



Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe

*National Policies
and Measures*



Eurydice Report

Education and
Training



Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe:

National Policies and
Measures

Eurydice Report

*Education and
Training*

This document is published by the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA, Education and Youth Policy Analysis).

Please cite this publication as:

European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2019. *Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe: National Policies and Measures*. Eurydice Report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

Printed version	EC-06-18-260-EN-C	ISBN 978-92-9492-846-7	doi:10.2797/222073
EPUB	EC-06-18-260-EN-E	ISBN 978-92-9492-847-4	doi:10.2797/043969
PDF	EC-06-18-260-EN-N	ISBN 978-92-9492-849-8	doi:10.2797/819077

Text completed in December 2018.

© Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency, 2019.

Reproduction is authorized provided the source is acknowledged.

Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
Education and Youth Policy Analysis
Avenue du Bourget 1 (J-70 – Unit A7)
BE-1049 Brussels
Tel. +32 2 299 50 58
Fax +32 2 292 19 71
E-mail: eacea-eurydice@ec.europa.eu
Website: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>

CONTENTS

Table of Figures	5
Codes and Abbreviations	8
Executive Summary and Main Findings	9
Introduction	29
Context	35
Migration population and education statistics	35
Feeling a sense of belonging and experiencing bullying at school – Experiences of students from migrant backgrounds	40

PART I: MAPPING

I.1: Governance	51
I.1.1. National definitions	51
I.1.2. Policy challenges, strategies and top-level coordination	54
I.1.3. Funding to support the integration of students from migrant backgrounds	60
I.1.4. Monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment	64
I.2: Access to Education	69
I.2.1. Rights and obligations	69
I.2.2. School placement	76
I.3: Language, Learning and Psycho-Social Support	91
I.3.1. Learning support in preparatory classes	91
I.3.2. Language provision and support	97
I.3.3. Learning support in mainstream classes	102
I.3.4. Psycho-social support	110
I.4: Teachers and School Heads	115

PART II: ANALYSIS

II.1: Introduction	129
II.2: Making Room for Diversity in School	131
II.2.1. Teaching the language of instruction	131
II.2.2. Home language teaching	136
II.2.3. Intercultural education	140
Summary	143

II.3: Taking a Whole-Child Approach to Teaching and Learning	147
II.3.1. Creating an optimal state for learning	147
II.3.2. Addressing migrant students' holistic needs	149
II.3.3. Supporting teachers in adopting a whole-child approach	154
II.3.4. Promoting a whole-school approach	156
Summary	159
II.4: Conclusion	163
<hr/>	
Glossary	167
I. Definitions	167
II. ISCED Classification	170
References	173
Annex	179
Acknowledgements	189

TABLE OF FIGURES

Table of Figures	5
Executive Summary and Main Findings	9
Figure 1: Conceptual framework for the analysis of policies and measures promoting the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools	11
Figure 2: Most common criteria used to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds, 2017/18	12
Figure 3: Proportion of foreign-born people under 15 years old among all young people in the same age group, 2017	13
Figure 4: Limit on the time spent in preparatory classes/lessons (in years) and the number of curriculum subjects covered, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	16
Figure 5: Main criteria for allocating funding to support the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	17
Figure 6 : Issues related to intercultural education included in teacher competence frameworks for initial teacher education (ITE), 2017/18	21
Figure 7: Learning support measures to be provided in mainstream classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	22
Figure 8: Programmes, courses and/or other activities targeting school leaders to help them support the integration process, 2017/18	25
Figure 9: Objectives and activities related to the involvement of migrant students' parents, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	26
Figure 10: Emphasis of policies relating to linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	28
Introduction	29
Figure 11: Conceptual framework for the analysis of policies and measures promoting the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools	32
Context	35
Figure 12: Annual immigration into European Union countries (EU-28, in millions), 2007-2016	35
Figure 13: Proportion of native- and foreign-born population, 2017	36
Figure 14: Proportion of native- and foreign-born people under 15 years old, 2017	37
Figure 15: Change in the proportion of foreign-born young people under 15 years old (percentage points), between the years 2014 and 2017	38
Figure 16: Early leaving from education and training (ELET), native-born and foreign-born population, 18-24 year-olds, 2017	39
Figure 17: Percentage of foreign-born vs native-born people aged 18 to 24 with upper secondary or post-secondary, non-tertiary level education (ISCED 3-4), 2017	40
Figure 18: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 4th grade foreign-born and native-born students, 2016	41
Figure 19: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 4th grade students speaking the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016	42
Figure 20: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 8th grade foreign-born and native-born students, 2016	44
Figure 21: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 8th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016	45
Figure 22: Differences in parents' perception of their child's school, depending on country of birth and language spoken at home, 2016	46
Figure 23: Parents' involvement in their child's education, as reported by school heads, mean scorepoints, 2016	48

PART I: MAPPING **51**

I.1: Governance **51**

Figure I.1.1:	Most common criteria used to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds, 2017/18	52
Figure I.1.2:	Newly arrived migrant students identified as a specific category, 2017/18	54
Figure I.1.3:	Main challenges in integrating children and young people from migrant background in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	55
Figure I.1.4:	Strategies/action plans addressing the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds in primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	57
Figure I.1.5:	Priority areas addressed by top-level strategies/action plans, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	58
Figure I.1.6:	Top-level bodies coordinating policies that have an impact on the integration of migrant students into school, 2017/18	59
Figure I.1.7:	Funding to support the integration of migrant students, from top-level and from local authorities, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	61
Figure I.1.8 :	Main criteria for allocating funding to support the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	63
Figure I.1.9:	Data sources for monitoring the performance of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	65
Figure I.1.10:	Monitoring the policy areas related to migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	66
Figure I.1.11:	Impact assessments related to the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	67

I.2: Access to Education **69**

Figure I.2.1:	Rights and obligations of compulsory school age children and young people from migrant backgrounds with respect to education, in primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), as compared to their native-born peers, 2017/18	71
Figure I.2.2:	Right to compensatory education for young migrants over compulsory school age who have not completed compulsory education, as compared to their native-born peers, 2017/18	73
Figure I.2.3:	Information, advice and guidance for newly arrived immigrant children and young people, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	74
Figure I.2.4:	Maximum time period for schools to enrol newly arrived migrants, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), number of days, 2017/18	77
Figure I.2.5:	Criteria for determining school grade, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	79
Figure I.2.6:	Use of top-level criteria for assessing competences in the host country language and prior learning, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	81
Figure I.2.7:	Initial placement of newly arrived children and young people from migrant backgrounds, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	83
Figure I.2.8:	Minimum and maximum time period to be spent by newly arrived migrants in separate lessons or classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	86
Figure I.2.9:	Time period set for providing support to newly arrived migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	88

I.3: Language, Learning and Psycho-Social Support	91
Figure I.3.1: Curriculum content of preparatory classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	92
Figure I.3.2: Learning support measures to be provided in preparatory classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	95
Figure I.3.3: Specific support to be provided during the transition from preparatory to mainstream classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	96
Figure I.3.4: Provision of the language of instruction in additional classes, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	98
Figure I.3.5: Home language teaching for migrant students in primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	100
Figure I.3.6: Entitlement to home language teaching, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	101
Figure I.3.7: Learning support measures to be provided in mainstream classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	103
Figure I.3.8: Measures contributing to the effective monitoring and assessment of migrant students' performance and progress in school, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	105
Figure I.3.9: Extra-curricular activities to support the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	106
Figure I.3.10: Objectives and activities related to the involvement of migrant students' parents, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	107
Figure I.3.11: Status of intercultural education in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	109
Figure I.3.12: Use of intercultural mediators for promoting the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	111
Figure I.3.13: Provision of psycho-social support for migrant students and unaccompanied minors, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	112
I.4: Teachers and School Heads	115
Figure I.4.1: Main policy challenges relating to teachers working with migrant students, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	116
Figure I.4.2: Financial incentives for teachers working with migrant students, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	117
Figure I.4.3: Issues related to the integration of migrant students included in teacher competence frameworks for initial teacher education (ITE), 2017/18	118
Figure I.4.4: CPD activities organised or supported by top-level education authorities on issues related to the integration of migrant students, 2017/18	120
Figure I.4.5: Resource centres, websites and teachers' networks supporting teachers working with migrant students in education, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18	121
Figure I.4.6 A: Teachers providing additional classes where the language of instruction is taught during school hours, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18	123
Figure I.4.6 B: Teachers <u>within the school</u> providing additional classes where the language of instruction is taught during school hours, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18	123
Figure I.4.7: Top-level regulations on who should provide home language teaching in mainstream education, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18	125
Figure I.4.8: Support programmes, courses and/or other activities for school heads to help them support the integration of migrant students, 2017/18	126

PART II: ANALYSIS **129**

II.2: Making Room for Diversity in School **131**

Figure II.2.1:	How curricula make room for diversity in schools	131
Figure II.2.2:	The main purposes of home language teaching	137
Figure II.2.3:	Policies related to making room for diversity in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	145

II.3: Taking a Whole-Child Approach to Teaching and Learning **147**

Figure II.3.1:	Incorporating the 'whole-child approach' in schools	147
Figure II.3.2:	Policies related to taking a whole-child approach in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	162

II.4: Conclusion **163**

Figure II.4.1:	Emphasis of policies relating to linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18	164
----------------	---	-----

CODES AND ABBREVIATIONS

Country codes

EU/EU-28 European Union	CY Cyprus	UK United Kingdom
BE Belgium	LV Latvia	UK-ENG England
BE fr Belgium – French Community	LT Lithuania	UK-WLS Wales
BE de Belgium – German-speaking Community	LU Luxembourg	UK-NIR Northern Ireland
BE nl Belgium – Flemish Community	HU Hungary	UK-SCT Scotland
BG Bulgaria	MT Malta	EEA and candidate countries
CZ Czechia	NL Netherlands	AL Albania
DK Denmark	AT Austria	BA Bosnia and Herzegovina
DE Germany	PL Poland	CH Switzerland
EE Estonia	PT Portugal	IS Iceland
IE Ireland	RO Romania	LI Liechtenstein
EL Greece	SI Slovenia	ME Montenegro
ES Spain	SK Slovakia	NO Norway
FR France	FI Finland	RS Serbia
HR Croatia	SE Sweden	(*) The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia
IT Italy		TR Turkey

(*) Provisional code

Statistics

(:) Data not available (–) Not applicable or zero

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND MAIN FINDINGS

Why is the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools an important topic?

A student who is well-integrated into the education system both academically and socially has more chance of reaching their potential. Students from migrant backgrounds, however, face a number of challenges in this respect that can affect their learning and development. According to the academic research literature, three types of challenges can be distinguished:

1. those related to the migration process (e.g. leaving the home country, having to acquire a new language, adapting to new rules and routines in schools, etc., and the impact of these acculturation stressors on migrant students' overall well-being) (Hamilton, 2013);
2. those related to the general socio-economic and political context (e.g. policies affecting the availability of resources to education systems and schools for promoting integration as well as policies promoting inclusion and equality more generally) (Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014); and
3. those related to student participation in education, including the limited scope of initial assessment, which does not always take account of both academic and non-academic aspects (i.e. social, emotional and health issues); inappropriate grade placement; language provision that is not adapted to the needs of students with a different mother tongue; insufficient learning support and a lack of social and emotional support; teachers who are not trained and/or supported to deal with diversity in the classroom; insufficient home-school cooperation; and a lack of or inflexibility in funding to provide adequate provision and support – to name but some (Reakes, 2007; Hamilton, 2013; Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013; Trasberg & Kond, 2017).

Migrant students are lagging behind their native-born peers in most European education systems

It therefore does not come as a surprise that overall migrant students underperform and express a lower sense of well-being in school compared to native-born students in most European countries. As reported in the OECD's PISA survey of 2015, the proportion of low-achieving migrant students exceeds that of native-born students in most participating European countries, even when socio-economic status is controlled for (OECD, 2016).

Similarly, according to the latest Eurostat data ⁽¹⁾, the rate of foreign-born students leaving education and training early is higher than the rate of the native-born population in almost all European countries for which data is available. Accordingly, tackling migrant students' lower educational outcomes and their retention in the education system is reported as a main policy challenge in 17 education systems ⁽²⁾ across Europe.

Primary school students who do not speak the language of instruction at home report a lower sense of belonging and experience more bullying at school

A secondary analysis of contextual data from the IEA PIRLS 2016 ⁽³⁾ and ICCS 2016 ⁽⁴⁾ surveys shows that, in primary and lower secondary education in most European countries, there are no

⁽¹⁾ Eurostat, Labour Force Survey [edat_lfse_02] (data extracted in June 2018)

⁽²⁾ BE nl, CZ, DK, ES, FR, MT, NL, AT, PT, FI, UK-WLS, UK-NIR, CH, LI, NO, RS, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

⁽³⁾ <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/index.html>

⁽⁴⁾ <https://iccs.iea.nl/home.html>

statistically significant differences between foreign-born and native-born students' sense of school belonging and the extent to which students experience bullying behaviours from their peers.

In contrast, some statistically significant differences can be found between primary school students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not. The latter have a lower sense of belonging to their school, and they report being more frequently bullied by their peers in almost all European countries participating in PIRLS 2016. At lower secondary level, the differences in school belonging and experiences of bullying between those who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not are smaller and can be seen in fewer countries, according to ICCS 2016 data.

European policy context

The evidence presented above underlines the importance of investing effort into helping children and young people from migrant backgrounds to become well-integrated into the education system and through this into society. Without this investment, these children will not reach their full potential. This concern has always been emphasised at European level, and many EU policy initiatives have been developed over the years to address the different challenges faced by these students.

The most recent initiatives include the European Commission's 2016 Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals ⁽⁵⁾ and the 2017 Communication on the protection of children in migration ⁽⁶⁾. The former document highlights, amongst other things, that education and training is one of the most powerful tools for integration. The latter document sets out actions to reinforce the protection of all migrant children at all stages of the process, which include an assessment of the needs of each child as early as possible upon arrival and access to education without delay and regardless of status.

Building on this, the 2018 Council Recommendation on promoting common values, inclusive education and the European dimension of teaching ⁽⁷⁾ stresses the importance of ensuring effective and equal access to quality inclusive education with the necessary support for all learners, including those from migrant backgrounds.

About this Eurydice report

This executive summary provides a comprehensive overview of the main findings of the Eurydice report on 'Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe: National Policies and Measures'. The general objective of the report is to support European cooperation related to the education of migrant students by providing a comparative analysis of the key policies and measures promoted by top-level education authorities in this area (see Figure 1).

The report starts with a context chapter presenting demographic data on migration in Europe. It also provides data on migrant students' educational attainment and their sense of well-being in schools. It is followed by a comparative analysis which is divided into two main parts:

1. A mapping of policies and measures in 42 education systems of the Eurydice Network covering the following areas: governance; access to education; language, learning and psycho-social support; and teachers and school heads. This mapping is based on qualitative data provided by the Eurydice Network on official regulations and recommendations related to the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools in Europe.

⁽⁵⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160607/communication_action_plan_integration_third-country_nationals_en.pdf


⁽⁶⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/20170412_communication_on_the_protection_of_children_in_migration_en.pdf

⁽⁷⁾ [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0607\(01\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0607(01)&from=EN)

- II. A deeper analysis of some of the integration policies and measures that are directly related to the individual child in 10 selected education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom – England). This analysis is structured along two main conceptual dimensions: one on addressing linguistic and cultural diversity in schools and the other on taking a whole-child approach.

It should be noted that the report only examines the existence and content of top-level regulations and recommendations that are directly related to the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools. The analysis of the wider context (i.e. the characteristics of the education systems or the socio-economic/political context) is beyond the scope of the report. Moreover, the report does not reflect whether and to what extent the policies and measures analysed are put into practice at local/school level; nor does it cover any other measures that may have been introduced under the auspices of local and/or school autonomy.

Figure 1: Conceptual framework for the analysis of policies and measures promoting the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools



Source: Eurydice.

This executive summary began by addressing the question why the integration process is an important issue for migrant students in schools. It continues with an explanation of what is meant by the term 'students from migrant backgrounds' and this is followed by a summary of the policies and measures introduced by top-level education authorities across Europe to promote the integration of these students. These are grouped under four main headings:

1. Access to education and training
2. Language support in linguistically and culturally diverse environments
3. A whole-child approach to teaching and learning
4. Comprehensiveness of policy approaches


What do we mean by 'students from migrant backgrounds'?

The report focuses on children and young people from migrant backgrounds. They are defined as newly arrived/first generation, second generation or returning migrant children and young people. Their reasons for having migrated (e.g. economic or political) may vary, as may their legal status – they may be citizens, residents, asylum seekers, refugees, unaccompanied minors or irregular migrants. Their length of stay in the host country may be short- or long-term, and they may or may not have the right to participate in the formal education system of the host country. Migrant children and young people from within and outside of the EU are taken into account.

This common definition enables a comparison to be made between the education policies of 42 education systems on migrant student integration. Official documents issued by the different

education authorities may, however, emphasise one or more of the specific characteristics of this population to determine who in particular should benefit from the policies and measures. Figure 2 shows that the 'country of origin' and the 'residence/immigration status' are used by policy-makers in most education systems to identify migrant students; students' 'first language' and their 'country of birth' are also important criteria.

Figure 2: Most common criteria used to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This figure is located in Chapter I.1 'Governance' (see Figure I.1.1).

By contrast, 'parents' country of birth' is less often used to identify migrant students. Not surprisingly, given this lack of reference, policies related to migration and education rarely target the second generation, i.e. students born in their country of current residence who have at least one foreign-born parent. In fact, only Italy reported such policies. Likewise, only a few countries, including Estonia, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Slovenia, explicitly target returning migrant students in their education policies – i.e. students returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants in another country.


In most countries, the proportion of immigrants under 15 years old is below 10 %

Eurostat data on immigration rates in Europe shows that the numbers of people entering EU Member States fluctuates between the years and varies a great deal between countries. In the last decade, the highest numbers entered in 2007 (ca. 4 million), 2015 (ca. 4.7 million) and 2016 (ca. 4.3 million). These numbers include intra-European migration and migration from outside the EU ⁽⁸⁾.

Statistics focusing on a specific age group – young people under 15 years of age – indicate that in almost all countries with available data the group of foreign-born constitutes less than 10 % of this population (see Figure 3). The figure is below 5 % in 17 countries and between 5 % and 10 % in 10 countries. Luxembourg is a clear outlier, most likely due the size of the country and also the substantial influx of highly skilled migrant workers from neighbouring countries.

⁽⁸⁾ Eurostat, Immigration by age group, sex and citizenship [migr_imm1ctz] (data extracted in June 2018)

Figure 3: Proportion of foreign-born people under 15 years old among all young people in the same age group, 2017



Source: Eurostat, Population on 1 January by age group, sex and country of birth [migr_pop3ctb] (data extracted in June 2018).

Explanatory note

This figure is located in the chapter 'Context' (see Figure 14).

What do top-level education authorities across Europe do to support schools in integrating migrant students?

The integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools is a complex process, which aims to give children and young people access to quality education and to provide any necessary language, learning and social-emotional support. It also involves helping them to adapt to their new school environment and ensuring that they make good progress in their learning. Taking the process a step further means ensuring that this environment is welcoming for students from diverse backgrounds and with different needs, and guaranteeing a safe space where all students feel secure, valued and able to learn.

1. Access to education and training

Access to education and training is a universal human right, regardless of legal status. However, access alone is not sufficient if it is not combined with quality education and training, i.e. the opportunity to enrol in schools providing high quality teaching, learning and support as well as educational pathways which meet students' learning needs and aspirations (European Commission, 2013). Children and young people from migrant backgrounds may face challenges in both areas.

Migrant children and young people of compulsory school age have the same education rights and obligations as their native-born peers in most European education systems

In most European education systems, children and young people from migrant backgrounds of compulsory school age have the same rights and obligations to participate in education as those born in the host country. However, in eight countries (Bulgaria, Denmark, Lithuania, Hungary, Romania, Sweden, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey), some categories of migrant children and young people have different rights and/or obligations.

For example, in Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, migrant children and young people with resident status have the right, but are not obliged to participate in education. Despite European agreements⁽⁹⁾ specifying that national authorities should provide education for asylum seekers within three months of submitting their request, minors who are asylum seekers do not have the same education rights as native-born students in Denmark, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey. Finally, minors who are irregular migrants are in the most uncertain position – not having the same rights to participate in education as native-born children of the same age in Bulgaria, Denmark, Lithuania, Hungary, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey. In Sweden, irregular migrants can, but are not obliged to participate in compulsory education.

There is evidently a risk that migrant children and young people who do not have the same rights and obligations with respect to compulsory education in the host country may significantly fall behind their peers in their cognitive and social-emotional development.

Students over compulsory school age who lack resident status have no right to access education in 13 education systems

Young people from migrant backgrounds over compulsory school age face one of two situations: either they have the appropriate prior education and so can move on to a higher level of education in the host country, or they have not yet completed compulsory education and so need compensatory education to acquire equivalent educational attainment. In both cases, most education systems grant these students the same rights to education as they do to students of compulsory school age.

However, in 13 education systems⁽¹⁰⁾, some young people from migrant backgrounds (mostly asylum seekers and/or irregular migrants) who are over compulsory school age but have yet to complete compulsory education do not have the same rights as their native-born peers to participate in compensatory education. For example, in the Netherlands, irregular migrant young people who are 18 or older can complete the educational programme that they have started when they become 18, but they do not have the right to start another programme (general or IVET) when they are 18 or older. In Belgium (Flemish Community) and Switzerland, because participation in vocationally-oriented compensatory programmes that include work-based learning at a company requires a residence permit, irregular migrants over compulsory school age cannot enrol, although they are allowed to complete a programme if they enrolled earlier in Belgium (Flemish Community), or they can apply for a temporary residence permit in Switzerland.

An initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students is not widely carried out and is rarely comprehensive in Europe

Top-level education authorities advocate taking into account newly arrived migrant students' competences in the language of instruction and/or the results of the assessment of their prior learning in 21 European education systems⁽¹¹⁾. These elements usually contribute either to decisions on how to place the students in schools and/or to provide learning support to meet their needs.

Top-level criteria for assessing competences in the language of instruction and/or prior learning, which can promote consistency in the initial assessment of migrant students across all schools in the

⁽⁹⁾ Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast) [Online] Available at: <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013L0033&from=FR> [Accessed 22 October 2018].

⁽¹⁰⁾ BE nl, BG, CZ, DK, HR, LT, HU, NL, PL, CH, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, NO, TR

⁽¹¹⁾ BE de, BG, CZ, DK, DE, ES, FR, HR, IT, CY, LU, MT, RO, SI, SK, FI, SE, CH, LI, ME, RS

education system, exist in only 18 education systems ⁽¹²⁾. And only four of the ten education systems investigated in Part II of the report (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Portugal, Sweden and Finland) specify in their official documents that next to the language of instruction and prior learning the students' social and emotional well-being should also be assessed.

Newly arrived migrant students are usually placed in preparatory classes or lessons if their language skills are not strong enough to follow mainstream teaching

Once children and young people from migrant backgrounds are enrolled in the education system, they may be placed in different settings. Newly arrived students whose competences in the language of instruction are good enough to follow the normal curriculum are generally placed in mainstream classes for all lessons alongside their native-born peers. In Czechia, Latvia, Slovakia, the United Kingdom (Scotland) and Montenegro, all newly arrived migrant students are placed in mainstream classes for all lessons, at all education levels.

Newly arrived migrant students with lower level or no skills at all in the language of instruction are usually placed in preparatory classes or lessons ⁽¹³⁾. There are generally three ways in which these classes are organised:

1. Students are placed in mainstream classes for most lessons but take some lessons in separate groups.
2. Students are placed in separate groups for most of their lessons and join mainstream classes for some lessons (in general sports, arts and music, where they can establish contacts and participate in classes even with limited language skills).
3. Students are placed in separate groups for all their lessons.

According to the research literature, preparatory classes or lessons may provide more time and space for the teaching and learning of the language of instruction than full integration into mainstream education right from the start (Koehler, 2017). However, preparatory classes/lessons have also been found to hinder integration by separating migrant students from their native-born peers. Moreover, migrant students' educational progress may be delayed if too strong a focus is placed on the acquisition of the language of instruction, to a degree that students' learning in other curriculum subjects is halted (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016).

Recognising the potential negative consequences of lengthy separated provision on the education outcomes and social integration of newly arrived migrant students, 21 ⁽¹⁴⁾ of the 33 education systems that have preparatory classes or lessons limit the time migrant students spend in this separate provision, in most cases to one or two years. Targeted language and/or learning support for newly arrived migrant students, however, usually last longer than the preparatory classes, and continue into mainstream education.

Another way in which top-level education authorities try to limit the potential negative impact of preparatory classes on migrant students' learning is by offering a content-rich curriculum, which provides teaching in other subject areas than just the language of instruction. In 13 ⁽¹⁵⁾ of the 33 education systems with preparatory classes, top-level regulations/recommendations stipulate that

⁽¹²⁾ BE de, BG, DK, DE, ES, FR, CY, LU, MT, NL, AT, PT, RO, FI, SE, CH, LI, ME

⁽¹³⁾ Preparatory classes – in some countries also referred to as 'reception classes' or 'transition classes' – are separate classes or lessons in which newly arrived migrant students are provided with intensive language teaching and, in some cases, an adapted curriculum for other subjects with the intention of preparing them to integrate better into mainstream classes (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017b).


⁽¹⁴⁾ BE fr, BE de, BE nl, DE, EE, EL, FR, HR, IT, CY, LT, LU, AT, PL, RO, SI, FI, SE, CH, LI, NO

⁽¹⁵⁾ BE fr, BE nl, DK, EL, FR, CY, LT, LU, MT, PL, FI, SE, CH

these classes should cover other curriculum subjects (especially other core subjects such as mathematics, foreign languages, natural sciences, etc.), in addition to the language of instruction.

Figure 4 shows that in some countries, such as Greece, France, Luxembourg, Finland and Switzerland, where newly arrived migrant students may spend up to six years in preparatory classes or lessons, official documents indicate that a relatively large number of subjects should be covered. Conversely, in countries like Romania and Slovenia the narrow focus of preparatory classes/lessons on one or two subjects coincides with the fact that the time limit for these classes is relatively short and it is recommended that students should also follow all other subjects in mainstream education.

Figure 4: Limit on the time spent in preparatory classes/lessons (in years) and the number of curriculum subjects covered, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

This figure is based on Figure I.2.8 in Chapter 2 'Access to Education' and Figure I.3.1 in Chapter 3 'Language, Learning and Psycho-social Support'.

Source: Eurydice.

2. Language support in linguistically and culturally diverse environments

Proficiency in the language of instruction is necessary for students to access the school curriculum and to benefit from the learning opportunities offered by schools. School performance depends very much on students' level of literacy in the language of instruction. This affects all learners, but particularly those from disadvantaged backgrounds, including some categories of migrant students. (European Commission, 2017d) Wider societal issues are also at play: giving all children the chance to fulfil their potential in education plays a major role in building a more democratic and equitable society.

Language issues extend beyond the teaching of the language of instruction. Academic research has shown how taking into consideration students' linguistic and cultural realities has positive effects on students' well-being and performance in school (Thomas and Collier, 1997; Cummins, 2001; Garcia, 2009). Statistics discussed above indicate that primary school students whose home language differs from the language of instruction have a lower sense of school belonging and are more at risk of bullying at school.

The teaching of the language of instruction, home languages and all other curriculum subjects takes place in a learning environment which may (or may not) make room for linguistic and cultural diversity. Intercultural education may be used to build such an environment as it promotes the creation of a common learning and living space in which all students – whatever their linguistic and cultural background – can enter into dialogue, recognise their similarities beyond their differences, show respect for one another, and potentially change the way they see themselves and others.


Teaching the language of instruction

The teaching of the language of instruction to migrant students poses particular challenges as this language is often a second or additional language which needs to be learnt and mastered to a sufficiently high level in order to learn other subjects. Proficiency in the language of instruction also facilitates the socialisation process in schools. For these reasons, specific teaching measures relating to the language of instruction need to be part of any comprehensive education policy that seeks to improve the way migrant students are integrated into schools.

The 'number of migrant students needing language support' is often used as a criterion for allocating funding

About two-thirds of the top-level education authorities in Europe that have a budget for integrating migrant students into schools, acknowledge the key role of the language of instruction by using the 'number of migrant students needing language support' as a criterion for allocating funding (see Figure 5). In some countries, these education authorities also use other criteria such as the 'number of migrant students in the school/municipality'.

Figure 5: Main criteria for allocating funding to support the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This figure is located in Chapter 1 'Governance' (see Figure I.1.8).

The initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students' competences in the language of instruction is not only used to make decisions on school placement, it also provides teachers with the necessary information to plan their lessons and provide the appropriate support for each student according to the particular language needs. For instance, Austria has very recently introduced policy measures related

to the testing of the language of instruction. These measures are distinctive in that all students – native-born and migrant alike – must have their German skills tested before they start school.

All top-level education authorities in Europe, except the United Kingdom (England), Bosnia-Herzegovina and the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, also provide regulations or recommendations on the provision of additional language of instruction classes to migrant students, either within or outside school hours, at all or some educational levels. These additional classes may be provided in the context of preparatory classes. In many education systems where these are provided by teachers working within the school, top-level education authorities expect these teachers to hold additional qualifications, such as in teaching the language of instruction as a second or additional language.

The school curriculum, as a broader framework in which the teaching of the language of instruction is provided, may facilitate the learning of the language of instruction. Several top-level education authorities in Europe seem to have acknowledged the transversal curricular dimension of the language of instruction. For instance, 15 top-level education authorities⁽¹⁶⁾ have identified as a particular policy challenge, teachers' ability and qualifications to teach curriculum subjects in the language of instruction to students for whom it is a second or additional language. Twenty-two top-level education authorities⁽¹⁷⁾ organise or support CPD activities to allow teachers to acquire these competences.

The more detailed analysis of ten education systems in Part II of the report shows that they all view the language of instruction as a transversal competence. This means that all teachers (language teachers and content-based subject teachers) are expected to help all students, including migrant students, improve their skills in the language of instruction.

In three of the ten education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Austria and Finland), raising language awareness⁽¹⁸⁾ is a transversal learning objective of the curriculum. Developing language awareness when studying language and non-language subjects contributes to a deeper insight into linguistic matters, which facilitates language learning and helps achieve a high proficiency level in the languages learnt by students (Svalberg, 2007). In Finland, language awareness is considered a key aspect of school culture, which makes every school a 'community with language awareness'. In this case, this concept embraces various aspects of language learning as relevant in the school context: it stresses the key importance of language for learning, interaction and cooperation, and for the building of identities and socialisation.

Complementary to this transversal approach to the language of instruction, the Swedish and Finnish education systems have developed a curriculum for learning the language of instruction as a second language. In Finland, it is available to students whose home language differs from Swedish and Finnish and who are in need of such teaching, while in Sweden, this curriculum is available to a wider group of students, but is also provided on a needs basis. In both countries, those students can study this curriculum throughout their school education.

⁽¹⁶⁾ BG, DE, EE, EL, IT, CY, LT, LU, MT, PT, SE, IS, ME, NO, RS

⁽¹⁷⁾ BE de, BG, CZ, DE, EE, IE, ES, EL, CY, LV, LU, MT, AT, PT, SI, SK, FI, CH, IS, LI, ME, NO

⁽¹⁸⁾ Language awareness refers to a person's sensitivity to a conscious awareness of the nature of language and its role in human life (Donmall, 1985). It embraces ideas such as explicit knowledge about language, conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use' (Association for Language Awareness, 2012, as seen in Ellis, 2012).

Teaching of home languages

It is very rarely a right for migrant students to study their home language at school

Thirteen top-level education systems ⁽¹⁹⁾ across Europe have regulations or recommendations on the provision of home language tuition in school, although this is rarely a right, and when it is, it is subject to certain conditions (e.g. a minimum number of students required). In education systems where there is no top-level education policy on this issue, teachers may still be expected to make room for their students' home language(s) in different ways. This is for example the case in France, Portugal and the United Kingdom (England). In these cases, home languages are mostly used in an instrumental way as they mainly help support migrant students in achieving proficiency in the language of instruction.

Of the ten education systems under closer investigation, official documents in the majority of them (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Italy, Austria, Slovenia and Sweden) consider that the main purpose of home language teaching is preserving and promoting migrant students' home language. Furthermore, these documents point out the role this teaching plays in developing migrant students' intercultural competences. Ultimately, this teaching is intended to help migrant students build their (multicultural) identity, and it consequently facilitates their integration into school. In Austria and Sweden, the learning of home languages is moreover considered as the basis of the whole education process in school. In other words, it is seen as contributing to migrant students' achievement and well-being. In Sweden, where top-level education authorities have defined a very comprehensive assessment procedure, migrant students' competences in their home language are also assessed.

Finland is the only one of the ten selected education systems where the teaching of home languages is seen as a contribution to fostering bilingualism and plurilingualism for all learners. In this country, top-level education authorities draw on the linguistically and culturally diverse environment in which schools operate. All languages present in the school are consequently valued and used; they all pertain to the school culture. The curriculum promotes plurilingualism and aims to develop students' linguistic awareness.

Austria, Sweden and Finland are the only three of the ten selected education systems where top-level education authorities have designed a curriculum specifically for the teaching of home languages.

Home language teachers either come from abroad or are born and educated in the country where they teach

In only seven of the 42 education systems (Spain, Italy, Austria, Finland, Sweden, Switzerland and Norway) do the top-level education authorities provide recommendations or regulations on the qualifications necessary to teach home language classes. The analysis of the ten education systems shows that the systems providing home language teaching can be divided into two categories. The first group includes education systems where home language teachers mostly come from the countries where the languages are spoken. Consequently, their initial teacher education has taken place in those countries. This is the case in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Italy, where cooperation with foreign countries has been established in order for specific languages to be taught. In the second group of education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Austria, Slovenia, Sweden and Finland), home language teachers have different profiles in terms of qualifications and origins: they might come from abroad or they may be first or second generation migrants who were educated and trained in Europe.

⁽¹⁹⁾ DK, DE, EE, ES, IT, LV, LT, AT, SI, SE, CH, IS, NO

Intercultural education

In the majority of countries across Europe, intercultural education is referred to as a subject or theme in the national curriculum. It may also be an aspect of school culture or addressed through special days or projects.

Intercultural education can be an education principle, a cross-curricular theme or taught through specific curriculum subjects


A closer analysis of the curriculum and official documents of the ten selected education systems shows substantial differences in how intercultural education is promoted. It is part of the national curriculum in nine of the ten education systems – Portugal is the exception, where it is promoted through several individual initiatives and projects across the country. However, from 2018/19, intercultural education becomes part of the curriculum of 'Citizenship and development'.

In Sweden and Italy, it is a principle underpinning the whole curriculum: it is considered as an educational response, which concerns all students, to the growing multicultural dimension of our societies. In Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Austria and Finland, intercultural education is promoted as a cross-curricular theme; and the subjects through which it should be developed are indicated in the curricula. Finally, in France, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England), intercultural education is taught through specific subjects, citizenship education in particular.

When considering teacher education and training, Figure 6 shows that in the majority of the 42 education systems that have a teacher competence framework for ITE, such official documents include competences related to intercultural education such as teaching in diverse, multicultural classrooms and/or addressing general discrimination issues and implicit bias against culturally and linguistically diverse students. In 34 education systems, teachers can also acquire at least one of these two competences during continuing professional development (CPD) ⁽²⁰⁾.

⁽²⁰⁾ BE fr, BE de, BE nl, BG, CZ, DE, EE, IE, ES, FR, HR, IT, CY, LV, LT LU, HU, MT, AT, PT, RO, SI, SK, FI, SE, UK-WLS, UK-NIR, UK-SCT, CH, IS, LI, ME, RS, TR

Figure 6 : Issues related to intercultural education included in teacher competence frameworks for initial teacher education (ITE), 2017/18



Explanatory note

This figure is based on Figure I.4.3 in Chapter 4 'Teachers and School Heads'.

3. A whole-child approach to teaching and learning

Education authorities can play an important role in supporting students from migrant backgrounds by providing the necessary policies and measures to encourage schools to take a whole-child approach to meeting students' needs. In addition to support for learning languages and other curriculum subjects, this approach means helping students with their social and emotional development. This contributes to improving migrant students' overall school performance and minimises the risk of low achievement and early school leaving (Trasberg & Kond, 2017).

Addressing migrant students' holistic needs


According to the research literature, students' academic development and potential cannot be fully realised without supporting their social and emotional needs (Hamilton, 2013; Slade & Griffith, 2013; Krachman, LaRocca & Gabrieli, 2018). This applies to all students, but in particular to students from migrant backgrounds who may face additional challenges, such as social and cultural obstacles, barriers to full participation in schools, segregation and/or hostility and bullying within the host society (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016; Trasberg & Kond, 2017). Thus, while focusing on developing migrant students' language skills and promoting their learning in general, it is equally important to promote their personal, social and emotional development in order to create an optimal state for learning.

Policies and measures on learning support tend to focus on students' academic rather than their social and emotional needs

Across Europe, 33 education systems report that they have top-level regulations and/or recommendations on the provision of learning support measures (see Figure 7). In most of them, these measures apply to all students who need additional learning support, including migrant students. Despite the fact that teachers generally have autonomy when it comes to the teaching methods they use in the classroom, the forms of learning support most frequently advocated are those implemented by teachers, i.e. individualised learning support and differentiated teaching. Less frequently reported

are centrally set limits on class size and learning support provided with the help of other students, such as peer education or mentoring.

Figure 7: Learning support measures to be provided in mainstream classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This figure is based on Figure I.3.7 in Chapter 3 'Language, Learning and Psycho-social Support'.

The analysis of the content of official documents in the ten education systems selected for closer scrutiny shows that even though they all promote certain learning support measures for students with additional learning needs, which include migrant students, the focus of these measures is mainly on academic needs. Support needs that go beyond the cognitive and address migrant students' emotional and social support needs are highlighted only in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), and indirectly in Portugal where learning support is provided by multidisciplinary teams that include psychologists, social workers, intercultural mediators and other specialised staff.

Less than half of all education authorities support the continued assessment of migrant students' educational progress, and it mainly focusses on the language of instruction

The monitoring and assessment of migrant students' performance and progress can help schools identify those students needing additional support. However, the top-level education authorities in only 23 education systems ⁽²¹⁾ provide teachers with some form of support such as continuous assessment tools or national tests specifically developed for assessing migrant students' knowledge and skills.

The analysis in the ten selected education systems shows that the main focus of these assessment instruments is generally on migrant students' language skills, except in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) where support for the continuous assessment of migrant students is given to teachers through counselling teams specialised in language, interculturality and social cohesion. In other words, very little emphasis seems to be put in official documents on the continuous assessment of migrant students' other competences and learning needs, including their social and emotional needs.

⁽²¹⁾ BE de, BG, CZ, DK, DE, IE, EL, FR, IT, CY, LV, LT, LU, AT, PT, SI, SK, FI, UK-WLS, UK-NIR, CH, LI, NO

Most education systems promote the development of social-emotional competences and the availability of psycho-social support for all students, including migrant students

Despite the fact that policies on learning support for migrant students with additional learning needs focus mainly on academic aspects, seven of the ten selected education systems, report that they promote the development of all students' social and emotional competences through their national curricula. These competences may be transversal ones taught across the whole curriculum (Finland), or integrated into some subjects only (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, and Slovenia) or expressed as a general objective of education (France, Austria, Portugal and the United Kingdom – England).

Children and young people who develop their social and emotional skills can acquire protective characteristics, such as the ability to manage feelings and friendships, solve problems, cope with difficulties, etc., that often prove to be more effective in dealing with difficult issues than concentrating only on students' immediate problems (Cefai, 2008). Nevertheless, for migrant students experiencing social and emotional difficulties (e.g. due to acculturation and/or resettlement stressors, experiences of bullying or hostility, or potential traumatic experiences, etc.), there may also be an increased need for psycho-social support services in schools as a therapeutic measure. Across Europe, the majority of education systems promote the availability of psycho-social services as well as specific support for unaccompanied minors through official regulations/recommendations. In France, Italy and the United Kingdom (England), the services are exclusively focussed on unaccompanied minors.

The analysis of the official documents addressing psycho-social support reveals that in only four of the ten selected education systems (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Austria, Finland and Sweden) is the psycho-social support promoted by education authorities (either through specially trained teams/staff or specific information material) geared towards the particular needs of students from migrant backgrounds; whereas the other countries offering psycho-social support make it available to all students, and migrants are not specifically targeted. Although the importance of offering psycho-social support to all students who may need it is unquestionable, it may be worth exploring further the need for targeted advice and support to address the specific problems faced by students from migrant backgrounds. One place to start may be the monitoring of the availability of psycho-social support for migrant students, which is currently done in only seven of the 42 education systems (Spain, Cyprus, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Sweden and Serbia).

Supporting teachers to meet migrant students' holistic needs

Teachers are at the forefront when it comes to supporting the integration of students from migrant backgrounds in schools. However, the research literature shows that they often feel unprepared and insecure when confronted in the same classroom with students from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds (e.g. Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013; Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014; European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015; Trasberg & Kond, 2017). This finding is confirmed by the fact that in 28 European education systems ⁽²²⁾ teachers' lack of competences to work in diverse and multicultural classrooms is reported as a main policy challenge.

