschappelijke kosten-batenanalyse brede school [Costs and gains for society of the extended school].* Utrecht: Berenschot/Oberon/Stichting Atlas voor Gemeenten.

Bonden oneens over cao leraren [Unions disagree with collective agreement for teachers]. (2008, December 17). *BN/De Stem* .

Bosker, R., & Guldemond, H. (2004). *Een herijking van gewichtenregeling [Re-assessment of the weight rules].* Groningen: GION.

Bouma, J.-d. (2008, May 19). Een hemelbestormer die niet gaat zitten kneuteren [An assoulter of heaven, who is not doing nothing]. *NRC Handelsblad .*

Bouma, J.-d. (2008, January 25). Ineens is het onderwijsniveau ècht gedaald [Suddenly the quality level of education has fallen really]. *NRC Handelsblad .*

Bude, H. (2008). *Die Ausgeschlossenen. Das Ende vom Traum der gerechten Gesellschaft [The excluded. The end of the dream of the just society].* Munich: Hanser.

Buijs, F. J., Demant, F., & Hamdy, A. (2006). *Strijders van eigen bodem. Radicale en democratische Moslims in Nederland [Fighters from here. Radical and democratic Muslims in The Netherlands.* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Burgers, P., & Woudenberg, C. (2008 June). *Arnhemse monitor primair onderwijs 2006, 2007,2008 [Arnhem monitor primary education 2006, 2007. 2008].* Stichting PAS.

CBS [Statistics Netherlands]. (2008, April 8). *Speciaal onderwijs; leerlingen op special scholen [Special education; pupils of special schools].* Retrieved May 1, 2008 from STATLINE: http://statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/?DM=SLNL&PA=37746SOL&D1=0& D2=0,5&D3=0&D4=a&HDR=T&STB=G1,G2,G3&VW=T

CBS. (2008, June 04). *Aantal achterstandleerlingen in het basisonderwijs gehalveerd [Number of disadvantaged pupils halved in primary education].* Retrieved June 05, 2008 from STATLINE: http://www.cbs.nl/nl-NL/menu/themas/onderwijs/publicaties/default.htm

CBS. (2008). *Jaarboek onderwijs in cijfers 2008 [Yearbook education in figures 2008].* Den Haag: CBS.

CBS. (2007, October 10). *Met/zonder startkwalificatie; kenmerken[With or without start qualification; characteristics].* Retrieved April 4, 2008 from CBS STATLINE: statline.cbs.nl/StatWeb/publication/

CBS. (2007). Onderwijs en maatschappelijke omgeving [Education and society]. In *Jaarboek onderwijs in cijfers 2008 [Yearbook education in figures 2008* (pp. 93-136). The Hague: CBS.

CBS. (2008, July 2008). *Statline.* Retrieved January 26, 2009 from statline.cbs.nl.

CFI. (2006). *Nieuwe gewichtenregeling basisonderwijs [New weight rules for primary education].* Zoetermeer: CFI.

Comer, J. P. (2004). *Leave no child behind. preparing today's youth for romorrow's world.* New Haven and London: Yale University press.

Commissie Gelijke Behandeling [Committee on Equal Treatment]. (2005). Advies Commissie Gelijke Behandeling inzake spreidingsbeleid in het primair onderwijs [Advice of the Committee on Equal Treatment in primary education]. In *Bakens voor spreiding en integratie [Highlights for dsispersion and integration]* (p. bijlage). The Hague: Onderwijsraad [Education Council].

Commissie Leraren [Committee Teachers]. (2007, September). *Leerkracht! Advies van de Commissie Leraren [Teachers! Advice of the Committee Teachers].* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Commissie Toekomst Leraarschap [Committee for the Future of Professional Teaching. (1993). *Een beroep met perspectief [A profession with perspective].* Zoetermeer: Ministry of Education.

Dagevos, J. (2007). Arbeid en inkomen [Work and income]. In J. Dagevos, & M. Gijsberts, *Jaarrapport integratie 2007 [Annual report on integration 2007]* (pp. 131-162). The Hague: SCP.

Dan blijft autist maar thuis [Then the autistic pupils should stay at home]. (2008, November 28). *NRC Handelsblad* .

De Boer, A. (2008, November 20). Eerwraak in de klas luistert heel nauw [Honour revenge in the class is requiring most appropriate response]. *BN/De Stem* .

De Heus, M., Dronkers, J., & Levels, M. (2009 January). *Educational systems as a resource or hindrance for immigrants? The effects of educational system characteristics of both countries of origin and destination on the scientific literacy of immigrant children in Western countries.* Interuniversity Institute, Dep. of Political and Social Sciences, Fiesole.

De Vries, G. (2000, May 19). Eis 12 jaar voor schietpartij Veghel [12 years were claimed for shoot-out in Veghel]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Dirks, B., & Gerrits, R. (2008, December 17). Leraren boos over kortere vakantie [Teachers angry about shorter holidays]. *De Volkskrant* .

Dorst, A. v., Wiefferink, K., Düsseldorp, E., Galindo Garre, F., Crone, M., & Paulussen, T. (2008, January). *Preventie van pesten op basisscholen volgens de PRIMA-methode [Prevention of bullying at rpimary schools applying the PRIMA method].* Leyden: TNO.

Dorst, A. v., Wiefferink, K., Paulussen, T., & Crone, M. (2008). *Pesten aanpakken op school. Effect van de PRIMA-methose [Measures agianst bullying at school. Effect of the PRIMA method.* TNO.