Most education authorities try to address teachers' unpreparedness to work in culturally diverse classrooms through teacher education and training

In an effort to promote certain teacher competences and steer the education and training programmes of future teachers, the majority of European education systems include competences related to

⁽²²⁾ BE nl, BG, CZ, DE, EE, EL, ES, IT, CY, LV, LT, LU, MT, AT, PT, RO, SI, FI, SE, UK-ENG, UK-WLS, UK-NIR, CH, IS, LI, ME, NO, TR

teaching in diverse, multicultural classrooms in their ITE competence frameworks and/or they promote these skills through CPD activities organised or supported by the top-level education authorities.

The analysis of the content of ITE competence frameworks shows that in eight of the ten selected education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia and the United Kingdom –England) these instruments emphasise the skills needed for teaching students from migrant backgrounds. However, apart from general references to teachers' familiarity with the intercultural dimension and their ability to teach in diverse and multicultural classrooms, specific competences that also take into account migrant students' more holistic needs are only highlighted in Portugal and Slovenia. The competence frameworks of both these countries highlight teachers' role in addressing the individual learning needs of migrant students as well as ensuring their general well-being and helping them to feel that their individual and cultural identity is accepted and appreciated in school.

In the area of CPD, six of the ten selected education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain, Italy, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden) organise and/or support in-service training activities to raise teachers' awareness of both the academic and the social-emotional needs of students from migrant backgrounds. Together with the findings on ITE competences frameworks, this shows that while higher education institutions have autonomy in designing teacher education and training programmes, top-level education authorities can play an important role in influencing the knowledge and skills covered and potentially also the attitudes teachers develop so that they are better prepared to address the holistic needs of students from migrant backgrounds in their classrooms.

The use of teaching assistants and intercultural mediators to support migrant students' school integration does not seem to be sufficiently exploited

Teachers are of course not alone in ensuring that migrant students are successfully integrated into schools. The report shows that many other professionals, such as school counsellors, social pedagogues, psychologists, social workers, etc., may contribute to this process. Two particular types of staff who provide effective support in this context were investigated in more detail: teaching assistants and intercultural mediators.

Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) is the only one of the ten education system where teaching assistants (who have the same status as other teachers) are deployed and tasked with ensuring not only the academic progress of migrant students but also with making a contribution to students' overall feeling of well-being in school.

The use of intercultural mediators is advocated by only 13 out of 42 education systems⁽²³⁾. Official documents promote the use of these professionals to support migrant students' initial integration in both the academic and social spheres. Given the capacity of both teaching assistants and intercultural mediators to support migrant students' holistic needs, it may useful to further investigate the role and impact these professionals may have.

⁽²³⁾ CZ, DE, ES, IT, CY, LU, AT, PL, SI, UK-WLS, UK-NIR, CH, LI


Involvement of school heads, parents and other local community actors

The 'whole-school approach' is a collaborative approach which involves teachers, school heads, other education professionals, parents as well as the local community. This approach has been found to be a significant factor in addressing migrant students' holistic needs and ensuring students' continued progress.

Only half of all education systems provide support to school heads to ensure the successful integration of migrant students

School heads can play an important role in coordinating the range of language, learning and social-emotional support needed for students from migrant backgrounds. Figure 8 shows that top-level education authorities in 22 European education systems organise or support specific training programmes, networking activities and/or offer guidance materials to help school leaders in integrating migrant students.

Figure 8: Programmes, courses and/or other activities targeting school leaders to help them support the integration process, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This figure is based on Figure I.4.8 in Chapter 4 'Teachers and School Heads'.

When it comes to school heads' role in promoting a whole-school approach which is attentive to the holistic needs of migrant students, the analysis shows that only one of the ten selected education systems – Sweden – puts an emphasis on raising school leaders' awareness of the social-emotional and mental health needs (including chronic stress and traumatic experiences), which can impact on migrant students' school outcomes.


Around two-thirds of education authorities promote the involvement of parents in school and provide information focussing on the children's academic development

In order to respond to the different support needs of students from migrant backgrounds, the involvement of parents or caregivers is also crucial (Trasberg & Kond, 2017). The report's secondary analysis of parents' responses to PIRLS 2016 shows that, in about half of the participating European countries, the parents of foreign-born students and students who do not speak the language of

instruction at home have a more positive perception of school than the parents of native-born students or those who speak the language of instruction at home. These parents feel that their child's learning is well supported at school and they are sufficiently informed about his/her progress. Nevertheless, school heads report lower parental involvement in schools with a high proportion of students who do not speak the language of instruction at home than in schools where most students do so.

In an effort to strengthen links with migrant students' parents and to capitalise on the positive effects of involving them in their children's education, 26 education systems across Europe have put in place top-level regulations/recommendations to promote schools' efforts to keep parents informed, as well as to actively engage them in the education process (see Figure 9). Examples of these initiatives include a training programme for migrant students' parents that aims to enhance their capacities to support their children, as is the case in France; or informing them about the coverage of the school curriculum so that they will be more aware and in a better position to guide and support their children, as is the case in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland).

Figure 9: Objectives and activities related to the involvement of migrant students' parents, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

This figure is located in Chapter 3 'Language, Learning and Psycho-social Support' (see Figure I.3.10).

The analysis of the official documents in the ten selected education systems shows that only two of them (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, and Slovenia) cover the areas of parental involvement in a holistic way. In both of these education systems, emphasis is put on the potential of parents to contribute to the physical, cognitive, social and emotional development of their children as well as to address any psycho-social difficulties. In contrast, in the other education systems the focus remains on the involvement of parents in the academic aspects of their children's education. Given that parents' awareness of their children's social and emotional development and well-being may in fact be greater than their awareness and capacity to intervene in their educational development, the role of parents in supporting the social and emotional needs of migrant students in schools may be something to be further explored.

There may be more room in official documents for highlighting the importance of cooperation with outside professionals and local organisations

In addition to the involvement of migrant students' parents, the academic research literature has highlighted the importance of cooperation between schools and professionals and organisations from outside (such as social and health services, NGOs, language schools, cultural societies, etc.) in integrating migrant students (e.g. Weare, 2002; Cefai et al., 2014; Hunt et al., 2015). The analysis of top-level regulations/recommendations shows that only five of the ten selected education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Italy, Portugal and Slovenia) encourage schools and teachers to cooperate closely with local organisations; but only Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) extends this cooperation to address not only students' academic development and progress but also their psycho-social support needs. In order to ensure that migrant students' holistic needs are taken into account in the integration process, more attention may need to be paid to supporting a whole-school approach that encourages the involvement of all key players in this process, including those in the wider community.

4. Comprehensiveness of policy approaches

The findings of the report show that integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools is an issue that requires, maybe more than any other educational issue, a comprehensive policy approach. This implies not only policy interventions across the whole range of areas addressed above, but also the involvement of stakeholders from different policy areas and levels as well as those in local communities.

Few education systems have specific top-level strategies or action plans for integrating migrant students into schools

When the challenges to be addressed are complex, affecting a number of policy areas and stakeholders, and requiring significant resources, top-level authorities may adopt comprehensive strategies or action plans. Top-level authorities in 25 education systems in Europe⁽²⁴⁾ have adopted targeted or broader strategies or action plans addressing this issue. Ten of these (Germany, Greece, Spain, Italy, Cyprus, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, the United Kingdom – Northern Ireland, and Switzerland) have targeted strategies in the field of education, while others have broader strategies, e.g. for promoting social integration or language acquisition, but which also consider school integration. Most strategies in place are recent and have a three-year timeframe.

Most education systems have developed policies and measures in a number of areas relevant to migrant students' school integration

Education systems that do not have a top-level strategy for integrating migrant students into schools may still have many relevant policies and measures in place. The results of the report's mapping of education policies and measures, which were summarised above, show that in most European countries, there are indeed top-level regulations and/or recommendations in many of the key policy areas related to the integration of migrant students into schools. In some countries, due to the characteristics of the education system, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on some of these policies to local authorities or schools; while other top-level education authorities do not address certain policy areas at all. This inaction may be due to a number of factors, including demographic, socio-economic and political factors, etc., which are beyond the scope of this report.


⁽²⁴⁾ BG, CZ, DE, EE, IE, EL, ES, HR, IT, CY, LV, LT, AT, PT, RO, SI, FI, UK-WLS, UK-NIR, UK-SCT, CH, IS, ME, NO, RS

Thus, while the mapping in the first part of the report focusses mainly on the existence of top-level regulations and recommendations to promote the integration into schools of students from migrant backgrounds – which provides a good starting point for analysing the range of policy areas addressed by education authorities – developing an understanding of the comprehensive nature of policy approaches requires also a detailed analysis of the content of these top-level regulations/recommendations, as carried out in the second, analytical part of this report in relation to ten education systems only.

Policies in only two of the ten selected education systems put equal emphasis on addressing diversity and promoting a whole-child approach

A number of policy areas that are closest to the individual child, i.e. those linked to language support in linguistically and culturally diverse environments and the provision of holistic learning support, also referred to as a 'whole-child approach', were investigated in more detail in Part II of the report. A large amount of academic research literature, presented in the report, highlights the importance of each area, and shows, in fact, that in order to address the integration of students from migrant backgrounds in a comprehensive and systematic fashion all these areas need to be given careful attention.

Figure 10: Emphasis of policies relating to linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This figure is located in Part II 'Analysis' (see Figure II.4.1).

Overall, the analysis in Part II of the report confirms that a comprehensive approach to policies for integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools is crucial. The challenges these students face, which can affect how well they are integrated and in turn how well they perform in school, are numerous and therefore only the policy responses which take account of the many different issues and actors involved are likely to offer adequate solutions. Policy approaches which give access to quality education that accommodates linguistically and culturally diverse students and favours their cognitive as well as social-emotional development, are, moreover, not only beneficial for the integration of students from migrant backgrounds but for all students learning together in Europe's schools.

Figure 10 shows that among the ten education systems examined in Part II of the report, Finland and Sweden stand out in terms of having policies and placing a strong emphasis on both the diversity dimension and the whole-child approach. Policies and measures in Germany (Brandenburg) and Austria, on the other hand, are strong on diversity; however, they do not stand out in terms of the whole-child approach. Conversely, the policies and measures in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Portugal and Slovenia related to diversity are not distinctive; however, these education systems stand out with regard to the whole-child approach.

INTRODUCTION

Challenges related to migration and education

Migration is not a new phenomenon in Europe. Even though the humanitarian migration flows, which peaked in 2015, contributed to an acceleration of migration trends in recent years, societies have always been and will continue to be characterised by the movement and diversity of people. However, despite all current efforts across Europe to promote the integration of people from migrant backgrounds within their countries, these groups continue to lag behind native populations in many areas, including educational attainment, employment and social outcomes (Eurostat, 2018).

This report focuses on the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools. This is a complex process which aims to give children and young people access to quality education and to provide any necessary language, learning and social-emotional support. It also involves helping them to adapt to their new school environment and ensuring that they make good progress in their learning. Taking the process a step further means ensuring that this environment is welcoming for students from diverse backgrounds and with different needs, and guaranteeing a safe space where all students feel secure, valued and able to learn.

Definition of 'students from migrant backgrounds'

In this report, students from migrant backgrounds are defined as newly arrived/first generation, second generation or returning migrant children and young people. Their reasons for having migrated (e.g. economic or political) may vary, as may their legal status – they may be citizens, residents, asylum seekers, refugees, unaccompanied minors or irregular migrants. Their length of stay in the host country may be short- or long-term, and they may or may not have the right to participate in the formal education system of the host country. Migrant children and young people from within and outside of the EU are taken into account but the report excludes those from ethnic minority backgrounds who have been living in the host country for more than two generations.

Throughout the report, the term 'children and young people from migrant backgrounds' and 'migrant children and young people' are used interchangeably and with specific reference to those newly arrived who have not yet been enrolled in the education system. 'Students from migrant backgrounds' and 'migrant students' are used interchangeably and refer to those already in school.

According to a wealth of research evidence, students from migrant backgrounds face a number of challenges that may have a detrimental impact on their learning and development, and, consequently on the level of inclusion and equality within education systems. Broadly speaking, there are three types of challenges in the area of migration and education: those related to the migration process, those related to student participation in education and those related to the general socio-economic and political context.

The process of migration often results in significant changes in the lives of children and young people. They have to leave their previous lives behind and, upon arrival in the new country of residence, they may need to acquire a new language, adapt to new rules and routines in schools as well as deal with unfamiliar experiences in the wider community (Hamilton, 2013). The impact of such significant life changes (in the academic literature also referred to as 'acculturation stressors') depends on individuals' inner strengths or vulnerabilities; and this affects migrant students' well-being and consequently their educational attainment (Hek, 2005; Fisher & DeBell, 2007; Trasberg & Kond, 2017).

In addition to the afore-mentioned challenges, asylum seeker and refugee children/young people may have had to deal with experiences of persecution, violence, war, family loss, etc., which can have a significant effect on their welfare. Moreover, all newly arrived migrants may face 'resettlement stressors' such as poor housing, financial hardship and a lack of social support networks. Hostility within the host societies towards people from migrant backgrounds, whether they are newly arrived or long-term residents, can create barriers to building social bridges (Trasberg & Kond, 2017). For children and young people, the lack of secure attachments to peers as well as negative relationships with school teachers can contribute to feelings of isolation or rejection, which are in turn predictive of social, emotional and behavioural problems, including a higher risk of early school leaving (Hamilton, 2013).

These are only some of the issues that children and young people from migrant backgrounds may face. It is also important to note that they are not a homogeneous group. They have many and varied characteristics, such as their particular linguistic and cultural background, their reasons for having migrated and the socio-economic status of their families. However, they are all at risk of facing similar challenges in successfully integrating into school and achieving their academic potential.

Most importantly, all the challenges highlighted here are certainly not meant to feed into what has been identified as a 'deficit model', which only emphasises the problems migrant students may encounter (Rutter, 2006; Cefai, 2008; Nilsson & Bunar, 2016). On the contrary, they are intended to highlight that when it comes to integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools there is a need to find individualised solutions and to adopt a holistic view of migrant students' needs and capacities (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016).

Recent research has identified some of the barriers faced by students from migrant backgrounds:

- a lack of information in schools about the academic and non-academic (i.e. social, emotional, health, etc.) background of migrant children as they arrive;
- inappropriate grade placement;
- language provision that is not adapted to the needs of students with a different mother tongue;
- insufficient learning support and a lack of social and emotional support;
- teachers who are not trained and/or supported to teach in diverse classrooms;
- insufficient home-school cooperation;
- a lack of and inflexibility in funding to provide adequate provision and support.

(Reakes, 2007; Hamilton, 2013; Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013; Trasberg & Kond, 2017)

Moreover, researchers describe a general lack of comprehensive educational strategies or at least systematic approaches in this area, regardless of the national context, resulting in 'a plethora of local solutions of varying quality, leading to diverse outcomes' (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016, p. 411).

This report attempts to shed light on the policies and measures introduced by top-level education authorities across Europe to remove the barriers to migrant students' full participation in education and thus to facilitate their integration into school.

It should be noted, however, that schools operate within education systems, which again are shaped by countries' wider socio-economic and political contexts (see Figure 11). The analysis of these wider contexts is, however, beyond the scope of this report. Nevertheless, it is important to stress the impact of macro-level policies. For example, policies resulting in or perpetuating residential segregation (along ethnic boundaries) have educational implications. Schools in disadvantaged areas where the

majority of students and residents are of immigrant background often face a multitude of challenges. It makes the process of integrating migrant children into local communities more difficult and poses problems for language acquisition. These schools may also lack resources – both financial and human – thereby compounding the problems facing migrant students' in terms of achieving successful educational outcomes (Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014).

European policy context

The importance of promoting the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds in schools and, through education, integrating them into society has always been emphasised at European level, and many EU policy initiatives have been developed to address the different challenges these students are facing. The policy documents that have been developed during the last decade include the European Council conclusions of March 2008 ⁽¹⁾. This document urges Member States to take concrete action to improve the educational achievement of learners from migrant backgrounds. The Council conclusions of November 2009 on the education of children from migrant backgrounds ⁽²⁾ reaffirmed that education plays an important role for the successful integration of migrants into European societies. Starting with early childhood education and basic schooling, but continuing throughout all levels of lifelong learning, targeted measures and greater flexibility are needed to cater for learners from migrant backgrounds, whatever their age, in order to provide them with the support and opportunities they need to become active and successful citizens, and empower them to develop their full potential.

Another important policy document is the Council Recommendation of June 2011 on policies to reduce early school leaving ⁽³⁾, which notes that the average dropout rate among migrant groups is twice that of native-born students and that therefore Member States should develop targeted measures to significantly reduce early school leaving among these populations.

One of the more recent initiatives by the European Commission for the integration of migrants is the launch of the 2016 Action Plan to support Member States in this regard ⁽⁴⁾. In addition to actions proposed in key-areas such as pre-departure and pre-arrival integration measures, access to basic services, employment, active participation and social inclusion, education and training are once again highlighted as the most powerful tools for fostering integration. Therefore, access to these services should be ensured and promoted as early as possible.

Moreover, in April 2017, the European Commission published a Communication on the protection of children in migration ⁽⁵⁾, which sets out actions to reinforce the protection of all migrant children at all stages of the process. This includes an assessment of the needs of each child as early as possible upon arrival and access to education without delay, regardless of their status.

Last but not least the 2018 Council Recommendation on promoting common values, inclusive education and the European dimension of teaching ⁽⁶⁾ highlights the importance of ensuring equal access to quality inclusive education and the necessary support for all learners, including those from a migrant background.

⁽¹⁾ https://www.consilium.europa.eu/ueDocs/cms_Data/docs/pressData/en/ec/99410.pdf

⁽²⁾ [http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52009XG1211\(01\)&from=EN](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:52009XG1211(01)&from=EN)

⁽³⁾ <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:C:2011:191:0001:0006:en:PDF>

⁽⁴⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160607/communication_action_plan_integration_third-country_nationals_en.pdf


⁽⁵⁾ https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/20170412_communication_on_the_protection_of_children_in_migration_en.pdf

⁽⁶⁾ [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0607\(01\)&from=EN](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32018H0607(01)&from=EN)

Objectives of this report

This Eurydice report aims to support European cooperation in the area of migrant education by providing a comparative overview and analysis of the policies and measures promoted by top-level education authorities across Europe to support the integration of students from a migrant background in school.

Figure 11: Conceptual framework for the analysis of policies and measures promoting the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools



Source: Eurydice.

and recommendations. In other words, it does not reflect whether and to what extent these policies and measures are put into practice at local/school level. Moreover, it also does not cover any other measures that may have been introduced under the auspices of local and/or school autonomy.

It does so by mainly focusing on the policies and measures that have an impact on the ways in which newly arrived migrant students are placed in schools and on how schools subsequently address the various issues related to migrant students' integration, including language, learning and psycho-social support as well as the role of education professionals, parents and the school community in this respect. But it also takes into account governance mechanisms, including the coordination, funding, monitoring and assessment of the impact of policies and measures intended to promote integration (see Figure 11).

It should be noted, however, that the report only examines the existence and content of top-level regulations

Content and structure

The executive summary, presented ahead of this introduction, provides a comprehensive overview of all the aspects covered in this report as well as the main findings emerging from its different parts.

The context chapter presents demographic data on migration in Europe, data on migrant students' educational attainment as well as information regarding migrant students' sense of belonging and experiences of bullying in schools.

This is followed by the two main parts of the report providing a comparative analysis of education policies and measures on the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools in Europe:

- I. The first part is a mapping of policies and measures in a wide range of areas in 42 education systems of the Eurydice Network. It is structured according to four main chapters addressing governance; access to education; language, learning and psycho-social support; and teachers and school heads. Each chapter presents some key indicators with clear, precise and comparable information displayed as graphics and are accompanied by brief commentaries and a headline summarising the key findings.

- II. The second part consists of a deeper analysis of the policies and measures that are closest to the individual child in ten selected education systems ⁽⁷⁾. After an introduction, a comparative analysis follows, which is based on two conceptual dimensions: one related to addressing linguistic and cultural diversity in schools and the other to adopting a whole-child approach. The conclusions at the end of this part summarise the main findings on both conceptual dimensions.

Finally, further information on certain policy areas as well as some detailed statistical data is available in the Annex.

Scope

The main focus of the report is on the top-level regulations and recommendations promoted by education authorities to support the integration of students from migrant backgrounds in schools. In other words, education provided to migrant students outside of mainstream education (e.g. in refugee camps) or by other organisations (e.g. NGOs) is not considered.

The report aims to present the position of top-level education authorities vis-à-vis a given policy area, irrespective of whether the official documents are mandatory in nature (top-level regulation) or not (top-level recommendation). Where top-level education authorities formally delegate the duty to make decisions on a policy area to local authorities or schools, this is indicated as the 'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'.

The report covers general school education, i.e. primary, general lower and upper secondary education, as well as school-based initial vocational education and training (IVET) (ISCED levels 1, 2, and 3).

It provides information on all the countries that are part of the Eurydice Network, except Albania, numbering 42 education systems in total.

The reference year is 2017/18.

The Eurydice data is confined to public sector schools, except in the three Communities of Belgium, Ireland, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (England). In these education systems, government-dependent private institutions account for a significant share of school enrolments and may follow the same rules as public schools.

Where possible, Germany, Spain and Switzerland have provided information on official documents issued by the top-level education authorities. All three countries have also reported information from one or more *Länder*, Autonomous Communities and language regions/cantons, respectively. In the case of Spain, this includes the following Autonomous Communities: Cataluña, Principado de Asturias, La Rioja, Región de Murcia, Castilla-La Mancha, Extremadura, Illes Balears and Castilla y León, and City of Ceuta (these have also been considered as top-level education authorities).

⁽⁷⁾ Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England)

Methodology

The compilation of the report involved two main stages. The first stage saw an initial mapping of existing policies and measures related to the integration of migrant students into schools in 42 education systems (Part I). This part is intended to provide a general overview of the situation across Europe with regard to a number of key policy areas.

The differences that emerged in the extent to which European countries are concerned by migration (especially in terms of the size of their migrant population) led to a second stage in the development of the report. This stage involved a deeper analysis in ten selected education systems – namely those with a relatively large migrant population and relevant policies and measures in the particular areas under investigation i.e. how diversity in schools is being addressed and whether a whole-child approach is being adopted (Part II).

Information on policies and measures issued by top-level education authorities has been gathered by the Eurydice Network using questionnaires prepared by the Education and Youth Policy Analysis Unit in the Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Official documents (regulations, recommendations, national strategies, action plans, etc.) that have been issued and/or are recognised by top-level authorities have been the prime sources of information for answering these questionnaires.

In addition, the report presents some of the key findings presented in the current research literature on the integration of students from migrant backgrounds. These are used in Part I of the report mainly to introduce the different aspects being covered; while Part II of the report draws on the research findings to develop its conceptual dimensions and analysis.

The migration population and education data is based on Eurostat statistics. The information on migrant students' sense of belonging and experiences of bullying in school is based on a secondary analysis of survey data gathered by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) in the context of their Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2016 ⁽⁸⁾ and the 2016 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) ⁽⁹⁾. To facilitate the reading of this data, which is provided in Figures 12-23 of the 'Context' chapter, the country information is presented in order of decreasing value rather than the usual alphabetical order by country code.

The preparation and drafting of the report was coordinated by EACEA Education and Youth Policy Analysis Unit. It was checked by all the Eurydice National Units. All contributors are acknowledged at the end of the report.

⁽⁸⁾ <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/index.html>

⁽⁹⁾ <https://iccs.iea.nl/home.html>

CONTEXT

Before examining the policies for integrating students from migrant backgrounds into education, it is necessary to provide some contextual information. This chapter examines recent data on migration and education in Europe, including migrant populations, migrant student attainment levels, and migrant students' sense of belonging and bullying experiences at school. Discussion of the first two issues is based on Eurostat data, while the latter aspects are examined based on two sources of survey data: the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2016 ⁽¹⁾ and the 2016 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) ⁽²⁾.


Migration population and education statistics

The first section of this chapter examines recent demographic data on immigration in the European Union. The proportion of migrants in the whole population (see Figures 12 and 13), and in the youth population (see Figures 14 and 15) will be investigated. In addition, recent data on students leaving the education and training system early (see Figure 16) and the educational attainment level of migrants (see Figure 17) will be examined, the latter with reference to the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) ⁽³⁾ data.

In 2016, annual immigration in the European Union was only slightly higher than in 2007

As a result of both intra-EU mobility and immigration from outside of the EU, European populations have become increasingly diverse, although the annual number of immigrants has fluctuated somewhat in recent years. Figure 12 shows that from 2007 to 2009, there was, in fact, a significant decrease in migration of almost one million people over the two years.

Figure 12: Annual immigration into European Union countries (EU-28, in millions), 2007-2016



Source: Eurostat, Immigration by age group, sex and citizenship [migr_imm1ctz] (Data extracted in June 2018)

Explanatory note

The figure shows the annual immigration into European Union reporting countries, and it includes both intra-EU and migration from outside the EU to the reporting country.

Country-specific notes

Belgium: Data missing for 2008 and 2009.

Bulgaria: Data missing for 2008-2011.

Romania: Data missing for 2007.

⁽¹⁾ <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/index.html>

⁽²⁾ <https://iccs.iea.nl/home.html>


⁽³⁾ <http://www.oecd.org/pisa/>

From 2010, annual immigration began to rise gradually, culminating in the biggest annual increase of around 900 000 people in 2015 as a result of the humanitarian crisis. For example, the number of first time asylum applicants increased by more than 130 % in the fourth quarter of 2015 compared with the same quarter of 2014 but had remained unchanged since the third quarter of 2015 ⁽⁴⁾. The following year, the numbers dropped slightly, to almost the same level as in 2007.

The proportion of migrants in the total population is the lowest in eastern European countries

The proportion of the total foreign-born population compared to the native-born population in the European countries for which data is available ranges from 1.7 % in Poland to 45.8 % in Luxembourg. The group of countries with the lowest proportion (less than 10 %) can be found in Eastern Europe, together with Finland and Portugal. The term 'foreign-born' includes all people born outside the reporting country, which means immigrants from both EU countries and those outside the EU, including refugees and asylum seekers, and all other types of migration, thus representing a diverse group.

Figure 13: Proportion of native- and foreign-born population, 2017



Source: Eurostat, Population on 1 January by age group, sex and country of birth [migr_pop3ctb] (Data extracted in June 2018)

	LU	CH	CY	AT	SE	IE	BE	DE	NO	MT	EE	UK	IS	HR	ES	LV
Foreign-born	45.8	29.5	21.0	18.9	17.9	16.7	16.6	15.4	15.2	15.1	14.6	14.2	13.7	13.1	12.9	12.9
Native-born	54.2	70.5	79.0	81.1	82.1	83.3	83.4	84.6	84.8	84.9	85.4	85.8	86.3	86.9	87.1	87.1
	NL	FR	SI	DK	EL	IT	PT	FI	HU	LT	CZ	SK	RO	BG	PL	
Foreign-born	12.5	12.2	11.9	11.6	11.6	10.0	8.5	6.5	5.2	4.5	4.4	3.4	2.2	2.1	1.7	
Native-born	87.5	87.8	88.1	88.4	88.4	90.0	91.5	93.5	94.8	95.5	95.6	96.6	97.8	97.9	98.3	

Source: Eurostat Population on 1 January by age group, sex and country of birth [migr_pop3ctb] (Data extracted in May 2018)

Country-specific note


France: Provisional data.

⁽⁴⁾ For more detailed information, see Eurostat's Quarterly Report on Asylum: <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/6049358/7005580/Asylum+quarterly+report+-+Q4+2015.pdf/7c7307b1-a816-439b-a7d9-2d15e6e22e82>

In almost all countries, the proportion of immigrants under 15 years old is less than 10 %

As Figure 14 shows, the largest proportion of migrants under 15 years old can be found in Luxembourg (19.9 %), and it is higher by quite a substantial margin than the second largest, which can be found in Ireland (12.0 %). This seemingly disproportionate figure in Luxembourg is most likely due to the size of the country and the substantial influx of highly skilled migrant workers from neighbouring countries. In almost all European countries, the proportion of migrants in the under-15 age group is less than 10 %. In seven countries the proportion is less than 3 % (Slovakia, Portugal, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, Czechia and Croatia).

Figure 14: Proportion of native- and foreign-born people under 15 years old, 2017



	LU	IE	CH	CY	SE	AT	IS	NO	MT	BE	UK	RO	DK	NL	ES
Foreign-born	19.9	12.0	10.0	8.8	8.5	8.2	8.0	7.7	7.5	7.4	6.0	5.7	5.4	4.6	4.6
Native-born	80.1	88.0	90.0	91.2	91.5	91.8	92.0	92.3	92.5	92.6	94.0	94.3	94.6	95.4	95.4
	BG	FR	SI	HU	FI	IT	EL	LT	SK	PT	LV	EE	PL	CZ	HR
Foreign-born	4.4	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.6	1.8	1.4	1.1	1.0
Native-born	95.6	96.1	96.3	96.4	96.5	96.5	96.6	96.9	97.2	97.3	97.4	98.2	98.6	98.9	99.0

Source: Eurostat Population on 1 January by age group, sex and country of birth [migr_pop3ctb] (Data extracted in May 2018)

Country-specific notes

Germany: Missing data.


Liechtenstein: Data excluded as it covers young people with residency and citizenship in Liechtenstein, but who were born in the nearby regions of Switzerland or Austria.

In a large majority of countries, the proportion of native- and foreign-born people under 15 years old increased between 2014 and 2017

Figure 15 shows the change in the number of under 15 years old between 2014 and 2017. The largest increases over the period were in Romania (3.5 percentage points) and Malta (2.8 percentage points). The largest decreases can be found in Cyprus (-1 percentage point), Spain (-0.9 percentage points) and Croatia (-0.8 percentage points).

In most countries there has been a slight annual increase, only a few tenths of a percentage point. However in Romania, for example, the annual increase has been at least 1 percentage point. Notable exceptions to the increasing trend are Spain and Italy, where the proportion of migrants has decreased slightly every year, and Liechtenstein, where the increase has been more than 3 percentage points annually.

Figure 15: Change in the proportion of foreign-born young people under 15 years old (percentage points), between the years 2014 and 2017



RO	MT	AT	BG	SE	DK	UK	HU	NL	LV	LT	SK	LU	NO	IS	CH	FI	BE	FR	PL	SI	CZ	EL	EE	PT	IE	IT	HR	ES	CY
3.5	2.8	1.8	1.7	1.6	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	0.9	0.9	0.7	0.6	0.5	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.2	-0.2	-0.5	-0.8	-0.9	-1.0

Source: Eurostat Population on 1 January by age group, sex and country of birth [migr_pop3ctb] (Data extracted in May 2018)

Country-specific notes

Portugal: Data for 2013 instead of 2014.


Liechtenstein: Data excluded as it covers young people with residency and citizenship in Liechtenstein, but who were born in the nearby regions of Switzerland or Austria.

In almost all countries, the early leaving rate is higher for foreign-born than native-born young people

When it comes to the educational performance of students from migrant backgrounds, data from international surveys such as PISA has consistently shown that migrant students are at a disadvantage in European societies. As reported in the PISA study of 2015, the difference in the proportion of low achievers between migrant students and native-born students is quite large. In science, the difference in PISA scores is between 25 and 33 percentage points in Sweden, the Netherlands, France, Denmark, Belgium, Greece, Austria and Slovenia. While the achievement of second generation students is better than for first generation, it is still lower than that of native-born students. Even if socio-economic status is controlled for, migrant students still have substantial disadvantage in science skills (OECD, 2016).

As migrant students often lag behind in important school subjects at lower secondary level, it is not surprising that many of them leave education and training at the end of lower secondary education or even earlier. Figure 16 compares the differences in the rates of students leaving the education and training system early between the total population and the foreign-born population in the 18 to 24 age group. In almost all countries, the early leaving rate for the foreign-born population is higher than for the native population, being highest in Turkey (over 60 %), followed by Spain and Italy (over 30 %). The lowest early leaving rates among the foreign-born population can be found in Ireland (4 %), the Netherlands (6.6 %) and Luxembourg (8.2 %). In two of these countries (Ireland and the Netherlands), the rate is lower for the foreign-born population than for the native population, albeit by a small margin. The United Kingdom also falls into this category with 9.5 % of foreign-born students leaving early compared with 10.8 % of native-born students.

Figure 16: Early leaving from education and training (ELET), native-born and foreign-born population, 18-24 year-olds, 2017



(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

	TR	ES	IT	(*)	DE	IS	AT	CY	EL	BE	FR	SE	FI	PT	NO	CH	CZ
Foreign-born	64.1	31.9	30.1	23.6	23.1	19	18.4	18.1	16.9	16.4	15.5	15.5	15.2	13.9	13.4	10.3	9.5
Native-born	31.6	15.6	12	8.3	8.1	17.7	5.3	5.7	5.4	7.9	8.3	6.2	7.9	12.5	10.1	3.3	6.7
	UK	DK	LU	NL	IE	MT	RO	BG	HU	EE	SK	LV	LT	PL	ME	SI	HR
Foreign-born	9.5	9.3	8.2	6.6	4.0	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
Native-born	10.8	8.8	6.8	7.1	5.3	18.4	18.1	12.8	12.5	10.9	9.3	8.6	5.4	5	4.8	4.2	3.1

Source: Eurostat Early leavers from education and training by sex and country of birth [edat_lfse_02] (Data extracted in June 2018)

Explanatory note

Early leavers from education and training, previously referred to as early school leavers, refers to people aged 18 to 24 who have completed lower secondary education at most (ISCED 2) and are not involved in further education or training. The indicator 'early leavers from education and training' is expressed as a percentage of the total population aged 18 to 24.

Country-specific note


Bulgaria, Estonia, Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia and Montenegro: Data not available.

In a large majority of countries, more native-born than foreign-born people have completed upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education

As discussed above, young people from migrant backgrounds tend to have lower levels of educational achievement and they leave education and training earlier than their native-born peers in most European countries. This also impacts on their subsequent academic progress and attainment. Figure 17 compares the attainment levels of foreign-born and native-born people between the ages of 18 and 24. It shows the differences between native- and foreign-born young people who have reached either upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education level. In most countries, there are more native-born than foreign-born people with this level of education. The largest difference (over 15 percentage points) can be found in Sweden, Finland, Italy, Poland and Germany. In Bulgaria and Hungary, there is a substantially larger proportion of foreign-born than native-born people with upper secondary or post-secondary non-tertiary education level, with a difference of 19.3 and 13.2 percentage points respectively.

Not having upper secondary education often results in further disadvantages. While not impossible, it is very difficult to gain access to university without at least upper secondary education, thus resulting in disadvantages within the job market.

Figure 17: Percentage of foreign-born vs native-born people aged 18 to 24 with upper secondary or post-secondary, non-tertiary level education (ISCED 3-4), 2017



(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

	HR	EL	ME	(*)	SI	FI	BG	HU	CH	IE	CZ	IT	PL	LV	FR	LT	UK
Native-born	79.0	78.8	77.8	75.6	71.0	69.1	67.5	66.3	66.3	65.7	65.1	65	64.7	63.8	62.9	62.6	62.3
Foreign-born	81.5	67.2	76.8	68.9	74.6	48.3	86.8	79.5	54	64.1	60	46	49.4	:	53.0	:	55.7
	EE	RO	SE	SK	DE	MT	CY	AT	NL	PT	BE	DK	ES	LU	NO	IS	TR
Native-born	62.1	62.1	61.6	61.5	60.6	60.5	60	58.4	58	57.4	56.7	53.9	51.8	51.1	50.0	45.7	39.9
Foreign-born	:	:	38.8	:	45.5	52.4	61.5	50.8	49.2	55.3	48.9	42.1	37.9	50.1	47.0	47.0	26.6

Source: Eurostat Population by educational attainment level, sex, age and country of birth (%) [edat_ifs_9912] (Data extracted in June 2018)

Country-specific note

Slovenia: No post-secondary non-tertiary level exists.

Feeling a sense of belonging and experiencing bullying at school – Experiences of students from migrant backgrounds

Students' mental, emotional and physical well-being have an impact on their ability to establish lasting, good relationships and to develop the motivation needed for learning and achieving good academic results. A sense of belonging is a basic human need (Maslow, 1943), a person needs to feel accepted and respected by other people and to have his/her place in the community in order to develop further. School belonging, that is, being accepted and valued by peers and teachers, and having friends is of key importance for adolescents to feel well at school and to be able to thrive (Allen & Kern, 2017). The sense of belonging may increase students' self-confidence and academic motivation and decrease school related anxiety (Goodenow, 1993). For students from migrant backgrounds, and/or for those who speak a language at home which is different from the language of instruction, having a sense of belonging is particularly important if they are to be successfully integrated within their school community and, ultimately, if they are to achieve their academic potential.

Large scale international surveys gather information on student well-being and sense of security. The 2015 Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) 2015 (OECD, 2018), the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) 2016 ⁽⁵⁾ and the 2016 International Civic and Citizenship Education Study (ICCS) ⁽⁶⁾ also enquired about students' well-being and experiences of bullying

⁽⁵⁾ <https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/index.html>

⁽⁶⁾ <https://iccs.iea.nl/home.html>

(see Figures 18-21). In all these studies, information is available on the well-being of native-born and foreign-born students, those who speak the language of instruction, and those who do not. Indeed, in PIRLS 2016 about 3.9 % of the participating 4th grade European students ⁽⁷⁾ were born in another country; and about 15.9 % spoke a language at home that was different from the language of instruction at school ⁽⁸⁾. In ICCS 2016, 6.3 % of 8th grade students reported that they had been born in a country other than the host country, and 13.7 % did not speak the language of instruction at home. Individual countries show varying levels of immigration as presented in Figures 13 and 14.


In primary education, students who speak the language of instruction at home report a higher sense of school belonging and experience less bullying at school

In PIRLS 2016, a set of questions enquired about students' sense of school belonging, that is, the extent to which they feel appreciated by their teachers and are proud of their school. A second set of questions asked whether students had experienced any sort of bullying from their peers (malicious gossip, being excluded from activities/friendship groups, being physically hurt, etc.).

Figure 18 suggests that fourth grade students' sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying do not greatly vary whether they were born in the host country or not. Almost none of the index differences are statistically significantly different from zero.

In only two countries can statistically significant differences be observed. In Finland, foreign-born students report higher levels of school-belonging than the native-born in the 4th grade. In Ireland, foreign-born students are bullied in school by their peers more often than native-born students.

Figure 18: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 4th grade foreign-born and native-born students, 2016



Positive values: Foreign-born students report a **higher sense** of school belonging and/or **greater** experience of bullying

Negative values: Foreign-born students report a **lower sense** of school belonging and/or **less** experience of bullying

∅ = refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

	Differences statistically significant	Differences NOT statistically significant
Sense of school belonging	■	■
Experience of bullying	■	■

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

⁽⁷⁾ I.e. students participating in the 22 European countries.

⁽⁸⁾ This data also includes speakers of minority languages of the country.

Explanatory note (Figure 18)

The figure depicts the differences in the synthetic index between foreign-born and native-born:

Sense of school belonging – calculated on students' responses to the statements proposed under the question 'What do you think about your school?' - 'I like being in school', 'I feel safe when I am at school', 'I feel like I belong to this school', 'Teachers at my school are fair to me' and 'I am proud to go to this school'. Response options included 'Agree a lot', 'Agree little', 'Disagree a little' and 'Disagree a lot' (G12 of the PIRLS contextual 'Student Questionnaire').

Experiences of bullying – based on answers to the question 'During this year, how often have other students from your school done any of the following things to you (including through texting or the internet)?' – 'Made fun of me or called me names', 'Left me out of their games or activities', 'Spread lies about me', 'Stole something from me', 'Hit or hurt me (e.g. shoving, hitting, kicking)', 'Made me do things I didn't want to do', 'Shared embarrassing information about me' and 'Threatened me'. Response options included 'At least once a week', 'Once or twice a month', 'A few times a year' and 'Never' (G13 of the PIRLS contextual 'Student Questionnaire').

Data on the country of birth is based on responses provided by students' parents to question 3A in the PIRLS 'Learning to Read' questionnaire. Native-born students refer to students who were born in the host country. Foreign-born students refer to students who have been born in a country other than the host country. (See Annex Table 2.)

The figure shows values after having controlled for students' socio-economic background. See technical notes and Table 3 in the Annex.


Education systems are ranked in descending order of index difference between the sense of school belonging of foreign-born and native-born students. All the internal consistency indices (Cronbach alpha) are equal or higher than 0.70 for question G12 and equal or above 0.80 for question G13.

Country-specific note

United Kingdom (ENG): Data is not available. UK (England) did not administer the PIRLS 'Learning to Read' questionnaire.

In contrast, as shown in Figure 19, more obvious differences appear in 4th grade students' sense of school belonging and bullying experiences when looking at the language spoken at home. Those who speak the language of instruction at home usually report a higher sense of belonging and fewer experiences of bullying at school than those who speak another language at home, in almost all education systems. It should, however, be noted that this indicator does not take into account whether the student was born in the host country. For this reason, students who do not speak the language of instruction may include foreign-born students, as well as those second generation students who speak another language at home and those speaking a minority language (European Commission/ EACEA/Eurydice, 2017a).

Figure 19: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 4th grade students speaking the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016



Positive values: Students who speak the language of instruction at home report a **higher** sense of belonging and/or **more** experiences of bullying

Negative values: Students who speak the language of instruction at home report **lower** sense of belonging and/or **less** experiences of bullying

Ø = refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

	Differences statistically significant	Differences NOT statistically significant
Sense of school belonging	■	■
Experience of bullying	■	■

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Explanatory note (Figure 19)

The figure depicts the differences in the synthetic index between those speaking the language instruction at home and those who do not, calculated on the basis of answers to questions G12 and G13 of the PIRLS contextual 'Student Questionnaire' (see explanatory notes under Figure 18). Data on the language spoken at home is based on responses to the PIRLS 'Student Questionnaire', question G3 (see Annex Table 4).

The figure shows values after having controlled for students' socio-economic background. See technical notes and Table 5 in the Annex.

Education systems are ranked in descending order of index difference between the sense of school belonging of students who always or almost always speak the language of instruction at home and those who sometimes or never speak it at home. All the internal consistency indices (Cronbach alpha) are equal or higher than 0.70 for question G12 and equal or above 0.80 for question G13.

The largest index differences in students' sense of school belonging can be observed in Hungary, Lithuania, Belgium (Flemish Community) and Czechia, where those who speak the language of instruction feel significantly better than those who do not. The smallest (statistically significant) differences are shown in France and Denmark. When looking at students' experiences of being bullied, those students who do not speak the language of instruction at home report more bullying than those who do, in particular in Hungary, Portugal, Lithuania, Czechia, Latvia, and Italy. There is a smaller (statistically significant) difference in bullying experiences between the two groups in Germany and the United Kingdom (England). Interestingly, in the case of bullying, differences are somewhat larger than differences in the sense of school belonging, and they are also significantly different from zero in almost all countries.

Taking into account the data presented in the two figures above (Figures 18 and 19), there are differences in 4th grade students' sense of school belonging as well as in their experiences of bullying depending on whether they speak the language of instruction, but there are no real differences depending on whether they were born in the country of the survey. In Ireland, both foreign-born students and those who do not speak the language of instruction at home report somewhat more bullying from their peers.

In lower secondary education, the differences in experiences of bullying between those who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not are smaller than in primary

In the International Civic and Citizenship Study (ICCS) 2016, 8th grade students were asked similar questions to the 4th grade students in PIRLS 2016 – relating to their sense of school belonging and their experience of bullying. Figure 20 presents the differences in the sense of school belonging and bullying experiences between foreign-born and native-born students. There are only few education systems where statistically significant differences can be seen. Namely, in Bulgaria and Malta, foreign-born 8th grade students report a lower sense of school belonging than the native-born; with the biggest difference between foreign- and native-born students in Bulgaria.

Among the 15 European education systems participating in the survey, 8th grade foreign-born students report having experienced bullying from their peers more often than native-born students in the Netherlands, Belgium (Flemish Community) and Italy.

Figure 20: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 8th grade foreign-born and native-born students, 2016



Positive values: Foreign-born students report **higher** sense of belonging and/or **more** bullying experiences

Negative values: Foreign-born students report **lower** sense of belonging and/or **less** bullying experiences

Ø = refers to the average of 15 European education systems participating in the survey.

	Differences statistically significant	Differences NOT statistically significant
Sense of school belonging	■	■
Experience of bullying	■	■

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of ICCS 2017.

Explanatory note

The figure depicts the differences in the synthetic indexes between native-born and foreign-born:

Sense of school belonging – calculated on students' responses to the question 'How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements about teachers and students at your school?' – 'Most of my teachers treat me fairly', 'Students get along well with most teachers', 'Most teachers are interested in students' well-being', 'Most of my teachers listen to what I have to say', 'If I need extra help, I receive it from my teachers', 'Most teachers would stop students from being bullied', 'Most students at my school treat each other with respect', 'Most students at my school get along well with each other', 'My school is a place where students feel safe', 'I am afraid of being bullied by other students'. The response options included 'Strongly agree', 'Agree', 'Disagree' and 'Strongly disagree' (Q19 of the ICCS contextual 'Student Questionnaire').

Experiences of bullying – based on answers to the question 'During the last three months, how often did you experience the following situation at your school?' – 'A student called you by an offensive nickname...', 'A student said things about you to make others laugh', 'A student threatened to hurt you', 'You were physically attacked by another student', 'A student broke something belonging to you on purpose', 'A student posted offensive pictures or text about you on the internet'. The response options included '5 times or more', '2 to 4 times', 'Once' and 'Not at all' (Q20 of the ICCS contextual 'Student Questionnaire').

Data on the country of birth is based on responses provided by students to question Q4 in the ICCS 'Student' questionnaire. Native-born students refer to students who were born in the host country. Foreign-born students refer to students who have been born in a country other than the host country (see Annex Table 6).

The figure shows values after having controlled for students' socio-economic background. See technical notes and Table 7 in the Annex.

Education systems are ranked in descending order of index difference between the sense of school belonging of foreign-born and native-born students. All the internal consistency indices (Cronbach alpha) are equal or higher than 0.80 for question Q19 and equal or above 0.70 for question Q20.


Country-specific note

Germany: Data refers to North Rhine Westphalia.

Figure 21 shows differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying between those 8th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not. Differences are statistically significant only in few countries. In Malta, the Netherlands and Italy, those who speak the language of instruction at home feel significantly better at school than those who do not. As far as bullying experiences are concerned, in Lithuania, Italy, Latvia and the Netherlands, students who do not speak the language of instruction at home are victims of bullying more often than their peers who do.

In Malta, both foreign-born students and those not speaking the language of instruction report a lower sense of school belonging. In two education systems, Italy and the Netherlands, both foreign-born and those who do not speak the language of instruction at home face more bullying in the 8th grade.

Figure 21: Differences in the sense of school belonging and experiences of bullying by peers between 8th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016



Positive values: Students who speak the language of instruction at home report a **higher** sense of belonging and/or **more** experiences of bullying

Negative values: Students who speak the language of instruction at home report a **lower** sense of belonging and/or **less** experiences of bullying

Ø = refers to the average of 15 European education systems participating in the survey.

	Differences statistically significant	Differences NOT statistically significant
Sense of school belonging	■	■
Experience of bullying	■	■

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of ICCS 2016.

Explanatory note

The figure depicts the differences in the synthetic indexes between those speaking the language of instruction at home and those who do not, based on answers to Q19 and Q20 in the ICCS contextual 'Student questionnaire' (see explanatory notes for Figure 20). Data on the language spoken at home is based on responses to the ICCS 'Student' Questionnaire, question Q5 (see Annex Table 8).

The figure shows values after having controlled for students' socio-economic background. See technical notes and Table 9 in the Annex.

Education systems are ranked in descending order of index difference between the sense of school belonging of students who always or almost always speak the language of instruction at home and those who sometimes or never speak it at home

Country-specific note

Germany: Data refers to North Rhine Westphalia.

Parents of foreign-born students and those who do not speak the language of instruction at home have a more positive opinion of their child's school

Students' well-being at school also depends on their parents' perception and attitudes towards school, learning and teaching (Trasberg & Kong, 2017; Smit & Driessen & Sluiter & Slegers, 2007). Parents' perceptions of the school may be shaped by a number of factors, these include discussions with their children, other parents and school staff; their children's school performance; their overall level of information about the education system; and their own previous experiences. In the case of parents of children from migrant backgrounds, the parents' current level of integration in society may also influence their views.

Figure 22 depicts differences in parents' school appreciation depending on whether their child was born in the country of the survey or not, and whether their child speaks the language of instruction at home or not.

Figure 22: Differences in parents' perception of their child's school, depending on country of birth and language spoken at home, 2016



Positive values: Parents of foreign-born and/or those whose child does not speak the language of instruction at home have a **more** positive opinion
Negative values: Parents of foreign-born and/or those whose child does not speak the language of instruction at home have a **less** positive opinion
 Ø = refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

	Differences statistically significant	Differences NOT statistically significant
Differences between parents of foreign-born and native-born	■	■
Differences between parents of students who do not speak the language of instruction at home and those who do	■	■

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Explanatory note

The figure depicts, in relation to parents' perceptions of their child's school, the differences in the synthetic indexes between the parents of foreign-born and of native-born students and between those speaking the language of instruction at home and those who do not. The synthetic indexes are calculated on the basis of responses to statements under the question 'What do you think of your child's school?' – 'My child's school does a good job including me in my child's education', 'My child's school provides a safe environment', 'My child's school cares about my child's progress in school', 'My child's school does a good job informing me of his/her progress', 'My child's school promotes high academic standards', 'My child's school does a good job in helping him/her become better in reading'. The response options included 'Agree a lot', 'Agree a little', 'Disagree a little' and 'Disagree a lot' (Q9 in the PIRLS 2016 contextual parents questionnaire ('Learning to Read')).

Data on the country of birth is based on responses provided by students' parents to question 3A in the PIRLS 'Learning to Read' questionnaire. Native-born students refer to students who were born in the host country. Foreign-born students refer to students born in a country other than the host country (see Annex Table 2).

Data on the language spoken at home is based on responses to PIRLS 'Student Questionnaire', question G3 (see Annex Table 4).

The figure shows values after having controlled for students' socio-economic background. See technical notes and Table 10 in the Annex.

Education systems are ranked in descending order of index difference between the perception of parents whose child was born in another country and those whose child was born in the host country.

Country-specific note

United Kingdom (ENG): Data is not available as UK (England) did not administer the PIRLS 'Learning to Read' questionnaire.

In about half of the participating education systems, the parents of foreign-born students report a more favourable opinion of their child's school than parents of the native-born. This is the case in Germany, Czechia, France, Belgium (Flemish and French Communities), Slovenia, the Netherlands and Finland.

When the differences surrounding the language spoken at home are examined, parents whose children do not speak the language of instruction at home also tend to have a more positive view of their child's school. This is the case in nine education systems (Belgium – Flemish Community, Germany, Belgium – French Community, the Netherlands, Austria, Norway, Slovenia, Finland and France). In contrast, in Spain and Malta, the parents of students who do not speak the language of instruction at home have a less positive appreciation of school than parents of children who do speak the language of instruction at home. Interestingly, in several of these countries, a relatively high proportion of students do not speak the language of instruction at home (see Annex Table 4).

This more positive perception of school held by parents of foreign-born 4th grade students and those who do not speak the language of instruction at home is somewhat contrary to common public opinion. However, it may actually offer an opportunity for schools and policy-makers to involve the parents of these students more in their child's education. As mentioned above, numerous studies have proved that parents' involvement in school life can encourage children to perform better at school and strengthen their sense of belonging (see also Chapter 3.3 and II.3.4). In order to capitalise on this opportunity, further investigation may be needed into the reasons why parents of foreign-born students and parents of students who do not speak the language of instruction at home have a higher opinion of school than others: is it due to effective communication between schools and these parents, is it due to cultural factors, or, more negatively, is it simply due to a lack of information about their child's performance and the quality of education?

In schools with a high proportion of students who do not speak the language of instruction at home, school heads report less parental involvement

When it comes to the actual involvement of parents in school life, PIRLS 2016 suggests that parents do not participate very actively in any European education system. At European level, based on the perceptions of school heads, parents' involvement in their child's education is rated as 'medium' (see Explanatory notes to Figure 23).


There are, however, some differences between schools. Figure 23 presents parental involvement in schools where different percentages of students speak the language of instruction at home, as reported by school heads. Mean score points for parental involvement in schools with more than 75 % (A), schools with 25-75 % (B) and schools with less than 25 % of students (C) who speak the language of instruction at home are presented for each participating education system, as well as the European mean. The table accompanying the figure shows the mean score point differences between schools with a high percentage (more than 75 %) of students speaking the language of instruction at home and mixed (25-75 % such students) schools, as well as schools with less than 25 % of such students.

The majority of students in European education systems attend schools with at least 75 % of students speaking the language of instruction at home. In only a few education systems do 10 % or more students attend schools where less than a quarter of students speak the language of instruction at home (Belgium – Flemish Community, Bulgaria, Germany, Latvia, Austria and the United Kingdom – England) (see Annex Table 11). The figure takes a home language that is different from the language of instruction as a rough proxy for immigration background. However, it should be born in mind that, in some countries, the proportion of migrant students may be low (see Figure 13 and Annex Table 2); at the same time, the proportion of those who do not speak the language of instruction at home may still be high. This is the case, for example, when national or linguistic minorities may speak a language at home that is different from the language of instruction. For example, in Bulgaria, the proportion of students participating in PIRLS 2016 who were born in another country is 2.31 %, while 19.2 % attend schools where less than 25 % speak the language of instruction at home. Similarly, in Latvia, the proportion of foreign-born students in PIRLS 2016 is 1.44 %, while 23.78 % of students attend schools where less than 25 % speak the language of instruction at home (see Annex Table 12).

Figure 23 suggests that school heads perceive less parental involvement in schools where a smaller percentage of students speak the language of instruction at home. This is the case in Belgium (Flemish Community), Bulgaria, Germany, Spain and Austria (all with statistically significant differences). In Denmark and France, parental involvement is also lower in schools where 25-75 % of students speak the language of instruction at home than in schools with more than 75 % of such

students. However, schools with less than a quarter of students speaking the language of instruction at home show higher parental involvement than mixed schools (i.e., with 25-75 %), according to school heads.

Figure 23: Parents' involvement in their child's education, as reported by school heads, mean scorepoints, 2016



Ø = refers to the average of the 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

● = signals that fewer than 30 students or fewer than 5 schools were in that category.

	Ø	BE fr	BE nl	BG	CZ	DK	DE	IE	ES	FR	IT	LV	LT
Difference between A and B	1.35	1.08	1.09	1.45	●	2.45	2.01	2.04	1.50	3.11	0.78	0.21	●
Difference between A and C	1.82	4.90	2.33	4.60	●	1.51	4.47	1.10	1.54	2.30	:	-0.91	●
	HU	MT	NL	AT	PT	SI	SK	FI	SE	UK-ENG	UK-NIR	NO	
Difference between A and B	●	0.14	2.33	1.76	●	0.93	2.59	2.01	1.85	1.00	-1.97	1.29	
Difference between A and C	:	●	●	4.03	-0.74	:	3.90	●	0.45	1.18	●	●	

Statistically significant differences are marked by a darker tone.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Explanatory note

The figure depicts mean synthetic indexes in parental involvement in schools with A) more than 75 %, B) between 25-75 % and C) less than 25 % of students who speak the language of instruction at home, based on school heads' responses to the question 'How do you characterize each of the following within your school?' – 'Parental involvement in school activities', 'Parental commitment to ensure that students are ready learn', 'Parental expectations for student achievement', 'Parent support for student achievement'. The response options included 'Very high', 'High', 'Medium', 'Low' and 'Very low'. The mean index may range between 5 and 20 (Q13 in the PIRLS 2016 contextual 'School Questionnaire').

Data on the proportion of students speaking the language of instruction at home is based on responses provided by school heads to question 4 in the PIRLS 'School Questionnaire' (see Annex Table 4).

In the figure, education systems are ranked in descending order mean score points of parental involvement for schools with less than 25 % of students speaking the language of instruction at home (see Annex Table 12).

The table presents mean score point differences in parental involvement, as reported by school heads, between schools with more than 75 % and schools with 25-75 % students speaking the language instruction (A-B), and between schools with more than 75 % and less than 25 % of students who speak the language of instruction at home (B-C). The analysis is based on three categories, but in some education systems less than 5 schools or less than 30 students were in the sample in that category, which is not sufficient to consider the results reliable.

The table presents the differences between the means of A and B, and A and C categories (see also Annex Table 13).

Part I: Mapping



I.1: GOVERNANCE

In order for countries to have an effective approach to integrating students from migrant backgrounds, education systems need to have appropriate governance structures. This chapter focuses on four areas of governance related to the integration of migrant students into education: how countries define students from migrant backgrounds; the policy challenges faced and how these are addressed in terms of strategies and policy coordination; how funding is allocated and the levels of administration involved; and lastly, the extent to which education systems engage in evidence-based policy making, with respect to the monitoring and evaluation of migrant student performance, or the carrying out of any impact assessments to measure the success of policies in this area.

I.1.1. National definitions

From a statistical and legal point of view, European countries share some of the same definitions relating to migrants. For statistical data collection purposes, Eurostat distinguishes first generation immigrants – those born outside the host country, whose parents were also born outside; and second generation – those born in the host country but at least one of whose parents was born outside. International and EU legislation specifies further legal categories: for example, nationals of EU Member States, third country nationals and people seeking international protection (see Chapter I.2).

Besides shared concepts, national administrations may have their own terminology reflecting national circumstances. This section will thus explore which criteria top-level authorities most commonly use to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds (see Figure I.1.1), and whether specific terminology is in use in the education system. In addition, the section also discusses whether newly arrived migrant students are distinguished as a specific category in education policy (see Figure I.1.2).

Country of citizenship and residence/immigration status are the criteria most used in top-level policy documents to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds


As shown in the Context chapter, the 42 European education systems in this report have very different experiences of immigration, not only in terms of numbers but also in the variety of countries of origin and legal status. Countries have also been affected differently by the most recent humanitarian migration crisis. For these and other reasons, top-level authorities focus on different criteria in their national policies relating to children and young people from migrant backgrounds.

Figure I.1.1 shows that the criteria most commonly used to identify children from migrant backgrounds, as indicated in top-level policy documents, are the country of citizenship, and immigration or residence status.

The country of citizenship is used to identify children and young people who are nationals of another country. Twenty-seven systems refer to this criterion. EU Member States may, in addition, further distinguish between EU citizens and third country nationals.

Twenty-seven systems take immigration or residence status into account in their definitions. Very often, among these, specific statuses are taken into account such as refugee, asylum seeker and unaccompanied minor. Asylum seekers are often mentioned in the context of the implementation of the EU Directive 2013/33/EU⁽¹⁾, which calls on EU Member States to provide education for those seeking asylum within three months of their application.

⁽¹⁾ Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast); <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013L0033&from=FR>

Figure I.1.1: Most common criteria used to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds, 2017/18

Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the criteria that top-level education policy documents, including legislation, recommendation and strategies, etc., most commonly used to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds. The figure shows the number of countries using each criterion. Country specific information on criteria used in top-level regulations/recommendations is presented in the Annex.

Residence status refers to any authorization issued by a state allowing other countries' nationals (EU or third country nationals) to stay legally in their territory. Residence permits are issued for a minimum period of three months.

Immigration status refers to the legal basis for entry and stay in the host country such as EU citizenship; third country national working, studying, etc. in the host country; refugees, asylum seekers, unaccompanied minors and irregular migrants.

First language generally refers to the mother tongue or language that children and young people speak at home.

Criteria such as the country of birth and first language are used in less than half of the systems to identify migration background. Country of birth typically allows for identifying children and young people who may have been born in another country but have been naturalised since their arrival to the host country. Thirteen countries use country of birth as a criterion together with country of citizenship. Three systems use only country of birth.

When first language is used as a criterion, the aim is generally to determine whether the child's first language is the language of the host country or the language of instruction. Some countries tend to focus on competences in the host language rather than immigration information in their education policies. This is the case in Belgium (Flemish Community), France, the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland). For instance, while Dutch language competence is the only criteria used for education policy development in Belgium (Flemish Community), data on nationality, country of birth and language(s) spoken at home are collected for research purposes – the results of which, ultimately, contribute to policy monitoring and advice. In France, the term *élève allophone nouvellement arrivé* applies to a newly arrived student whose first language is other than French. The concept is referred to frequently in policy documents and underpins the monitoring of the integration of newly arrived migrant students. In the United Kingdom (England and Wales), 'students who have English as an additional language (EAL)' and 'students who have Welsh as an additional language (WAL)' in Wales are used as specific terms in policy development. However, data is collected on students' country of citizenship, country of birth, ethnicity and proficiency in English in England and on ethnicity, proficiency in English and first language in Wales. In the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the term EAL has been replaced by 'newcomer', which takes into account the first language as well as the cultural and social needs of students.

Parents' country of birth and citizenship are reported as identification criteria in seven and nine countries, respectively. Bulgaria, Denmark, Slovenia and Liechtenstein use both criteria; while the remaining countries use one of the two. For instance, in Denmark, an 'immigrant' is a person born outside Denmark whose parents were also not born in the country. 'Descendants' are born in Denmark but their parents were not and kept their citizenship of origin.

As mentioned before, countries tend to use terms and definitions which correspond to international conventions. Very few countries have introduced additional national definitions to refer to children and young people from migrant backgrounds in their national policy documents or legislation. In Estonia, top-level documents identify children and young people or parents who were born in Estonia, who left to live in another country and have recently returned to Estonia. For example, the Estonian Education Information Database distinguishes, *Tagasipöörduja* – returnee, i.e. an Estonian national returning to the country after having resided abroad. Similarly, in Poland, top-level education documents distinguish 'Polish citizens who have attended schools in other countries' and have then returned to Poland.

The criteria and national definitions discussed above may have an impact on rights and obligations in education (see Chapter I.2), the provision of support (see Chapter I.3), the allocation of related resources (see Figures I.1.7-8), and monitoring and/or collection of administrative data (see Figures I.1.9-11). Very few countries use parents' information as criteria, often due to legal considerations related to personal data protection. However, taking into account parent information could help identify second generation students (i.e. those born in the host country but whose parent(s) were born in or are citizens of another country) in order to tailor specific policies for this target group. Residence and immigration status – used by most countries – allow for planning education policies and targeting support, for example, by identifying migrants given leave to remain on humanitarian grounds and developing the policies needed to cope when large numbers of new arrivals need urgent psycho-social support. Finally, using the first language as a criterion for identifying migrant students may help in allocating support for learning the language of instruction or the home language (see Chapter I.3.2).


Newly arrived migrant students are identified as a specific category in about half of the education systems in Europe

Immigrant children and young people who have newly arrived in the host country face specific challenges. They and their families often do not know the education system of the host country and they may not speak the host country's language(s) when they arrive. Furthermore, those seeking international protection may not have any documentation attesting to their prior learning or they may not have been in education for a long time – in some cases these children may not have had any schooling at all. Their experiences of displacement may also have affected them psychologically and physically (European Commission, 2013).

For these reasons, as shown in Figure I.1.2, 23 education systems distinguish between newly arrived migrant students and other first generation migrants or second generation students who have been residing in the country and participating in the education system for some time. Some education systems also target new arrivals for specific support (see Chapters I.2 and I.3).

In some education systems, the 'newly arrived' status is defined in terms of a specific timeframe calculated from the time of arrival at the host country (Belgium – Flemish and French Communities, Denmark, the Netherlands, Iceland and Norway). In other systems, it is counted from their enrolment in the education system (Belgium – Flemish Community, France, Slovenia, Sweden and the United Kingdom – England, Northern Ireland). For example, in Belgium (Flemish Community), students are considered as 'non-Dutch speaking newcomers' (and thus may benefit from reception education) if they have resided for a maximum of one year (without interruption) in Belgium, and been enrolled for nine months maximum in a school which has Dutch as a language of instruction; they do not speak Dutch at home nor is it their mother tongue and their competence in the Dutch language is not good enough to follow mainstream instruction.

Figure I.1.2: Newly arrived migrant students identified as a specific category, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure depicts education systems where top-level regulations/recommendations identify newly arrived migrant students.

Country-specific note

Spain: Some Autonomous Communities may distinguish newly arrived students.

The timeframe frequently corresponds to the length of time in which newly arrived students are eligible for targeted support (although the support period may often be longer than this – see Figure I.2.9 and Chapter I.3).

I.1.2. Policy challenges, strategies and top-level coordination

In public policy-making, identifying and analysing the issues that face society, proposing relevant policy responses and setting up structures for implementing and monitoring policy changes are key aspects of governance. This section will focus specifically on the main challenges identified by top-level authorities with respect to the integration into schools of children and young people from migrant backgrounds (see Figure I.1.3). The strategies drawn up by top-level authorities to address these challenges will be examined and the priorities identified (see Figures I.1.4 and I.1.5). Given the complexity of integration policies and the need to involve multiple players, the section will also assess the prevalence of coordination bodies at the top level of government (see Figure I.1.6).


Providing adequate language and learning support to children and young people from migrant backgrounds is a challenge in a majority of education systems

This section discusses the main challenges facing top-level authorities in integrating children and young people from migrant backgrounds into their school system. According to research literature in the area, these often comprise issues of access, the provision of resources and high quality support, and improving educational outcomes. Figure I.1.3 enumerates the most common challenges faced by public authorities across Europe in integrating children and young people from migrant backgrounds into schools.

The majority of education systems (29) find providing quality language and learning support a major challenge. Belgium (German-speaking Community), Malta and Portugal report that teaching staff have

not been trained to work with the linguistically and culturally diverse newcomers that have recently arrived in their countries – most teachers lack the knowledge and skills to manage diversity in classrooms and there is a shortage of appropriate adapted teaching materials. Finland faces challenges in implementing language awareness, which is a new approach in its national curriculum. Switzerland points to issues related to the arrival of a specific age group of recent migrants: a large number of young people (16-20 year-olds) who have not completed compulsory education. They cannot be integrated into the school grade for their age group, and due to their significant lack of skills, they cannot be effectively integrated into the labour market either.

Figure I.1.3: Main challenges in integrating children and young people from migrant background in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the (maximum) three main challenges as presented in official top-level documents. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Combating poor educational outcomes and student retention is the second main challenge reported in Europe (17 systems). In Belgium (Flemish Community), Spain and Switzerland, it is widely acknowledged in top-level policy documents that students from migrant backgrounds are overrepresented among early school leavers. The United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) points to an important attainment gap between first generation immigrants and the native-born population. In addition, Finland also reports that the transition of students from migrant backgrounds from basic education to upper secondary and higher education is not smooth.

A series of issues present challenges to about a third of the education systems: providing a sufficient number of school places and infrastructure, offering guidance and information on education and training possibilities, and providing a sufficient level and appropriate types of funding for integration.

In Belgium (German-speaking Community), previous reception arrangements and the number of places for newly arrived migrant students in schools near reception centres became inadequate due to the high number of new arrivals. However, this problem stimulated a debate and led to a system-wide policy response: besides the schools in the proximity of reception centres, all schools now need to provide places and support for new arrivals. Similarly, in Estonia and Malta, the reception of high number of refugees in schools puts a particular pressure on the system. For example, refugees attend

schools near refugee centres, or they tend to settle in certain disadvantaged geographical locations, which may lead to residential and school segregation in the neighbourhood schools. In addition, school administrative bodies are not able to react quickly to new training needs and resource distribution. Issues of coordination among top-level authorities and involving the competent bodies at local level in implementing policies have proved to be difficult in Greece and Cyprus.

Finally, there are six education systems (Croatia, Luxembourg, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia and Bosnia and Herzegovina) where top-level authorities have not explicitly identified any particular challenges related to the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds. According to statistical data, with the exception of Luxembourg, these countries have been less affected by immigration until fairly recently.

Few countries have specific top-level strategies or action plans on the integration of migrant students

To tackle system-wide challenges, top-level authorities have a number of policy tools at their disposal, which include comprehensive strategies or action plans. These are particularly useful when the changes to be implemented are complex and affect a wide range of policy areas and stakeholders, or when the implementation needs more time and significant resources. The advantages of comprehensive strategies and action plans are that they

- define a policy vision and the objectives to be achieved;
- name the responsible bodies;
- set a timeframe for completion of the various stages;
- identify the necessary financial resources;
- establish the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms needed to ensure the policies have been effective.


This is particularly the case when new policies are introduced and when a number of policy areas are affected. Once the policy measures become mainstreamed the strategy may not be used.

Figure I.1.4 shows that in 25 European education systems, one or more strategies or action plans deal with the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds in school. The scope and the coverage of these strategies are, however, different. Some focus on education, while others have a broader scope.

In ten systems, the top-level authorities have adopted a specific strategy/action plan on the integration of migrant students into the education system. In Germany, Greece, Spain (some Autonomous Communities), Cyprus, Portugal and Slovenia, the strategies cover primary, general secondary education and IVET. In Spain, all strategies have given a central place to teacher training in relation to migrant students. In three education systems, the strategy covers several educational levels (besides primary and secondary education) – in Greece, early childhood education, and early childhood education and care and adult learning in Finland and Switzerland. In addition, in Switzerland, the strategy sets specific targets, for example: in IVET, two thirds of all 16-25 year-old refugees and migrants with provisional leave to stay should be participating in post-compulsory education programmes within five years of their arrival.

In more than two-thirds of the education systems with strategies, school integration is included within a broader strategy. Most of these seek to integrate migrant people into society (Bulgaria, Czechia, Ireland, Spain, Croatia, Austria, Portugal, Romania, Finland, the United Kingdom – Wales and Scotland, Switzerland, Iceland, Montenegro, Norway and Serbia). These social integration strategies usually cover several policy fields, such as labour market integration, housing, access to public services, education, etc., and involve several different government departments. Education is regarded as a dimension of integration into society.

Figure I.1.4: Strategies/action plans addressing the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds in primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents top-level strategies and action plans. When a strategy/action plan covers education levels outside ISCED 1-3, this is specifically mentioned in the text below.

Country-specific notes

Germany: Data refers to the declaration of the Standing Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs.

Spain: The integration of migrant students is a competence of the Autonomous Communities. The strategies/action plans of the various Autonomous Communities cover different educational levels, but most cover compulsory education.

Italy: Data refers to the Guidelines for the reception and integration of foreign students (*Indicazioni nazionali per il curricolo della scuola dell'infanzia e del primo ciclo d'istruzione*).

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: The various cantonal strategies cover different educational levels.

Some of the other broader strategies that feature school integration have a focus on language acquisition. For example, in Estonia, EU co-funded structural development programmes address the acquisition of the Estonian language by the foreign-born population, including in general and vocational education. In Lithuania, the Government Plan 2018-2020 allocates resources to research on returnees' integration and the development of Lithuanian language proficiency tests for the foreign-born population.

Only few countries have both a strategy for the education sector and a broader strategy that includes education (Spain, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland and Switzerland). For instance, in Portugal, the Strategic Plan for Migration includes interventions in the field of education – for example, strengthening the teaching of Portuguese as a second language; consolidating teaching programmes for Portuguese as a second language, promoting intercultural education and awareness-raising of issues surrounding academic and professional recognition of qualifications. The strategy adopted in 2015 by the Portuguese Ministry of Education, on the other hand, focusses on the reception of refugee children and young people in schools. In Slovenia, there are two strategies in the field of education. The first is a 'Strategy on the integration of immigrant children, basic school and upper secondary school students into education in the Republic of Slovenia', which addresses the accessibility of education, diversity, multiculturalism and intercultural education. The second is a 'Resolution on the National Programme for Language Policy 2014-2018', which seeks to improve opportunities for learning the Slovenian language for both parents and children, to develop the basic school curriculum for Slovenian as a second language and new learning material.


Almost all strategies have been published since 2014 and most have a three- or a five-year timeframe. Their implementation is on-going. Exceptions are Austria, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), where strategies date back to before 2010. In Austria, top-level authorities adopt annual action plans as part of the implementation of their pre-2010 strategy. In Northern Ireland, the strategic document 'Every School a Good School: Supporting Newcomer Pupils' (2009) is currently being reviewed, and a new policy is expected to be available in late 2019. Many of the more recent strategies and action plans (in Bulgaria, Germany, Portugal, Romania, Finland, the United Kingdom – Scotland, Switzerland and Serbia) specifically address the integration of refugees and asylum seekers.

Eighteen countries do not have a strategy/action plan on the integration of children and young people from migrant background. This does not, however, mean that they do not have policies in place. For example, in France, policies on provisions for newly arrived non-French speaking students and those without previous schooling have been in place for several years. Similarly, Belgium, the Netherlands and Sweden have mainstreamed their policy measures (see Chapters I.3 and I.4).

Top-level strategies cover a wide range of intervention areas

Figure I.1.5 shows that top-level strategies/action plans, when available, usually cover a wide range of interventions in most countries.

Figure I.1.5: Priority areas addressed by top-level strategies/action plans, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the priorities set out in top-level strategies/action plans relating to the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds into school. Variations between education levels are presented in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.


Almost all education systems with a strategy/action plan identified 'facilitating access to mainstream education' as a strategic priority. Support for schools and teachers, training teachers, ensuring an inclusive school climate and coordinating stakeholders are all prioritised by more than two thirds of systems with a strategy. In contrast, only eight countries with a strategy prioritise combatting school segregation and carrying out research on the integration of students from migrant backgrounds.

About half of the systems have established a top-level body that has a responsibility for coordinating policies on integrating migrant students into schools

Policies related to the effective integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds in schools are manifold. Besides education policy, housing, health, youth, employment and others policies can have an impact on migrant children and their parents. Due to the complexity of this field and the variety of stakeholders involved, in order to have a positive and lasting impact, policy planning, implementation and monitoring must be coordinated at the highest level. A single coordination body with a clear mandate, political leverage and power to intervene can ensure that top-level policies are coherently implemented and the system can adapt to and, if needed, rapidly react to change (Ahad & Benton, 2018).

Figure I.1.6 shows that in 24 of the 42 systems a top-level coordination body has a mandate to ensure that top-level bodies and other responsible actors at lower administrative levels (including regional, local and school levels) communicate with each other and align their policy agenda in the areas of education, housing, health, etc. in order to support the integration of children and young people from migrant backgrounds in schools. This body may take different forms: it may be an existing or a new institution with a specific mandate to work in the field of social integration of migrant people, or a coordination group with representatives from various relevant bodies, which monitors policy implementation and can take certain decisions, or a line ministry whose portfolio also includes integration of migrants. Most of these coordination bodies cover policies related to the integration of people from migrant backgrounds in general. Education and the integration of children and young people into schools are just one of the areas covered.

Figure I.1.6: Top-level bodies coordinating policies that have an impact on the integration of migrant students into school, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

In eleven countries, a dedicated top-level body coordinates related policies at national level. Their mandate is usually to facilitate the social integration of people from migrant backgrounds. This is the case, in Belgium (Flemish Community), Germany, Croatia, Ireland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, the United Kingdom (Scotland), Switzerland, Norway and Serbia (see further information about the specific bodies in the Annex). In Spain, the central government is responsible for immigration policy, and the Autonomous Communities have decision making competences over integration policy. At the state level, however, the Forum for the Social Integration of Migrants (*Foro para la integración social*

de los inmigrantes) has an information and advisory role. It formulates proposals and recommendations aimed at promoting the integration of immigrants and refugees into Spanish society; it gathers information and monitors programmes and activities delivered by the General State Administration, the Autonomous Communities and local administrations on the social integration of migrants.

In Bulgaria, Cyprus, Lithuania and the Netherlands, an inter-ministerial coordination group has a mandate for coordination.

In some countries, a specific ministry is responsible for policy coordination. In Czechia, Luxembourg and Austria, it is the ministry of the interior or the Ministry of foreign affairs, which is responsible for coordinating policies related to migration, including social integration and integration into school. In Malta, the Ministry for European Affairs is responsible for coordination. In Sweden, the ministry for employment is in charge of coordinating integration policies, which also includes education. In Finland, it is the Ministry for Employment and the Economy. In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Ministry of Labour and Social policy is responsible for integration policies. In Belgium (German-speaking Community), France and Turkey, the ministry in charge of education oversees this area. In addition, in France, inter-ministerial coordination is established for certain tasks and target groups. In particular, the information and reception of children and their families is a task shared between the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of National Education; responsibility for non-accompanied minors is shared between seven institutions.

In 18 education systems, there is no top-level body with a mandate for coordinating integration policies. Responsibilities may be shared between several ministries, as for example in Italy and Latvia, where three and four ministries, respectively, are involved; or in Luxembourg, where five different bodies with different levels of competences are responsible. In Greece, the Ministry of Education, Research and Religious Affairs cooperates with the other bodies involved in refugee reception and integration procedures.

I.1.3. Funding to support the integration of students from migrant backgrounds

Allocating resources to narrow the achievement gap between native-born and migrant students has been found to have an impact on educational results (OECD 2009). When designing funding mechanisms, policy makers need to determine the target groups for additional funding and decide which administrative level of the education system should manage these resources, only then can they be distributed between the different levels of education (*ibid.*). A NESSE-report (2008) recommended that schools with large proportions of migrant students should be allotted additional financial resources. This funding should be perceived as an investment rather than a cost (*ibid.*).

The section below examines the main ways in which funds are provided to support the integration of migrants into schools. Figure I.1.7 looks at the funding from (a) top-level and (b) local authorities, while Figure I.1.8 focusses on the criteria for allocating funding. Any private funding that schools receive is not considered in this report.

No judgement is made here about which funding methods might be better than others. Indeed, as Sugarman, Morris-Lange & McHugh (2016, p. 2) point out, 'as with any complex policy challenge, there is not a single best design for supplementary funding. The appropriateness of the design depends on the needs of the student population and the educational context, including the capacities of schools and school systems to meet those needs'.


In more than half of the countries, migrant integration is funded by the top-level from a dedicated budget, or from a budget for disadvantaged students

There are three main ways in which top-level authorities provide funding for the integration of migrant students (see Figure I.1.7 A):

- from a dedicated budget for migrant students;
- from a broader budget for disadvantaged students;
- on application by schools or local authorities for extra funding.

All three ways can be found in Italy and Malta, the United Kingdom (England) and Switzerland, while 12 countries use none of these methods.

Figure I.1.7: Funding to support the integration of migrant students, from top-level and from local authorities, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the sources of funding available for the integration of migrants from the top- and local levels of government, and whether schools/local authorities may apply for extra funds. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes (Figure I.1.7)

Belgium (BE nl): Only primary and general lower secondary education are covered.

Estonia: Figure A: Only IVET covered. Figure B: Only primary and general lower secondary education are covered.

Spain and Malta: Does not concern IVET.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Netherlands: Figure A: Does not concern IVET.

Poland: Category 'A' in Figure A refers to the mechanism for increasing the education component of the general budget that local authorities receive for running schools.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: Only primary and general lower secondary education are covered. Funding mechanism may vary between Cantons and local authorities.

As the figure shows, 18 education systems provide funding from a dedicated budget for supporting the integration of migrants. In five of them (Belgium – French Community, France, Croatia, the United Kingdom – Northern Ireland, and Liechtenstein), it is the only method of allocation used by top-level authorities. For example, in Lithuania, there is specific additional funding for both newly arrived and returning migrants in the 'Student Basket' allocation system.

A substantial number of education systems (13) provide funds from a general budget for disadvantaged students. In Austria and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Scotland), money can be allocated from both a dedicated budget and a budget for disadvantaged students.

Examples from education systems with budgets aimed at disadvantaged students include Germany, where, in some *Länder*, the allocation of extra funds is based on socio-economic indices, but schools in socially deprived areas still receive additional funds in *Länder* which do not have such indices. Similarly, in the United Kingdom (Scotland), 'Pupil Equity Funding' has a focus on closing the poverty-related attainment gap, and is awarded to schools on the basis of the number of pupils who are eligible for free school meals. This could include groups of migrant students.

In 14 education systems, local authorities or schools can apply for funding from top-level authorities according to their needs. In Slovenia and Netherlands, applying for extra funds is the only method by which funding can be obtained for supporting the integration of migrant students. In the Netherlands, depending on the number of asylum seekers, primary schools can currently apply for extra funding, which they receive as a lump sum. There is a minimum threshold in terms of student numbers and a maximum amount paid. Secondary schools, on the other hand, can apply for funds for all non-NL students who have arrived within the last two years whether they are refugees or other migrants from within or outside the European Union. There is no number threshold and no maximum amount paid. However, from 1st April 2019, secondary schools will automatically receive the additional funding, without the need to apply for it.

There are different ways in which schools or local authorities can apply for extra funding for integrating migrants. Schools/local authorities can apply for project funding from the top-level authorities in 11 education systems (Bulgaria, Czechia, Estonia, Spain, Italy, Latvia, Malta, Portugal, Slovenia, Serbia and the United Kingdom – England). In four countries (Greece, Latvia, Portugal and Sweden), local authorities can apply for an increase in their 'lump sum' allocation from the top-level authorities. The lump sum is a general budget allocation that local authorities can use for purposes other than education. Lastly, schools/local authorities can apply for an increase in their education budget in eight education systems (Belgium – German-speaking Community, Czechia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands and Slovenia).

For example, in Belgium (German-speaking Community), in addition to the general allocation of funding from the top-level, schools can apply for additional resources in relation to the number of students from migrant backgrounds. They may be awarded additional teaching hours to run preparatory classes or courses for students from migrant backgrounds. Schools in Cyprus can apply

to the Ministry of Education for extra teaching hours and teaching staff in relation to the number of their students from migrant backgrounds. The number of migrant students in school or in the municipality is one of the main criteria used in allocating funding which is dealt with in more detail in the following section.