Dronkers, J. (2008). Education as the backbone of inequality. European education policy: constraints and possibilities. In F. Becker, K. Duggek, & T. Mörschel, *Social Democracy and Education. The European Experience.* Amsterdam: Metz & Schilt.

Dunning, B., Kraus, P., Van rost, M., Peerenboom, S., De Bruijn, J., Van Eeten, M., et al. (2009 March). *Inzicht in resultaat. Oordelen over effectiviteit van maatregelen gericht op het terugdringen van voortijdig schoolverlaten [In view of result. Judgements on effectiviness of measures to reduce early school leaving].* TU Delft & Beerenschot. TU Delft & Beerenschot.

Eimers, T. (2006). *Vroegtijdig is nog niet voortijdig. Naar een nieuwe beleidstheorie voortijdig schoolverlaten [Early is not yet too early. Towards a new policy theory concerning ealry school leaving].* Nymegen: KBA.

EIRO. (2003, April 1). *Akkoord CAO onderwijspersoneel [Agreement concerning the labour conditions of educational personnel].* Retrieved May 7, 2008 from

EUROFOUND:
http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2003/04/word/nl0304102fnl.doc

European Commisison–Eurydice. (2009, January 23). *The Education System in the Netherlands 2006/07*. Retrieved February 04, 2009 from Eurybase–The Information Database on Education Systems in Europe: eacea.ec.europa.eu/ressources/eurydice/eurybase/pdf/0_integral/NL_EN.pdf

EUROSTAT. *Early school leavers - total. Percentage of the population aged 18-24 with at most lower secondary education and not in further education and training.*

Extra, G., & Yagmur, K. (2006). Immigrant minority languages at home and at school. A case study of the Netherlands. *European Education , 38* (2), 50-063.

Fekkes, M. (2005). *Bullying among elementary school children.*

Frissen, P. (2004 December). *Van maakbaarheid naar autonomie en variëteit. Een bestuurlijke review van OAB/WSNS/LGF [From makable to autonomy and variation. A governance review of OAB/WSNS/LGF].* Breda.

Gemeente Arnhem. (2009, January 22). *arnhem.incijfers.nl*. Retrieved January 27, 2009

Gemeente Arnhem. (n.d.). *Malburgen vernieuwt.* Retrieved January 27, 2009 from www.malbirgen.com.

General Audit Chamber. (2006 May). *Staat van de beleidsinformatie 2006: Voortijdig Schoolverlaten [State of policy information 2006: Early School Leaving].* The Hague: General Audit Chamber.

General Audit Chamber. (2005). Weer Samen Naar School: Zorgleerlingen in het basisonderwijs [Together to School Again: care pupils in primary education. *Tweede Kamer, vergaderjaar 2004-2005, 29 962, nrs. 1-2* . The Hague: SDU.

Gerrits, R. (2008, May 19). Eén digitaal loket tegen spijbelen [One digital portal against absenteeism]. *De Volkskrant* .

Gerrits, R. (2007, December 6). Rugzakje speciaal onderwijs kost miljard [Backbacks for special education cost one billion]. *De Volkskrant* .

Gerrits, R. (2009, February 27). Speciaal onderwijs pot miljoenen op [Special education is sititng on millions]. *Volkskrant* .

Gijsberts, M., & Herweijer, L. (2007). Allochtone leerlingen in het onderwijs [Immigrant pupils in education]. In J. Dagevos, & M. Gijsberts, *Jaarrapport integratie 2007 [Annual report on integration 2007]* (pp. 102-130). The Hague: SCP.

Graas, D. (1996). *Zorgenkinderen op school. Geschiedenis van het speciaal onderwijs, 1900-1950 [Care needing children at school. Hostory of special education, 1900-1950].* Louvain/Apeldoorn: Savant.

Groot, W. (2008, April 10). Hoogleraar Groot: "Waar is de brede school in het onderwijs?" [Prof. Groot: "Where is the extended school in education?". (Nicis, Interviewer)

Haest, M., & Walraven, G. (2007). *Gemengd naar school. Kies voor kleurrijk [Going mixed to school. Choose for diversity].* Amsterdam: Kenniscentrum Gemengde Scholen.

Haest, M., & Walraven, G. (2007). *Segregatie in het basisonderwijs tegengaan? Perspectiefrijke initiatieven van onderop. Overzicht en handreiking [How to counter-act the segregation in primary education? Initiatives with good perspectives from below. Overview and helping hand].* Amsterdam: Walraven & Haest Onderzoek Advies en Communicatie.

Hartgers, M. (2007). Scholen in de Randstad sterk gekleurd [Schools in Central Holland strongly coloured]. *Sociaaleconomische Trends* (3e kwartaal), 12-18.

Herweijer, L. (2008 August). *Gestruikeld voor de start. De school verlaten zonder startkwalifictaie [Stumbled before the start. Leaving school before strat qualitfication].* The Hague: SCP.

Heus, M. d., Dronkers, J., & Levels, M. (2009 January). *Educational systems as a resource or hindrance for immigrants? The effects of educational system characteristics of both countries of origin and destination on the scientific literacy of immigrant children in Western countries .* Fiesole: Interuniversity Institute and University of Tilburg.

Huisman, C. (2009, February 5). *'Dwang nodig bij schoolkeuze' ['Force needed for school choice'].* Retrieved February 5, 2009 from Volkskrant: www.volkskrant.nl/binnenland/article1143590.ece/Dwang_nodig_bij_schoolkeuze?

Huisman, P., Gramberg, P., & Waterreus, J. (2005). Spreidingsmaatregelen verkend [Dispersion measures reviewed]. In *Bakens voor spreiding en integratie [Highlights for dispersion and integration]* (p. Attachment). Rhe Hague: Onderwijsraad [Council of Education].

In 't Veld, R., & others, a. (2006 May). *Rapport 'Kosten en baten van voortijdig schoolverlaten' [Report 'costs and benefits of early school leaving'].* On assigment of the Task Force Youth Unemployment en Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. Rebelgroup KBA.

Informatie over OETC en OALT. (n.d.). From http://www.taalsite.nl/-1917-/bibliotheek/lexicon/00208/

Informatie over schakelklassen [Information on insertion classes]. (n.d.). From http://www.schakel-klassen.nl

Informatie over voortijdig schoolverlaten [Information on early school leaving]. (n.d.). Retrieved April 2, 2008 from Website van Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap: http://www.voortijdigschoolverlaten.nl

Ingrado. (2008, October 8). Verslag thuiszittersonderzoek Ingrado 2007-2008 [Home-sitters Report Ingrado 2007-2008].

Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education]. (2007 May). *Cluster 4. De kwaliteit van het onderwijs aan leerlingen met ernstige gedragsproblemen [Type 4. The qualty of education for pupils showing seriuos challenging behaviour].* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education]. (2007 May). *De kwaliteit van het speciaal basisonderwijs in 2005 en 2006 [The quality of special primary education in 2005 and 2006].* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Inspectie van het Onderwijs [Inspectorate of Education]. (2008 November). *De kwaliteit van reboundvoorzieningen in het voortgezet onderwijs. Bevindingen uit het inspectietoezicht in 2007 [The quality of rebound arrangements in secondary education. Observations of the Inspectorate's inspection visits in 2007].* The Hage: Inspectie van het Onderwijs.

(2008). *Jaarverslag 2007 Pestweb [Annual report 2007 Bully-site].* Pestweb.

Jager, B. D., & Meer, C. V. (2007). *The Development of Minimum Standards on Language Education in Regional and Minority Languages.* Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Mercator European Research Centre on Multilingualism and Language Learning.

Kammer, C., & Reerink, A. (2008, March 17). Een land vol kinderen met afwijkend gedrag [A country full of children that show deviant behaviour]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Karsten, S., & Felix, C. (2005). Achterstanden- en integratiebeleid [Deficiency and integration policies]. In *Onderwijs in thema's* (pp. 87-116). The Hague: Onderwijsraad [Council og Education].

Karsten, S., Derriks, M., Emmelot, Y., Felix, C., Ledoux, G., & Fleurke, F. (2004). *Het gemeentelijk onderwijsachterstandenbeleid nader beschouwd [Municipal deficiency policies reviewed].* Amsterdam: SCO-Kohnstamm Instituut.

Kartsen, S., Roeleveld, J., Ledoux, G., Felix, C., & Elshof, D. (2002). *Schoolkeuze in een multi-etnische samenleving [School choice in a multi-ethnic society].* Amsterdam: SCO-Kohnstamm Instituut.

Kooijman, B. (2008, September 6). Liever geen gebrek. Regulier onderwijs weet zich geen raad met kinderen met beperkingen [Preferably no handicap. Mainstream education does not know what to do with special needs children. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Kooper, A. (2009, January 24). ROC pakt drop-outs keihard aan [Upper vocational centres take hard measures against dropouts]. *BN/De Stem* .

Kruiter, J., Oomen, C., Grinten, M. v., Dubbelman, E., & Zuidam, M. (2007). *Jaarbericht brede scholen 2007 [Annual report extended schools 2007].* Utrecht: Oberon.

Kruiter, J., Rijken, S., & Wit, W. d. (2007). *De locale educatieve jaaragenda 2007. Hoe vordert de ontwikkeling van de LEA in Nederlandse gemeenten? [The Local Education Agenda 2007. How is LEA developping in Dutch municipalities?].* Utrecht: Oberon.

Ledoux, G., Karsten, S., Breetvelt, I., Emmelot, Y., Heim, M., & Zoontjes, P. (2007). *Vernieuwing van zorgstructuren in het primair en voortgezet onderwijs. Een analytisch evaluatie van de herijking van het zorgbeleid [Innovation of the care-structures in primary and secondary education. An analytic evaluation of the changed principles of care policies].* Amsterdam: SCO-Kohnstamm.

Lijphardt, A. (1968). *The accommodation of politics: pluralism and democracy in the Netherlands.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Luyendijk, W., & Rensman, E. (1995, August 30). *'Op school zaken doen is zonder bewaking niet meer mogelijk '; Bij een benzinepomp gaat er op een dag minder geld om dan op een schoolboekenmarkt ['Doing business in school is no longer possible without protection'. A petrol station has less business to do than a schoolbook market.* Retrieved December 9, 2008 from archief.nrc.nl: http://archief.nrc.nl/?modus=l&text=onveilig+schoolplein&hit=15&set=1

Marcouch, A. (2009, January 26). *Leve het openbaar onderwijs! [Hurray for public education!].* Retrieved January 26, 2009 from Waterlandstichting: waterlandstichting.nl

Meijer, C. (2004). *WSNS welbeschouwd [Appropriate assessment of Together to School Again].* (C. Meijer, Ed.) Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Garant.