Figure I.1.7 B shows the funding situation at local level. In 13 education systems, local authorities may use their own revenue (taxes) for supporting the integration of migrant students, while in five systems (Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Sweden and Iceland) schools may apply for an increase in the resources awarded by local authorities for this purpose. While this is half as many as the education systems providing funding from top-level budgets, it indicates that the issue of migrant integration is recognised throughout the various levels of government.

The number of migrant students in schools and the need for language support are the two most common criteria for allocating funding

When allocating funding, the presence of significant numbers of migrant students is not the main concern of top-level authorities in many education systems, but rather whether these students have been identified as having additional needs in terms language support. Twenty-one education systems take the need for language support into account when allocating funding, 17 systems allocate purely on the basis of numbers in schools or municipalities, while eight systems include both of the above.

For example, in Austria, the Federal Ministry allocates extra-funding to the provincial governments and boards of education according to the number of students needing German language tuition. In Finland, the number of inhabitants, pupils and students in a municipality who do not speak the language of instruction are considered when allocating funding for primary and general lower secondary education, and only the number of students is considered when allocating funding for general upper secondary education.

Figure I.1.8 : Main criteria for allocating funding to support the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level authorities' main criteria for allocating funding for supporting the integration of migrant students. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes (Figure I.1.8)

Estonia: Does not apply to upper general secondary education

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Finland: Applies only primary and lower general secondary education.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Iceland: The number of migrant students needing language support applies to primary education. Number of migrant students in school/municipality applies to upper general secondary education.

Switzerland: Applies only primary and lower general secondary education. Criteria may vary between Cantons.

Liechtenstein: Does not apply to IVET: Need for extra teaching staff.

I.1.4. Monitoring, evaluation and impact assessment

In recent years there has been an increasing emphasis on establishing an evidence base for public policy-making. In order to be effective, this process requires not only the introduction of policies based on sound research evidence but also the monitoring and evaluation of outcomes and the assessment of the impact of new policies or measures. Collecting and analysing other types of evidence is also crucial in the policy-making process (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017d). In the area of education, the European Commission (2007) has suggested that it would be helpful for the education sector to learn from other policy domains which are more successful in using research and other evidence to improve their practices.

Developing any type of policy calls for the establishment of a baseline of evidence, from which to measure progress. With respect to the integration of migrant students, an important element of this baseline data is student performance. Collecting and analysing this data can help to identify problems and find solutions. Figure I.1.9 below shows which countries monitor the performance of migrant students and what data sources are used.


Assessing the impact of new policies and measures is also important in order to determine whether they have been successful, or whether new approaches are needed. Figure I.1.10 shows which specific policy areas relating to migrant students are monitored and whether impact assessments are undertaken in these areas (see Figure I.1.11).

National and international test results are the most common sources of data for monitoring the performance of migrant students

While most education systems monitor the performance of migrant students, a substantial minority (15) do not. In general, monitoring policies cover all migrant students, including those newly-arrived. Figure I.1.9 shows that more than half of the systems use the results of either national or international tests as a tool for monitoring the performance of migrant students. While most of them use both types of tests, only international tests (such as PISA, TIMSS, PIRLS) are used in Germany, Latvia, Malta, Portugal and Slovenia, while only national tests are used in France and Italy. Tests specifically designed for migrants students are used in only three countries (Denmark, Spain and Cyprus).

In addition to migrant students' test results, administrative data on grade retention and/or leaving the education and training system early are used as a monitoring tool in 16 education systems. Greece, Latvia and Malta use data on early leaving, while Portugal uses data on grade retention. In Greece, Hungary, the Netherlands and Serbia, data on both early leaving and grade retention are used for monitoring the performance of migrant students.

Figure I.1.9: Data sources for monitoring the performance of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the data sources used for monitoring the performance of migrant students by top-level authorities. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE nl): Does not apply to primary education.

Denmark: Applies only to primary and lower general secondary education.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Spain: Examinations targeting migrant students applies to primary and lower secondary education. Results of standardised national and international tests do not apply to IVET.

Luxembourg: Results of standardised international tests applies only to lower general secondary education.

Malta and Austria: Does not apply to IVET.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: Results of standardised national tests concerns primary and lower general secondary education. Results of standardised international tests apply to lower general education.

Iceland: Results of standardised national tests applies to primary and lower general secondary education. Administrative data on early leaving from education/training applies to upper secondary education and IVET.

Norway: Administrative data on early leaving from education/training applies to upper general secondary education and IVET. All other data in the figure apply to primary and lower general education.

Language support and access to education are the policy areas most commonly monitored


Of the countries that have monitoring systems, almost all monitor the provision of language support for migrant students in order to inform policy-making in this area. For example, in Finland, statistics are collected on the state-funded home language teaching in compulsory and general upper secondary education. Recent indications are that the number of students taking part has increased but the number of education providers has decreased.

In Portugal, language provision for migrant students is monitored, but not systematically. Based on the latest available data, it is estimated that in 2012/13 public schools in Portugal had 8 395 students attending classes in Portuguese as a non-native language, particularly in the Lisbon, Faro and Setúbal districts. In Austria, the Ministry of Education collects annual data about mother tongue teaching, which covers the proportion and numbers of students/teachers/federal states involved and the courses provided. Data are collected on an annual basis and the changes in the numbers of students/languages/teachers involved are being monitored.

Almost all of the countries that have monitoring systems monitor the access to education for migrant students. Furthermore, the strategies for integrating migrant students in general and the learning support for these students are monitored in about a dozen countries. Psycho-social support and

teacher training are not very widely monitored. The former is monitored in Spain, Cyprus, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Sweden and Serbia, while the latter is a focus in Spain, France, Cyprus, Latvia, Luxembourg and Serbia. All in all, the most comprehensive monitoring systems can be found in Cyprus, Latvia, and Luxembourg (all policy areas), and France and Serbia (five out of six policy areas). In Spain, while all the policy areas are shown in the Figure as being monitored, the situation is different in each Autonomous Community, and not all areas are necessarily monitored in every Autonomous Community. (For more comprehensive information on these policies see Chapter I.3.)

Figure I.1.10: Monitoring the policy areas related to migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the areas of policy related to migrant students monitored by top-level authorities. The policy areas are listed in descending order, from most to least frequently monitored. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes


- Ireland:** There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.
- Spain:** Includes primary and lower general secondary education.
- Malta:** Does not include IVET
- Austria and Finland:** Language provision for migrant students does not include IVET.
- United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR):** School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
- Switzerland:** Language provision for migrant students includes primary and lower general secondary education. Learning support refers to secondary general education and IVET.

Only a minority of countries have conducted impact assessments relating to the integration of migrant students

As Figure I.1.11 depicts, only a minority of countries report having conducted impact assessments relating to the integration of migrant students into schools. These include national reports, research and analyses of 'what works', carried out or commissioned by education authorities. Five education systems (Belgium – Flemish Community, France, Cyprus, Latvia and Sweden) assess the impact of measures across a wide range of the policy areas examined in this report (see previous Figure). As with the monitoring process, 'language support' was the most common area of focus in impact assessments (nine education systems). The area of 'access to education', however, which was subject to monitoring in a relatively large number of systems, had impact assessments carried out only in Belgium (Flemish Community), France, Italy and Latvia.

Examples of specific policies, which have been subject to impact assessment, include a national study in Portugal in the area of language provision for migrant students. It focused on the assessment of the impact of the teaching of Portuguese as non-native language (PLNM), and it was conducted between 2012 and 2014. The results are being taken into consideration in the preparation of new legislation.

Figure I.1.11: Impact assessments related to the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure shows whether impact assessments related to integration of migrant students have been carried out by top-level authorities. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Estonia: Does not apply to IVET.

Spain: Refers to primary and general lower secondary education.

In Finland, a targeted funding policy in Helsinki provides extra resources to schools providing compulsory education in areas of deprivation, to be used primarily to hire additional staff. The outcomes were examined using a 'Difference in differences' design that compares schools impacted by the policy with other schools in Helsinki as well as similar schools in other Finnish cities. The migrant students involved in the scheme were less likely to drop out of education (with a difference of six percentage points) after completing basic education and more likely to be accepted in general upper secondary education rather than IVET (with a difference of seven percentage points). At the same time, native-born students also benefitted in terms of reduced drop-out, albeit with a narrower margin of three percentage points. The impact of the policy is particularly significant amongst low-performing native-born male students and female students from migrant backgrounds.

In Sweden, in 2014, the Swedish Schools Inspectorate reviewed how municipalities work to allocate their resources so as to counteract the negative impact of school segregation (either ethnically or socio-economically) on student performance. The review shows that no one system of resource allocation fits all municipalities. Different models of resource allocation exist and there are several examples of municipalities which have allocated resources in ways which have resulted in better results for children, students, schools and the municipalities themselves. The review describes a large number of initiatives that municipalities highlight as being successful in reducing the effects of school segregation on student performance.

In the United Kingdom (England), the National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (NALDIC) – the subject association for English as an additional language (EAL) – published an audit of EAL training and professional development provision in 2014. The audit found that EAL training 'remains patchy'. It found also that high quality, relevant, continuing professional development and vocational training on EAL for mainstream and specialist staff across the school workforce is not yet consistently accessible nationally.

I.2: ACCESS TO EDUCATION

Access to quality education for all is high on the agenda in Europe and in the wider international community. It has two aspects: access to education as a universal human right regardless of legal status (Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948); and access to quality education – enrolling in a school that provides high quality teaching and learning, and being able to take educational pathways that lead to high level skills (European Commission, 2013). Children and young people from migrant backgrounds may face challenges in both areas. This may be because they do not have full rights to participate in education, but more often it is due to structural factors and migrants' lack of information or support in navigating an education system they do not understand. This chapter will focus on access policies affecting the initial stages of the enrolment and integration process. Language and learning support policies, which are key dimensions of quality education provision throughout a child's schooling, are addressed in Chapters I.3 and I.4.

This chapter will first examine the top-level policies on the rights and obligations of children and young people from migrant backgrounds with respect to education. In addition, information will be presented on services that provide information, advice and guidance on education rights, obligations and opportunities for those who do not understand the education system. Macro-level policies which determine what kind of schooling newly arrived migrant children can access will then be explored. These include the timeframe for school enrolment, criteria for determining the school grade children are placed in, and any wider school enrolment policies. Policies primarily affecting newly arrived migrant children and young people will be addressed as they are the ones most likely to be accessing national education systems for the first time. However, wherever relevant, and information is available, policies directed at first or second generation migrant children and young people will also be discussed.

I.2.1. Rights and obligations

The legal status given to the families of newly arrived children and young people, or to newly arrived children and young people themselves, may affect their rights and obligations in the education system (Figures I.2.1 and I.2.2). For the purposes of this report, three broad categories of migrants have been identified: those who hold a residence permit; asylum seekers and irregular migrants.

Having a residence permit indicates that the host country has given the migrant leave to stay (for three months or longer). It gives rights and obligations in society, including in education, and these are usually the same as for the native-born population. Residence permits are given to a broad range of migrants including EU workers, third country nationals who reside in the country for employment, research, study or family reunification purposes. They are also given to those who have been granted refugee status and therefore the right to stay in the host country.

The EU and other international organisations have made an attempt to draw attention to the need to educate resident children. Directive 77/486/CEE⁽¹⁾ addresses the education of children of migrant workers from another EU Member State. It applies to children for whom education is compulsory according to the host country regulations. The Directive calls for free tuition, adapted to the needs of these children, and the teaching of the host country language. In addition, it promotes the teaching of the first/home language and the culture of the country of origin in cooperation with the Member State of origin.

⁽¹⁾ Council Directive 77/486/EEC of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers (77/486/EEC) <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A31977L0486>

EU legislation also provides for the equal treatment of third country nationals legally residing in Member States; and thus they should have the same rights and obligations as nationals. Similarly, the EU Action Plan for the integration of third country nationals ⁽²⁾ also calls for the same provisions for refugees, and asylum seekers – to be discussed below – whose applications would most probably be accepted.

Asylum seekers submit a request for humanitarian protection and are waiting for the decision of the host country. According to Article 14 of the EU Directive 2013/33/EU ⁽³⁾, asylum seekers who are minors should have access to education within three months of the submission of their asylum request. It also specifies that 'preparatory classes, including language classes, shall be provided to minors where it is necessary to facilitate their access to and participation in the education system'.

Finally, irregular migrants enter or stay in the country without the necessary authorisation required under immigration regulations and have not submitted a request for asylum. They do not have a legal status in the country ⁽⁴⁾. There is no EU regulation or international agreement on their rights in host countries. However, the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child ⁽⁵⁾ require that children should have access to education regardless of their immigration status.

In more than three-quarters of education systems, all compulsory school age children and young people from migrant backgrounds have the same rights and obligations with respect to education as their native-born peers

In all European countries, it is a legal right for children and young people who are nationals of the country to participate in public education free of charge. Participating in education is also obligatory for children and young people of a certain age ⁽⁶⁾. Compulsory school age is defined in the top-level regulations/recommendations of each education system. It starts in most European countries at the beginning of primary education between the ages of 4 and 6 and ends between the ages of 15 and 18. Most countries extend the same rights and obligations to children and young people who are not citizens of the host country. However, different legal statuses may imply different rights and obligations with respect to education. Figure I.2.1 shows the national policies on the rights and obligations with respect to the education of compulsory school age children and young people from migrant backgrounds as compared to their native-born peers.

In 34 education systems, all compulsory school age children and young people from migrant backgrounds (including those with a residence permit, asylum seekers and irregular migrants) have the same rights and obligations in compulsory education in the host country. In contrast, in eight education systems, some children and young people from migrant backgrounds have different rights and/or obligations from their native-born peers.

⁽²⁾ Action Plan on the integration of third country nationals COM (2016) 377 final; https://ec.europa.eu/home-affairs/sites/homeaffairs/files/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/proposal-implementation-package/docs/20160607/communication_action_plan_integration_third-country_nationals_en.pdf


⁽³⁾ Directive 2013/33/EU of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2013 laying down standards for the reception of applicants for international protection (recast); <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32013L0033&from=FR>

⁽⁴⁾ Some countries, however, grant temporary residence permit to irregular minors under specific circumstances.

⁽⁵⁾ <http://www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx>

⁽⁶⁾ Schooling obligations maybe met by attending school or through home education, depending on specific top-level legislation in the education system concerned (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, forthcoming).

Figure I.2.1: Rights and obligations of compulsory school age children and young people from migrant backgrounds with respect to education, in primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), as compared to their native-born peers, 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the rights and obligations of compulsory school age children and young people from migrant backgrounds in comparison with their native-born peers.

Country-specific note

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey: The figure does not capture information on the obligations of children and young people with resident status – top-level regulations do not oblige those with resident status to participate in education.

In education systems where some migrant students have different rights and/or obligations, it is often associated with a particular legal status. In Romania, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, children and young people with resident status are not obliged to participate in compulsory education; nevertheless, they have the right to do so. In all the other 39 education systems, however, children and young people of compulsory school age who have resident status are obliged to participate in schooling.

Similarly, migrants with asylum seeker status do not have the same rights to compulsory education as native-born children in some education systems. This occurs in three education systems. In Denmark, asylum seekers have the right to participate in separate education, i.e. not in mainstream education, at all the education levels discussed in this report. In the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and in Turkey, top-level regulations do not cover the rights and obligations of asylum seeker children and young people with respect to education.

Irregular migrants are in the most uncertain situation regarding their rights and obligations with respect to schooling. In Bulgaria, Denmark, Lithuania, Hungary, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey, legislation does not explicitly grant education rights to compulsory school age irregular migrants at any level of education. In Sweden, irregular migrants can, but are not obliged to participate in compulsory education.

Young migrants over compulsory school age have similar rights to compensatory education as their native-born peers in over half of the education systems

When migrant young people over compulsory school age enter the host country they may be in one of two situations ⁽⁷⁾: on the one hand, their prior educational attainment may give them direct access to the level of education appropriate for their age group, for example, they have completed lower secondary education and can therefore access post-compulsory education (i.e. general or vocational upper secondary level (ISCED 3) or higher); on the other hand, they may have not yet completed compulsory education and may need compensatory education (see Glossary) to help them acquire compulsory school attainment and catch up with their peer group.

Where young people over compulsory school age can prove they meet requirements to have access to the next level, most education systems (31) treat newly arrived migrant young people in the same way as their native-born peers. However, some education systems make distinctions depending on the legal status of the young people (Bulgaria, Denmark, Lithuania, Hungary, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey) – similar to their policy with respect to compulsory education. In addition, in Czechia and Slovenia, top-level regulations/recommendations do not explicitly grant the same rights to irregular migrants over compulsory school age to participate in ISCED 3 general education and IVET programmes, although in practice they may be allowed to enrol. In the Netherlands, irregular migrant young people who are 18 or older can complete the educational programme that they have started when they become 18, but they do not have the right to start a post-compulsory programme (general or IVET) when they are 18 or older. In Finland, enrolment in 'preparatory education for general upper secondary level' necessitates a residence permit, therefore, asylum seekers and irregular migrants may not benefit from this programme. In Switzerland, students over compulsory school age (16 years of age) need to have a residence permit in order to participate in IVET. This is because the work-based learning part of IVET is regarded as employment, which necessitates a residence permit. Thus, in Switzerland, irregular migrants can apply for a temporary residence permit to study in IVET if they meet certain criteria. In Norway, asylum seekers have the same rights as citizens and residents up to the age of 18, and they have the right to finish the school year they have started when they become 18. Illegal migrants, though, do not have a right to education beyond the age of compulsory schooling (16 years of age). This means that they do not have a right to enrol in upper secondary programmes.

The recent humanitarian crisis has shown that there are situations when young people who are over compulsory school age arrive in the host country with (sometimes significantly) lower educational attainment than is normal for their age and many may have not completed compulsory education. This is partly because humanitarian migrants travel across countries, sometimes for a long time, and may not have had the opportunity to participate in formal education. This may also be due to particular circumstances in the education system or the society of the country of origin. These young people need to be enrolled in education as soon as possible so they have a chance of reaching their educational potential (European Commission, 2014).


Figure 16 of the Context chapter shows that the rate of young people leaving the education and training system early is higher among those from migrant backgrounds than among their native born peers. This suggests that new arrivals are also at particular risk. If these young people are to develop the necessary key competences and complete at least upper secondary education, they need

⁽⁷⁾ The end of compulsory education is between 15 and 18 years of age in European countries (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017a). In many countries, this overlaps with the end of ISCED level 2 or the first or second year of ISCED level 3 general education and IVET programmes. In some countries (Belgium and Portugal), however, the end of compulsory education coincides with the end of ISCED 3 level education (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017c).

similar rights to education, including access to the compensatory measures available to their native-born peers.

In 28 education systems, all newly arrived migrant young people have the same rights to participate in compensatory education as their native-born peers (see Figure I.2.2), but the data does not tell us what services and programmes are actually available. The case of France, where the number of newly arrived young people is increasing, presents potential challenges: although they have a right to participate in compensatory programmes, there is little provision on the ground for non-French speaking 16-18 year olds whose prior educational attainment does not correspond to their age or for those who do not have education at all. Currently, the *UPE2A Lycée* and the *Mission contre le Décrochage Scolaire* ⁽⁸⁾ are piloting reception education for young people in this situation. In Austria, specific remedial programmes have been designed for young people from migrant backgrounds who are considered to be potential early school leavers.

Figure I.2.2: Right to compensatory education for young migrants over compulsory school age who have not completed compulsory education, as compared to their native-born peers, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the right to compensatory education of young people from migrant backgrounds who are over compulsory school age but have not completed compulsory education. For the definition of compensatory education see Glossary.

There are ten education systems (Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Lithuania, Hungary, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Norway and Turkey) where some young people from migrant backgrounds (mostly asylum seekers and/or irregular migrants as presented above) who are over compulsory school age but have yet to complete compulsory education do not have the same rights as their native-born peers to participate in compensatory education either. These countries have the same policy regarding the rights to education of young people from migrant backgrounds who are over compulsory school age regardless of their prior educational attainment.

Besides these countries, in Belgium (Flemish Community), Croatia and Poland, irregular migrants do not have the same rights as their native-born peers. In Poland, for example, they do not have the right to participate in compensatory education. In Belgium (Flemish Community), because participation in

⁽⁸⁾ Mission Against Early School Leaving

vocationally-oriented compensatory programmes that include work-based learning at a company requires a residence permit, irregular migrants over compulsory school age (18) cannot enrol, although they are allowed to complete a programme if they enrolled earlier.


Information, advice and guidance services for newly arrived migrant children focus on the provision of written information

Upon arrival in the host country, newly arrived children, young people and their families often do not understand their educational rights and obligations, nor do they know how to navigate the education system to find out what opportunities or support are available. They face challenges in obtaining information because they do not know who to ask, they may not even have a common language in which to communicate. Parents may also meet difficulties – linguistic and cultural – in relating to the school, which may deter them from becoming involved in their children's education.

Information, advice and guidance at this stage is key to helping migrant families navigate their way around the education system. Schools often provide ad hoc help to newcomers in enrolling or choosing the right pathway, however, top-level regulations or recommendations in this area can ensure that provision is consistent across the education system.

Figure I.2.3 shows that in 11 education systems top-level regulations require/recommend at least three types of measures, which often include written information about the education system, interpreters and a dedicated resource person/contact person. In a further 13 systems, one or two of these measures are required/recommended. In eight education systems, top-level authorities explicitly request/recommend that information, advice and guidance services should be offered but they do not provide further guidance (to top-level bodies, local authorities, schools) what these could be. Finally, in ten systems, top-level regulations do not call for information, advice and guidance to support the access of newly arrived children and young people from migrant backgrounds. Local authorities, schools and other stakeholders may, however, provide information on their own initiative.

Figure I.2.3: Information, advice and guidance for newly arrived immigrant children and young people, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the most common types of information, advice and guidance services advocated by top-level legislation or recommendations. They may be organised by top-level bodies or delivered by local authorities or schools. The figure does not provide detail on which migrant groups, if any, are targeted (i.e. those with residency permits, asylum seekers or irregular migrants).

Country-specific notes (Figure I.2.3)

Germany: Data applies to some *Länder*.

Estonia and Greece: Data refers to measures targeting asylum seekers and refugees.

Spain: Each Autonomous Community is responsible for its school integration measures, which in all cases include written information on the education system, dedicated resource persons, interpreters and dedicated reception centres, among others.

United Kingdom (SCT): Local authorities are obliged to provide written information about local schools and school enrolment, and individual schools publish a school handbook.

Iceland: Data refers to ISCED 1-2 levels. There is no top-level regulation or recommendation addressing this area at ISCED 3 level.

The services most often provided are written information about the education system and a dedicated resource or contact person, which are explicitly required or recommended in 19 and 14 systems, respectively. In Czechia, Lithuania, Austria, Portugal, the United Kingdom (Scotland) and Switzerland, written or audio information is available on the education system for foreigners on the websites of top-level authorities. In addition, in Lithuania, an information leaflet is published in English, Russian and Arabic. Austria has produced and made public an information DVD on the Austrian school system. In the United Kingdom (Scotland), Education Scotland has produced a guide for the parents of refugees and asylum seekers about the Scottish education system. In the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), translated letters and guidelines about school policies are available on the website of the Intercultural Education Service. The role of resource and contact persons⁽⁹⁾ is discussed in more detail in Chapter I.3.

Interpreters are provided in twelve systems, and reception centres which (also) provide information, advice and guidance on education are in place in ten systems. For example, in Portugal, the High Commissioner for Migration has set up a telephone translation service in ten languages, which is also available to help migrants in contacting schools or other education institutions. In Iceland, the National Curricula calls on all municipalities to provide specialist services to schools. These also include interpreters for children and families in need.

Reception centres which also provide information, advice and guidance on the education system and the schooling opportunities available are advocated in the least number of education systems. Three types of centre were identified: centres set up to welcome refugees (Belgium – German-speaking Community, Bulgaria and Finland), national or local information centres for immigrants which may also provide information on education (Bulgaria, Portugal and Romania) or specialised centres that provide school information and may carry out other tasks such as initial assessments or support communication between schools and families (Greece, France, Luxembourg and Austria).

The remit and organisation of the centres working in education varies between countries, reflecting their specific situations. In Greece, the Ministry of Education, Research and Religious Affairs appoints 'Refugee Education Coordinators' (RECs) in all major refugee accommodation centres. They monitor the integration of refugee children into public education, and also liaise between students, parents, school principals and teachers. RECs are teachers with indefinite contracts who apply to be seconded to this post. In France, a dedicated centre, CASNAV⁽¹⁰⁾ establishes welcome offices staffed by a CASNAV trainer, a teacher or a psychologist. They meet the newly arrived migrant for a dialogue and a pedagogical assessment, if possible in the person's home language. They propose a schooling pathway/option which is transmitted to all the services that work with the student in the education department responsible. In Luxembourg, the CASNA⁽¹¹⁾ welcomes newcomers over 12 years old and

⁽⁹⁾ At local or school level, resource or contact persons usually provide advice and help newly arrived students and their parents in matters related to the school, the education system and other issues related to education.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Centre Académique de Scolarisation des élèves Nouvellement Arrivés et des enfants issus des familles itinéraires ou de Voyageurs (CASNAV) – Academic Centre for the Schooling of Newly Arrived Students and Children of Traveller Families.

⁽¹¹⁾ *Cellule d'accueil scolaire pour les élèves nouveaux arrivants* (CASNA) – School reception unit for newly arrived pupils

provides advice in Luxembourgish, French, German, English and Portuguese (or other languages on request). In Austria, reception centres and resource persons ⁽¹²⁾ are made available by the regional school boards, which advise all young people from migrant backgrounds. In Finland, reception centres for unaccompanied minors are requested to prepare an integration plan for newly arrived unaccompanied minors. This plan builds on their prior learning and includes guidance for their integration into compulsory education. Finally, in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), the Intercultural Education Service, which is not a centre, but a service to schools, provides a range of support services for newcomer pupils in schools. On request it offers interpretation services for newcomers' initial parent-teacher meetings and for the two additional parent-teacher meetings held each year. It also provides translated materials and guidelines on school policies, and advice on welcoming newly arrived migrants and planning their first weeks in school. The service also advises schools on monitoring students' progress, providing access to the curriculum, overcoming specific language difficulties they may have and supporting their exam preparations in the post-primary phase.

I.2.2. School placement

Top-level policies exist in many education systems that determine how quickly children who have a right to be in education in the host country should be able to access education services (Figure I.2.4) and what kind of education they can participate. These policies are influenced by the regulations/recommendations surrounding education rights, school admission, selection and needs assessment (Figures I.2.5 to I.2.9).


Less than half of the education systems set a maximum time period within which newly arrived migrants should be participating in education

Continuity in education is important for all children. For children and young people from migrant backgrounds this continuity may be threatened depending on how much time elapses between their departure from their country of origin, their arrival in the host country and their enrolment in school. Longer breaks may hit the most disadvantaged migrant students hardest. For example, in the case of children and young people with short term leave to stay, asylum seekers or irregular migrants schooling may be delayed or refused. In order to address this issue, at least for some of the children at risk, the EU Directive 2013/33/EU requires that refugee and asylum seeker children should be enrolled in education within three months of their arrival.

As shown in Figure I.2.4, in 19 education systems, top-level regulations or recommendations specify a maximum number of days or months within which migrant children and young people should be enrolled into school. The time period varies between immediate enrolment upon application (for example, in Belgium – French Community and Liechtenstein) and 91 days (Latvia). Most education systems that have established a timeframe have designated a maximum of 84 or 91 days (mainly expressed as twelve weeks or three months). This timeframe is related to international obligations to enrol refugee and asylum seeker children in compulsory education. However, a number of systems, such as Denmark, Lithuania (for refugees), Austria, Sweden, the United Kingdom (England and Wales) and Norway, have designated a shorter period.

⁽¹²⁾ http://www.schule-mehrsprachig.at/fileadmin/schule_mehrsprachig/redaktion/hintergrundinfo/schulberatungsstellen_april17.pdf

Figure I.2.4: Maximum time period for schools to enrol newly arrived migrants, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), number of days, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

BE fr	BE de	BE nl	BG	CZ	DK	DE	EE	IE	EL	ES	FR	HR	IT
0	⊗	60	⊗	⊗	21	⊗	84	⊗	84	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗
CY	LV	LT	LU	HU	MT	NL	AT	PL	PT	RO	SI	SK	FI
84	91	30/90	84	⊗	⊗	⊗	3	⊗	⊗	90	90	84d	⊗
SE	UK-ENG	UK-WLS	UK-NIR	UK-SCT	BA	CH	IS	LI	ME	NO	RS	(*)	TR
28	20	20	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	84	0	⊗	28	⊗	⊗	⊗

⊗ No time period set for schools to enroll newly arrived children and young people from migrant background

Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure shows which education systems have established a time period for the entry of newly arrived children and young people from migrant backgrounds into the education system as defined in top-level regulations/recommendations. The accompanying table provides the detail in terms of the maximum number of days allowed. Although some education systems specify the time period in terms of weeks or months, for ease of comparability, all data have been converted into days. Variations according to education level and legal status are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Estonia and Cyprus: Data applies only to refugees of compulsory school age.

Greece, Romania, Slovenia, Slovakia and Iceland: Data applies to asylum seekers who have submitted their request for protection.

Latvia: Data refers to refugees and asylum seekers.

Lithuania: 30 days (one month) refers to all children and young people from migrant backgrounds who have a residence permit. 90days (three months) refers to asylum seekers.

Austria: Data refers to compulsory education.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS): Data refers to unaccompanied minors who have applied for asylum ('looked-after' status).

Norway: Data refers to compulsory school age refugees and asylum seekers.

Twenty-three education systems do not specify a time period at the top-level, despite the requirement in the EU Directive on humanitarian migrants. Many of them, however, emphasise that children of compulsory school age – who have the right to schooling – must go to school and that puts a pressure on schools and local authorities to provide a place immediately on arrival or very soon after.

As far as post-compulsory education is concerned, no specific enrolment obligations have been set in any education system. Newly arrived young people need to follow the regular procedures and annual enrolment deadlines.

At primary and lower secondary levels, a child's age, and at upper secondary level, evidence of previous educational attainment from school documentation are the main factors in determining the school grade of newly arrived migrants

Children and young people learn more effectively if they can build on their previous learning and if the learning environment is challenging enough so that they remain motivated to learn. For children who start their education in their own national education system, national school admission policies define the criteria to be used in determining when children are ready to start primary school, and when they should progress to the next grade or level of the education system. The criteria most frequently used are age and the completion of the previous level of education.

Immigrants come from different education systems and often speak a language which is different from the language of instruction in the host country. Their learning history is also varied. Some have participated regularly in education in their country of origin and this is well documented. Others may not possess relevant certificates or school documentation, they may have had their studies interrupted or they may not have had any education at all. Due to their limited or non-existent skills in the language of instruction, particularly where their previous education has also been limited, newly arrived children and young people may be enrolled into school grades that are significantly below their age and cognitive abilities. Any misdiagnoses could have an impact on a child's remaining school career. In order to ensure that newly arrived migrants are placed at an education level and grade that best suits their learning needs, top-level authorities and schools, as appropriate, need to have a set of criteria and to ensure that children are placed in the most appropriate grade.


Figure I.2.5 shows the factors that are generally considered, according to top-level policy documents, in determining the school grade of newly arrived migrants who enrol for the first time in the host country's education system. These are the child's age, evidence from school documentation, the level of competences in the host country language and the results of any assessment of prior learning.

Ten systems (Belgium – Flemish Community, Hungary, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom – England, Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey) do not prescribe or recommend how the school grade of newcomers should be determined at primary, general secondary education and IVET. In a few other systems at some levels of education schools, and typically school heads (in Finland, teachers), or school committees, set up for this purpose, are free to decide how they determine the school grade of newly arrived children. These include Belgium (French Community) at primary level, Finland and Iceland at general upper secondary level and in IVET.

In all other systems, at least one criterion is specified by top-level authorities, and schools themselves apply the criteria and guidance in identifying school level and grade. France and Luxembourg are exceptions: the welcome offices of CASNAV in France and CASNA in Luxembourg (see also Figure I.2.3) carry out the assessments and determine or guide the school enrolment process of newly arrived migrant children who have a first language other than language of instruction (French in France and French/German/Luxembourgish in Luxembourg).

Figure I.2.5 A shows that age is by far the most used criteria in determining school grade at primary and lower secondary levels: at primary level, 29, and at lower secondary level, 28 systems refer to it. In Greece, at primary level, and in Denmark, Estonia, Ireland, Austria, Iceland and Norway, at both levels, age is actually the only factor that schools are required or recommended to take into account in determining school grade. This means that new arrivals are typically enrolled in grades that correspond to their age.

Figure I.2.5: Criteria for determining school grade, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the criteria used in determining the school grade of newly arrived children and young people from migrant backgrounds. Part A of Figure I.2.5 presents the situation at primary and lower secondary levels, and part B at general upper secondary level and IVET. Further variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (French Community): Data refers to general secondary education and IVET. Top-level regulations do not address this area at primary education level.

Denmark: Data on host country language competences refers to general upper secondary education. In IVET, this is not used as criterion for determining school grade.

Greece: School documentation is considered in general secondary education and IVET. When school documentation is missing, school grade is determined based on parents' formal written declaration.

Spain and Malta: Data does not apply to IVET.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Cyprus: The level of host country language competences are taken into account for determining school grade at primary education level only.

Lithuania: School documentation (e.g. certificates) is only considered in school-based IVET.

Austria: School documentation (e.g. school certificates) is considered in upper secondary post-compulsory education.

Slovenia: As from July 2018, the 'Results of the assessment of prior learning' are also required to be taken into consideration in general upper secondary education and IVET for persons under international protection who do not have relevant school documentation.

Switzerland: Top-level regulations/recommendations may vary between cantons

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme. The level of host country language and the results of the assessment of prior learning refer in Figure I.2.5 A to lower secondary education only and in Figure I.2.5 B to general upper secondary education. The assessment results are considered to be part of the streaming process whereby students are guided towards one of three types of schools based on student performance.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Only few countries allow for the placement of new arrivals at one or two grades lower than is normal for their age group if their host country language competences or level of prior learning do not correspond to the level expected for their age group at primary and lower secondary levels. In these systems, the level of language skills and/or prior learning of the candidate are assessed prior to taking any decision on school grade. This is the case in Czechia (at primary and lower secondary levels),

France, Cyprus, Slovakia and Switzerland. In Spain, this may happen when regular measures such as individual education plans and preparatory classes would not be sufficient to address the new arrival's needs.

More than a third of the systems take into account school documentation, the level of competences in host country language and the results of the assessment of prior learning at primary and lower secondary levels. In many countries, certificates of educational attainment and other school documentation (including information on the education system, the national qualification system, credit systems and progression routes) are used as evidence in determining the appropriate school grade. However, information is not available in the present data collection on who is responsible for analysing this documentation – whether it is a central body, local authorities or schools themselves – and whether they have the appropriate resources to read and analyse school documentation from the countries concerned. In these systems, language and cognitive skills are tested only when school documentation is not available, which may happen in the case of asylum seekers and refugees. For example, this is the main approach in Belgium (French Community) and Croatia in lower secondary education; and it is a common approach at all levels in Slovenia.

As mentioned above, there are some systems where competences in the language of the host country and/or prior learning of all newly arrived migrants are assessed at primary and lower secondary levels. These assessments are partly used to determine the school level and grade and partly for diagnosing learning support needs (see Chapter I.3). In Belgium (German-speaking Community), Czechia, Italy and Slovakia, next to age, the most important criterion when enrolling newly arrived migrants is the level of competences in the language of the host country. In Belgium (German-speaking Community), newly arrived migrant children can only be enrolled in mainstream schools if their competences in the German language is above level A2 of CEFR⁽¹³⁾. Those with lower levels can attend preparatory classes where mixed-age groups are organised by ISCED level. Similarly, in Liechtenstein, the level of competences in the language of the host country is a factor in determining whether newly arrived migrants are advised to enrol in mainstream education or in a one-year intensive course in the host country language (*Intensiv-Kurs DaZ*). In Portugal, the assessment of prior learning is not used for determining school grade but it is in deciding what learning support is needed. (See also Part II for specific cases of initial assessment.)

Examples from countries that assess the prior learning of new arrivals include Sweden, where specific diagnostic tests are in place in several school subjects for determining school grade. In France, Cyprus and Switzerland, both language and cognitive skills are assessed. In France, prior learning is tested in the home language of the pupil in order to exclude distorting factors in the assessment that might be due to a lack of French language skills; nevertheless, French language skills are also tested. Those new arrivals whose competences in the French language do not reach level B1 in CEFR, are guided towards UPE2A.

In general upper secondary education and IVET, in systems with top-level regulations or recommendations in this area, age is slightly less prominent as a criterion than at lower educational levels (see Figure I.2.5 B). The use of school documentation is more marked at this educational level. It is used by as many education systems as the age factor in general upper secondary education, while in IVET, school documentation seems to be more widely used than age or other factors. The results of assessments in the host country language and of prior learning are used for determining the school grade in IVET to a somewhat lesser extent than in general upper secondary education or at


⁽¹³⁾ Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. (2001) <https://www.coe.int/en/web/common-european-framework-reference-languages>

lower education levels. In Finland, students do not study within grades, but take courses or study units. Nevertheless, prior learning and competences in the host country language are assessed – prior learning achievement is recognised, when relevant, and learning support is planned according to student needs.

Less than a third of the education systems have developed top-level criteria for the assessment of prior learning and use this for determining school grades

Although assessment in the language of the host country and prior learning are not the most significant factors in determining school grade, it is still interesting to see whether top-level authorities have developed assessment criteria to ensure a consistent approach across the education system or whether schools are free to make their own decisions in this area. Figure I.2.6 presents the various country approaches in this domain.

Figure I.2.6: Use of top-level criteria for assessing competences in the host country language and prior learning, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on criteria for assessing competences in the host country language and prior learning in primary, general secondary education and IVET. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

To accurately interpret this figure, the information needs to be examined together with the country data in Figure I.2.5 on whether home language skills and prior learning are assessed.

Country-specific notes

Denmark: Data refer only to ISCED 3 level general education and IVET.

Germany: Data applies to some *Länder*.

Cyprus: Data applies to ISCED 2 and 3 levels general path and IVET.

Malta: Data refers to ISCED 1-3 general path.

Netherlands: Data applies to only to IVET. No top-level regulations apply in general education.

Slovenia: As from September 2018, top level criteria are in place for the assessment of host country language competences for students who do not have a certificate of Slovenian language competences at A2 level of CEFR at upper secondary general education and IVET. As from July 2018, top-level criteria for the assessment of prior learning are available in general upper secondary education and IVET for persons under international protection who do not have relevant school documentation.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: Data on host country language assessment refers to ISCED 1-2 levels and IVET; data on the assessment of prior learning refers to ISCED 3 and IVET. Criteria may vary between Cantons.

Liechtenstein: Data refers to top-level assessment criteria applicable to all students (i.e. not targeted to newly arrived) as part of the streaming process where students are guided towards one of three types of schools based on their performance at lower secondary and general upper secondary education level.

Of the 22 education systems where top-level authorities require or recommend that the level of host country language competences or prior learning could or should be used in determining the school grade of new arrivals (see Figure I.2.5), 18 have established top-level assessment criteria to support the process in one or both areas. In Germany, Spain, France, Luxembourg, Romania, Finland and Switzerland, these include criteria for both host country language and prior learning. Belgium (German-speaking Community) and Malta have developed top-level criteria only for assessing host country language competences. Bulgaria, Denmark, Cyprus, Sweden and Montenegro have adopted top-level criteria for the assessment of prior learning. In Portugal, competences in the host country language do not play a role in determining school grade, but top-level assessment criteria (CERF) are available for determining language support needs. Similarly, top-level authorities in the Netherlands do not require the assessment of competences in the host country language, but they make available assessment criteria that can be used in IVET institutions across the country.

In the remaining seven systems where the assessment of prior learning or language skills is required, there are no top-level criteria to guide schools in this initial assessment. In these systems, schools are free to decide exactly what is assessed and how the assessment is carried out. Czechia, Croatia, Italy, Slovenia, Slovakia, Iceland and Serbia belong to this latter group. In July 2018, Slovenia introduced top-level criteria for the assessment of the prior learning of young people who benefit from international protection and do not have school documentation; top-level criteria also became available from September 2018 for the assessment of host country language skills in upper secondary general education and IVET.

Newly arrived migrant students usually participate in separate/preparatory classes or lessons if they have inadequate host country language skills to follow mainstream tuition


Once children and young people from migrant backgrounds are enrolled in the system, they may be placed in different settings. They may be placed directly into mainstream classes or they may be put into separate provision for a period of time. Some countries use the term 'preparatory classes', others 'reception classes' or 'transition classes' to describe this separate provision. In many countries, a combined approach is used with pupils taking some lessons in a mainstream class and some in separate provision – the proportion of time spent in each varies between countries and even according to individual need. The lessons given in separate classes are aimed at allowing for more intensive teaching or more targeted support to be given to the new arrivals.

While intensive language and learning support may be beneficial in preparing the new arrivals to enter mainstream education, experiences in some countries show that education in separate groups, for all or most lessons and for a long time, where newly arrived migrants have little contact with their native-born peers, can be counter-productive for social integration (Bunar, 2017).