Meijnen, W. (2003). *Onderwijsachterstanden in basisscholen, NWO/BOPO-studie [Educational deficiencies in schools for primary education, NWO/BOPO-research].* Apeldoorn: Garant.

Meijs, J. (2008, June 7-8). In het basisonderwijs heeft zich een ramp voltrokken [In primary education a disaster has occurred]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Mens, A., & Calcar, C. v. (1981). *Onderwijsstimulering op weg [Priority education in development].* Nijmegen/Amsterdam: ITS/SCO.

Mercator-Education. (2007). *The Frisian language in education in the Netherlands 4th edition.* Liouwert/Leeuwarden: Mercator, European Research Centre on Multiligualism and Language Learning.

Messing, C., Van Veen, D., & Wienke, D. (2004 July). *Evaluatierapport 'Time out-voorzieningen in het voortgezet onderwijs in Amsterdam' [Evaluation report 'Time-out Arrangements in secondary education in Amsterdam'].* LCOJ. Utrecht: NIZW.

Minister and State Secretaries of Education. (2007). *Actieplan leerkracht van Nederland. Beleidsreactie op het advies van de Commissie Leraren [Action plan teachers of the Netherlands. Policy response on the advice of the Committee Teachers].* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Minister and State Secretary of Education. (2006 April 28). *Brief aan de voorzitter van de Tweede Kamer 'Aanval op de uitval' [Letter to the president of Paliament 'Attack on school leaving'.* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Minister en staatssecretaris van onderwijs [Minister and State-Secretary of Education]. (2009 February 10). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over Cijfers 2007-2008 Voortijdig Schoolverlaten [Letter to Parliament on Figures 2007-2008 with regard to early school leaving].* The Hague: Ministerie van Onderwijs [Ministry of Education].

Minister of Education. (2008, December 4). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer inzake Midterm Review: Het beste Onderwijs [Letter to Parliament on Midterm-review: The best Education].* The Hage: Ministry of Education.

Minister of Education. (2004, April 23). Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over onderwijs, integratie en burgerschap [Letter to Parliament on education, integration and citizenship].

Minister of Education. (2004, April 23). Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over onderwijs, integratie en burgerschap [Letter to Parliament on education, integration and citizenship].

Minister of Education. (2006, February 12). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over reken- en taalvaardigheid van instromers in de opleiding tot leraar basisonderwijs en de doorlopende leerlijnen in reken- en taalvaardigheid [Letter to Parliament on skills in arithmetics and language of starting students in the teacher training for primary education and ongoing learning lines for skills in arithmetics and language].* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Minister of Education. (2005, September 30). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over Vernieuwing zorgstructuren funderend onderwijs [Letter to Parliament on the Innovation of care-structures in basic education].*

Minister of Education. (2008, May 30). Brief aan de Tweede Kamer: beleidsreactie 'Tijd voor Onderwijs' [Letter to Parliament: Policy reaction 'Time for Education'].

Ministry of Education. (2006 April). *Aanval op de uitval. Perspectief en actie [Attack on school leaving. perspective and action].* The Hague: Ministry of Education.

Ministry of Education. (1981). *Beleidsplan culturele minderheden in het onderwijs [Green paper on cultural minorities in education].* Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.

Ministry of Education. (1974). *Beleidsplan voor het onderwijs aan groepen in achterstandssituaties [Green paper on the education for disadvantaged groups].* Den Haag: Staatsuitgeverij.

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). *Dossier lerarenopleiding [Portfolio teacher training].* Retrieved May 7, 2008 from http://www.minocw.nl/lerarenopleidingen/index.html

Ministry of Education. (n.d.). *Kwaliteitsagenda voortgezet onderwijs. Tekenen voor kwaliteit, afspraken voor een beter voortgezet onderwijs 2008-2011 [Quality agenda secondary education].* Retrieved May 7, 2008 from http://www.minocw.nl/documenten/49542a.pdf

Ministry of Education. (2006). *Leerplusarrangement VO en Nieuwkomers VO [Learning plus arrangements in secondary education and for newcomers in secondary education].* Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap.

Ministry of Education. (2008, July 10). *Mobiele veiligheidsteams voor scholen [Mobile safety teams for the schools].* Retrieved December 9, 2008 from www.minocw.nl.

Ministry of Education. (2009, March 12). *Ruim 3200 leerlingen combineren vmbo en mbo2 [More than 3200 pupils will combine lower and upper vocational education].* Retrieved March 13, 2009 from Aanval op de schooluitval [Attaque on early school leaving]: www.minocw.nl/aanvalopschooluitval/

Ministry of Education. (2007, November 28). *Scholen voor morgen. Samen op weg naar duurzame kwlaiteit in het primair onderwijs [Schools for tomorrow. Together*

underway towards sustainable education]. Retrieved May 7, 2008 from http://www.minocw.nl/documenten/49767a.pdf

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (2008). *Dossier Vrijheid van Onderwijs [Portfolio Freedom of Education*. Retrieved April 16, 2008 from http://www.minocw.nl/vrijheidvanonderwijs

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (n.d.). *Dossier Weer samen naar School [Portfolio Together to School Again]*. Retrieved April 9, 2008 from www.minocw.nl

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (2005, September 30). *Notitie vernieuwing van de zorgstructuren in het funderend onderwijs. Bijlage bij de brief van 30 september 1005 [Working document concerning Innovation of the care-structures in bsic education. Appendix to the letter of 2005, September 30]*.

Ministry of Education, Culture and Science. (2006, September 4). *Uitwerkingsnotitie Vernieuwing Zorgstructuren funderend onderwijs [Implementation plan Innovation Care-strustures basic education]*.

Ministry of Education, Directorate of Communication [Press release]. (2008, September 04). *Van Bijsterveldt : 52 miljoen voor scholen om schooluitval te voorkomen. Landelijke actieweek 'Doorzettuh' van start [Van Bijsterveld: 52 MEURO available for schools to take preventive action against early school leaving. National action week 'Doorzettuh!' was launched]*. Retrieved November 05, 2008 from Aanval op Schooluitval [Attack on Early School Leaving]: www.minocw.nl

Ministry of Interior. (2007, April). Actieplan polarisatie en radicalisering 2007-2011 [Action plan polarisation and radicalisation 2007-2011].

Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. (2007, Dember 21). *Brief van de staatsecretaris van sociale zaken en werkgelegenheid en de minister voor jeugd en gezin [Letter of the State-Secretary of Social Affairs and Employment and the Minister for Youth and Family]*. 29.544, nr. 132. Tweede Kamer.

Mooij, T., & Smeets, E. (2006). Design, development and implementation of inclusive education. *European Educational Research Journal , 5* (2), pp. 94-109.

mozaiekarnhem.nl. (n.d.).

Mulder, L. (1996). *Meer voorrang, minder achterstand? Het onderwijsvoorrangsbeleid getoetst [More priority, less deficiencies? Assessment of priority education]*. Nymegen: ITS.

Mulder, L., Hoeven, A. V., & Ledoux, G. (2007). *De opbrengsten van de pilot-schakelklassen [Results of the pilot insertion classes]*. Nymegen/Amsterdam: ITS/SCO-Kohnstamm Instituut.

Mulder, L., Hoeven, A. V., Vierke, H., Ledoux, G., Veen, I. V., Oud, W., et al. (2008). *Inrichting en effecten van schakelklassen. Resultaten van het evaluatieonderzoek schakelklassen in het schooljaar 2006/2007 [Organisation and effects of insertion classes. Outcomes of the evaluation research project on insertion classes in the school year 2006-2007]*. Nymegen: ITS and Kohnstamm Institute.

Muskens, G. (2008 September). *Theoretical issues and preliminary comparative conclusions with regard to inclusion and education. Internal interim report*. Lepelstraat: DOCA Bureaus.

Muskens, G., & others, a. (1988). *Leraar tot (w)elke prijs. [Teacher, at what costs?].* Tilburg: IVA.

Muskens, G., & Peters, D. (2008 June). *Inclusion and education in the Netherlands. Preliminary revoew and assessment of resources as available.* Lepelstraat: DOCA Bureaus.

National Research Council, Institute of Medicine. (2004). *Engaging schools. Fostering high school students' motivation to learn.* Washington D.C.: The National Academies Press.

Nationale Jeugdraad [National Youth Council]. (2009, January 22). *Wat is gezondheid? [What is health?].* Retrieved January 23, 2009 from www.jeugdraad.nl/bestanden/file/Panelverslag%20Wat%20is%20gezond%20-%20lang.pdf

NRC Handelsblad. (2008, December 1). ISBO: geen nieuwe islamscholen [ISBO: no new islamic schools].

NRC Handelsblad. (2008, November 13). Veel fraude islamscholen met rijksgeld. Ook grote onderwijsproblemen [Frequent fraud of islamic schools with state funding. Also major educational problems]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Oberon. (2006). *Gemeenten over de lokale educatieve agenda 2006 [Municipalities on the Local Education Agenda 2006].* Utrecht.

Oberon in co-operation with Sardes. (2006, August). *De zorgstructuur in het voortgezet onderwijs. Evaluatie van het gemengde model van bekostiging [The care-structure in secondary education. Evaluation of the mixed budget model].* Utrecht: Oberon.

Oberon. (2006). *Zicht op resultaat. Evaluaties van brede scholen in Nederland [Achievement perspectives. Evaluation of extended schools in the Netherlands].* Utrecht: Oberon.

OECD. (2007). *PISA 2006. Science competencies for tomorrow's world (two volumes).* Paris: OECD.

OECD. (2007). *PISA 2006. Science competencies fro towmorrow's world. Volume 1: analysis.* Paris: OECD.

Olweus, D. (s.a.). *Bullying in schools: facts and intervention.* Bergen, Norway: Research Centre for Health Promotion.

Onderwijsraad [Education Council]. (2007, September). *Leraarschap als eigenaarschap [Being a teacher meanis ownership].* The Hague: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad [Education Council]. (2009 February). *Stand van educatief Nederland 2009 [State of education in The Netherlands 2009].* The Hague: Onderwijsraad.

Onderwijsraad [Education Council]. (2002 July). *Vaste grond onder de voeten [Solid ground under the feet].* The Hague: Onderwijsraad.

Over Friese taal en cultuur [On Frisian language and culture]. (2004). Retrieved April 16, 2008 from http://209.85.135.104/custom?q=cache:MVB5SOvikxMJ:www.fryslan.nl/download.asp%3Flink%3D%27/files/11904/taalfanithertnederlansk.pdf%27%26link

ID%3D119426+Friestalig+onderwijs&hl=nl&ct=clnk&cd=1&client=google-coop-np

Parlementaire Enquêtecommissie Onderwijsvernieuwing (Commissie Dijsselbloem) [Parliamentary Investigation Committee on Innovations in Education (Committee Dijsselbloem)]. (2008, February 13). *Tijd voor onderwijs [Time for Education].* The Hague: Parliament.