Figure I.2.7 shows that in the majority of education systems (28) top-level regulations/recommendations explicitly mention that newly arrived children and young people may be placed directly in mainstream classes, where they study together with native-born students in all lessons during school hours. In five of these systems (Czechia, Latvia, Slovakia, the United Kingdom – Scotland, and Montenegro), all newly arrived migrant students are placed in mainstream classes for all their lessons, at all education levels – from their initial entry into the host country education system. In the remaining 23 systems, only some new arrivals are directly integrated into mainstream classes from the beginning. Usually these are children or young people who already have good skills in the language of instruction and are able to follow mainstream tuition. In Belgium (Flemish Community), in primary education, top-level regulations/recommendations explicitly refer to placement in mainstream classes for all lessons. Schools can, however, decide to place newly arrived migrant students with

insufficient skills in the host country language into language immersion classes for a maximum period of one year.

Figure I.2.7: Initial placement of newly arrived children and young people from migrant backgrounds, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on where newly arrived migrant children and young people start their education in the host country – in separate or mainstream classes or in some form of combined provision. Where different options are possible, the criteria are explained in the text below. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (Flemish Community): In general secondary education and IVET, 'non-Dutch speaking newcomers' (Flemish definition; see Chapter I.1.1) are placed in separate/preparatory classes for all lessons.

Denmark: Newly arrived migrants can be provided education in separate groups only at primary and lower secondary education levels.

Germany: Students may be enrolled in mainstream classes for all lessons only at primary level. At general secondary level and IVET, all options presented are possible. Regulations on class placement vary between *Länder*.

Greece: Top-level regulations for the organisation of 'reception' classes (mainstream classes for most lessons, partially separate) at general secondary education level and in IVET apply specifically to the 2017/18 school year. Data on separate/preparatory classes for all lessons refers to the 'Reception School Facilities for Refugee Education (DYEP)'.
Lithuania: Top-level regulations do not address class placement in IVET.

Malta: At primary and lower secondary levels, all options presented are possible. In general upper secondary education, students can be placed in mainstream classes for all lessons, mainstream classes for most lessons and partially separate, and in preparatory classes for all lessons. Top-level regulations do not address class placement in IVET.

Austria: In the 2017/18 school year, students with inadequate German language competences attended language support groups (*Sprachstartgruppen*) instead of other compulsory subjects, or language support lessons (*Sprachförderkurse*), while in mainstream. From 2018/19, students with inadequate German language skills are to be enrolled in German support classes (*Deutschförderklassen*), for 15 lessons at primary level and for 20 lessons at lower secondary level. The rest of their school time students join mainstream classes (according to their age group).

Portugal: In IVET, the data presented only applies to 'Education Training Courses (CEF) and the 'Specialised Artistic Education Courses'.

Slovenia: At upper secondary level and IVET, all newly arrived migrants are placed in mainstream classes for all lessons.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: Regulations on class placement vary between the Cantons. At primary and lower secondary levels, placement in mainstream classes for all lessons and mainstream classes for most lessons, partially separate exist in all cantons. Separate/preparatory classes for all or most lessons exist in few cantons at primary and lower secondary levels. In upper secondary general education, all admitted students are placed in mainstream classes for all lessons. In IVET, three categories apply: mainstream classes for all lessons, mainstream classes for most lessons, partially separate and separate/preparatory classes for all lessons.

Liechtenstein: 'Preparatory classes for all lessons' applies only to primary and lower secondary education levels.

In nearly half of the education systems, newly arrived migrants enrolled in mainstream classes may have some separate lessons during school hours. These separate lessons often focus on the teaching of the language of instruction as a second language. Some countries may also call this type of provision as a 'preparatory class/lesson'. In Serbia, all newly arrived migrants have this combined provision (mainstream classes for most lessons, separated for some), while in the remaining 18 systems only some students have it. In Estonia, almost all newly arrived students have lessons in Estonian as a second language separately from mainstream classes. In the first year, it is eight to ten

lessons a week, but this decreases later, according to the student's needs. In mainstream classes, they begin by attending lessons where the knowledge of the language of instruction is not considered vital – such as arts, technology, crafts, music, gymnastics and foreign languages, sometimes maths and chemistry. In Portugal, all first and second generation students whose Portuguese language skills are B2 or C1 are integrated into mainstream classes, for all lessons. Those whose competences are below this level attend mainstream classes, but instead of Portuguese lessons (for native-born students) they participate in 'Portuguese for non-natives' lessons. The assessment of language skills is carried out at local level.

Separate/preparatory classes, for all or most lessons, are provided in about 18 education systems. Their purpose is to provide intensive and targeted support to those who are new to the education system, and to prepare them to integrate into mainstream education. This is usually separate provision with its own curriculum, which may be broader or narrower depending on the number of subjects and competences covered. (Figure I.3.1 presents more detail on the content of preparatory programmes.) The time children and young people spend in separate/preparatory classes also varies between countries (see Figure I.2.8).

In 13 of the systems with separate/preparatory classes, students spend their whole school day in this separate provision. In Belgium (French and Flemish Communities – secondary level), Poland and Liechtenstein, students with inadequate skills in the language of instruction are typically enrolled in these classes. In France, students without prior educational attainment and with poor French language skills are enrolled in separate/preparatory classes full-time. If needed, they can continue studying in separate classes and join mainstream classes for some lessons in the second year.

In 11 education systems, students may participate in separate/preparatory classes for most of their school time, and follow some lessons with native-born students in mainstream classes. Common lessons often include those that do not require a high level of language skills, such as physical education, music or arts (for example, in Croatia, France and Malta). In France, newly arrived students who have participated in education prior to their arrival but do not have adequate French language skills can follow mainstream classes in physical education, music and plastic arts. They can integrate into maths, English language and science classes as soon as possible according to their individual timetable. In Germany, Greece, Malta, Sweden, Switzerland and Norway, new arrivals may be placed in preparatory classes for all or most lessons. In Austria, from the 2018/19 school year, students with an inadequate command of the language of instruction (German) are to be enrolled in *Deutschförderklassen* (German support classes) for a maximum of four terms (15 lessons of German as a second language at primary level and 20 lessons in lower secondary education). For the rest of their school time, students join their mainstream class (according to their age group).

In some countries, newly arrived migrant students who have poor skills in the host country language are recommended to attend specific schools, which offer additional host country language support. In France, newly arrived migrant children and young people who have inadequate French language skills are recommended to enrol into schools which offer a programme specifically designed for newly arrived migrants ('UPE2A' ⁽¹⁴⁾). Belgium (French Community – in secondary education, 'DASPA' ⁽¹⁵⁾) and Cyprus take a similar approach, but the target group is broader. In these two education systems, all students who have a first language other than the language of instruction are recommended to attend schools where they can participate in adapted programmes with an intensive language

⁽¹⁴⁾ *Unités Pédagogiques pour Élèves Allophones Arrivants* (Pedagogical Unit for the Newly Arrived Non-French Speaking Students)

⁽¹⁵⁾ *Dispositif d'Accueil et de Scolarisation des élèves Primo-Arrivants* (Reception and Schooling Service for Newly Arrived Students)

component. In addition, in Belgium (French Community), all newly arrived students (regardless of their French language skills) whose school documentation does not provide evidence that the student has attainment recognised as equivalent to national certificates are obliged to enrol into 'DASPA'. In Belgium (Flemish Community), newly arrived migrants who meet the specific 'non-Dutch speaking newcomer' criteria (see Chapter I.1.1) are guided towards schools providing language support at secondary level ('OKAN'). For this reason, the choice of schools for these students may be more limited than for those speaking the language of instruction.

In 11 education systems (Bulgaria, Denmark, Hungary, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom – England, Wales and Northern Ireland, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey), there are no top-level regulations/recommendations which address the placement of newly arrived migrant children and young people in schools. Finally, in Czechia and Denmark, newly arrived migrants – like all other students – may be placed in separate provision for students with special educational needs, if such needs are identified.

A limit is set on the amount of time newly arrived migrant students can spend in separate provision in about half of the countries


Where newly arrived migrants spend some or all their school lessons in separate provision, top-level authorities often set a timeframe by the end of which students should become fully integrated into mainstream classes. Figure I.2.8 shows that this occurs in around a half of the European education systems and the time limit varies.

Sixteen education systems have regulations/recommendations on the length of provision in separate (preparatory) classes, where newly arrived migrant students may spend most or all of their school day (see Figure I.2.7). Only one education system defines a minimum period for separate classes (Belgium – French Community – one week) and all others set a maximum.

The maximum time period in which newly arrived migrants can study in separate classes/groups is generally between one and two years. Luxembourg provides for a longer maximum period: three years at lower secondary level and four years at general upper secondary level and in IVET. In Germany, regulations on timeframes vary between the *Länder*, but usually students transfer from separate/preparatory classes to become integrated into mainstream education within a period of six months to two years. In Croatia, students in preparatory classes continue to benefit from additional separate lessons and support after they have been integrated into mainstream classes.

Ten education systems refer to the length of time in which newly arrived migrant students can follow some separate lessons while they spend most of their time in mainstream education. Croatia and Italy set a minimum period for this purpose – 35 weeks and 16 weeks, respectively. The maximum period newly arrived migrants can follow separate lessons is between 24 weeks in Italy and five years maximum in Greece. In Greece, the 'Reception Classes' scheme, which accommodates all native-born students and those from migrant backgrounds who need help with the Greek language, is offered in two cycles: Cycle I for students with elementary or no Greek language skills lasts for one year, plus one year extension; Cycle II for students with intermediate Greek language skills lasts for two or three years maximum. Students needing to attend both cycles may take some subjects in separate classes, while also taking mainstream classes in subjects where they do not need a high level of Greek language skills – this arrangement may continue for up to five years.

Figure I.2.8: Minimum and maximum time period to be spent by newly arrived migrants in separate lessons or classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

	BE fr	BE de	BE nl	BG	CZ	DK	DE	EE	IE	EL	ES	FR	HR	IT
Separate classes	1w-1.5y	<1/2y	1y	⊗	⊗	⊗	<0.5-2y	⊗	⊗	⊗	:	1y	35-70w	⊗
Separate lessons	⊗	⊗	1-2y	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	<3y	⊗	1-5y	:	<2/3y	>35w	16-24w
	CY	LV	LT	LU	HU	MT	NL	AT	PL	PT	RO	SI	SK	FI
Separate classes	⊗	:	<1y	<3/4y	⊗	⊗	⊗	<2y	<2y	⊗	⊗	<5d	⊗	<1y
Separate lessons	<2y	⊗	⊗	<4y	⊗	⊗	⊗	<2y	⊗	⊗	1y	⊗	⊗	<6y
	SE	UK-ENG	UK-WLS	UK-NIR	UK-SCT	BA	CH	IS	LI	ME	NO	RS	(*)	TR
Separate classes	<2y	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	1-2y	⊗	<1y	⊗	<2y	⊗	⊗	⊗
Separate lessons	:	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	1-3y	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗

⊗ No time period determined for schools to enroll newly arrived children and young people from migrant background
 <X Maximum X (years/weeks/days)

y years
 w weeks
 d days

Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the minimum and maximum period in which newly arrived migrants can be placed in separate provision i.e. separate (preparatory) classes for all or most lessons, or for some separate lessons only while they attend mainstream classes. Variations between education levels and specific provisions are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE de): At primary level, migrant students can study in separate groups (preparatory classes) for a maximum of one year. In general secondary education and IVET, the maximum time period is two years.

Belgium (BE nl): In primary education, top-level regulations allow for the organisation of language immersion classes for all non-Dutch speaking students, which is a maximum of one year. In general secondary education and IVET, the time period for placement in separate classes may be longer than one school year for individual pupils if the student enrolls after 1 October and has been in Belgium for less than a year at the beginning of the new school year.

Germany: Top-level regulations on the time period vary between *Länder*.

Greece: For the 2018/19 school year, the time period is defined for separate classes (DYEP) in the newly adopted Law 4547/2018. It is one school year with the possibility of a one-year extension. Following an assessment of their progress, students can transfer to mainstream classes at any point in time.

Spain: Top-level regulations on the time period vary between Autonomous Communities; therefore, it is not possible to report data.

France: With regard to separate lessons, in primary education, this breaks down into a minimum of nine hours per week, and in secondary general education and IVET, a minimum of 12 hours a week is recommended, but the number of hours may vary depending on students' individual needs.

Lithuania and Malta: Top-level regulations do not address class placement in IVET.

Luxembourg: Data on separate classes refers to general secondary education and IVET. Data on separate lessons refers to primary education.

Slovenia: Data refers to primary and lower secondary education levels.

Finland: Data refers to the period when schools may receive top-level funding for separate classes and lessons to support the acquisition of the host country language as a second language at primary and general secondary levels. At all relevant educational levels, preparatory classes can be centrally funded for a maximum of one year.

Sweden: Data refers to primary and lower secondary education levels. In general upper secondary education and IVET, there are no top-level regulations on how long students can be in separate classes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: Top-level regulations/recommendations on the maximum time period vary between cantons. Not all cantons define a maximum period. The maximum period for separate lessons (when students are in mainstream classes for most of their lessons) is between one and three years in primary and lower secondary education. Separate/preparatory classes may last for a maximum of one or two years.


The targeted support period for newly arrived migrants is usually longer than the time allocated for preparatory classes

Regardless of whether learning support is provided in separate/preparatory classes or in mainstream classes, top-level authorities may define a specific time period during which newly arrived migrant students benefit from additional attention and support at the beginning of their school career in the host country. Such targeted care may significantly help students become acquainted with the system, learn what is expected of them and get to know their peers and the school environment in general.

While Chapter I.3 discusses the content of support measures in more detail, this section will explore the extent to which countries define a timeframe for delivering targeted support to newly arrived migrant students (support available for all students with specific learning needs is not covered in this section). Figure I.2.9 shows that most of the countries that make a distinction between newly arrived migrant students from other migrant students (15 of 23) set some form of timeframe for the provision of support.

The length of the dedicated support period ranges from minimum one week in Belgium (French Community) to four years in Lithuania and Sweden. The most common time period is one or two years. In Denmark, Romania, Norway and Iceland, newly arrived migrants are eligible for learning support from the moment they enter the host country. In all other countries, newly arrived migrant students may receive support from the moment they are first enrolled in the education system.

This support period typically addresses students needing help with the language(s) of instruction and focusses on language acquisition. In Denmark, newly arrived students who do not speak Danish well can receive instruction in the Danish language for up to two years; however, those arriving in Denmark over the age of 14 or those who have not received reading and writing instruction can continue to access support. In France, non-French speaking newcomers who have previously been educated in their home country (*Elèves allophones nouvellement arrivés*) may receive support for two years; while those not having had prior education (*Non Scolarisé Antérieurement*) usually receive it for three years. In Italy, newly arrived migrant students may benefit from eight to ten Italian language lessons during a period of 16-24 weeks. In Belgium (Flemish Community), non-Dutch speaking newcomers are entitled to receive 'reception education' (preparatory classes) for a year at all levels, and additional support for one year in mainstream classes. Finally, in Liechtenstein, non-German speaking newcomers of compulsory school age are obliged to follow a one-year intensive German as a second language course after enrolling in education. If required, this support can be extended to the age of 18. Following the one-year course, pupils are entitled to additional language support, integrated into the curriculum for mainstream classes.

Figure I.2.9: Time period set for providing support to newly arrived migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18


Source: Eurydice.

BE fr	BE de	BE nl	BG	CZ	DK	DE	EE	IE	EL	ES	FR	HR	IT
1w-1.5y	⊗	1-2y	⊗	⊗	2y	⊗	3y	⊗	⊗	⊗	2-3y	⊗	16-24w
CY	LV	LT	LU	HU	MT	NL	AT	PL	PT	RO	SI	SK	FI
⊗	1-3y	2-4y	⊗	⊗	⊗	2y	⊗	1y	⊗	1y	2y	⊗	⊗
SE	UK-ENG	UK-WLS	UK-NIR	UK-SCT	BA	CH	IS	LI	ME	NO	RS	(*)	TR
4y	3y	⊗	3y	⊗	⊗	1-2y	1y	1y+	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗	⊗

⊗ No time period set for the provision of support for newly arrived migrant students | w weeks y years

Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure shows whether top-level regulations/recommendations set a time period for the provision of targeted support for newly arrived migrant students. The table presents the length of this targeted support period. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Czechia: No distinction is made between newly arrived and other migrant students in top-level regulations/recommendations. At primary and lower secondary level, migrant students from EU and EEA countries must receive a minimum of 70 lessons in the Czech language provided in a school in the region.

Spain: Some Autonomous Communities may distinguish between newly arrived and other migrant students. For example, in Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, newly arrived migrants are distinguished from other students from migrant backgrounds; however, a time period is not specified as they can receive support for as long as they need it.

Poland: Data in the table refers to learning support in school subjects. Host country language support is provided for as long as a migrant student needs it – as shown in the figure.

Slovenia: At primary and lower secondary levels, adapted assessment procedures may be applied. At primary, lower and upper secondary general education and IVET, intensive Slovenian language support applies.

Iceland: Data refers to school support for integrating refugees. The time period is not specified for other newly arrived migrant students.

In some countries, although it is not of primary importance, it is taken into account whether a student has just arrived from another country or has lived in the country for some time. Students qualify as newcomers if, at the time of their first enrolment in the education system, they do not speak the language of instruction at home, or their skills in the host country language are not considered to be good enough to learn effectively. In the United Kingdom (England and Northern Ireland), all students with a language other than English, or Irish in Northern Ireland, who enrol in the education system for the first time, are eligible for language support and are monitored and assessed in the first three years of their schooling. In the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), following the three years' support, schools

must carry out an assessment of a students' skills in the host country language against the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) to provide evidence that the entitlement to additional funding continues to apply. This additional assessment is completed on an annual basis as long as additional support is deemed necessary (see Chapter I.1.1 on funding).

Several countries that distinguish newly arrived migrant students from other migrant students underline that the timeframe for support is not specified as students can receive support as long as they need it (Belgium – German speaking Community, Denmark (see above), Cyprus, Luxembourg and Norway). All these countries refer in particular to language support. In Belgium (German-speaking Community), students are eligible for targeted support until they acquire at least level A2 CEFR in the host country language.

While support seems to focus a lot on host country language acquisition in this introductory period, other areas of cognitive development, psychological and social integration may also be provided. For example, in Slovenia, newly arrived students can benefit from adapted assessment criteria and procedures in the first two years of their schooling in primary and lower secondary education, if their parents agree. In Sweden, besides support for the acquisition of the host country language, support for the development of the student's home language is also provided in preparatory classes. (See further support measures in Chapter I.3.)

Ireland, Finland, Portugal and the United Kingdom (Scotland) do not recognise newly arrived migrant students as a specific target group. Their comprehensive support system is intended to respond to the individual needs of all students. Therefore, in their criteria for student support they also consider students' additional support needs arising from their migration background – for example, social and emotional support (see Part II 3.2 for specific cases on social and emotional support). In the United Kingdom (Wales), newly arrived migrants are not identified as a specific target group; all students whose first language is other than English or Welsh (i.e. are learning English or Welsh as an additional language) may receive language support to access the curriculum as long as they need it.

I.3: LANGUAGE, LEARNING AND PSYCHO-SOCIAL SUPPORT

This chapter contains four sections on the approaches promoted by European education systems to the provision of language and learning support as well as psycho-social support, all of which are central to ensuring that students from migrant backgrounds are effectively integrated into school.

In some education systems, there is an initial integration phase where language and learning support is provided to newly arrived migrant students in separate classes or lessons, also referred to as preparatory classes. The first section of this chapter examines the curriculum content of these classes and the advocated types of learning support.

Elsewhere, migrant students are placed directly into mainstream classes but are still provided with additional support. Language support is a key element of this and so the second section investigates top-level regulations/recommendations on the provision of additional classes in the language of instruction and students' home language tuition.

The other measures promoted by education authorities to support migrant students in mainstream classes are analysed in the third section of this chapter. In addition to pedagogical support, these include the involvement of parents in their children's education and the provision of intercultural education. Both these measures have been shown to contribute to a positive and supportive learning climate.

Finally, the last section of this chapter looks at the regulations/recommendations on psycho-social support for migrant students, including whether intercultural mediators are involved. The section also makes specific reference to provision for unaccompanied minors.

I.3.1. Learning support in preparatory classes

As previously mentioned, one organisational approach for the integration of newly arrived migrant children and young people is to place them in so-called 'preparatory classes' (see also Figures I.2.7 and I.2.8). In some countries, these are also referred to as 'reception classes' or 'transition classes'. In these separate classes or lessons, students are provided with intensive language teaching and, in some cases, an adapted curriculum for other subjects. The intention is to give them a sound preparation before fully integrating them into mainstream classes (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017b).

It has been suggested that preparatory classes provide more time and space for the teaching and learning of the language of instruction than is available in mainstream classes. This is seen as particularly important at secondary level when students are older and therefore less likely to pick up the new language. Moreover, in secondary education, the curriculum subjects and requirements are increasingly complex and so demand a good command of the language of instruction (Koehler, 2017). On the other hand, preparatory classes can also hinder integration by separating migrant students from their native-born peers; and they may lead to delays in migrant students' educational progress if a too strong a focus on the acquisition of the language of instruction means that students' learning in other curriculum subjects is delayed (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016).

Where newly arrived migrant students spend all or most of their school day in preparatory classes it is critical to balance students' language and subject content learning (ibid.). Figure I.3.1 therefore investigates the curriculum content of preparatory classes as specified in top-level regulations and/or recommendations.

While providing newly arrived migrant students in preparatory classes with a high level of cognitive challenge, it is important to also provide them with intensive learning support (Sinkkonen & Kytälä, 2014; Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013). Figure I.3.2 examines the kinds of learning support measures that should be provided to these students, according to top-level regulations and/or recommendations.

Where students do not have access to effective language and learning support, the full transition from preparatory to mainstream classes can become problematic (Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013). Figure I.3.3 thus presents information on whether top-level authorities advocate specific support in schools to facilitate a smooth transition for students from migrant backgrounds.

Most top-level authorities advocate the teaching of a variety of subjects in preparatory classes

As shown in Figure I.3.1, across Europe, 26 education systems report that they have top-level regulations and/or recommendations on what preparatory classes for newly arrived migrant students should cover. However, in Italy and the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), according to official documents, determining the content of preparatory classes is the responsibility of local authorities/schools.

In the Netherlands, Portugal as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina, while preparatory classes may be provided, there are no top-level regulations and/or recommendations on their content. Finally, nine other education systems (Czechia, Latvia, Hungary, Slovakia, the United Kingdom – Scotland, Iceland, Montenegro, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey) report that they have no regulations/recommendations on this issue nor do they provide any preparatory classes.

Figure I.3.1: Curriculum content of preparatory classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the content of the curriculum of preparatory classes (or lessons). 'Responsibility of local authorities/schools' means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty for making decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

For a definition of preparatory classes: see Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE nl): Primary education and part-time IVET are not covered.

Denmark, Luxembourg and Slovenia: General upper secondary education and IVET are not covered.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Greece: The curriculum content is related to two types of supportive schemes: a) the curriculum for 'Reception School Facilities for Refugee Education' (DYEP) structures covering six subjects (DYEP structures are offered in primary and lower secondary education); b) the curriculum for Reception Class I and II covering the language of instruction as well as a number of other subjects of the mainstream curriculum, depending on the decision of the teachers council as well as on the education level (Reception Classes are offered in primary, general lower and upper secondary education and IVET).

Spain: Preparatory classes prioritise the learning of the language of instruction and the integration of students into mainstream classes; however, it is also recommended that some elements of other areas of the curriculum are included. IVET is not covered.

Cyprus: The teaching of the language of instruction is encouraged at all education levels; mathematics and natural sciences only at lower secondary level.

Lithuania: Social studies and intercultural education are not included at primary level.

Malta and Liechtenstein: IVET is not covered.

Austria: In the school year 2017/18, students in mainstream classes whose level of German was not up to standard attended language support groups (*Sprachstartgruppen*), or language support lessons (*Sprachförderkurse*) instead of classes in other compulsory subjects. Since 2018/19, such students have been enrolled in German support classes (*Deutschförderklassen*), for 15 lessons at primary level and for 20 lessons at lower secondary level. These preparatory classes follow a specific curriculum. For the rest of their school time, students join their mainstream class (according to their age group).

Slovenia: There are no preparatory classes in general upper secondary education and IVET.

Finland: Physical education, arts education and religion, ethics and/or moral education are not included in IVET.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: There are preparatory classes in primary and lower secondary education as well as in IVET, but not in general upper secondary education. The IVET preparatory classes cover all the curriculum subjects presented in the figure. The curriculum content of these classes varies at primary and secondary level, and it also varies across different Cantons.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Norway: According to official documents, schools have to offer Norwegian in preparatory classes in upper secondary education. At all other education levels, local authorities and schools have the freedom to decide on the organisation and content of education for newly arrived migrant students.

Most of the education systems with top-level recommendations and/or recommendations on the content of preparatory classes indicate that these classes should cover a variety of subjects. In fact in some countries, such as Denmark, Greece, Luxembourg, Poland, Finland and Sweden, all or almost all subjects presented in Figure I.3.1 are mentioned in official documents. By contrast, in 13 education systems ⁽¹⁾, they focus exclusively on the teaching of the language of instruction or combine this with intercultural or citizenship education.

In some cases, such as in Romania, the narrow focus can be explained by the fact that, in parallel to language learning in an introductory course, newly arrived migrant students should follow all other subjects in mainstream education. In Spain, it is recommended that preparatory classes focus on the language of instruction, and that as soon as possible, migrant students should begin to spend less time in preparatory classes and more time in mainstream classes with their native-born peers. Similarly in Slovenia, official guidelines recommend that newly arrived migrant students attend preparatory classes with a narrow focus on the language of instruction and intercultural education for only 20 lessons before being integrated into mainstream classes.

Apart from the tendencies outlined above, it can be noted that the curriculum content of preparatory classes follows a similar pattern to that of mainstream education, i.e. a relatively stronger emphasis on the core curriculum subjects. After the language of instruction, the other subjects (listed in descending order), are: mathematics (in 12 education systems); natural sciences and social studies (each in 10 education systems); foreign languages (mainly English), physical education and arts education (each in 9 education systems); ICT (in 8 education systems); and intercultural education as well as religion, ethics and/or moral education (each in 7 education systems). Home language tuition is mentioned in the top-level regulations/recommendations on the content of preparatory classes in only two countries – Finland, and Sweden.

⁽¹⁾ Belgium (German-speaking Community), Bulgaria, Germany, Estonia, Ireland, Spain, Croatia, Austria, Romania, Slovenia, Liechtenstein, Norway and Serbia

Other subjects mentioned in top-level regulations/recommendations include citizenship education (in Germany) and music, safety education, preparation for family life and entrepreneurship (in Poland). Moreover, some education systems' make reference to key competences rather than subjects, including transversal ones such as learning to learn and social skills (in the Flemish Community of Belgium), and cultural competences including managing daily life, multi-literacy, sustainability and global responsibility (in Finland).

A range of different learning support measures should be offered in preparatory classes

In order to help newly arrived migrant students make good progress in preparatory classes, official documents advocate the provision of a variety of learning support measures. These include measures that are often under the direct control of top-level education authorities, such as setting upper limits on class sizes to ensure better learning conditions, or providing specific teaching material adapted to the needs of students. They also include different forms of pedagogical support that are usually under the control of teachers, such as differentiated teaching, individualised or group-based learning support, or types of support provided with the help of other students, such as peer education or mentoring by an older or more experienced student.


Figure I.3.2 shows that in 19 of the 33 education systems where preparatory classes or lessons for newly arrived migrant students generally exist (see also Figure I.3.1) top-level regulations and/or recommendations refer to some of the learning support measures mentioned above (for information on learning support measures for mainstream classes see Figure I.3.7). This is not the case in Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, the Netherlands, Portugal, Bosnia and Herzegovina nor in Liechtenstein, despite the fact that preparatory classes generally exist. In the French and Flemish Communities of Belgium, Italy, Sweden as well as in the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), the choice of support measures is, according to official documents, the responsibility of local authorities/schools.

Most of the education systems with top-level regulations/recommendations in this area advocate the use of at least three of these learning support measures in preparatory classes. In Germany, Cyprus, Malta and Slovenia either all or nearly all support measures are referred to in official documents. Conversely, in four other education systems only one of these support measures is advocated, namely specific teaching material in Romania, differentiated teaching in the German-speaking Community of Belgium and Norway and individualised learning support in Serbia.

Overall, top-level education authorities tend to refer most frequently to differentiated teaching (14 education systems); whereas the other support measures over which teachers have control, i.e. group-based and individualised learning support, are mentioned by fewer education systems (12 and 11, respectively). The setting of class size limits and provision of teaching material, which are support measures under direct control of top-level education authorities, are mentioned in the regulations/recommendations of 13 education systems. The learning support measures for newly arrived migrant students in preparatory classes least frequently cited in official documents are mentoring (in 4 education systems) and peer education (in 3 education systems).

The fact that pedagogical support measures provided by teachers and especially by peers are less frequently cited in top-level regulations/recommendations may be explained by the fact that schools and teachers are generally quite autonomous with respect to determining and providing the teaching and learning support that is most relevant to students' needs. In line with this, Polish regulations highlight, for example, that support measures in preparatory classes must be adjusted to the developmental, educational and psycho-physical needs of the learners. Additionally, the measures may include support by speakers of the migrant students' home language.

Figure I.3.2: Learning support measures to be provided in preparatory classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on learning support measures in preparatory classes (or lessons). 'Responsibility of local authorities/schools' means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty for making decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

For definitions of preparatory classes and the different learning support measures: see the glossary.

Country-specific notes

Spain and Malta: IVET is not covered.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Cyprus: Only primary education is covered.

Luxembourg: Primary and general lower secondary education are mainly covered. Mentoring is only advocated in general lower secondary education.

Slovenia: There are no preparatory classes at general upper secondary education and IVET.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.


Switzerland: There are preparatory classes in primary and lower secondary education as well as IVET, but not in general upper secondary education. The IVET preparatory classes cover all the curriculum subjects presented in the figure. The curriculum content varies at primary and secondary level, and it also varies across different Cantons.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Specific support for the transition into mainstream education is advocated in slightly more than half of the education systems with preparatory classes

In order to facilitate the learning progress of students from migrant backgrounds and avoid any disruption in their schooling, increased support may be needed when students transition from preparatory classes to mainstream classes. Figure I.3.3 shows that there are top-level regulations and/or recommendations promoting the provision of specific support during this transition phase in 16 out of the 33 education systems where preparatory classes for newly arrived migrant students are provided (see also Figures I.3.1 and I.3.2).

Figure I.3.3: Specific support to be provided during the transition from preparatory to mainstream classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the provision of specific support during migrant students' transition from preparatory classes (or lessons) to mainstream classes. **'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'** means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

For a definition of **preparatory classes**: see Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE nl): Primary education is not covered.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Luxembourg: General lower and upper secondary education are not covered.

Malta: IVET is not covered.

Netherlands: Primary and lower secondary education are not covered.

Slovenia: There are no preparatory classes in general upper secondary education and IVET.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: There are preparatory classes in primary and lower secondary education as well as in IVET, but not in general upper secondary education.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

In Italy, the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland) and Serbia, the support given to migrant student during their transition from preparatory to mainstream education is, according to official documents, the responsibility of local authorities/schools. In 12 education systems⁽²⁾ there are no regulations/recommendations on any specific support to be provided during this transition phase, despite the fact that preparatory classes generally exist. In the remaining nine education systems there are no preparatory classes and consequently no regulations or recommendations in this area.

Examples of the kinds of support to be provided to migrant students moving from preparatory classes into mainstream classes include those set down in official documents in the German-speaking Community of Belgium, whereby preparatory students at primary level spend one day per week in the regular class; and at general secondary level they are progressively integrated into regular classes. In the Flemish Community of Belgium, on entry to a mainstream class, every student from a migrant background is allocated a certain amount of teaching hours for guidance, support and monitoring of their progress.

⁽²⁾ Belgium (French Community), Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Spain, Croatia, Lithuania, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina

I.3.2. Language provision and support

A sound knowledge of the language of instruction is a prerequisite for any student to succeed and, as the language of instruction is rarely the home or first language of migrant students, they usually need stronger linguistic support than their native-born peers (OECD, 2018).

The 'language dimension' is a consistent feature of educational policies and measures to facilitate the integration of migrant students. It includes the teaching of the language of instruction not only as a separate subject, but also as a transversal element taught across the whole curriculum. It also embraces the teaching of migrant students' home language. Language teaching can, moreover, be embedded in schools within a broader curricular perspective which values all languages and promotes plurilingualism. These and other aspects of the language dimension are discussed at greater length in Part II of this report.

This short section mainly concerns two very specific aspects of the 'language dimension', i.e. the teaching of the language of instruction to migrant students in additional classes (see Figure I.3.4) and the teaching of home languages (see Figures I.3.5 and I.3.6). This latter issue was the subject of one of the key recommendations made by a group of experts who took part in workshops and Peer Learning Activities (PLAs) organised by the European Commission (European Commission, 2017b).

'Additional classes' refers to lessons in addition to those provided within the standard school curriculum. They may be scheduled within or outside the time allocated for teaching the standard school curriculum. Discussions on the scheduling of these classes can be found in Chapter 2 (see Figure I.2.7) and in the first section of this chapter.



In nearly all countries, official documents promote the teaching of the language of instruction in additional classes

Nearly all education systems have issued top-level regulations/recommendations on the teaching of the language of instruction in additional classes in one or more education levels, either during or outside school hours, or both. Only Luxembourg (except at primary level), the United Kingdom (England), Bosnia-Herzegovina and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia do not have any regulations/ recommendations on this issue.

According to the regulations or recommendations, this provision takes place within school hours in the majority of education systems. In 13 of these, the classes take place also outside school hours at some or all levels of education. In some cases, such as Poland, students attend these classes during school hours when they are in preparatory classes (see Figure I.3.1) and outside school hours when they are in mainstream education. In only two countries, is this additional teaching of the language of instruction provided exclusively outside school hours (Bulgaria and Turkey). Each approach (within or outside school hours) clearly has benefits, but also disadvantages. For instance, students following additional classes outside normal school hours may experience longer school days than their peers who only follow the standard curriculum; on the other hand, students who have these classes during school hours may miss other lessons from the standard school curriculum.

In a few education systems, the responsibility for deciding whether to provide the teaching of the language of instruction in additional classes and when to organise it is delegated to local authorities or schools. This is the case in Denmark, Lithuania, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom (Scotland). In three other countries (Estonia, Portugal and Norway), schools only have the power to make decisions in relation to additional classes outside school hours; while in Iceland, they may only make decisions when the additional classes take place within school hours. In Slovenia, schools' room for manoeuvre lies in their power to determine the time when these classes take place (within or outside school hours).

Figure I.3.4: Provision of the language of instruction in additional classes, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

These maps show whether there are top-level regulations/recommendations on the teaching of the language of instruction in additional classes within and/or outside school hours for newly arrived/first generation migrant students. Variations between educational levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

'Additional classes' means additional lessons where the language of instruction is taught, scheduled within or outside the time allocated for teaching the standard school curriculum.

'Responsibility of local authorities/schools' means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools.

Country-specific notes

During and outside school hours:

Denmark: No top-level regulations/recommendations on this type of provision in upper general secondary education or in IVET school-based programmes.

Spain: No top-level regulations/recommendations on this type of provision in IVET school-based programmes.

Ireland: No nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

During school hours:

Luxembourg: According to top-level regulations/recommendations, there is provision of the language of instruction in additional classes at primary level.

Malta: Schools are responsible for this issue at lower and upper general secondary education.

Switzerland: According to top-level regulations/recommendations, there is no provision at general upper secondary education.

Iceland: According to top-level regulations/recommendations, there is no provision at upper general secondary education and in IVET school-based programmes.

Outside school hours:

Czechia and Malta: There is no provision outside school hours at upper secondary education.

Switzerland: There is no provision outside school hours in IVET school programmes.

There is little variation between educational levels regarding the provision of these additional classes. In a small minority of countries (Denmark, Spain, Malta and Switzerland), the variation between educational levels applies to both classes within and outside school hours (see Figures I.3.4 A and B and country-specific notes); in Luxembourg and Iceland, it only applies to additional classes within school hours (see Figure I.3.4 A); in Czechia, it only applies to additional classes outside school hours. The most common pattern among these countries is the absence of regulations/recommendations for upper general secondary education and/or school-based IVET programmes. In Luxembourg, this lack of official recommendations also applies to lower secondary education. In Malta, the pattern varies depending on whether the classes are organised during or outside normal school hours.

Official documents advocate teaching home languages in a minority of education systems

UNESCO has been advocating home language teaching in pre-primary and primary education since 1953. Over the years, scientific research has consistently highlighted the positive effects of such teaching on students' social, cognitive and linguistic development (see Part II). In the EU, a Council directive on the education of children of migrant workers was adopted in 1977. According to this directive, EU member states 'shall take appropriate measures to promote [...] teaching of the mother tongue and culture of the country of origin for the children for whom school attendance is compulsory in the host state', and 'who are dependants of any worker who is a national of another' ⁽³⁾. The home languages concerned in this section are, however, not only those of EU member states, but all migrant languages regardless of country of origin.


As Figure I.3.5 shows, top-level regulation/recommendations advocate home language teaching in 13 education systems. This teaching is encouraged in many Northern European countries; by contrast, this is rarely the case in Eastern European countries. In Southern and Western Europe, the picture is much more diverse.

In four countries (Denmark, Spain, Luxembourg and Switzerland), the regulations/recommendations on the provision of home language teaching vary according to educational level. In all, except Luxembourg, the regulations/recommendations apply to primary and lower secondary education only. In Luxembourg, they apply exclusively to primary education.

In France, education authorities do not provide for the teaching of home languages in schools. However, some of the languages spoken by many migrant students at home, such as Arabic or Turkish, can be chosen by students for the baccalaureate as their second or third modern languages. France is, in fact, one of the very few countries that has developed national tests in a very large number of languages (44) (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017b, p. 128).

⁽³⁾ Council Directive 77/486/EEC of 25 July 1977 on the education of the children of migrant workers (77/486/EEC) <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX%3A31977L0486>

Figure I.3.5: Home language teaching for migrant students in primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This map shows whether there are top-level regulations/recommendations on home language teaching for migrant students in mainstream education. These languages are not limited to the languages of EU member states (as referred to by the 1977 Council Directive), but cover other languages as well. Variations between educational levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Home language: The language mostly spoken at home by migrant students. It differs from the language of instruction, used in the school context. In most cases, the home language is also students' first language or mother tongue.

'Responsibility of local authorities/schools' means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Switzerland: No top-level regulations/recommendations on this type of language provision in upper general secondary education or in IVET school-based programmes.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

Luxembourg: Top-level regulations/recommendations on this type of language provision exist at primary level.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

The entitlement to home language teaching is always conditional

Where migrant students are entitled to home language teaching (EU as well as third countries' languages), this entitlement is always subject to certain conditions. These are defined by top-level regulations/recommendations in eight education systems.

In some cases, such as in Estonia and Sweden, the regulations specify a minimum number of interested students for the classes to run. For example, in Estonia, 'ten' is the requisite threshold needed. In Sweden, local authorities are required to provide home language teaching in lower and upper secondary schools if at least five students request a particular language. Schools may co-ordinate their courses to create student groups of the requisite size.

In Norway, according to regulations, home language or bilingual teaching is provided to students whose mother tongue differs from Norwegian or Sámi, and who do not have the language competences to follow the curriculum taught in one of these two languages. Once these students are able to follow the standard curriculum, home language or bilingual teaching stops.


In Denmark, Latvia and Lithuania, the entitlement covers specific languages only. In Denmark, the languages covered are EU and Scandinavian languages. In Latvia and Lithuania, migrant students

may currently go to a certain number of schools, which were mostly established during the Soviet period, and in which the teaching is partly delivered in other languages than Latvian and Lithuanian respectively. In Latvia, for instance, today's migrant students speaking the following languages (Russian, Byelorussian, Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian, Estonian and Hebrew) may enrol in one of these schools and receive tuition in their home language). These languages have no official recognition as minority/regional languages.

Finally, in Iceland, migrant students may request to study their home language instead of Danish, which all students have to learn alongside English, provided that they have a prior knowledge of the language in question.

In some countries, regardless of whether students are entitled to home language classes, they may be provided where circumstances allow, such as when qualified teachers or appropriate courses are available (Spain, Sweden and Switzerland). In addition, the offer of home language classes may depend on agreements made with immigrant communities or the authorities of the countries of origin (Spain, Italy and Slovenia). In Spain, for example, cooperation between the Comunidad Autónoma de Castilla-La Mancha and the Comunidad Autónoma La Rioja with the governments of the Kingdom of Morocco and of Romania have resulted in the development of the Arabic and Moroccan Culture Teaching Programme (LACM) and the Romanian Language, Culture and Civilization Teaching programme (LCCR) respectively. Teachers on these programmes have qualified under the Moroccan and Romanian teacher education systems.