Pas, G., & Peters, D. (2004). *Het basisonderwijs zwart wit bekeken. Naar een lokale aanpak van etnische segregatie in het basisonderwijs [Black and white view on primary education. Towards local measures against ethnic segregation in primary education].* Utrecht: Wetenschappelijk Bureau Groenlinks.

Peschar, J., & Meijer, C. (1997). *WSNS op weg. De evaluatie van het 'Weer Samen Naar School-'beleid [WSNS underway. The evaluation of the 'Together To School Again' policy].* Groningen: Wolters/Noordhoff.

Pesten.startpagina.nl [Start page bullying]. (n.d.). Retrieved April 9, 2008

Pestweb [Bully-site]. (n.d.). Retrieved April 9, 2008 from http://www.pestweb.nl/aps/pestweb

Peters, D. (2006). *Tot elkaar veroordeeld. Analyse van de vooralsnog vrijblijvende aanpak van etnische segregatie in het basisonderwijs.* Enschede: Universiteit Twente.

Peters, D. (2006). *Tot elkaar veroordeeld. Analyse van de vooralsnog vrijblijvende aanpak van etnische segregatie in het basisonderwijs. Bijlageboek [Condemned to each other. Aanalysis of the currently non-binding measures against ethnic segregation in primary education. Appendices].* Enschede: Universiteit Twente.

Peters, D., & Haest, M. (2007). *Stap voor stap naar een gemengde school [Step by step towards a mixed school].* Amsterdam: OCO.

Peters, D., Haest, M., & Walraven, G. (2007). *Gemeenten in actie tegeen segregatie in het basisonderwijs [Municipal action against segregation in primary education].* Utrecht: Forum.

Peters, D., Haest, M., & Walraven, G. (2008). *Perspectieven voor het tegengaan van etnische segregatie in het voortgezet onderwijs. [Perspectives for measures against ethnic segregation in secondary education] Een verkennend onderzoek.* Den Haag: Ministerie van Onderwijs Cultuur en Wetenschap.

Politieke stilte rond wachtlijsten speciaal onderwijs [Political silence around waiting lists special education]. (2006, August 24). Retrieved May 1, 2008 from Zorg + Welzijn: http://www.zorgwelzijn.nl/home/id5601-63502/politieke_stilte_rond_wachtlijsten_speciaal_onderwijs.html

Prick, L. (2006). *Drammen dreigen draaien. Hoe het onderwijs twintig jaar lang vernieuwd werd [Pressure, threats and a merry-go-around. How education was innovated during twenty years].* Amsterdam: Mets & Schilt.

Prick, L. (1983). *Het beroep van leraar. Satisfactie en crisis in de lerarenloopbaan [The teaching profession. Satisfaction and crisis in the careers of teachers].* Amsterdam: unknown.

Ramadan, T. (2008 april). *Brug van vertrouwen. Educatie: de eerste pijler [Bridge of trust. Education, the first pillar].* Burgerschap, identiteit en je thuis voelen [Citizenship, identity and feeling home]. Rotterdam: Gemeente Rotterdam, Dienst JOS.

Rijksbegroting 2008 [National Budget Plan 2008]. (2008). Retrieved March 25, 2008 from Chapter VIII Education, Culture and Science, Article 1 Primary Education:
www.rijksbegroting.nl/rijksbegroting_nl/kst108428b_6.php?cycl=2008&fase=m n&hfds=40.19

ROA Researchcentrum voor Onderwijs en Arbeidsmarkt. (2009 February). *Zonder diploma. Aanleiding, kansen en toekomstintenties [Without diploma. Reasons, chances and intentions for the future].* ROA.

Rutten, S., & Peters, D. (2005). Spreiden is geen kinderspel. Een analyse van succes- en faalfactoren in gemeentelijk beleid betreffende etnische segregatie in het onderwijs [[Dispersion is no childrens' game. An analysis of success and failure factors in municipal policies concerning ethnic segregation in education]. In *Bakens voor spreiding en integratie [Highlights for dispersion and integration]* (p. bijlage). The Hague: Onderwijsraad [Council of Education].

Sjoukes, Y. (2009, April 08). Schooldiploma's: 'Dat moet snel beter hier' [School diploms: 'That should be better here at short notice']. *BN/De Stem* .

Sociaal-Economische Raad [Socio-economic Council]. (2007 a). De arbeidsmarktpositie onder allochtone jongeren [The labour market position of immirgant young people]. In *Niet de afkomst maar de toekomst. Naar een verbetering van de arbeidsmarktpositie van allochtone jongeren [Not descent but future. Towards an improvement of the labour market position of immigrant young people]* (pp. 23-31). The Hague: Sociaal-Economische Raad [Socio-economic Council].

Sociaal-Economische Raad [Socio-economic Council]. (2007 b). Toerusten voor de arbeidsmarkt [Preparation for the labour market]. In *Niet de afkomst maar de toekomst. Naar een verbetering van de arbeidsmarktpositie van allochtone jongeren [Not descent but future. Towards an improvement of the labour market position of immigrant young people]* (pp. 33-53). The Hague: Sociaal-Economische Raad [Socio-economic Council].