Figure I.3.6: Entitlement to home language teaching, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

Variations between educational levels are indicated in the country-specific notes. For additional information on home language provision, please see also Figure I.3.5.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Switzerland: No top-level regulations/recommendations on this type of language provision in upper general secondary education or in IVET school-based programmes.

Estonia: No entitlement in school-based IVET programmes.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

I.3.3. Learning support in mainstream classes

Children and young people from migrant backgrounds may find it difficult to integrate into mainstream education. They may not only have to learn (or improve their skills in) the language of instruction but also to adapt to a new curriculum and sometimes to new ways of learning. Consequently, they may need learning support in addition to help with the language of instruction (Trasberg & Kond, 2017).

By providing policies and guidance on learning support, education authorities can help schools and teachers to ensure that migrant students' learning needs are met, thereby helping them to raise their level of achievement and reduce the risk of them leaving school early (ibid.). Providing relevant learning support is, moreover, not only beneficial for students from migrant backgrounds but also for all other students with additional support needs (Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014). In some education systems, therefore, learning support for migrant students is part of the support package available to all students. In order to shed light on the efforts of European education systems in this area, Figure I.3.7 shows which learning support measures are required or recommended by top-level authorities in mainstream classes and whether it is targeting migrant students or all students.

In order to improve the academic achievement of students from migrant backgrounds it is essential to monitor their progress. This involves both assessments to identify students underperforming as well as systematic evaluations to determine whether the learning support provided is effective (OECD, 2015). Figure I.3.8 shows the types of support that, according to official documents, should be provided, to enable teachers to monitor and assess migrant students' progress and performance.

In addition to learning support, extra-curricular activities are also helpful in helping migrant students to integrate (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016). They may be provided in schools but delivered by external bodies such as municipalities, NGOs, and migrant or other volunteer organisations. They often include not only academic, but also cultural, intercultural and sports activities. Figure I.3.9 shows whether top-level education authorities promote the provision of these types of extra-curricular activities.

Figure I.3.10 looks at top-level regulations and/or recommendations on the involvement of migrant students' parents or families in their children's schooling. Even though further research is needed to determine the particular effects of different forms of parental involvement, evidence shows that it does matter for migrant students' educational outcomes (Santos, Godas, Ferraces & Lorenzo, 2016). Establishing links between schools and migrant students' parents or families can help improve student achievement and influence students' attitudes towards other cultural groups (Van Driel, Darmody & Kerzil, 2016).

The final figure in this section, Figure I.3.11, investigates whether official documents promote intercultural education and/or activities in schools. In this report, intercultural education is understood to be a means of promoting understanding between different people and cultures. It also seeks to explore, examine and challenge all forms of stereotypes and xenophobia, while promoting equal opportunity for all. As a result, it helps to ensure a positive learning climate and a respect for diversity among students.


Most education systems advocate learning support measures for all students with additional needs, including those from migrant backgrounds

The various learning support measures provided in preparatory classes to support the progress and integration of migrant students (see Figure I.3.2) may also be offered in mainstream classes. Across Europe, 33 education systems report that top-level regulations and/or recommendations advocate the provision of such measures in mainstream classes. In the Flemish Community of Belgium, Sweden

and Serbia, according to official documents, the provision of learning support is the responsibility of local authorities/schools. However, in the French Community of Belgium, Greece, the Netherlands, Romania, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Turkey, there are no top-level regulations/recommendations in this area.

Figure I.3.7 shows that in 13 education systems some learning support measures are specifically targeted at students from migrant backgrounds, according to top-level regulations/recommendations. In 20 other education systems, authorities indicate that learning support should be available to all students with additional needs, including those from migrant backgrounds. In Germany, Croatia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovenia and Slovakia, both types of learning support measures, those targeting students with migrant background as well as those targeting all students, are promoted in top-level regulations/recommendations.

Figure I.3.7: Learning support measures to be provided in mainstream classes, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the provision of learning support measures in mainstream classes. 'Responsibility of local authorities/schools' means that, according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

For definitions of the different learning support measures: see Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Denmark: General upper secondary education and IVET are not covered.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Spain and Malta: IVET is not covered.

Cyprus: Only primary education is covered.

Latvia: Specific teaching material is not advocated for IVET; mentoring is not advocated for general upper secondary education and IVET.

Luxembourg: Specific teaching material is only advocated for primary education.

Hungary: Peer education is not advocated for primary education.

Slovenia and Finland: Group-based learning is not advocated for general upper secondary education and IVET.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS): While most of these measures are not specifically advocated, funding and accountability frameworks provide a strong incentive for schools to support learners with additional needs, including migrant students.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: Cantonal regulations may vary. General upper secondary education is not covered.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

In line with the provision of learning support in preparatory classes (see Figure I.3.2), the support measures under the control of classroom teachers are more in evidence. In particular, individualised learning support, differentiated teaching and group-based learning support are mentioned most frequently in official documents (in 22, 21 and 18 education systems, respectively). However, specific teaching material provided by top-level education authorities is also widely mentioned and appears in the official documents of 18 education systems. Limits set on class sizes and peer education are much less frequently referred to (in 10 and 9 education systems, respectively), as is mentoring by an older student or a more experienced person (in only 6 education systems).

Other support measures mentioned in top-level regulations and/or recommendations include cooperative forms of learning (in Spain), remedial instruction (in Austria and Poland) and the use of ICT tools (in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia).

Top-level authorities advocate specific measures for monitoring and assessing migrant students' learning in around half of the education systems

Systematic school assessment can be used to monitor the learning progress of students from migrant backgrounds and to identify any additional support needs. Top-level authorities often establish a framework to facilitate this process, which might include national tests, guidance for schools and teachers, assessment tools, teacher training, etc. Figure I.3.8 shows that in 23 of the 32 education systems where top-level regulations/recommendations exist in this area, there are provisions specifically targeting students from migrant backgrounds, including newly arrived migrant students. In the remaining education systems, the provisions target all students, including those from migrant backgrounds, and everyone is assessed according to the same criteria and methods.

By contrast, in another 10 education systems there are no such regulations and/or recommendations on the assessment of (migrant) students' performance and progress.


The most frequently cited support measure for assessing students from migrant backgrounds is the provision of specific assessment tools (in 18 education systems). The Estonian Ministry of Education and Research has, for example, developed an advisory website for curriculum implementation, which also contains assessment tools and guidelines for students from migrant backgrounds. Other countries, such as Cyprus, Austria, Portugal and Switzerland have specific tools for assessing migrant students' skills in the language of instruction.

Teacher training is the second most frequently reported support measure for assessing migrant students' school performance and progress (in 17 education systems). An example of the kind of training offered to teachers for assessing students from migrant backgrounds can be found in Greece where school advisors are responsible for providing scientific and pedagogical guidance, support and training, including on assessment, to all teachers of migrant students both in preparatory and mainstream classes.

National tests (also referred to as standardised tests or central examinations) also contribute to the effective monitoring of student achievement and are the third most often reported measure (in 16 education systems). In addition to national tests taken by all students, including those from migrant backgrounds, some education systems report having national tests specifically for migrant students. For example, in the German-speaking Community of Belgium, national tests help to determine whether students from migrant backgrounds need to attend preparatory classes.

Less frequently referred to in official documents are guidance on differentiated assessment (in 13 education systems) and formative assessment (in 11 education systems). An example of guidance on differentiated assessment can be found in Slovakia where, according to official documents, different assessment criteria may be applied when assessing students who have a home language that is different from the language of instruction. An example of guidance on formative assessment can be found in Cyprus where official documents stipulate that teachers of students from migrant backgrounds can access a number of formative tests that can be given to students every three months in order to monitor and assess their progress.

Figure I.3.8: Measures contributing to the effective monitoring and assessment of migrant students' performance and progress in school, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure shows the types of support measure advocated by top-level education authorities to support the monitoring and assessment of migrant students. **Responsibility of local authorities/schools** means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. The items are listed in descending order, from most to least frequently included in top-level regulations/recommendations. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

- Czechia:** Only applies to general secondary education or IVET in courses completed with the *maturita* examination.
- Denmark and Switzerland:** General upper secondary education and IVET are not covered.
- Denmark and Italy:** The types of support provided to teachers to assess migrant students target, amongst others, the second generation (students with foreign-born parent(s)).
- Ireland:** There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.
- Spain:** IVET is not covered.
- France and Lithuania:** These types of support target, amongst others, returning migrant students.
- Malta:** Guidance on differentiated as well as formative assessment are not promoted in IVET.
- Portugal:** National tests are not promoted in IVET.
- United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR):** School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
- Liechtenstein:** Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Less than half of all education systems have regulations or recommendations on extra-curricular activities relating to migrant students


Extra-curricular activities are an additional measure that can help support students from migrant backgrounds both academically and socially. Figure I.3.9 shows that across Europe, only 15 education systems report having top-level regulations and/or recommendations on extra-curricular activities. This may be explained by the fact that such activities generally lie outside the framework of compulsory education.

Five education systems (Latvia, Romania, the United Kingdom – Scotland, Norway and Serbia) report that, according to official documents, this area is the responsibility of local authorities/schools; whereas in the remaining European countries this issue is not addressed at all. In Portugal, some government funding exists to promote social inclusion through extra-curricular activities (e.g. through the 'Choices' programme supported by the High Commission for Migration), in which many students from migrant backgrounds take part.

Most of the education systems with regulations/recommendations on extra-curricular activities advocate four or more different types of activities for migrant students only. By contrast, in Lithuania, Hungary and Poland, extra-curricular activities are advocated for all students, including those from migrant backgrounds. In Malta and Slovenia, official documents advocate both extra-curricular activities targeting migrant students specifically and those targeting all students.

A similar number of education systems promote a majority of these extra-curricular activities, although language development and creative activities have a slight advantage (in 11 education systems), compared to general learning activities as well as activities facilitating social interaction (sports and intercultural) (in 10 education systems). Homework clubs are the least promoted reported (in 5 education systems only).

Figure I.3.9: Extra-curricular activities to support the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on extra-curricular activities to support the integration of migrant students. **'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'** means that, according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. The items are listed in descending order, from most to least frequently included in top-level regulations/recommendations. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes


- Ireland:** There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.
- Spain:** IVET is not covered.
- France:** These extra-curricular activities target, amongst others, returning migrant students.
- Italy:** These extra-curricular activities target, amongst others, second generation (students with foreign-born parent(s)).
- Malta:** Activities supporting language development are not promoted at general upper secondary education, and IVET is not covered at all.
- Sweden:** Primary and general lower secondary education are not covered.
- United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR):** School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
- Liechtenstein:** Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

To give an example, the EU co-funded project of the Maltese Ministry of Education and Employment on 'Language learning and parental support for integration' promotes extra-curricular activities that provide students from migrant backgrounds with out-of-school opportunities to establish personal relationships with Maltese children while practicing communication in Maltese and English through creative sessions. Another example comes from the Spanish Región de Murcia and also other Autonomous Communities where, with the support of the Ministry of Education, Culture and Sports, the 'MUS-E' programme has been implemented. This after-school programme uses arts as a tool for increasing children's motivation, improving student learning and developing their emotional intelligence as well as for encouraging co-existence in schools.

About half of the education systems try to keep migrant students' parents informed about their children's education as well as involving them actively

In an effort to establish links with migrant students' parents and to capitalise on the positive effects of involving migrant students' parents in their children's education, 29 education systems across Europe have put in place top-level regulations and/or recommendations on this issue (see Figure I.3.10). While in most of these the measures are targeted at the parents of (newly arrived) migrant students, in 13 others ⁽⁴⁾ they apply to all parents, as all parents have the same rights and obligations with respect to their children's education.

Figure I.3.10: Objectives and activities related to the involvement of migrant students' parents, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the involvement of migrant students' parents in school. **'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'** means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate, the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Denmark and Switzerland: General upper secondary education and IVET are not covered.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Spain and Finland: IVET is not covered.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

⁽⁴⁾ Czechia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, the United Kingdom (Scotland), Montenegro and Serbia

In Malta, the Netherlands and Norway, on the other hand, according to official documents, this area is the responsibility of local authorities/schools; while in 10 education systems in Europe there are no top-level regulations or recommendations related to the involvement of parents in school.

Where these regulations and/or recommendations do exist, the majority of education systems specify a two-fold objective – schools should inform migrant students' parents about their children's education and encourage them to take an active part in the educational process. With regard to the first element, an emphasis is placed, for example, on the initial contact and consultation between schools and migrant students' parents (Spain and Romania); the availability of information on the school and/or the education system (France); and encouraging schools to keep parents informed about their children's performance, progress and learning needs (Lithuania and Austria).

Examples of initiatives provided by top-level education authorities to promote the active involvement of migrant students' parents include the 'Open the school to parents' programme in France. This is a training programme that aims to enhance parents' capacities to better support their children's education by promoting parents' French language skills, their knowledge of the values underpinning French society, as well as their knowledge of the way the school operates and its expectations. Another example of how schools are encouraged to actively involve migrant students' parents, can be found in the 'Toolkit for diversity' in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), which recommends that parents are provided with an overview of the work to be covered during the year in each curriculum area so that they will be more able to help and support their child and make links to previous learning.


Other measures that have been defined in countries' top-level regulations/recommendations as ways to promote the involvement of migrant students' parents in school include, for example, the signing of mutual arrangements or commitment letters between schools and parents, stating the schools' objectives related to attendance, guidance, the learning of the language of instruction and co-existence – as is the case in the Flemish Community of Belgium and in the Spanish Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña. Schools in Czechia, Latvia, Lithuania and Portugal are encouraged to invite all parents, including those of students from migrant backgrounds, to participate in school governing bodies together with other representatives of the school community.

Intercultural education is promoted as a subject or theme in the classroom in slightly more than half of all education systems

As already mentioned in the introduction of this section, intercultural education plays an important role in ensuring both a positive learning climate for students from migrant background as well as promoting understanding and respect for diversity among all students. As Figure I.3.11 shows, 31 education systems across Europe have top-level regulations and/or recommendations in place, which promote intercultural education in schools. In the Netherlands, according to official documents, the provision of intercultural education is the responsibility of local authorities/schools; while in 10 education systems, there are no regulations or recommendations in this area.

Among the education systems that have top-level regulations and/or recommendations in this area, 26 promote intercultural education as a curriculum subject or theme. In some of these, such as Bulgaria and Spain, intercultural education is included in the curriculum as a general objective; while in Czechia, Lithuania or Cyprus, for example, it is defined as a cross-curricular theme. In a number of other education systems, including France and the United Kingdom, intercultural education is being taught, in particular, in the context of citizenship education.

Figure I.3.11: Status of intercultural education in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on intercultural education and/or activities in schools. **'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'** means that according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate, the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

Spain, Malta and Slovakia: IVET is not covered.

Portugal: From the 2018/19 school year, intercultural education becomes a compulsory theme in the curriculum of Citizenship and Development in all schools.

Romania: From the 2018/19 school year, the subject 'Social education – Intercultural education' starts to be taught in grade 6.

United Kingdom (ENG): Intercultural education is not specifically mentioned as a subject or theme in the curriculum at Key Stage 3 (ages 11-14).

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: General upper secondary education and IVET are not covered.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Apart from France, Latvia, the United Kingdom (England and Scotland) and Norway where official documents promote intercultural education only as a subject or theme in the curriculum, most other countries also stipulate that it should be treated as a general aspect of school life as well as being the focus of special days or projects.

Conversely, in the German-speaking Community of Belgium, Hungary, Portugal, Romania and Serbia, intercultural education is more limited, according to top-level regulations and/or recommendations, and is seen only as a general aspect of school life or the focus of special days or projects. For example, in Portugal, intercultural education is mainly promoted through specific initiatives or actions taken in the wider context of migration policies. However, from the 2018/19 school year, intercultural education becomes a compulsory theme in the curriculum of Citizenship and Development in all schools. It is a transversal topic in the first grades of primary level; a specific subject in the last grades of primary and at lower secondary level; and at upper secondary level, schools are free to decide how to teach it.

I.3.4. Psycho-social support

In addition to developing the language competences of students from migrant backgrounds and ensuring they are making good progress generally, it is equally important that schools attend to students' social, emotional and mental well-being. Newly arrived migrant students, in particular, have to acquire a new language, adapt to new academic routines as well as deal with unfamiliar experiences in the wider community. Furthermore, the linguistic, cultural and social differences they often face can create barriers to full participation in school, especially in forming social relationships (Hamilton, 2013).

In this context, schools can help by promoting a caring and respectful environment which supports children's capacity to communicate and connect with teachers and peers. Figure I.3.12 investigates top-level regulations and/or recommendations on the use of intercultural mediators who can play an important role in the process of introducing migrant students to a new language and culture. By acting as an interpreter or support person they can help to create positive relationships between students, their parents or families as well as in the wider school community (Popov & Sturesson, 2015).

Figure I.3.13 analyses the way in which top-level education authorities ensure the provision of psycho-social care and support in schools. How students respond to significant life events such as migration also depends on their inner strengths and vulnerabilities, which in turn determine their coping styles (Fisher & DeBell, 2007). In addition to the psychological effects of such changes, children and young people who have escaped war and persecution must cope with the additional emotional trauma they may have experienced. The situation can be even more aggravated in the case of unaccompanied minors who are left without a family or sufficient social support (Huddleston & Wolffhardt, 2016).

Taking into consideration not only migrant students' academic but also their social and emotional needs is therefore critical in helping them integrate into school life (see also Part II.3 on promoting a whole-child approach). The same principle applies to all students, irrespective of their background. Research shows that education systems are found to be more successful when they seek to ensure the social and emotional well-being of all children and young people by strengthening their resilience and providing any support necessary (Hamilton, 2013).


Only a minority of education systems promote the use of intercultural mediators in supporting migrant students' integration

Despite the support that intercultural mediators can give for promoting the integration of students from migrant backgrounds, only 13 education systems encourage their use at all education levels through top-level regulations and/or recommendations (see Figure I.3.12). In Estonia, Latvia, the United Kingdom (Scotland) as well as Norway, according to official documents, the duty to decide on the use of intercultural mediators is the responsibility of local authorities/schools. The remaining 25 education systems do not make any reference to intercultural mediators in their official documents (they may, however, assign certain resources or contact persons, see Figure I.2.3).

Spain is amongst the countries where intercultural mediation is officially promoted in most Autonomous Communities. For example, in the Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón, Cantabria or Andalucía, there are official programmes of intercultural mediation to support those students who are less familiar with the educational environment, facilitating their reception and their social and school integration as well as promoting intercultural co-existence in the sense of promoting an open mentality, integration and tackling exclusion.

Another example can be found in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), where official guidelines recommend the use of interpreters, buddies and peer support for newcomer students, along with support from teaching assistants, to help ensure intercultural mediation and the integration of migrant students in school.

Figure I.3.12: Use of intercultural mediators for promoting the integration of migrant students, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the use of intercultural mediators in schools. **'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'** means that, according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

For a definition of **intercultural mediator**: see Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: General upper secondary education is not covered.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Most education systems ensure the provision of psycho-social support to migrant students


In order to respond to the social and emotional needs of students from migrant backgrounds, the majority of education systems in Europe advocate the provision of psycho-social support services for these students as well as the provision of specific support for unaccompanied minors at all education levels (see Figure I.3.13).

In the German-speaking Community of Belgium, according to official documents, this matter is the responsibility of local authorities/schools. In Estonia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Iceland, on the other hand, there are no top-level regulations/recommendations on psycho-social support for migrant students or support for unaccompanied minors.

In the great majority of countries where official documents promote psycho-social support services for migrant students (or all students including migrant students), the focus is on providing assistance to these students as a remedial measure. In other words, it is required/recommended that on demand, the psycho-social support staff (including psychologists, social workers, counsellors, etc.) can be

contacted by teachers or schools in order to help identify the needs of students and to develop an individual support programme.

Figure I.3.13: Provision of psycho-social support for migrant students and unaccompanied minors, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

The figure presents the top-level regulations/recommendations on the provision of psycho-social support for migrant students (or all students including migrant students) and the provision of psycho-social support for unaccompanied minors. **'Responsibility of local authorities/schools'** means that, according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decision on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

- Cyprus:** Psycho-social support for unaccompanied minors is not advocated for primary education.
- Malta:** Support for unaccompanied minors is not advocated in IVET.
- Netherlands:** Psycho-social support for migrant students is not advocated in IVET.
- Ireland:** There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes.
- United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR):** School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
- Liechtenstein:** Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

For example in Greece, psychologists and social workers are expected to offer their services in all general and vocational education schools where there are students in need of psycho-social support. In Austria, 'Mobile intercultural teams' (MIT) have been set up under the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Education as a response to the increasing numbers of migrant students and unaccompanied minors due to the humanitarian migration flows since 2015. The MITs are responsible for supporting schools, teachers, parents and students and complement school psychologists in implementing preventive measures, networking and counselling. In the 2017/18 school year, an additional 85 social workers, working as members of the MITs, have been allotted to compulsory schools according to need. Together with the school administration, the MITs devise school-specific psycho-social support measures.

In addition to needs-based support services, a few European countries also highlight that their top-level regulations/recommendations on psycho-social support for migrant students emphasise preventive actions (see also Part II.3.2. on social and emotional well-being). This includes the importance of promoting migrant students' social and emotional development (Ireland) or their health and well-being more generally (Lithuania).

Seventeen education systems in Europe also report having top-level regulations or recommendations on the provision of specific support for unaccompanied minors. In France, Italy and the United Kingdom (England), the existing official documents focus exclusively on support for unaccompanied minors and do not address psycho-social support for all (migrant) students.

According to the existing regulations/recommendations, unaccompanied minors should benefit from psycho-social support as well as other services such as social care and specific educational support. For example, in the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), unaccompanied migrant children are placed in the care of the local authority and, as such, support normally available to looked-after children is available to them. In England and Wales, this includes a requirement to be supported in school by a designated member of staff who acts as a resource and advocate for these children and young people. Every child looked after by the local authority should also have a personal education plan (PEP), which forms an integral part of the child's overall care and support plan. PEPs are intended to ensure access to services and support, contribute to stability, minimise disruption and broken schooling, signal particular educational needs, establish clear goals, and act as a record of progress and achievement.

I.4: TEACHERS AND SCHOOL HEADS

Teachers and other educational staff are in the front line when it comes to supporting migrant students' integration into society. Without a sound education these young people will not be able to access the high level skills and employment opportunities needed to achieve their personal ambitions and make an effective contribution to the social and economic fabric of the host country. Students from migrant backgrounds often have a range of educational and psychosocial needs that must be met if they are to achieve their potential – needs which demand a wide range of skills and expertise from teachers and the various other education professionals working within schools and in the wider education system.

This chapter looks at the various policy levers used by top-level education authorities to make sure that educational professionals have the appropriate skills to meet migrant students' specific needs and facilitate their integration into schools. It focuses mostly on teachers, and marginally on school heads. Other staff, such as teaching assistants, are not employed in all schools across Europe, and/or their role is not defined or regulated by top-level education authorities. Consequently, they are not covered in this comparative mapping of official recommendations/regulations.

A first step that may be taken by top-level education authorities is to build a clear view of the specific challenges in relation to teaching staff and their role in integrating migrant students into schools (see Figure I.4.1). This knowledge is clearly useful in identifying appropriate policy measures. For example, where there are teacher shortages in schools accommodating a large number of migrant students, top-level education authorities may want to provide specific incentives, including financial ones (see Figure I.4.2), to encourage teachers to work in these schools.

The education and training of teachers and other educational staff is largely the responsibility of higher education institutions, which have a great deal of autonomy in designing study programmes. However, top-level education authorities may contribute to the shaping of the professional profile of teachers through, for example, the competence framework for initial teacher education (see Figure I.4.3), the organisation of continuing professional development (CPD) activities (see Figure I.4.4) and the establishment of resource centres (see Figure I.4.5) that support the integration of migrant students.

Migrant students usually have specific language needs, which must be properly addressed. Top-level education authorities may want to ensure that those responsible for teaching migrant students have appropriate qualifications. This chapter contains two indicators focusing specifically on those providing additional classes where the language of instruction is taught (see Figure I.4.6) and those teaching home languages (see Figure I.4.7).

As already highlighted, the successful integration of migrant students in schools requires expertise from various educational professionals, which in turn necessitates close cooperation between all stakeholders. In this context, adopting a whole-school approach is helpful in tackling the issues relating to migrant students in schools (see Part II). Such an approach demands strong and skilled leadership from school heads (see Figure I.4.8).

In nearly two thirds of education systems, teaching a diverse range of students in multicultural classrooms is acknowledged as a challenge for teachers


The integration of migrant students into education systems poses many challenges. Figure I.4.1 focuses on the main policy challenges, particularly those relating to teachers working with migrant students, as indicated in official documents. The role of school staff in this area is indeed crucial, and the majority of countries have identified some recruitment and skill-related issues as particularly challenging.

In terms of skills, official documents in nearly two-thirds of education systems recognise that teachers need to have stronger competences for working with a diverse range of students in multicultural classrooms and this is seen as a policy challenge. In nearly half of the education systems, these documents also make specific references to the lack of skills to support newly arrived students either in preparatory/separate classes or in mainstream education. In two education systems (United Kingdom (England) and Spain), communicating and/or interacting with migrant students' parents is seen as a challenge, and support to teachers should be provided.

In terms of recruitment, a little more than one-third of the education systems face difficulties in finding teachers qualified to teach curriculum subjects to students for whom the language of instruction is a second or additional language. A quarter of education systems also identify the recruitment of teachers from migrant backgrounds as a challenge. By contrast, only two education systems (Malta and Sweden) face a general shortage of teachers in schools with large numbers of students from migrant backgrounds. In these two countries, however, the teacher shortage concerns the education system as a whole.

Focussing on the teaching of the language of instruction as a second language, several countries report policy measures taken recently to provide teachers with appropriate skills. For instance, in Belgium (German-speaking Community), teachers in preparatory classes have to follow a 10-ECTS training course for teaching the language of instruction as a second language. Likewise, in Austria, all teachers currently undergoing initial teacher education (ITE) and continuing professional development (CPD) get the chance to develop or strengthen a wide range of competences relevant for teaching migrant students, with a focus on multilingualism, intercultural education and pedagogy in the context of migration.

Figure I.4.1: Main policy challenges relating to teachers working with migrant students, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

This Figure shows the main policy challenges as identified by top-level education authorities in official documents. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Language of instruction as a second/additional language: see the Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Spain: Challenges are identified at the level of Autonomous Communities (AC). No particular challenges identified by AC's official documents for general upper secondary education and IVET programmes.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

In the vast majority of countries no financial incentives are offered to teachers working with migrant students

Figure I.4.1 shows that a substantial number of countries face some challenges in recruiting teachers with some specific skills to work with migrant students. Yet, across Europe, top-level education authorities do not usually issue regulations/recommendations on the provision of financial incentives to teachers working with this particular student population. There are very few countries that offer financial incentives, but some of those that do, indicate which teachers are targeted. In Latvia and Slovenia, the incentives target teachers of preparatory classes for newly arrived migrant students, while in Italy they target those working in mainstream schools that have large numbers of socially disadvantaged students and students from migrant backgrounds.

In Estonia and Slovenia, schools with newly arrived migrant students receive additional financial support, which is then given to teachers as extra allowances. In Estonia, for example, schools get EUR 400 per year for every newly arrived migrant student attending classes at primary and lower secondary levels. This grant is available for three years. Where a school has only one or two newly arrived migrant students, it receives EUR 1 000 per year.

In addition to financial resources, top-level education authorities provide other incentives, for example, teachers working with migrant students can benefit from better working conditions (e.g. working in smaller size classes) or better career opportunities (e.g. faster promotion), as they take on additional responsibilities. However, these advantages might not be specifically linked to teaching migrant students, but may also cover other categories of students, such as those with special needs.

Figure I.4.2: Financial incentives for teachers working with migrant students, primary, general secondary education and school-based IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18

**Explanatory note**

This figure shows whether top-level regulations/recommendations refer to financial incentives for teachers who work in separate/preparatory classes for newly arrived migrant students and/or mainstream schools enrolling large numbers of students from migrant backgrounds. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.


Country-specific notes

Estonia: No financial incentives for teachers in upper general secondary education and in school-based IVET programmes.
Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.
United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

In 15 education systems, teacher competence frameworks for ITE include general competences related to the integration of migrant students

A teacher competence framework, as defined in this report, is a set of statements about what a teacher as a professional should know, understand and be able to do. The framework may be included in any type of official document issued by a top-level education authority (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2018). Across Europe, higher education institutions (HEIs) enjoy a high level of autonomy in designing their education and training programmes, including those for future teachers. In this context, the teacher competence framework may be used by top-level education authorities to define the desired teacher competences and thereby influence the content of teacher education and training programmes. As Figure I.4.3 shows, only nine education systems do not have a teacher competence framework in place.

Figure I.4.3: Issues related to the integration of migrant students included in teacher competence frameworks for initial teacher education (ITE), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

This Figure shows the main issues relating to the integration of migrant students included in the competence frameworks for initial teacher education (ITE) for primary, general lower and upper secondary education and IVET programmes. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

The subjects are listed in descending order, from most to least frequently included in teacher competence frameworks.

Language of instruction as a second/additional language: see the Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Denmark: No top-level teacher competence frameworks for ITE for teachers in general upper secondary education and on school-based IVET programmes.
Spain: Autonomous Communities, which develop their own competence frameworks may include those listed above.
Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.
Netherlands and Austria: Information shown in the figure does not apply to IVET programmes.
Poland: The teacher competence framework for early stage education (grade 0 and first 3 years of ISCED 1) includes teaching in diverse, multicultural classrooms.
United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
Switzerland: None of these issues included in the top-level teacher competence framework for ITE for teachers in upper general secondary education and in school-based IVET programmes.
Liechtenstein: Teacher education takes place abroad.

In the majority of education systems, the framework includes competences related to diversity and/or anti-discrimination issues. In most of these cases, the framework refers to both. Furthermore, 15 education systems explicitly refer to matters related to the integration of migrant students. In the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), for example, all programmes of initial teacher education must be designed to enable future teachers to develop professional competences, such as the ability to recognise the significant features of students' cultures, languages and faiths and to address the implications for learning coming from them. In Switzerland, the standing conference of the institutions providing initial teacher education programmes has issued some recommendations on the need for teachers to be able to develop teaching methods for intercultural education.

Many teachers across Europe work in multilingual classrooms where the language of schooling is not necessarily the students' home language (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017b). Therefore, all subject teachers need the skills to enable them to address this language specific issue experienced by many students. In nine education systems, being able to teach curriculum subjects in the language of instruction to students for whom it is a second/additional language is a competence included in the teacher competence framework. In Austria, for example, according to the new competence profile for teachers, implemented since 2015/16, teachers should have developed skills and knowledge in relation to the following language-related issues: migration backgrounds, language education, German as a second language, and German as the language of the education discourse.

As previously mentioned, students from migrant backgrounds often need support in different areas (language, learning and psycho-social). In these circumstances, school staff are strongly urged to cooperate in order to provide effective, multi-dimensional assistance to migrant students. The whole-school approach is generally considered to be useful in this respect. It involves cooperation not only within the school, but also with all the stakeholders outside the school who are responsible for children's personal and learning development. In nine education systems, according to the teacher competence framework, future teachers are expected to develop this competence during their initial teacher education.

In a majority of countries, teachers have opportunities to further develop their competences to teach in diverse, multicultural classrooms through CPD

Continuing professional development (CPD) provides teachers with a chance not only to continually strengthen their skills, but also to build new ones. As the working environment and demands on teachers change, it is crucial for teachers to be able to update their skills so that they are equipped to respond successfully to all challenges. For education authorities, CPD is an instrument that can be used to ensure that all school staff have the knowledge and skills required to implement new policies and reforms effectively. In Sweden, for example, new regulations were introduced in 2016 to improve migrant students' performance at school. Special reference was made to the compulsory assessment of the skills and knowledge of every newly arrived child. Subsequently, top-level education authorities provided web-based courses to teachers on how to map the prior learning of newly arrived migrant students.

In a majority of countries, top-level education authorities provide in-service opportunities for teachers to develop new or additional competences on issues related to the integration of migrant students. CPD is provided on teaching in diverse, multicultural classrooms (30 education systems); the integration of migrant students in schools (25 education systems) and discrimination issues (26 education systems). In Belgium (German-speaking Community), for instance, top-level education authorities have introduced specific training initiatives for school staff on how better to support young people from migrant backgrounds who have suffered traumas. In about half of the education systems,


teachers are offered CPD opportunities to develop their skills in teaching curriculum subjects in the language of instruction to students for whom it is a second/additional language (22 education systems).

As migrant students are usually in need of a wide array of support (language, learning and psycho-social), various school professionals are required to work together – and it is important that their expertise is properly used and coordinated. Adopting a whole-school approach to support migrant students can facilitate this cooperation. However, CPD activities in relation to the whole-school approach are only offered in a minority of countries (14 education systems). In Cyprus, Bulgaria, Latvia and Montenegro, it is an obligation for teachers to participate in these CPD activities; in Montenegro, the issue is also indicated in the teacher competence framework (see Figure I.4.3).

In the vast majority of cases, teachers are under no obligation to attend any of these CPD activities. Cyprus and Luxembourg are the only countries where all the CPD activities mentioned are mandatory for teachers.

Finally, top-level education authorities in seven education systems do not organise or support any of the CPD activities mentioned above.

Figure I.4.4: CPD activities organised or supported by top-level education authorities on issues related to the integration of migrant students, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

This Figure shows the existence of CPD activities organised or supported by top-level education authorities. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

The subjects are listed in descending order, from most to least frequently mentioned CPD activities.

Language of instruction as a second/additional language: see the Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Spain: The Autonomous Communities develop their CPD competence frameworks which may include those listed above

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

Malta and Austria: The CPD activities shown do not apply to school-based IVET programmes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.


Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Resource centres support teachers working with migrants in many countries

Initial teacher education and continuing professional development play an essential role in providing teachers with the necessary skills and knowledge to deal with the many faceted issues related to integrating migrant students into schools (see Figures I.4.3 and I.4.4). In addition to this, top level education authorities in the vast majority of countries have established resource centres or set up

websites to provide further support for teachers. Establishing specialist resource centres is one of the actions recommended by a group of experts gathered by the European Commission to take part in thematic workshops and peer learning activities (European Commission, 2017). In a few countries, top-level education authorities also support teachers' networks. Most of the countries where top-level authorities do not organise or fund these types of support measure are in South-East Europe.

Figure I.4.5: Resource centres, websites and teachers' networks supporting teachers working with migrant students in education, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Explanatory note

This Figure shows where resource centres, websites or teachers' networks to support teachers working with migrant students, have been set up or supported by top-level education authorities. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

A **resource centre** provides information, teaching and learning materials, training and other pedagogical resources.

Country-specific notes

Denmark: The website does not cover upper general secondary education.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented school-based IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

Greece: The website does not cover upper general secondary education and school-based IVET programmes.

Malta and Austria: The information shown does not apply to school-based IVET programmes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

The resource centres or websites provide specific teaching materials. In addition, some of them have other purposes. In France, for example, apart from *Canopé*, which is the provider of resources for the Ministry of National Education and Youth, the Academic Centres for the schooling of newly arrived non-French speaking students and students from traveller families (CASNAV) also offer continuing professional development for teachers and foster cooperation between the various stakeholders working with migrants. In Luxembourg, the service for the schooling of foreign students (SECAM) provides information to foreign students and their parents. It also provides all kinds of support to teachers, including intercultural mediation services.

The issues addressed by the resource centres and websites also vary according to the country. The International Development Education Association Scotland (IDEAS), for example, promotes education for global citizenship, and provides resources for teaching in this area. Global citizenship education is indeed seen as very relevant for students living in an increasingly more globalised world where populations from different backgrounds live together. In Norway, the National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO), which was established in 2004, aims to promote inclusive and equal education for

linguistic minorities. Other resource centres or websites focus more on language related issues such as the Centre for Slovene as a Second and Foreign Language (in Slovenia). Intercultural issues are at the centre of the Intercultural School Stamp Initiative set up by the High-Commissioner for Migration (Portugal), which has developed with other stakeholders an 'intercultural school kit' providing materials on intercultural issues.

Finally, decentralised countries such as Finland and Switzerland have developed networks of municipalities working with migrant students (Finland), or cantonal officers working in the area of intercultural education (Switzerland).

Many countries expect that teachers providing additional classes for teaching newly arrived migrant students the language of instruction hold additional qualifications

The vast majority of education systems have issued top-level regulations/recommendations on additional classes where the language of instruction is taught to newly arrived/first generation migrant students during school hours (see Figure I.3.4 A). Similarly, in the great majority of education systems, there are regulations or recommendations on who should be providing this teaching – nearly all of these indicate that it should be teachers working within the school (see Figure I.4.6 A). Furthermore, these teachers are often expected to hold other qualifications in addition to those normally required to teach in mainstream education. Although in some education systems, this expectation does not extend to all of these teachers (see Figure I.4.6 B – chequered representation on map).

Often, the additional qualifications recommended are those expected for teaching the language of instruction as a second language. This is, for example, the case in Germany, France, Italy, and Sweden. France and Italy have recently (in 2014 and 2015 respectively) established a specific competitive examination for those teaching the language of instruction as a second language.

In Sweden, each school student following the language introduction programme has a right to a language tutor. This language tutor can be a school teacher or any other member of the school staff provided that s/he knows the language of instruction. The teaching of the language of instruction can be provided by both the teacher and the tutor working in cooperation.

The guidelines in the United Kingdom (Wales and Northern Ireland) also indicate that a range of qualifications are acceptable for teaching the language of instruction to migrant students. Language support for newly arrived migrant students in additional classes may be provided by teachers qualified to teach the language of instruction as an additional language, as a foreign language or for speakers of other languages. Language support may also be provided by bilingual teaching assistants who speak the language of instruction and the student's home language.

Official documents in only four education systems (Belgium – French Community, Estonia, France and Slovenia) state that the additional classes where the language of instruction is taught can be provided by any teacher in the school. In France, these teachers need to hold additional qualifications which can be acquired through CPD. The qualifications are granted following the successful completion of an examination. In the other three countries, no additional qualifications are required. In Slovenia, from September 2018, a new rule applies to general upper secondary and IVET programmes: only teachers qualified to teach the Slovenian language will be able to teach these additional classes.

In Montenegro, foreign language teachers are responsible for this teaching.

Figure I.4.6 A: Teachers providing additional classes where the language of instruction is taught during school hours, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18





Figure I.4.6 B: Teachers within the school providing additional classes where the language of instruction is taught during school hours, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18



Explanatory note

The first map shows whether, according to top-level regulations or recommendations, those providing additional classes where the language of instruction is taught to newly arrived migrant students during school hours are teachers from within or outside the school. The second map shows the professional profile of the teachers from within the school (according to top-level regulations or recommendations). The chequered representation indicates that more than one approach is taken. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

During school hours means that the additional lessons where the language of instruction is taught are scheduled within the time allocated for teaching the standard school curriculum.

Any teacher in the school (with or without additional qualifications): This category encompasses teachers in the school (any teacher) with additional qualifications such as in France and teachers in the school (any teacher) without additional qualifications such as in Belgium (French Community), Estonia and Slovenia.

'Not applicable' in Figure I.4.6 B includes the following three situations:

- No top-level regulations/recommendations on additional classes for teaching the language of instruction;
- No top level regulations/recommendations on who should provide these classes;
- Teachers teaching these additional classes are only teaching staff outside the school.

Country-specific notes

Belgium (BE nl): For teachers in primary education, there is no recommendation on who should teach these additional classes.
Denmark and Iceland: No additional classes for teaching the language of instruction at upper general secondary education and in school-based IVET programmes.

Spain: According to top-level regulations/recommendations, no such provision in IVET school-based programmes.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

Luxembourg: No additional classes for teaching the language of instruction at general lower and upper secondary education and in school-based IVET programmes.

Malta: For school-based IVET programmes, teachers teaching the language of instruction with additional qualifications to those required to teach the language of instruction in mainstream education.

Slovenia: In upper secondary general education and school-based IVET programmes, additional classes for teaching the language of instruction may be organised in a surrounding school, and teachers belong to this school. In general upper secondary education and school-based IVET programmes, from September 2018 on, it is teachers teaching the language of instruction with no other additional qualifications – and not just any teacher in the school.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Switzerland: No additional classes for teaching the language of instruction at general upper secondary education.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Finally, in a few countries, according to top-level regulations/recommendations, additional classes for teaching the language of instruction are always provided by outside staff in Greece, and sometimes by outside staff in Spain, Hungary and the United Kingdom (Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland) (see Figure I.4.6 A). In Spain, the situation varies according to the Autonomous Community: in the Comunidad Autónoma de Aragón, for example, these classes are taught by generalist teachers (in primary education), teachers teaching Spanish language and literature (in secondary education) or external support teachers from the Aragonese Centre of Resources for Intercultural Education, if resources are available. In Greece, teachers of 'Reception classes' are recruited for one year and work under a fixed term contract – unlike other teachers who have permanent contracts. In Hungary, teachers trained to teach Hungarian as a foreign language may already be teaching in schools, or they may be recruited from outside the school on a temporary basis. In the United Kingdom (Wales), additional classes for teaching the language of instruction may also be taught by specialist English (or Welsh) as an additional language staff from local authorities. In the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), such classes may also be taught by external, often peripatetic, language or intercultural support staff/advisors.