Sontag, L., Kroesbergen, N., Leseman, P., Steensel, R. v., Ven, S. v., & Wolput, B. v. (2008, January). *De werking van de leerlinggebonden Financiering in het basisonderwijs en voortgezet onderwijs [The impact of pupil-related budgets in primary and secondary education].* Tilburg: IVA.

Speciaal onderwijs [special education]. (n.d.). Retrieved May 1, 2008 from Wikipedia, de vrije encuclopedie [Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia]: nl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Speciaal_onderwijs

Stadsdeel De Baarsjes [City district De Baarsjes]. (2008, November 28). *kerngegevensstadsdeel-1.pdf [indicators city district-1.pdf].* Retrieved November 28, 2008 from Stadsdeel De Baarsjes - bewoners [City District De Baarsjes - inhabitants]: baarsjes-amsterdam.nl

State-Secretaries of education. (2008, November 13). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over Aanbieding thema-onderzoek islamitisch onderwijs [Letter to parliament on the Presentation of specific report on Islamic education].* Ministry of Education, The Hague.

State-Secretary of Education. (2008, December 16). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer betreffende 'Aanbevelingen Commissie Onderwijstijd' [Letter to Parliament concerning the Recommendations Committee Educational Hours].* Ministry of Education, The Hague.

State-Secretary of Education. (2007 June 25). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over passend onderwijs [Letter to Parliament on appropriate education].*

State-Secretary of Education. (2007, November 16). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over sociale veiligheid in en om onderwijsinstellingen [Letter to Parliament on safety in and around educational institutions].* Ministry of Education, The Hague.

State-Secretary of Education. (2008, April 14). *Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over Veiligheid op School [Letter to Parliament on Safety Protection at School].* Nr. 29240-28.

State-Secretary of Education. (2007, November 16). *Huidig veiligheidsbeleid en resultaten. Bijlage 2 bij Brief aan de Tweede Kamer over sociale veiligheid in en rond onderwijsinstellingen [Present safety policies and outcomes. Appendix 2 of the Letter to Parliament on sociale safety in and around educatonal institutions].* Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, The Hague.

Status leraren nauwelijks veranderd [Status of the teachers did change hardly]. (2007, Octover 4). *Het Onderwijsblad* .

Steeg, M. V., & Webbink, D. (2006 February). *Voortijdig schoolverlaten in Nederland: omvang, beleid en resultaten [Early school leaving in the Netherlands: extend, policy and results].* The Hague: CPB.

Steenhuis, P., & Van Noordwijk, K. (2008, December). De droom van Oomen [Prof. Oomen's dream]. *M - Maandblad van NRC Handelsblad* , pp. 12-14.

Studulski, F., Kloprogge, J., Aarssen, J., Bontje, D., & Broekhof, K. (2005). *Quick scan dagarrangementen in zeven landen [Quick scan full-dau arrangements in seven countries].* Utrecht: Sardes.

Swart, L. (2007, November 15). Idiote maatregelen voor een idiote wet. Leraren en leerlingen vechten met urennorm [Crazy measures for a crazy rule. Teachers and pupils fight with the hours norm]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Te Loo, R. (2008, September 9). *Letter to the Ministry of Education.*

Tesser, P., Dugteren, F. v., & Merens, A. (1996). *Rapportage minderheden 1996. Bevolking, arbeid, onderwijs, huisvesting [Minority report §996. Population, work, education, housing].* Rijswijk/The Hague: SCP/VUGA.

Thurlings, J. (1979). Pluralism and assimilation in the Netherlands, with special reference to Dutch Catholicism. *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* , *20* (1-2), 82-100.

Turkenburg, M. (1999). *Gemeentelijk onderwijsachterstandenbeleid [Municipal rpiority education].* The Hague: SCP.

Turkenburg, M., & Gijsberts, M. (2007). Opleidingsniveau en beheersing van de Nederlanse taal [Level of education and proficiency in the Dutch language]. In J. Dagevos, & M. Gijsberts, *Jaarrapport integratie 2007 [Annual integration report 2007]* (pp. 72-101). The Hague: SCP.

Tweede Kamer [Parilament]. (2007, October 15). Vergaderjaar 2007-2008, 30 313, nr. 39. *Wijziging Wet op het Primair Onderwijs, Wet op de Expertisecentra, Wet op het Voortgezet Onderwijs ivm wijzigingen in het OAB [Changed education laws for primary. special and secondary education in relation to priority education policy]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2008 February 7). *Veiligheid op school. Verslag van een algemeen overleg [Safety protection in schools. Report of a general debate].* Nr. 29240-25.

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2000, February 22). Vergaderjaar 1999-2000, 27 020, nr. 1. *Aanpak onderwijsachterstanden [Measures against educational deficiencies]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2003, October 31). Vergaderjaar 2003-2004, 27 020, nr. 34. *Aanpak onderwijsachterstanden [Measures against educational deficiencies]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2004a, Juli 9). Vergaderjaar 2003-2004, 27 020, nr. 39. *Aanpak onderwijsachterstanden [Measures against educational deficiencies]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2004d). *Vergaderjaar 2003-2004, 28 689, nr. 17.*

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2004c). Vergaderjaar 2003-2004, 28 689, nr. 8-9. *Onderzoek integratiebeleid [Investigation of integration policies]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2004b, Oktober 22). Vergaderjaar 2004-2005, 27 020, nr. 41. *Aanpak onderwijsachterstanden [Measures against educational deficiencies]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2005a, May 27). Vergaderjaar 2004-2005, 27 020, nr. 45. *Aanpak onderwijsachterstanden [Measures against educational deficiencies]* .