Only a handful of countries provide recommendations on the qualifications necessary to teach the home language

Official documents promoting home language instruction exist only in a minority of education systems across Europe (see Figure I.3.5). Not surprisingly, not many countries have issued regulations or recommendations in relation to who should be providing this teaching.

Top-level education authorities in Austria, Finland, Sweden and Norway have specific regulations/recommendations on this topic, stating that such teaching should be provided by fully qualified teachers. In Spain and Italy, home language teaching is provided under bilateral agreements at state level with the countries from which the main migrant communities originate. Teachers are qualified according to the regulations of these countries. A similar situation occurs in Switzerland but teachers of home languages also receive support from the Swiss education authorities, notably the provision of CPD courses on home language teaching.

In a few education systems (Denmark, Germany, Latvia, Slovenia, the United Kingdom (England, Wales and Northern Ireland), top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on the requirements in relation to the qualifications of home language teachers to local authorities or schools.

Figure I.4.7: Top-level regulations on who should provide home language teaching in mainstream education, primary, general secondary education and IVET programmes, 2017/18



Explanatory note

'**Responsibility of local authorities/schools**' means that, according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty to make decisions on this policy area to local authorities or schools. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Home language: see the Glossary.

Country-specific notes

Denmark, Spain and Switzerland: There is no provision of home language teaching in general upper secondary education and school-based IVET programmes.

Ireland: There are no nationally implemented IVET programmes at the secondary level of education.

Luxembourg: There is no provision of home language teaching in general lower and upper secondary education and in school-based IVET programmes.

United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR): School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.

Liechtenstein: Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

In about one third of countries, specific CPD courses are available to support school heads in dealing with issues relating to the integration of migrant students

The professional profile of school heads and their range of duties varies across Europe. Nevertheless, in all countries, they are usually responsible for organising learning and teaching in school, and managing financial and human resources. Sometimes, they also teach. The process of integrating migrant students into schools can pose challenges for school heads since these students often need multi-dimensional support from a range of different professionals who may be based within the school or provided by external services. They often include specialist language teachers, learning support specialists and psycho-social staff. In order to effectively manage these support staff and ensure that the needs of migrant children are met, schools heads must have strong leadership and organisational abilities as well as excellent communication skills.

As Figure I.4.8 shows, top-level education authorities in a little more than half of the education systems support the production of guidance materials, or organise specific courses or other activities for school heads to help them integrate migrant students into their schools. In twelve of the education systems concerned, at least two of the support activities listed are offered to school heads.

In some countries, such as Cyprus and Portugal, some training/support initiatives are specifically organised to help school heads implement a particular action plan or project in relation to migrant


student integration (Cyprus) or, more generally, to improve student performance and reduce the risk of students leaving education early, including migrant students (Portugal).

In Malta, in order to share experiences between school leaders, peer learning activities are organised by the Institute for Education within the Ministry for Education and Employment. In Finland, a network of municipality coordinators working specifically in migrant education is being developed, the network also supports school heads.

In the United Kingdom (Scotland), the Scottish College for Education Leadership (SCEL) provides leadership programmes mapped to specific aspects of the General Teaching Council for Scotland (GTCS) Standards, which are the basis for the professional development of teaching staff. These standards have a focus on social justice. The programmes offered by SCEL include a focus on the professional values within the GTCS Standards and learning on general issues of equalities, diversity, etc.

Finally, school heads also benefit from various kinds of support provided to teachers and schools as a whole. For instance, the Intercultural Education Service (IES) in the United Kingdom (Northern Ireland) provides school-based support on intercultural awareness, assessment and planning, and curriculum access. In Sweden, several continuing professional development activities target teachers as well as school heads, and mixed groups are encouraged.

Figure I.4.8: Support programmes, courses and/or other activities for school heads to help them support the integration of migrant students, 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Explanatory note

This Figure covers school heads in primary, general secondary education and schools providing IVET programmes. Only support programmes, courses and/or other activities supported or organised by top-level education authorities are shown. Variations between education levels are indicated in the country-specific notes.

Country-specific notes

- Lithuania and Malta:** The support measures shown do not cover IVET programmes.
- United Kingdom (ENG/WLS/NIR):** School-based IVET is not a separate stream of provision.
- Liechtenstein:** Students in IVET-programmes attend schools in Switzerland for the school-based part of their programme.

Part II:

Analysis



II.1: INTRODUCTION

While the first part of the report aims to provide a comprehensive mapping of top-level regulations and recommendations in a wide range of areas, this second part of the report aims to provide a more focussed analysis. It also contributes to finding answers to the overarching question of the report, which is: what do top-level education authorities across Europe do to promote the integration into schools of students from migrant backgrounds? However, it does so by looking at the top-level regulations/ recommendations on some key areas that are close to the individual child, examined in relation to two main dimensions: the first is linguistic and cultural diversity and the second is the whole-child approach.

The chapter entitled 'Making room for diversity' focuses on regulations/recommendations in three areas: the teaching of the language of instruction, home language teaching and intercultural education. Intercultural education may be regarded as an education principle framing teaching and learning practices in schools. It promotes the creation of a common space in which all students – whatever their linguistic and cultural backgrounds – can enter into dialogue, recognise their similarities beyond their differences, show respect for one another, and become ready to change their representations of themselves and others.

The teaching of the language of instruction to migrant students is an essential task of schools that enables these students to fully benefit from learning opportunities and be socially integrated in schools. This teaching can be provided during classes dedicated to this language or it can be provided by all subject teachers across the curriculum. It can also take place in the context of a curriculum that promotes multilingualism and the teaching of migrant students' home languages. Depending on the approaches taken by education authorities, the learning environment may prove to be more or less 'diversity friendly'.

The chapter on 'Promoting a whole-child approach' also focuses on regulations/recommendations in three areas: addressing the holistic needs of migrant students, supporting teachers in taking a whole-child approach, and implementing a whole-school approach to migrant students' holistic needs. Taking a whole-child approach in schools can improve students' educational outcomes by creating a balance between the attention given to their academic development and that given to their social and emotional well-being. A number of studies referred to in the chapter confirm that students from a migrant background may particularly benefit from this approach.

The whole-child approach in schools requires all newly arrived migrant students' needs, i.e. cognitive as well as social and emotional needs, to be taken into account in their education. The chapter looks specifically at initial assessment, learning support provided both in the classroom and after school, and support for the development of migrant students' social-emotional competences or psycho-social therapeutic measures to help them recover from stressful experiences. In order to successfully implement a whole-child approach, teachers need to be trained and supported in this respect. Moreover, the school context should be one that is based on a whole-school approach, i.e. where migrant students and teachers work closely with school heads, parents and local organisations in order to address students' holistic needs.

This analysis focuses on policies and measures in ten education systems: Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England). The narrower range of education systems permits a deeper analysis. The education systems were selected on the basis of two main criteria: having a relatively large migrant population as well as relevant policies and measures in the particular areas under investigation (see also Context and Part I. Mapping).

This second part of the report thus offers a comparative analysis of the top-level regulations/recommendations in the ten education systems, which address the different elements of linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach in schools. The analysis is rooted in the available research evidence and this underpins the concluding section, which highlights the education systems that have the most comprehensive policies with respect to diversity and the whole-child approach and shows where the policy emphasis lies between the two.


II.2: MAKING ROOM FOR DIVERSITY IN SCHOOL

This chapter looks at the ways in which schools embrace diversity. It focusses on three main areas of the curriculum: the language of instruction, home languages and intercultural education (see Figure II.2.1). The discussion draws on research and evidence, and looks at whether the ten top-level education authorities promote policy measures allowing students from different language and cultural backgrounds to feel at home in schools.

As competences in the language of instruction are essential to study in the school environment, this objective has traditionally always been a focus of the school's tasks. The academic literature presented in this section, however, shows that there are ways in which this task can be more effectively undertaken. In particular, providing teaching in a broader multilingual and multicultural learning framework – where migrant students' language(s) and culture(s) are valued – has two significant educational benefits: firstly it helps migrant students learn the language of instruction more easily; and secondly it also gives them a chance to recompose their self-identity in a positive way, as their own language(s) and culture(s) are valued alongside those of the host country (see sections on 'Teaching the language of instruction' and 'Home language teaching').

Intercultural education can create the space and conditions necessary for all students from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds – native-born and migrant alike – to communicate, learn together, and develop as individuals aware of their own cultural identity and respectful of others' (see section on 'Intercultural education'). This fosters a more inclusive school.

Figure II.2.1: How curricula make room for diversity in schools



Source: Eurydice.

II.2.1. Teaching the language of instruction

Mastering the language of instruction is essential for any student to perform well at school. However, it is now widely acknowledged that in order to learn successfully, students need language skills that 'go beyond the spontaneous and generally informal language used in everyday social life' (Council of Europe, 2015, p. 10). They must be able to use confidently the specific language used in educational settings, which is often referred to as 'academic language'. This differs lexically and grammatically from everyday language, often featuring specialised vocabulary, clause connectors and independent clauses, to cite only a few of its linguistic characteristics (Bailey et al., 2007). Schools therefore have a duty to teach this language register to their students so that they can fully benefit from all learning opportunities.

Although this issue affects all learners, it is critical for those from disadvantaged backgrounds (Heppt, 2014). Success in education is important for an individual's life chances as it brings more and better personal, social and work opportunities. Therefore, ensuring that all children are given the chance to fulfil their potential at school should be a prime objective for any democratic society trying to achieve a more equitable system.

With regard to migrant students, the learning of the language of instruction poses particular challenges as, in most cases, it is their second or an additional language (OECD, 2018). This section focuses on the policies and measures introduced by top-level education authorities on key areas relating to migrant students' learning of the language of instruction in schools.

First, it looks at whether top-level education authorities provide teachers with specific guidelines or instruments to accurately assess newly arrived migrant students' competences in the language of instruction when they come to school for the first time. It must be borne in mind that students from migrant backgrounds are characterised by their heterogeneity. Beyond a few common characteristics and needs, they come from different countries, have different languages and cultures, and different school experiences (Le Pichon, 2016). Assessing their particular language needs is therefore a real challenge for teachers and they need guidance and support to be effective.

Second, the section addresses several issues related to the curriculum for teaching the language of instruction to migrant students. Does the curriculum allow for the language of instruction to be taught as a second or additional language? What is the position of the language of instruction in the curriculum: Is it taught only as a subject on its own or also as a transversal subject? Is language awareness part of the curriculum – is it addressed when teaching the language of instruction or in other subjects across the whole curriculum?

Language awareness refers to a 'person's sensitivity to a conscious awareness of the nature of language and its role in human life' (Donmall, 1985). It embraces ideas such as 'explicit knowledge about language, conscious perception and sensitivity in language learning, language teaching and language use' (Association for Language Awareness, 2012, as seen in Ellis, 2012, p. 2). This concept has its roots in a multilingual contrastive tradition, i.e. an approach focusing on the similarities and differences between languages; from the beginning, language awareness is also regarded as a means to fight ethnocentrism and includes a useful set of competences to live in a culturally and linguistically diverse society (Ellis, 2012). Multilingual speakers usually develop greater language awareness (Herdina and Jessner, 2002).

Initial assessment

Collecting information on newcomers' competences and knowledge is a basic and essential task performed by teachers in schools. This initial assessment is necessary for teachers to adequately plan their teaching lessons and respond as much as possible to students' individual learning needs. This sub-section looks at the initial assessment of students in the language of instruction and raises the question of whether top level education authorities support teachers in this task by issuing regulations/recommendations.

In nine of the ten education systems (Slovenia being the exception), top level education authorities provide regulations/recommendations on the assessment of newly arrived migrant students in the language of instruction. However, the scope and degree of precision set down in regulations/recommendations vary a great deal. In Finland, for example, official documents give few specific references to initial assessment and stipulate that each school or education provider has full autonomy in deciding the method, timing and those responsible for the process. Conversely, top-level education authorities in France and Sweden provide quite specific guidelines. In France, the initial assessment of the language of instruction targets all non-French speakers while in Sweden it is directed at newly arrived migrant students. Sweden is the only country where the initial assessment of the language of instruction is part of a comprehensive and mandatory initial assessment procedure

whereby knowledge and skills in all school subjects – including students' home language – are assessed (see also Section II.3.2 on initial assessment to identify migrant students' holistic needs).

In **France**, in primary education, initial assessment is carried out by a person specifically nominated for this task by the French inspectorate, with the help of trainers from CASNAV (*academic centres for the schooling of newly arrived non-French speaking students and students from traveller families*). With regard to languages, this assessment aims to elicit information on students' skills in French (oral and written forms), their verbal and non-verbal competences in other languages taught in the French education system, notably English. Those making the evaluation are welcome to use students' first language if it facilitates the evaluation process.

Two education systems (Austria and the United Kingdom – England) have very recently introduced policies in this area. The Austrian regulation is unusual in that it requires all students – native and migrant alike – to have their German skills tested before they start school. In the United Kingdom (England), an assessment of students with English as an additional language is carried out with a view to monitoring students' progress over the years. However, in June 2018, the Department for Education announced that the English as an Additional Language proficiency assessment and data collection would no longer be required from the 2018/19 school year.

Often, top-level education authorities provide teachers with relevant assessment materials to test newly arrived migrant students' competences. This is for example the case of Portugal where models of placement tests, based on the CEFR, are available on the Ministry of Education's website.

Beyond this initial assessment, most top-level education authorities (except the United Kingdom – England) continue supporting teachers in the continuous assessment of migrant students' language skills by providing guidance, specific assessment materials, training, etc.

In **France** and **Italy**, top-level education authorities have defined competence levels or benchmarks that can be consulted by teachers for the purpose of continuous assessment with respect to migrant students' language skills.

While Slovenia does not have any specific regulations/recommendations on the initial assessment of migrant students in the language of instruction during the reference year of this report, all schools are encouraged to consider any available documentation brought in by the students as well as their age, otherwise, they are left to decide for themselves on whether or how to assess students' skills. However, new rules (regulatory document) have been introduced (Summer 2018) for students enrolling in upper secondary education (including IVET programmes). They specify the content, organisation and criteria for the examination of newly arrived migrant students who cannot provide proof of their formal educational qualifications. For instance, students who do not have a certificate showing their competence level in the Slovenian language at level A2 of the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), established by the Council of Europe, must follow a specific course in Slovenian.

Curricular approaches to the language of instruction

The results of initial assessment may be used to help teachers decide in which grade to place newly arrived migrant students (see also Figure I.2.5). When a decision has to be taken on whether to place them directly into mainstream classes and/or place them in preparatory classes (see Figure I.2.7), it often depends on the students' level of proficiency in the language of instruction. In most of the ten education systems, when students do not have the language skills needed to cope in mainstream classes, they are placed in separate classes for some or all curriculum subjects. In addition as shown by Figure I.3.4, all the education systems, except the United Kingdom (England) have top-level regulations/recommendations on the provision of additional language of instruction classes for migrant students.

Specific curriculum for the language of instruction as a second language

Most of the ten education systems under discussion recommended that teachers providing additional language of instruction classes for migrant students should have additional qualifications in teaching the language as a second/additional language. However, it is rarely a requirement (see also Figure I.4.6). In this context, it is worth looking at the extent to which top-level education authorities support these teachers by providing guidance, for example, in the form of a curriculum to teach the language of instruction as a second language.

All education systems, except France and the United Kingdom (England), have issued a curriculum for the teaching of the language of instruction as a second language. In six of these (Germany ⁽¹⁾ – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Italy, Austria, Slovenia and Portugal), the main purpose of the curriculum is to support teachers in providing individualised teaching to migrant students so that they can all rapidly be taught the standard curriculum for the language of instruction. Some of these curricula structure the learning objectives according to the purposes of language use, and distinguish at least two stages: using the language for everyday communication and using it for study purposes.

In **Italy**, the curriculum guidelines for the teaching of Italian as a second language define two learning stages with specific learning objectives: learning Italian to communicate and learning Italian for study purposes (the 'bridge' stage).

In **Portugal**, the curriculum for Portuguese as a non-native language, aims at developing Portuguese as a language of communication, as a language of instruction and finally as an instrument for integration in a plurilingual and pluricultural society.

Finland and Sweden have developed a curriculum for the language of instruction as a second language. In Finland, it is available to students whose home language differs from Swedish and Finnish and who are in need of such teaching; while in Sweden, this curriculum is available to a wider group of students, but it is also provided on a needs basis. In both countries, those students can study this curriculum throughout their school education. Certification is provided at the end of the course as for any other subject of the curriculum. Students also have the right to change to the standard curriculum. Schools do not always organise separate classes or groups for teaching the language of instruction as a second language. Therefore, these students may sit in ordinary classes, but receive different teaching and assessment based on the curriculum for the language of instruction as a second language. This educational setting requires specific teaching strategies such as differentiation.

Debates about the very existence of Swedish as a second language, as a subject, have taken place in Sweden (Axelsson and Magnusson, 2012; Hyltenstam and Milani, 2012). Advocates stress that non-Swedish speakers need specific teaching arrangements in order to effectively learn the language; while opponents point out the separating effects resulting from this approach as it may place students in different learning groups (Magnusson, 2013). These two positions summarise very clearly the twin trap often faced by education authorities. In these circumstances, the way forward seems to be to adopt a balanced approach acknowledging students' specific language needs while facilitating their integration in school.

The language of instruction as a transversal competence

How the language of instruction as a subject is positioned within the curriculum can greatly influence its teaching not only to migrant students, but to all students. As previously highlighted, learning successfully at school requires proficiency in the language. Therefore, acknowledging the transversal nature of this subject by making it a transversal competence that all teachers should teach can

⁽¹⁾ The *Land* of Berlin shares the same curriculum ('Framework Curriculum for Berlin and Brandenburg') with the *Land* of Brandenburg.

significantly help all students improve their language skills. Providing language education across the whole curriculum through language-sensitive teaching is one of the evidence-based approaches for effective language instruction, particularly in multilingual classrooms (European Commission, 2017b). In addition, developing language awareness when studying language and non-language subjects is beneficial to all learners, and especially to bilingual and plurilingual students, including migrant students. It contributes to a deeper insight into linguistic matters, which facilitates language learning and helps them achieve a high level of proficiency in all the languages they know.

The section below briefly looks at whether the language of instruction has a transversal place in the curriculum, and whether language awareness is addressed as part of this subject or whether it is covered in any other subjects across the curriculum.

Curricula in all education systems make the language of instruction a transversal competence. However, the specific language dimensions defined as transversal vary across systems. In most of the education systems (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Italy, France, Portugal, Slovenia and the United Kingdom – England), the emphasis is put on the development of communicative competences. Students should develop their language skills and be taught how to use them in order to communicate effectively in different contexts and for different purposes.

In **Spain**, according to state-level official documents relating to the curriculum at primary level, language and communication are the basis for the construction, acquisition and communication of knowledge. Therefore, all subjects in the curriculum contribute to the development of students' communicative skills. In the same way, the curriculum at secondary level states that schools must promote communicative competences in all subjects, as a basic element for the acquisition and development of basic skills in content-related subjects.

In **France**, languages are seen as key instruments in which to communicate and think. It is in this particular framework that proficiency in French is promoted across the whole curriculum and placed at the forefront of transversal learning objectives.

In the **United Kingdom (England)**, language competences are closely associated with literacy, and all teachers are expected to develop pupils' spoken language, reading, writing and vocabulary as 'integral aspects of the teaching of every subject'.

Language awareness can be found as a transversal competence across the whole curriculum in Germany (Brandenburg), Austria and Finland. In these systems, the teaching of the language of instruction intends, among other things, to make students aware of the linguistic components of the language and how the language as a structure functions. In addition, in Finland, language awareness is considered as a key aspect of the school culture, which makes every school a 'community with language awareness'. In this case, this concept embraces various language related aspects relevant in the school context: it stresses the key importance of language for learning, interaction and cooperation and for the building of identities and socialisation.

In **Germany (Brandenburg)**, top level education authorities have developed a basic curriculum for language teaching across the whole curriculum (*Basiscurriculum Sprachbildung*). According to this basic curriculum, students can, for example, explain the meaning of words, including technical terms, on the basis of word formation patterns; students can compare words and phrases in different languages (home language, foreign languages learned and regional languages).

Not surprisingly, given that language awareness as a concept is rooted in a research tradition highlighting similarities and differences between languages, these three education systems view conscious awareness of the nature of language and its role for human beings, from a multilingual perspective. For instance, learning objectives include instructing students to appreciate different languages (Austria and Finland) and making them aware of language differences and similarities (Germany – Brandenburg, Austria and Finland).

Several other education systems include language awareness in their curriculum, not as a transversal theme or competence across the whole curriculum, but as a dimension present in some subject

curricula. In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Slovenia, language awareness is a cross-cutting theme in all language subjects in the curriculum; while in France, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England), it mostly concerns the language of instruction.

In **Slovenia**, the learning objectives of all foreign language curricula as well as Latin and Greek include, among other things, developing language skills, comprehending the individual linguistic resources of different language systems, and understanding pragmatic, sociolinguistic and rhetoric rules of each language.

The teacher's role in implementing the curriculum is undoubtedly crucial. In this context, when the curriculum identifies communication skills and/or language awareness as transversal themes or competences, one of the particular challenges is to have all teachers – not just those teaching the language of instruction – to implement them. In order to do so, language and content-based subject teachers need to cooperate effectively.

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, official documents state the need to establish cooperation mechanisms between teachers from language and non-language subjects. These teachers need to work cooperatively for teaching language content, which is identified as a priority, and as such, should facilitate students' progress in the achievement of the language-related objectives as defined by the curriculum.

Top-level education authorities in all education systems acknowledge that all teachers including content-based subject teachers have a role to play in teaching the language of instruction. In some countries, such as in France and Finland, the national curriculum states specifically that every teacher (France) or every adult (Finland) should be a language model for all students. In others, for example in Italy, all content-based subject teachers are strongly encouraged to pay specific attention to the language dimension of their subjects, and notably to the most abstract or subject-specific terms of the subject area they teach. In the United Kingdom (England), all teachers are expected to develop all students' spoken language, reading, writing and vocabulary as integral aspects of the teaching of every subject. For students with English as an additional language, teachers are expected to plan teaching opportunities to help them develop their English.

More specifically, in Austria, where the curriculum acknowledges the centrality of the language of instruction as a subject on its own, the official guidelines for initial teacher education (*PädagogInnenbildung NEU*) clearly state the obligation of all teachers to support the development of the students' language of instruction. Furthermore, all Austrian teachers also have continuing professional development (CPD) opportunities to develop their skills for language conscious teaching. The same CPD opportunities are provided to all teachers in Finland.

II.2.2. Home language teaching

The monolingual paradigm, prevailing in most European publicly-funded schools, is a legacy of the nation-building process (Busch, 2011). Indeed, in most cases, this process drew among other things on the exclusive use of one common language in public life. Although a majority of European countries officially recognise regional or minority languages within their borders for legal or administrative purposes, the vast majority of those countries have in fact only one language as a state language (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017b). In this context, education systems were (and still are) key players in promoting this common language across the country.

This monolingual paradigm, however, is increasingly under pressure as European societies are increasingly becoming more diverse linguistically and culturally, this being an effect of migration and globalisation (see also Chapter 'Context'). In addition, more opportunities for travel and new technologies allow people from migrant backgrounds to maintain closer ties to their family, home language and culture.

Academic work undertaken by several scholars (Thomas and Collier, 1997; Cummins, 2001; Garcia, 2009) consistently shows how taking into consideration students' linguistic and cultural realities has positive effects on students' well-being and proficiency level in school, notably with regard to the language of instruction. As stated by Cummins (2001, p. 19), 'to reject a child's language in the school is to reject the child'. Research carried out by Thomas and Collier (1997) demonstrates that learning home languages in the context of bilingual programmes allows students to acquire the language of instruction more rapidly even though it means less instruction time for it, as part of the language curriculum time is used for teaching home languages.

Figure I.3.5 in Part I of this report shows that top-level education authorities in a minority of education systems in Europe recommend the provision of home language instruction (13 education systems). Furthermore, this provision is rarely a right that migrant students can claim, and when it is, it is subject to conditions (see Figure I.3.6). The section below will go beyond these basic facts by discussing the following two issues:

- What are the main purposes of home language teaching according to official documents issued by top-level education authorities?
- Do top-level education authorities provide any guidelines on the initial assessment of students, the curriculum, or the training of teachers with regard to the teaching of home languages?

Responses to these questions will help build a picture of the policy on home language teaching in each education system. The ultimate objective is to gauge the extent to which policies acknowledge the multilingual dimension of European societies, by promoting the learning of all languages in schools, and most particularly the home languages of migrant students.

Purposes of home language teaching

This analysis of the purposes of home language teaching draws on a model of multilingual education developed by Busch (2011). Busch's model, however, has been simplified and modified in order to fit the specific characteristics of home language teaching. Home language teaching may serve three main objectives:

Figure II.2.2: The main purposes of home language teaching

Purpose 1	Purpose 2	Purpose 3
Facilitating the teaching of the dominant language, which, in this context, is the language of instruction	Supporting migrant students' language/culture maintenance and literacy acquisition	Fostering bilingualism and plurilingualism for all learners

Three education systems (France, Portugal and the United Kingdom – England) do not have specific top-level policies on the provision of home language teaching. This does not, however, mean that home languages are completely absent in schools. On the contrary, in all three education systems, teachers are expected to make room for migrant students' languages in the classroom in different ways. However, home language teaching is mostly instrumental in helping migrant students achieve proficiency in the language of instruction (Purpose 1).

In **France**, top-level education authorities recommend teaching approaches, which use the languages spoken by migrant students in the classroom. Teachers can for instance take a comparative approach to languages in order to highlight specific grammar points relevant to the French language.

In **Portugal**, top-level education authorities recommend that teachers develop glossaries which can cover several curriculum subject areas. These glossaries should primarily facilitate students' learning of curriculum subjects.

In addition, in France and in the United Kingdom (England), students can take national tests in some of the languages spoken by migrant students at home. These languages are, however, considered as 'foreign' by the syllabuses and national tests.

In the **United Kingdom (England)**, optional national tests are administered in languages such as Urdu, Persian, Arabic, Polish, etc. These tests lead to academic qualifications (General Certificates of Secondary Education (GCSEs) and A-Levels). Students can take these tests independently of any teaching of these languages in the school they attend.

Official documents in nearly all the remaining education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Italy, Austria, Slovenia, and Sweden) put much emphasis on 'preserving and promoting migrant students' home language' (Purpose 2). These documents also point out the role this teaching plays in the development of migrant students' intercultural competences. The focus is mainly placed on the acquisition of knowledge and understanding of their language and culture of origin. Ultimately, this teaching is intended to help migrant students build their (multicultural) identity, and consequently facilitate their integration in school.

In Austria and Sweden, the learning of home languages is considered as a basis not only for learning the language of instruction or other languages, but it also forms part of the whole education process in school. In other words, it is seen as contributing to migrants' students' broader achievements and their general well-being in school.

'Purpose 3' takes as a starting point the plurilingualism of every school and its students. Finland is the only country where the teaching of home languages is seen as a contribution to the fostering of bilingualism and plurilingualism for all learners. In this country, top-level education authorities draw on the linguistically and culturally diverse environment in which schools operate. All languages present in the school are consequently valued and used; they all pertain to the school culture. The curriculum promotes plurilingualism and aims to develop students' linguistic awareness.

Teaching home languages in schools

This short sub-section focuses on two aspects related to the teaching of home language in schools: the initial assessment of migrant students' level of proficiency in their home language, and the curriculum for home language teaching.

As already highlighted, only Sweden has defined a top-level comprehensive assessment procedure (see also Section II.3.2 on initial assessment in addressing migrant students' holistic needs), which includes the assessment of home languages. In all other countries, students' competences in their home language are either not assessed when they start school (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Portugal, Slovenia, Austria and the United Kingdom – England), or this assessment is the responsibility of teachers at school level (Italy and Finland).

Usually, top-level education authorities develop curricula for the subjects taught in school. This, however, is not often the case when it comes to home languages. Top-level education authorities in only three countries (Austria, Sweden and Finland) have designed curricula specifically for the teaching of home languages. These curricula assume that students have some prior knowledge of the languages, which are therefore not regarded as foreign languages. Theoretically, all home languages can be taught. In Austria, for instance, 26 home languages ⁽²⁾ were taught in schools across the

⁽²⁾ Albanian, Arabic, Bosnian/Croatian/Serbian, Bulgarian, Chinese, Dari, French, Greek, Italian, Kurdish/Kurmanci, Nepali, Pashto, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Romani, Rumanian, Russian, Slovak, Slovene, Somali, Spanish, Czech, Chechen, Turkish, Hungarian

country in 2015/16. In Finland, 57 languages ⁽³⁾ were taught in basic and general upper secondary schools across the country in the autumn semester 2017.

In education systems where there is no specific curriculum for home language teaching, depending on the language taught, teachers might use teaching materials made available to them by education authorities (Germany – Brandenburg), or curricula designed for the teaching of these languages as foreign languages, such as Portuguese in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) or the languages of former Yugoslavia and neighbouring countries in Slovenia.

In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), schools need to develop a school plan in which they must define how they intend to encourage the learning of the languages and cultures of the school community. In addition, Catalan education authorities encourage schools to provide home language teaching within the framework of the plan to boost the learning of the third language (after Catalan and Spanish).

Home language teacher training and supply to schools

Teachers are clearly key to the effective teaching of home languages in schools, as they are generally when it comes to achieving educational goals. In practice, with regard to initial teacher education, countries providing home language teaching can be divided into two categories. The first group includes those where home language teachers mostly come from abroad, and more precisely from the countries where the languages taught are spoken. Consequently, teachers' initial teacher education has taken place in those countries. This is the case of Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Italy, where cooperation with foreign countries has been established in order to deliver the teaching of specific languages.

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, from 2016/17, Arabic, Romanian and Portuguese can be selected as optional subjects in secondary education. These languages are part of the curriculum following collaboration agreements between Spain and other countries. In **Italy**, such agreements exist with Romania, China and Morocco.

In the second group of education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Austria, Slovenia, Sweden and Finland), home language teachers have different profiles in terms of qualifications and origins: for instance, they might come from abroad or be first or second generation migrants educated and trained in Europe.

CPD opportunities for home language teachers are provided or supported on a regular basis by top-level education authorities in Germany (Brandenburg), Austria, Slovenia, Sweden and Finland.

In **Austria**, since 2012, the nation-wide course 'Home-language teaching: Teaching first languages in the context of migration' has been offered four times: three times at the University College of Teacher Education of Vienna, once as a joint initiative organised by the University Colleges of teacher Education of Upper Austria, Linz, and Salzburg. This course lasts four semesters and is worth 30 EC-credits.

In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Italy, the responsibility for this type of provision is usually assumed by the relevant institutions in the countries where home language teachers come from and where the languages taught are spoken.

The supply of home language teachers can really be an issue. This often results from the high number of home languages that can potentially be taught across the country, and at the same time, the limited

⁽³⁾ Albanian, Amharic, Arabic, Armenian, Assyrian, Bengali, Bosnian, Bulgarian, Burmese, Chechnyan, Chinese, Czech, Danish, Dari, Dutch, English, Estonian, Filipino, French, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Hungarian, Igbo, Indonesian, Icelandic, Italian, Japanese, Karen, Kurdish, Lithuanian, Mongolian, Nepalese, Norwegian, Pasay, Pashto, Persian, Portuguese, Polish, Romany, Romanian, Russian, Rwanda, Sami, Serbian, Siamese, Slovakian, Somali, Spanish, Swahili, Tamil, Tigrinya, Turkish, Ukrainian, Urdu, Vietnamese

number of students who, in each school, wish or are entitled to benefit from home language teaching. With regard to this issue, three categories of education systems can be established. In the first group, including Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Italy, home language teacher supply is coordinated with the countries sending those teachers. In the second group, comprising Germany (Brandenburg), Austria, Sweden and Finland, teaching is organised by public authorities in the host country either at local level (Sweden and Finland), or at *Land* level in Germany and Austria. In addition, in Austria, overall monitoring is carried out by the Federal Ministry for Education. Slovenia also falls into the third category. In this country, schools can apply for public funds to provide home language lessons. These lessons are then organised by different actors with the support of schools.

In **Austria**, the organisation of home language teaching and the supply of teachers is coordinated by the educational boards of each federal *Land*. Depending on the number of students, the instruction in home languages can take place in two ways: if the number of students for a particular language in a particular school is high, then the teaching is organised in that school; if the number of students is too low, then students from different schools are grouped and taught together.

While schools and the curriculum play an important role in maintaining and developing migrant students' home languages, parents also have a role to play in this area (European Commission, 2017b). This role is in addition to their general engagement in and support for their children's education (see also Section II.3.4: Promoting a whole-school approach to migrant students' holistic needs).

II.2.3. Intercultural education

Intercultural education is not a new theme. In Europe, the Council of Europe had a pioneering role in its development and promotion. Since 1997, the Council of Europe has built a European model for the intercultural curriculum (Campani, 2014). The European Union too has launched a series of initiatives in this area such as the Year of Intercultural Dialogue (2008), and it has adopted the Green Paper 'Migration and mobility: Challenges and opportunities for EU education systems' (European Commission, 2008). Recently, in 2015, national culture ministers created a new policy coordination group on intercultural dialogue, focussing on the integration of migrants and refugees into society through the arts and culture. This working group produced a report containing 23 recommendations, focusing on themes such as empowerment through intercultural dialogue and the arts (European Commission, 2017a).

Such policy initiatives are an attempt to respond to the specific challenges, notably in terms of social cohesion, brought about by increasing migration related diversity within European societies. Intercultural dialogue is indeed often regarded as an instrument to find a balance between cultural diversity and social cohesion (Faas et al., 2014).

In the literature, 'multicultural' and 'intercultural' are sometimes used interchangeably. Some scholars argue that the only difference between the two terms is a geographical one: 'multicultural' being used more often by English-speaking researchers, while non-English-speaking researchers refer more readily to 'intercultural'. Other scholars, however, point out an essential conceptual difference between the two. 'Multicultural' refers to the nature of a society, while 'intercultural' focusses on interaction and process (Campani, 2014).

In this report, intercultural education is regarded as a means 'to create a common space based on mutual understanding, and recognition of similarities through dialogue'. This definition focusses on interaction and exchange between people of different cultures; it implies a sense of respect and openness to change; it often leads to a transformation of those who engage in the process. Finally,

intercultural education stresses the dynamic nature of cultures, therefore challenging all forms of stereotypes and xenophobia (Kirova and Prochner, 2015).

This section looks at two main areas of intercultural education: the school curriculum and teacher education and training.

Intercultural education in the curriculum

All ten education systems refer to intercultural education in one way or another. Figure I.3.11 in the first part of this report provides a clear picture of which education systems include intercultural education in the curriculum as a subject or a theme. However, substantial differences lie in the aspects emphasised and the curricular approach advocated in official documents, i.e. whether it is a general principle, a cross-curricular thematic area taught through specific curriculum subjects, or a topic mainly addressed through specific initiatives and projects.

In Italy and Sweden, intercultural education features in the curriculum as an overarching principle. How it should be taught in schools is, however, not further defined. It is considered as an educational response to the growing multicultural dimension of our societies which concerns all students.

The curricula in Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Austria, and Finland consider intercultural education to be a cross-curricular theme and indicate the curriculum subjects through which intercultural competences should be developed.

In Germany (Brandenburg), Austria and Finland, the basis for intercultural education is the necessity for young people to communicate and interact successfully not only in our globalised world, but in their own culturally diverse environment. Intercultural education should help students perceive, appreciate and critically reflect on cultural differences and related courses of action.

In **Finland**, education should help every child build their own cultural identity and develop as active player in their own culture and community while encouraging their interest in other cultures. The curriculum promotes interaction within and between cultures. Students are encouraged to learn to look at issues from other people's life situations and circumstances. Learning together across the boundaries of language, cultures, religions and beliefs creates a setting for genuine interaction and communality. Basic education should help students perceive cultures as a progression of the past, the present and the future where everyone has an agency.

In **Austria**, intercultural education qualifies young people for social interaction in a multicultural society as it fosters the competences for engaging in dialogue with people from other cultural backgrounds; it is committed to human rights and to equality of all human beings; it also deals with ethical and interreligious issues; it is an important contribution to personal development. Intercultural education concerns the whole school system and needs to be shared by all staff members. It imparts intercultural knowledge; it fosters a critical reflection of one's own use of language; it conveys a dynamic concept of identities and questions stereotyping. It makes a contribution against racism.

In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), intercultural education is seen as contributing to achieving school integration and social cohesion. It is based on the principle of respect for language and cultural diversity. It promotes inclusive spaces based on equality and the need to share common values, which encourage cohesion in society.

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, the curriculum for 'social and civic values' (primary education) and 'culture and ethics' (secondary education) includes intercultural education. In addition, each school is required to develop a 'Coexistence Project' for which education authorities provide schools with a number of teaching resources and materials. This project should foster intercultural education in the school, and beyond in the community.

In France, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England), intercultural education is taught through specific subjects or curricular areas, citizenship education in particular.

In **France**, intercultural education is mainly addressed in two of the five domains of the Common Foundation of Knowledge, Competences and Culture: 'personal and citizenship education' and 'representation of the world and human activity'. Through these specific curricular areas, students are expected to learn how to express their feelings and opinions as well as respect others'; they are also encouraged to reflect on themselves and others and be introduced to different beliefs and ways of thinking.

In **the United Kingdom (England)**, the statutory National Curriculum programme of study for citizenship education (Key Stage 4, ages 14-16) states that all students should be taught about 'diverse national, regional, religious and ethnic identities in the United Kingdom and the need for mutual respect and understanding'.

Finally, in Portugal, intercultural education is mainly promoted through specific initiatives or actions taken in the wider context of migration policies, but developed in close cooperation with the Ministry of Education. However, since 2018/19, intercultural education has become part of the curriculum of citizenship and development.

In **Portugal**, the 'Intercultural School Kit', prepared by the High Commission for Migration in cooperation with other partners, aims to provide schools and education staff, families and children, with a range of materials on intercultural issues – toolkits, books, leaflets, posters, games. As part of the national education strategy for citizenship, the subject Citizenship and Development has been taught in 235 public and private schools in the school year 2017/18. From the school year 2018/19 this subject is to be taught in every school. It addresses topics such as interculturality and human rights.

Beyond the formal curriculum, extra-curricular activities also have a role to play in promoting intercultural education in schools. Top-level education authorities in Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Italy highlight the role of these activities in providing authentic learning situations leading to the acquisition of intercultural competences. Cooperation with partners outside the school can help create these learning opportunities. In Slovenia, extra-curricular activities are part of the extended school programme. Some of these activities are intended to foster intercultural education, particularly with a view to improving the integration of migrant students.

Teacher education and training

Across Europe, higher education institutions providing initial teacher education (ITE) enjoy a high degree of autonomy when designing their courses. However, in the vast majority of countries, top-level education authorities have developed teacher competence frameworks defining the areas of competence or the specific competences that teachers should have. The main use of these frameworks is to define the competences a candidate teacher should have mastered by the end of ITE. It is less commonly used in the context of continuing professional development (CPD). It should be stressed that the level of detail in these frameworks varies a great deal between education systems. Some of them, for example, list only very broad and generic competence areas while others provide more detail on the specific skills, knowledge and/or attitudes required (European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2018).

As Figure I.4.3 in Part I of this report indicates, in all ten education systems, except in Finland and Sweden, the teacher competence framework for initial teacher education includes competences related to intercultural education such as teaching diverse, multicultural classrooms and/or addresses general issues of anti-discrimination and implicit bias towards culturally and linguistically diverse students. In Finland, such a framework does not exist while in Sweden, the competences identified are very generic. They concern for instance the need for teachers to understand different people and cultures and to accept and respect diversity in all areas of life.

In the other countries, the competences defined by the framework are more directly related to intercultural issues which are often quite broad, but can also target very specific topics. In Germany and Austria, for example, they focus very much on 'language' issues; in France, they concern primarily anti-discrimination issues.

In **Italy**, teachers should learn to increase their awareness of different cultures and acquire the skills enabling them to understand pupils' diverse cultural backgrounds. Intercultural education, as a teaching approach should be promoted during ITE.

CPD courses for teachers on intercultural education are organised and supported by education systems in all education systems, except in the United Kingdom (England) (see also Figure I.4.4). These courses are, however, optional. Beyond individual training courses, specific policy measures in Portugal and Finland with regard to CPD are worth highlighting.

In **Portugal**, in 2006, the High Commission for Migration established a network of 20 trainers. These trainers are available to schools wishing to organise training sessions on intercultural issues. These training sessions last for four to six hours.

In **Finland**, the State provides funding for CPD in 2018 focusing on cultural diversity. As a result, a wealth of CPD courses on intercultural competence, language awareness, and promoting the integration of migrants is available to teachers. In addition, the Ministry of Education has provided a special subsidy for the organisation of courses specifically targeting the integration of asylum seekers and migrants.