Tweede Kamer [Parliament]. (2005b, Oktober 4). Vergaderjaar 2005-2006, 27 020, nr. 50. *Aanpak onderwijsachterstanden [Measures against educational deficiencies]* .

Vallen, T. (2003). *Lopend onderzoek 'Meertaligheid en schoolsucces' [Current research 'Multiligualism and school achievement'].* Retrieved April 16, 2008 from Evaluatieonderzoeken naar GOA: www.goa.nl/Handboek%20GOA/Inhoud%20Handboek%20GOA/4.2.4.beheersingnederlandsetaal.html

Van Beek, H., & Creemers, K. (2008, November 21). Cyberpesten: van hoer tot dreigen met de dood [Cyber-bullying: for whore to death-thread]. *BN De Stem* .

Van der Steenhoven, P., & Van Veen, D. (2008). *NJI-monitor reboundvoorzieningen voortgezet onderwijs 2007 [NJI-monitor rebound arrangement in secondary education 2007].* Utrecht: NJI.

(2008). In J. Van Donselaar, & P. R. Rodrigues, *Monitor racisme and extremisme, achtste rapportage [Monitor racism and extremism, annual report eight].* Amsterdam & Leiden: Anne Frank Stichting / Leyden University.

Van Haalen, J. (2007). *Resultaten en ontwikkelingen van het onderwijsachterstandenbeleid 2002-2006 [Results and developments in priority education 2002-2006].* Utrecht: Sardes.

Van Kemenade, J. (2009, January 26). *Een voorwerp van aanhoudende zorgelijkheid [An issue of permanent worrying].* Retrieved January 26, 2009 from Stichting Waterland: www.waterlandstichting.nl

Van Veen, D., Van der Steenhoven, P., & Kuijvenhoven, T. (2007 September). *Reboundvoorzieningen Voortgezet Onderwijs 2006. Onderzoeksbevindingen en analyse van programma's [Rebound arrangements in secondary education 2006. Research data and analyses of programmes}.* LCOJ-Monitor. Utrecht: NJI.

Veen, D. v., Steenhoven, P. v., & Kuijenhoven, T. (2007). *LCOJ-monitor Reboundvoorzieningen Voortgezet Onderwijs 2006. Onderzoeksbevindingen en analyse van programma's [LCOJ-monitor Rebound provisions in secondary education 2006. Research outcomes and analysis of programs].* Utrecht: Nederlands Jeugdinstituut.

Veenstra, R. (s.a.). *Pesten als groepsproces: over pestkoppen, verdedigers en slachtoffers [Bullying as a group process: on bullyers, defendants and victims].* Groningen: University of Groningen, Department of Sociology.

Velderman, H. (2008). *Time-out en switch [Time-out and switch].* Amersfoort: Agiel.

Verbrugge, A., & Verbrugge, M. (2006, June 3). Help! Het onderwijs verzuipt. [Help! Education is drowning]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Vermaas, J., & Pluim, J. V. (2004). *Brede evaluatie WSNS, LGF en OAB. Samenvattend overzicht van de onderzoeksrapporten en reviews [Broad evaluation WSNS, LGF and OAG. Summary overview of the research reports and reviews].* The Hague.

Vink, R., Neut, I. V., & Vloet, A. (2008). *Neveneffecten indicator Leerplusarrangement VO [Side-effects indicator learning plus arrangement in secondary education].* Tilburg: IVA beleidsonderzoek en advies.

Vogels, R., & Bronneman-Helmers, R. (2003). *Autochtone achterstandsleerlingen: een vergeten groep [Native pupils with deficiencies: forgotten group].* The Hague: SCP.

Walters, D. (2008, May 21). Revolte begint op het Barlaeus [Revolt started at the Barlaeus Gymnasium]. *NRC Handelsblad* .

Weeda, F. (2009, April 11). Per school 42 heer melding incidenten [Per school 42 reports of an incident]. *NRC Handelsblad* , 1-2.

Werkgroep Good Practices–Quick Wins. (2006). *Aanval op de uitval. Deelproject voortijdigschoolverlaten OCW [Attack on early school leaving. Part-project early school leaving of the Ministry of Education].* The Hague: Ministry of Education, Culture, Science.

Wetenschappelijke Raad voor het Regeringsbeleid [Scientific Council for Government Policy]. (2009). *Vertrouwen in de school. Over de uitval van 'overbelaste' jongeren [Trust in the school. On 'stressed' young dropouts].* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Wielders, J., & Smets, J. (2007). *Argumenten die tellen. Reflecties vanuit theorie en praktijk over de maatschappelijke meerwaarde van brede scholen [Arguments that counted. Reflections from theory and practice with regard the added value for society of extended schools].* Tilburg: PON.

Winsemius, P., & e.a. (2008). Niemand houdt van ze …. [Nobody loves them ….]. *Kohnstammlezing 28 March 2008.* Amsterdam: Vossiuspers.

WSNS OAB. (2006). *Onderwijsachterstandenbeleid. Een onderzoek van de deelprojectgroep WSNS OAB over de stand van zaken ten aanzien van het onderwijsachterstandenbeleid [priority educ ation. Research done by the special working group WSNS OAB with regard to the state of affairs].* Woerden: WSNS OAB.