Ultimately, the quality of (initial and on-going) teacher education depends very much on the trainers leading the courses and on how these courses are designed. In the area of intercultural education, specific challenges exist. Researchers have highlighted the tension between the particular demands of intercultural education and what some scholars call the 'performative framework of teacher education' (Lanas, 2014). This type of framework tends to confine teachers to fixed professional roles and therefore lacks the 'space to produce knowledge that is open by nature'; it also sees knowledge as emotion-free (Lanas, 2014, p. 174). And yet, intercultural education needs teachers who are able to question some fixed truths, are open to change, able to confront emotionally difficult issues and know how to deal with them. Therefore, in order to be effective, training courses have to reduce this tension, and allow teachers to develop the specific skills and attitudes they need to teach intercultural education.

Summary

This summary provides an overview of the main findings of this chapter and highlights the education systems with the most comprehensive policies in each thematic area: teaching the language of instruction, home language teaching and intercultural education (see Figure II.2.3).

Proficiency in the language of instruction opens the door to learning opportunities at school and beyond, and it is a condition for full integration into society in the host country. The analysis shows that nearly all top-level education authorities issue regulations/recommendations to support teachers in assessing newly arrived migrant students' skills in the language of instruction. The exception is Slovenia, although this country has recently introduced some regulations for students at upper secondary level.

Two education systems (Austria and the United Kingdom – England) have introduced quite comprehensive and ambitious policies in this area: testing German skills of all students when they enter the school system (Austria), and regular monitoring of the proficiency in English of all students recorded as having English as an additional language (United Kingdom – England) (although this will no longer be a requirement from the 2018/19 school year).

With the exception of France and the United Kingdom (England), all top-level education authorities have developed a curriculum for teaching the language of instruction as a second language. In Finland, it is available to students whose home language differs from Swedish and Finnish and who are in need of such teaching; while in Sweden, this curriculum is available to a wider group of students, but it is also provided on a needs basis. In both countries, those students can study this

curriculum throughout their school education. They get a certificate in it at the end of their schooling, as for any other subject.

In the curricula of all ten education systems, the transversal nature of the language of instruction is acknowledged. Language awareness is a transversal competence across the whole curriculum in Germany (Brandenburg), Austria and Finland. It can be found as a cross-cutting theme in all language subjects in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Slovenia, and in the curriculum for the language of instruction in France, Portugal, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England).

These results above show that **Germany (Brandenburg)**, **Austria**, **Finland** and **Sweden** have developed several policy measures with regard to the language of instruction, which tend to respond more specifically to the needs of migrants students (see Figure II.2.3):

- a specific curriculum for teaching the language of instruction as a second language available to students whose home language differs from Swedish and Finnish (in Finland) and to a broader group of students (in Sweden), and who, in both cases, are in need of such teaching. This curriculum can be studied throughout their school education.
- systematic initial assessment of the language of instruction; and
- the transversal nature of the language of instruction with focus on language awareness (Germany – Brandenburg, Austria and Finland).

All education systems, except France, Portugal and the United Kingdom (England) have top-level education policies on the provision of home language teaching. The analysis shows that in nearly all these educational systems, its purpose is mainly to help migrant students preserve their home language and culture and improve their literacy. Finland stands out as it is the only country where home language teaching takes place in an educational context where bilingualism as well as plurilingualism is encouraged for all learners.

Top-level education authorities in only three countries have developed a curriculum for home languages (Austria, Finland and Sweden). With respect to assessment, only schools in Sweden are required to follow a comprehensive procedure that includes the assessment of migrant students' skills in their home language(s).

In practice, home language teachers come from abroad and so have received their teacher education in their home country (Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Italy). Elsewhere (Germany – Brandenburg, Austria, Slovenia, Sweden and Finland), home language teachers have either come from abroad or have been born and trained in the country in which they teach. In all but one of these five education systems, the supply of home language teachers is organised by the host country's public authorities at local level (Sweden and Finland) or at *Land* level in Germany (Brandenburg) and Austria. In Slovenia, schools can apply for public funds in order to provide home language lessons. These lessons are then organised by different actors with the support of schools.

With regard to the above policy area, three countries stand out (see Figure II.2.3): **Austria**, **Finland** and **Sweden**. In all three of them, top-level education authorities have developed a curriculum for the teaching of home languages; and public authorities supply home language teachers, some of which are educated and trained in the country where they teach. In addition to this, in Sweden, the initial assessment procedure includes the assessment of students' home language; in Finland, home language teaching is fully integrated in a comprehensive education policy which promoted bi- and plurilingualism for all.

Intercultural education is part of the national curriculum in all education systems except Portugal, where it is promoted through a number of initiatives and projects across the country. From 2018/19 though, it becomes part of the national curriculum. In Italy and Sweden, it is a principle underpinning the whole curriculum.

In Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluna), Austria and Finland, intercultural education is taught as a cross-curricular theme, and mention is made of the specific subjects that should address it. Finally, in France, Slovenia and the United Kingdom (England), intercultural education is taught through specific subjects, citizenship education in particular.

The teacher competence framework for initial teacher education includes competences related to intercultural education in all education systems, with the exception of Finland (which does not have a competence framework) and Sweden. The competences mentioned are usually quite broad, but some focus on specific topics such as discrimination issues. In all education systems, except in the United Kingdom (England), CPD courses are organised, or supported by top-level authorities. They cover many different aspects of intercultural education. In 2018, Finland dedicated specific funds for CPD focusing on cultural diversity. Teachers are not obliged to take these courses in any of the nine education systems.

The results above show that all ten education systems have included intercultural education in their education systems. However, it seems to occupy a stronger position in **Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Austria and Finland** (see Figure II.2.3), as in these education systems it is taught as cross-curricular theme across the whole curriculum and is promoted either in the competence framework for ITE or through CPD.

Figure II.2.3: Policies related to making room for diversity in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18

Education systems with:	Teaching the language of instruction	Home language teaching	Intercultural education
comprehensive policies	DE (Brandenburg), AT, FI, SE	AT, FI, SE	DE (Brandenburg), ES (Cataluña), AT, FI
policies in certain areas	ES (Cataluña), FR, IT, PT, SI, UK-ENG	DE (Brandenburg), ES (Cataluña), IT, SI	FR, IT, PT, SE, SI, UK-ENG
no top level regulations/recommendations		FR, PT, UK-ENG	

Source: Eurydice.


II.3: TAKING A WHOLE-CHILD APPROACH TO TEACHING AND LEARNING

The aim of this chapter is to investigate whether the ten selected European education systems promote a 'whole-child approach' to integrating students from migrant backgrounds into schools. This approach takes into account students' holistic, i.e. learning as well as social and emotional needs in certain key areas (see Figure II.3.1).

It starts with a short overview of the academic literature on the importance of taking a whole-child approach in order to create an optimal state for learning. The analysis that follows examines first whether top-level regulations and recommendations address migrant students' social-emotional needs in the areas of initial assessment and learning support.

The chapter then investigates whether the education authorities promote training and support for teachers to adopt a whole-child approach. And finally, it examines the regulations and recommendations on the role of school heads and the involvement of parents and the local community in a whole-school approach to addressing migrant students' holistic needs.

Figure II.3.1: Incorporating the 'whole-child approach' in schools



Source: Eurydice.

II.3.1. Creating an optimal state for learning

There is a large body of academic research pointing to the fact that in a climate preoccupied with raising academic attainment, especially in literacy, mathematics and other core subjects, the holistic needs of learners – both those from a migrant background and those who are native-born – may not be fully recognised. According to these findings, children and young people's growth and development, including their academic development, cannot be fully realised without supporting their non-academic needs (Hamilton, 2013; Slade & Griffith, 2013; Krachman, LaRocca & Gabrieli, 2018).

The basic assumption behind this claim – which is in line with Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943) – is that students are more likely to become engaged in school, act according to school goals and values, develop social skills, contribute to the school and wider community and achieve academically when their basic physiological needs (food, water, shelter, etc.) and psychological needs (safety, belonging, esteem, etc.) are met (Slade & Griffith, 2013). In terms of education policy and practice, this implies taking a holistic – in the literature also often referred to as a 'whole-child' – approach to education. It means creating learning environments that not only promote academic knowledge and skills but also the social and emotional competences of individual students (ibid.).

Many studies confirm the benefits of such an approach. The findings consistently show that students with strong social-emotional skills have higher academic achievement (e.g. Durlak et al., 2011; Farrington et al., 2012; Basch, 2015; Gabrieli, Ansel & Krachman, 2015). Even when controlling for other factors influencing academic outcomes, such as socio-economic status, higher levels of social competences in the early years have predictive value for school completion rates (Jones, Greenberg & Crowley, 2015). Social-emotional competences also do not only matter for school success, but they are also correlated with higher employment rates and wages as well as lower rates of substance

abuse, bullying and criminal activity (e.g. Durlak et al., 2011; Moffit et al., 2011; Voight, Austin & Hanson, 2013; Jones, Greenberg & Crowley, 2015).

A whole-child approach to teaching and learning is beneficial for all students. It not only aims to ensure that each child is 'healthy, safe, engaged, supported and challenged'; it is also best-suited for promoting students' transversal competences, such as collaboration, teamwork, problem-solving or critical thinking (Slade & Griffith, 2013). Students from migrant backgrounds may particularly benefit from this approach (Hamilton, 2013). They may face a number of challenges, e.g. as a result of their migration experience; potential language, cultural and social obstacles; barriers to full participation in schools; and/or hostility encountered within the host society (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016; Trasberg & Kond, 2017; see also the Introduction of the report). These experiences may have a significant impact on students' well-being, which in turn is directly related to their educational progress (Hek, 2005).

Thus, while focusing on developing migrant students' language skills and promoting their learning in general, it is equally important to attend to their socio-emotional well-being in order to create an optimal state for learning. The aim should be to achieve the right balance between the focus placed on core curriculum subjects, on the one hand, and on promoting personal and social development as well as positive attitudes, on the other hand (Hamilton, 2013).

Some of the research on policies and practices in this area shows that there is still work to be done to achieve this balance. Schools often focus on language-related issues as well as on emotional problems; however, less attention is given to the learning needs of migrant students in other areas of the curriculum (Arnot and Pinson, 2005). Other studies criticise the focus on the trauma experiences of migrant students at the expense of a concern with their educational needs (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016). Moreover, models of 'resilience', which aim to build up students' protective, social-emotional qualities rather than concentrating on their problems, are found to be more effective (Cefai, 2008).

In a UK study of local education authorities' policies and practices with regard to the education of migrant students, Arnot and Pinson (2005) identified a holistic model as one which recognises the complexity of migrant students' learning, social and emotional needs. Such a holistic model uses targeted policies to address any educational disadvantage faced by migrant students. These might include differentiated teaching and individualised support which takes account of students' social-emotional well-being. Support systems are established to meet all aspects of the various needs.

In addition, a 'whole-school approach' has been found to be a significant factor for addressing migrant students' holistic needs. This includes a commitment from school heads to provide comprehensive support to facilitate the integration of students from migrant backgrounds in schools, as well as the involvement of the students' parents or caregivers and other relevant actors in the local community (Taylor & Sidhu, 2012). By adopting this comprehensive approach, schools can increase engagement with the school community and are more likely to reach sustainable improvements.

School settings that promote a whole-child, whole-school approach, i.e. where the needs of all stakeholders are considered and provided for, are most likely to be successful in integrating migrant students into schools (Hamilton, 2013). In order to achieve this, careful planning is required to ensure that these principles are at the heart of education policies and practices. In other words, in order to be effective and sustainable the changes must be comprehensive and systemic (Slade & Griffith, 2013).

II.3.2. Addressing migrant students' holistic needs

Initial assessment

One of the key instruments for beginning to understand students' different learning needs is assessment (see also Figures I.2.5 and I.2.6, Figure I.3.8 and Section II.2.1 on Initial assessment in the language of instruction). For students from migrant backgrounds and in particular the ones who have recently arrived in the host country and are entering the education system, an early mapping of their knowledge and skills is a particularly important pedagogical tool. It enables schools to help these students develop their current potential and therefore enhance their educational opportunities (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016). Moreover, a careful, continuous assessment of individual students' progress and development needs helps ensure the adequacy of pedagogical responses (Popov & Stuesson, 2015).

The prevailing focus on core subjects and basic skills in national and international tests has led to a tendency for schools to over-emphasise these knowledge and skill dimensions in their instruction as opposed to addressing students' holistic needs. For migrant students' initial and continuous assessment to be comprehensive and holistic, it would need to address a variety of subjects as well as social-emotional aspects – if necessary and possible with the help of mother-tongue teachers (Krachman, LaRocca & Gabrieli, 2018).

Among the ten education systems, there are four (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Portugal, Sweden and Finland) that take into account academic as well as non-academic issues in their top-level regulations/recommendations on the initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students. Sweden is moreover the only country with mandatory initial assessment procedures:

In **Sweden**, initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students' knowledge and skills is mandatory in compulsory education since 2016. To this end, the Swedish National Agency for Education provides mapping material covering three aspects: 1) the students' language and experience, interests and expectations, according to the student's and their parents' or guardians' perception and description; attention is also explicitly paid to emotional issues and problems, such as post-traumatic stress syndrome; 2) the students' knowledge in the areas of literacy and numeracy; and 3) the students' knowledge in 15 of the subjects in compulsory education.

In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Portugal and Finland, there are no strict procedures for the initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students; however, official documents require that non-academic issues are taken into account to some extent:

For example, when students from migrant backgrounds enter the **Portuguese** education system, an initial interview should be conducted to evaluate verbal and non-verbal aspects (e.g. facial expressions or body language). This initial assessment should also be based on informal observations of student behaviour in school (in the classroom, the playground and cafeteria) in interaction with the teachers and peers. Additionally, a sociolinguistic assessment should be carried out based on parents' or guardians' responses to a form they need to fill out. It gathers a range of information including students' previous learning trajectories, learning difficulties, study habits, etc.

In **Finland**, initial assessment is addressed only in a very general way. The practical procedure for this assessment is decided at local level. Regarding social-emotional aspects, migrant students who are in primary and compulsory secondary education are given the necessary support that will allow them to achieve their learning potential. In the examination and planning of the support, the results of any other assessments and any previously provided support is taken into account. On this basis, a learning plan may be formulated, which may be part of the students' cultural integration plan. At general upper secondary level, an individual student welfare plan is implemented in cooperation with the students, i.e. taking into account the students' wishes and opinions on measures and solutions that concern his or her welfare.

In France, both language skills as well as competences in other core subject areas such as mathematics are required as part of the initial assessment, but not non-academic aspects.

In Germany (Brandenburg), Italy and Austria, official documents stipulate that the initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students' should be based on their competences in the language of instruction. Students' knowledge in other subject areas or their social-emotional well-being are not addressed. In the United Kingdom (England), competency in English as an additional language was the only area assessed in 2017/18; however, since the start of the 2018/19 school year this assessment is no longer a requirement.

Finally – and as already mentioned in Chapter II.2 – official documents in Slovenia do not include any specifications regarding the initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students entering the education system. In order to place the students in an appropriate school grade, education providers consider any available documentation as well as the age of the children, and they may assess students' prior knowledge and skills as they see fit. But since the school year 2018/19, upper secondary candidates under international protection who cannot provide proof of educational qualifications undergo an initial assessment in the language of instruction.

Regarding continuous assessment, apart from any general support for student assessment, the top-level authorities in all ten education systems provide specific support (such as guidelines or assessment materials) for assessing migrant students. However, the main focus everywhere is on support for assessing language skills (see also Section II.2.1 on Initial assessment in the language of instruction). Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) is the only education system, where, in addition to the focus on language skills, other social aspects of integration are mentioned in official documents on continuous assessment:

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, guidelines as well as related CPD activities and materials are provided to teachers for the continuous assessment of migrant students' skills in the language of instruction. In addition, support is given to teachers for the continuous assessment of migrant students by counselling teams specialising in language, interculturality and social cohesion (ELICs). These teams support teachers and schools in matters related to student diversity as well as communication and interaction with students' families.

Learning support

Once migrant students have been assessed, schools are responsible for providing learning and support to meet the needs identified. In ensuring migrant students' academic progress, schools need to find the right balance between providing stimulating and challenging learning content and providing the support students need to steadily progress and develop their knowledge and skills (Nilsson and Axelsson, 2013).

Previous research results show that in terms of learning content, preparatory classes typically provide intensive language and literacy learning and support. But where there is a too narrow focus on language teaching, students are not challenged enough and they only have a very limited or no access to the mainstream curriculum (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016; see also Figure I.3.1).

Nonetheless, migrant students who are directly and fully integrated into mainstream classes may also face challenges. In this situation too, a narrow focus on language difficulties may lead to a loss of valuable time with respect to the learning of other curriculum content (ibid.). Moreover, this approach can become especially problematic in situations in which migrant students experience insufficient support due to subject teachers' limited knowledge of the needs of second language learners and/or because there are simply not enough additional resources to support newcomers, who do not speak the language of instruction well, in mainstream classes (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016). A lack of structures for pedagogical and social support in the mainstream system risks, in turn, leaving students to their own devices, and it can feed into a so-called 'deficit-paradigm' that places emphasis on the problems of migrant students and makes them responsible for not succeeding in school (Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013).

In fact, in their top-level regulations/recommendations all ten education systems' indicate that learning support should continue to be provided to students from migrant backgrounds once they are fully integrated into mainstream education. However, approaches to this differ in that in some education systems the support available does not target migrant students specifically but is available to all students, and in only two education systems does this specific support also cover non-academic needs.

Across all ten systems, learning support for students with additional learning needs focusses in particular on differentiated and/or individualised teaching and learning methods. In addition, official documents in five education systems (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Portugal and Slovenia) highlight learning support measures specifically targeting students from migrant backgrounds. However, aspects of learning that go beyond the cognitive are only explicitly made in the official documents in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and implicitly in Portugal:

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, official documents specify that migrant students can receive additional learning support measures, if needed, including individualised language support, a curriculum adapted to their particular learning needs (with specific materials and assessment tools) and social-emotional support. The process to determine the measures to be applied comprises three steps: planning (based on prior knowledge, skills and learning needs), accompaniment (through provision of the necessary support and motivation) and assessment of achievement based on established learning objectives.

In **Portugal**, official documents promote group-based learning support strategies for all students with learning difficulties. Students from migrant backgrounds follow the Portuguese as a non-native language curriculum within the context of an individual work plan and additional language classes. Moreover, school clusters with large migrant student populations provide learning support measures that are supported through the Priority Intervention Educational Areas programme (TEIP) and the National Programme for the Promotion of School Success (PNPSE). The learning support measures are diverse, according to each school's needs, but they often include support from multidisciplinary teams comprising psychologists, social workers, intercultural mediators and other specialised staff.

In Italy and Slovenia, the learning support measures advocated focus mainly on academic aspects; however, they also include some form of social support provided by peers, a mentor or teaching assistants.

Official documents in both **Italy** and **Slovenia** highlight the importance of peer education experiences – in Italy, based on the help of second generation students (with foreign-born parent(s)) as tutors and guides for the newly arrived ones – as well as intergenerational support and mentorship.

Finally, in Germany (Brandenburg), Austria, Finland, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England), the learning support measures advocated, which also focus on differentiated and/or individualised approaches, do not target migrant students in particular, but rather all students in need of academic learning support.

In addition to the learning support provided in the classroom, extra-curricular support can be a helpful measure in ensuring the progress of migrant students' learning and development (Nilsson & Bunar, 2016). Of the ten education systems, top-level education authorities in only five systems (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Slovenia and Sweden) provide any form of guidance on this matter. In all of them, it is recommended that extra-curricular activities are used to promote the integration of students from migrant backgrounds. However, the social dimension of extra-curricular activities is only highlighted in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy and Sweden.

In **Spain**, state-level official documents encourage the use of extra-curricular activities as an important element to promote the integration of migrant students even though schools are generally autonomous in this area. Moreover, the 'Local educational plans' (*Plans Educatius d'Entorn*) in the **Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña** aim to ensure that schools and local authorities work together to promote social cohesion, co-existence and academic success within the extra-curricular context. The most disadvantaged

populations (including many students from migrant backgrounds) are targeted in particular and especially through the participation of students, their families and the local community.

In **Italy**, official guidelines promote extra-curricular activities on languages and learning more generally for students from migrant backgrounds. This includes tutoring and mentoring activities, learning support and counselling, sports activities as well as actions involving students' families.

Official documents in **Sweden** highlight the importance of extra-curricular activities as a tool for language development and the integration of migrant students through interaction with peers.

In Slovenia, emphasis is put on after-school classes for homework support and remedial classes.

Finally, in Germany (Brandenburg), Austria, Portugal, Finland and the United Kingdom (England), official documents do not address the provision of extra-curricular activities for students from migrant backgrounds; in other words, schools are fully autonomous with regard to this issue.

Social-emotional well-being

In promoting a whole-child approach to the school integration of students from migrant backgrounds, it is as important to support the development of students' social and emotional skills as it is to develop their language skills and learning more generally. Social and emotional skills can improve children and young people's ability to manage feelings and friendships, solve problems and cope with difficulties. They are essential life skills that support well-being and positive mental health. Children and young people who have developed social and emotional competences find it easier to manage themselves, relate to others, resolve conflict, and feel positive about themselves and the world around them.

Teaching social and emotional competences can strengthen migrant students' resilience and thus have a positive impact on their mental health and well-being, pro-social behaviour and academic outcomes (Durlak et al., 2011; Roffey, 2016). In order to support these students' social-emotional well-being and address any potential problems, psycho-social support measures, such as counselling or therapeutic services, can be provided in schools (Trasberg & Kond, 2017).

To support migrant students' development of social and emotional competences and help to prevent any psycho-social problems, top-level education authorities in seven of the ten education systems advocate that these matters are addressed in schools through the curriculum. The three exceptions are Germany (Brandenburg), Italy and Sweden.

In the seven education systems addressing this issue, the relevant official documents target the whole student population, including migrant students. In terms of the teaching approach, social and emotional competences are fostered in the most comprehensive way in Finland where it is treated as a transversal competence to be taught across the whole curriculum of both primary and compulsory secondary education:

In **Finland**, social and emotional competences are amongst the general objectives and cross-curricular topics for all students, including migrant students. During their years in basic education, students are given opportunities to assume responsibility for their own and shared work and actions. They develop their emotional and social skills by learning to appreciate the importance of human relationships and caring for others. They also learn personal skills including self-regulation, time management, recognition of key symbols related to safety and privacy and the setting personal boundaries.

Developing students' social and emotional competences is also a general objective in both, Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Slovenia. Moreover, these competences are integrated into the curricula of both education systems through certain subjects:

State-level education law in **Spain** entrusts the education authorities of the Autonomous Communities with the development of the necessary means for all students to reach the maximum personal, intellectual, social and emotional development. Consequently,

Catalan education law states that it is among its principles to develop 'the integral training of the intellectual, ethical, physical, emotional and social capacities of all students to allow them to fully develop their personality'. The development of students' emotional and social competences is included in the curricula of both primary and compulsory secondary education, in particular in the subject areas of values education, language, arts and physical education. The main learning objectives are: helping students' recognise their emotions and feelings and develop their thinking and reasoning skills so as to guide their ethical attitudes; helping students develop respectful relationships with others and resolve conflict through dialogue.

In **Slovenia** too, one of the goals of basic school education is to encourage a well-coordinated approach to the cognitive, emotional and social development of students. Moreover, social and emotional competences are developed through certain subjects. For example, at primary level through the subject 'Learning about the environment' and 'Society', students learn to express themselves, and to develop cognitive, emotional and social skills, including logical and critical thinking, effective problem solving strategies, etc.; and at secondary level through the subject 'Citizenship education and ethics', they learn about the individual as a social being, and an individual's role and responsibilities within different communities, how to solve social and ethical dilemmas, etc.

In France, Austria, Portugal and the United Kingdom (England), the development of students' social and emotional competences remains a general objective of education, and schools must find suitable means of achieving this.

For example in **France**, at the start of the 2016/17 school year, a health education framework applying to all school grades was introduced which covers three main dimensions: the development of psycho-social skills as part of the common set of knowledge and skills, the prevention of risks, such as addictive behavior, and the promotion of good health and well-being. The practical skills to be developed by students include decision-making; thinking critically; being self-aware as well as empathetic towards others; showing kindness; managing stress and emotions; and solving problems without aggression or violence, but rather by using means of expression, communication and discussion.

In addition to the general measures taken by some of the education systems to encourage all students, including those from migrant backgrounds, to develop social and emotional skills, there may also be a need to provide therapeutic psycho-social support services for some students (see also Figure I.3.13). Four of the ten education systems investigated (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Austria, Finland and Sweden) have developed such services which are open to all students in need, but they draw particular attention to the specific needs of students from migrant backgrounds. According to top-level regulations/recommendations in these four education systems, schools must consider, amongst other things, any psycho-social needs that may result from the migration process, including possible traumatic experiences; and they must ensure access to medical, psychological and psycho-social services.

Specialised staff such as school counsellors, psychologists, social workers, etc. are tasked in all four education systems with evaluating migrant students' social and emotional needs to promote their overall well-being and to provide the needed psycho-social support:

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, psycho-social support is provided by counselling teams in language development, interculturality and social cohesion (ELICs) and the counselling and psycho-pedagogical guidance teams (EAPS) that work in close collaboration with schools.

Similarly, in **Austria** mobile intercultural teams (MITs) work under the responsibility of the Federal Ministry of Education alongside school psychologists, schools, teachers, parents and students to support preventive measures, networking and counselling. Moreover, in the 2017/18 school year, 85 extra school social workers have been allotted to compulsory schools to respond to their needs. Together with the schools' administration, these professionals develop school-specific psycho-social support measures.

In addition to these human resources, top-level education authorities in Austria and Finland advocate that specific material is to be used in the context of psycho-social support to migrant students:

In **Austria**, an internet platform for psycho-social counsellors has been created. It provides a range of internet links as well as information and materials relating to the psycho-social support needs of asylum seeking children and young people. Two brochures have also been produced by top-level education authorities, which indicate all the psycho-social support programmes on offer that are particularly relevant for this student population.

Likewise, the **Finnish** National Agency for Education has developed support material targeting asylum seeker students, which focusses on student welfare and ways to support students' daily life and learning.

In Slovenia and Portugal, psycho-social support does not target migrant students specifically but is available to all students who may require it.

In **Slovenia**, all schools have a counselling service employing professional counsellors (psychologists, social workers, social pedagogues, etc.). The school counsellors are responsible for providing support to all students (including migrant students), teachers, parents and the school management with regard to a variety of issues, including school life and duties, school culture, overall climate and order, the physical, personal and social development of students, training and vocational guidance (transition).

Similarly, in **Portugal**, all school clusters have school psychologists who are able to intervene and support students with regard to psycho-social issues. Moreover, school clusters involved in the Priority Intervention Educational Areas programme (TEIP) develop a Multiannual Improvement Plan which follows the Ministry of Education's Guidelines. The plans should identify all students at risk of failure or leaving school early (including those from migrant backgrounds) and local (preferably preventive) responses should be made. Help is provided by multidisciplinary teams consisting of psychologists, social workers, intercultural mediators and other specialised staff.

In France, Italy and the United Kingdom (England), official documents do not address the issue of psycho-social support for migrant students; however, some references are made to the psycho-social support that should be given to unaccompanied minors.

Finally, in Germany there are no top-level recommendations or requirements for providing psycho-social support to students (from migrant backgrounds), but there is some evidence of practice. According to the 2016 'Report of the Standing Conference on the integration of young refugees through education', school psychological and/or social and youth welfare support services have significantly expanded in recent years as a result of the influx of refugees and the need to provide therapeutic support for those children and young people who have been traumatised through civil war and flight.

II.3.3. Supporting teachers in adopting a whole-child approach

Having examined the different kinds of policies and measures that contribute to meeting the holistic, i.e. academic as well as social and emotional needs of students from migrant backgrounds, the question that emerges is how top-level education authorities support teachers in implementing these. This section looks at how teachers are trained for the task and whether teaching assistants are available to help them.

Previous research results from different European countries highlight that teachers feel unprepared and insecure when confronted in the same classroom with students from different backgrounds and with a variety of different home languages (e.g. Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013; Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014; European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015; Trasberg & Kond, 2017). The increased demands on teachers' time, in a performance-driven culture, may make the task of providing individualised support too demanding for some teachers, especially when they have large numbers of migrant students in need of help. In these circumstances, there is a risk that migrant students will be perceived as a burden (Hamilton, 2013). Where newly arrived migrant students' needs for extra help go beyond the existing capacities for support, the situation can ultimately lead to student frustration and, in the worst cases, to learners giving up and dropping out of school (Nilsson & Axelsson, 2013).

With a view to improving teachers' effectiveness in attending to the different needs of learners, nine of the ten education systems have developed an initial teacher education (ITE) competence framework (see also Figure I.4.3). Finland is the only country without such a framework. In nearly all other education systems, the competence frameworks apply to all school teachers and include a

competence related to teachers developing their capacity to understand and attend to (migrant) students' different learning needs – except in France, where the focus is on teachers of modern languages and their skills related to teaching French as a foreign or second language.

In eight education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia and the United Kingdom –England), the ITE competence frameworks include a specific focus on improving teachers' skills related to teaching migrant students. But whereas the competence frameworks in Germany, Spain, Italy, Austria and the United Kingdom (England) make rather general reference to the need for teachers to be familiar with the intercultural dimension and the ability to teach in diverse and multi-cultural as well as linguistically diverse classrooms (see also Section II.2.3 on Teacher education and training), the ones in Portugal and Slovenia highlight specific teacher competences that also take into account migrant students' more holistic needs:

In **Portugal**, the skills highlighted in the 'Pre-primary, basic and secondary education teachers' general professional performance profile' emphasise teachers' role in creating an inclusive school environment, contributing to the quality of integration within the educational process and ensuring the well-being of students as well as the development of every aspect of their individual and cultural identity. Teachers are also expected to identify and respect the cultural and personal differences of individual students (and other members of the educational community), while valuing different knowledge and cultures, and combating exclusion and discrimination. In terms of teaching and learning, teachers should learn to provide different pedagogical strategies that facilitate student success and achievement within the socio-cultural framework of diversity and taking into account aspects related to students' personal, cultural and social contexts and lives.

In **Slovenia**, the criteria for the accreditation of teacher education programmes make reference to developing teachers' competences in implementing effective individualised and differentiated learning tasks, identifying students with additional learning needs and establishing cooperation between educational staff to respond to these needs. Other competences mentioned include fostering a safe and stimulating learning environment for students that makes them feel accepted and appreciated despite their differences, and encouraging students to cultivate positive attitudes by understanding and respecting social, cultural, language and religious origins as well as other personal circumstances.

Finally in Sweden, the main focus of the ITE competence frameworks is on developing teachers' capacity to understand the needs of all students, including those from migrant backgrounds, and to use and evaluate appropriate teaching methods as well encourage and support all students in reaching the defined educational goals.

Top-level education authorities are also able to help teachers' improve their ability to respond to the various needs of students from migrant backgrounds through continuing professional development (CPD) activities (see also Figure I.4.4). Eight education systems (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Austria, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden) provide CPD activities in this area. Six of them (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, Italy, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden) also provide CPD activities that aim to raise teachers' awareness of migrant students' social-emotional as well as academic needs.

In both **Germany (Brandenburg)** and **Finland**, the CPD activities are intended for all teachers. In addition to issues related to social and cultural diversity, they focus on topics such as learning disadvantages and pedagogical support opportunities as well as on dealing with migrant students who may have experienced trauma.

Similarly, the CPD activities organised or supported by the top-level education authorities in **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)** focus on diversity, inclusion, language competences as well as on socio-linguistic support in the reception process and in mainstream classrooms, i.e. taking into account personal, affective and social elements that influence the process of acquiring and learning languages in multilingual contexts.

In **Italy**, the National plan for CPD activities 2016-2019 aims to strengthen teachers' ability to encourage religious pluralism, respect for all and empowerment. The CPD activities proposed focus, amongst others things, on relational aspects, such as increasing the effectiveness of relations between schools and migrant families as well as relations between peers.

In both **Slovenia** and **Sweden**, apart from teachers' general skills to ensure that newly arrived migrant students' succeed at school, the CPD activities organised or supported by top-level education authorities address teachers' ability to reflect on their own attitudes and approaches to migrant students' development and learning. In **Slovenia**, an EU-supported project on social, emotional and intercultural learning for teachers and students aims to foster inclusion and develop more tolerant and non-discriminatory learning environments for all students. In **Sweden**, one of the CPD activities seeks to improve teachers' skills in addressing the effects of any traumatic experiences that may affect student learning.

The CPD activities promoted by the top-level education authorities in France and Austria have, however, a more narrow focus on languages, including the assessment of language competences and teaching in the language of instruction as a second language. In Portugal, the main focus is on intercultural education (see also Section II.2.3 on Teacher education and training).

Most of the CPD activities mentioned above are available to all teachers and are optional – except in Italy where participation is mandatory, and in France where it is a requirement for all teachers working in preparatory classes.

Finally, in the United Kingdom (England), there are no CPD activities specifically organised or supported by top-level education authorities to develop teachers' competences in meeting the specific learning needs of students from migrant backgrounds.

In addition to teacher education and training, another good source of support for teachers in addressing the needs of migrant students in school is the availability of teaching assistants (Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014; Trasberg & Kond, 2017). Of the ten education systems, teaching assistants are generally only deployed in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña). These staff contribute to ensuring not only the academic progress of migrant students but also their overall feeling of well-being in school:

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, two kinds of support teachers exist, host tutors and language and social support teachers. Both types of professionals have the same status as other teachers and they fulfil the following roles: working mainly in preparatory classes, their responsibilities include: the coordination of actions relating to the initial evaluation and the preparation of individualised education plans for newly arrived migrant students; managing preparatory classes including identifying the most appropriate teaching and learning methods; providing learning support, promoting intercultural education; working with specialists in educational services and participating in teaching team meetings as well as evaluation meetings to ensure that due attention is given to the needs of newly arrived migrant students. Language and social support teachers may be deployed as additional staff in schools with a higher percentage of migrant students than normal in order to encourage an approach that integrates language and subject learning. They help to promote the participation of students from migrant backgrounds in all school activities as well as extra-curricular activities, and support students in constructing their multiple identities.

In Slovenia, there are no top-level regulations/recommendations on teaching assistants helping teachers with the integration of migrant students in school. However, each class in basic and upper secondary education has a form teacher who is responsible for coordinating all teachers teaching their class and provides teaching support as well as general support to all students, including helping them to integrate socially.

II.3.4. Promoting a whole-school approach

Next to the training and support provided to teachers, a whole-school approach involving school heads, parents or caregivers and the local community is critical for attending to the holistic needs of students from migrant backgrounds in schools. A whole-school approach is widely recognised as essential not only for supporting students' academic achievements, but also for promoting their overall well-being (e.g. Weare, 2002; Cefai et al., 2014; Hunt et al., 2015).

School heads can play an important role in promoting a whole-school approach that is attentive to the holistic needs of students from migrant backgrounds (see also Figure I.4.8). Nine of the ten education systems investigated address the role of school heads in their top-level regulations/recommendations, or provide CPD activities and guidance materials targeting them specifically. The United Kingdom (England) is the only education system where the whole-school approach is not addressed by top level education authorities through the provision of specific CPD activities or guidance.

Sweden is the only education system where particular emphasis is put on raising school heads' awareness of social-emotional needs:

The **Swedish** National Agency for Education has collaborated with Save the Children to develop a training programme in trauma conscious care (TMO) for school heads and other staff in direct contact with newly arrived migrant students. It is based on the Children's Ombudsman's Report stating that the health of newly arrived migrant students' needs to be strengthened in order to face growing problems of mental health. For example, traumatic experiences that affect student learning need to be attended to and addressed in school. To this end, 33 training programmes were conducted in 2018 in compulsory and upper secondary schools across the country. TMO builds on the schools' mission to create a safe environment for learning and development through the support of adults and good relationships. It provides school staff with increased knowledge and insight into behaviours and approaches that can support students who have been exposed to severe stresses, including chronic stress and traumatic experiences.

The remaining education systems emphasise other aspects of the school heads' role. In both Austria and Finland, CPD activities and guidance materials are available to strengthen school heads' skills in managing cultural diversity and, in the case of Finland, also in managing multilingual schools.

In both France and Slovenia, official documents and, in the case of Slovenia, CPD activities, highlight the role of school heads in organising the schooling of migrant students, promoting inclusion and ensuring that learning support is provided. They also emphasise the responsibility of school heads' to establish relationships and cooperation between the school and migrant students' parents/families. Moreover, in Slovenia the National School for Leadership in Education organises meetings and consultations for school heads to discuss, exchange ideas and share experiences on different topics, including on facilitating the integration of migrant children.

In Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy and Portugal, official documents, CPD activities and guidance materials targeting school heads focus in particular on the language of instruction and the topic of intercultural education.

The involvement of parents and caregivers in school is as important as providing learning and other support in responding to the varied needs of students from migrant backgrounds (Trasberg & Kond, 2017; see also Figure I.3.10). Moreover, the social integration of parents has also been found to have a strong positive impact on children's academic achievement as well as their adaptation to the school system (Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014).

Top-level regulations/recommendations in all the education systems, except the United Kingdom (England), address the involvement of migrant students' parents in their children's education. The areas of involvement are the most comprehensive in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Slovenia, where it is recommended that schools and teachers collaborate with the parents not only with respect to academic support but also on psycho-social issues:

In **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña)**, the education authority provides a varied range of guides and instruments to help schools welcome the families of newly arrived migrant students. These include the reception plans to be developed by each school, the commitment letter by which families promise to support the education of their children, and the individualised education plans. Moreover, the 'Local educational plans' include activities for migrant families to help them and their children in the adaptation process. The plans also cover information on the education system and actions designed to support parents in helping their children

achieve academic success. Additionally, the Department for Education, together with the Consortium for Language Normalisation and the Department of Labour, Social Affairs and Family organise 'Workshops on Language and the Social Integration of Families in the Educational Environment'. These are intended to promote and improve the learning and the use of the Catalan language by parents of newly arrived students. They are also intended to help families to follow their children's progress and participate in the daily life of the school, as well as to strengthen coexistence and social cohesion in school. Psychosocial support is given, when the need arises, through counselling teams in language, interculturality and social cohesion (ELICs). These teams support teachers and schools in responding to student diversity and meeting any special educational needs they have. They also provide support to families. The counselling teams coordinate their actions with the local social and health services in order to offer coordinated care to students and families who need it.

In **Slovenia**, official guidelines for the integration of migrant students emphasise that schools should let parents know about their rights and duties. They should introduce parents to the Slovenian education system as well help them to understand the schools' expectations. Parents should be invited to participate in the life and work of the school, be offered the option of learning Slovenian alongside their children and be directed to the nearest institutions providing such programmes. They should also be offered different activities to build relationships (e.g. attending the introductory preparatory classes together before the school starts). Moreover, schools may help with translations, develop and provide brochures for parents, encourage family reading sessions for parents and their children, enable participation in various activities at education institutions (presentations about different professions, sessions on language, customs, traditions, dance, etc.), and hold themed meetings for children and parents at the library. The programming guidelines for the counselling service specify that school counsellors are responsible for the pedagogical, psychological and/or social counselling work. School counsellors provide information to parents about the physical, cognitive, social and emotional development of their children so they are able to recognise different behaviours. This may be a preventive measure or for intervention purposes, and if necessary counsellors provide support to parents themselves. They also organise, coordinate and run lectures and workshops for parents on various topics.

In Germany (Brandenburg), Italy, France and Austria, official documents addressing the involvement of migrant students' parents is focused mainly on academic issues, in particular on the information to be provided to them when their children enter school. In all four education systems, schools are required to inform parents about pedagogical and subject-specific objectives. They should tell them about the types of support available and also about their child's educational progress. The aim is to encourage parents to have a positive attitude towards the education of their children in order to establish a partnership between schools and parents.

To facilitate this process, top-level education authorities in all four education systems provide material, in the form of printed or online brochures to parents, which are made available in various languages, and they recommend that schools work in cooperation with interpreters and/or cultural mediators. Moreover, official documents of the Standing Conference of the Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs in **Germany** recommend family education as a useful element for strengthening the educational competences of parents and for supporting the whole family with regard to their children's education.

In both **France** and **Italy**, practical training courses are provided to support the parents of migrant students in developing their skills in the language of the host country and improving their knowledge of the way the school works and its expectations of both students and parents.

Finally in Portugal, Finland and Sweden, official documents make more general reference to this topic. In these education systems, it is recommended that schools inform and actively involve the parents of students from migrant backgrounds in their children's education. In Portugal, the official documents target all families, including the parents of migrant students, and encourage them to participate in school governing bodies.

In addition to the importance attached to the involvement of migrant students' parents in supporting their children's learning and overall development, another topic that is consistently emphasised in the research literature is the cooperation between schools and other professionals as well as organisations outside the school, such as social and health services, NGOs, language schools, cultural societies, etc. (e.g. Reakes, 2007; Ricucci, 2008; Sinkkonen & Kyttälä, 2014; Trasberg & Kond, 2017).

Top-level regulations/recommendations in five of the ten education systems – Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy, Portugal and Slovenia – encourage schools and teachers to cooperate closely with members of the local community to promote the integration of migrant students in school. Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) is the only one of these education systems that emphasises the importance of cooperation with local organisations not only with respect to migrant students' integration into school but also to respond to their psycho-social support needs:

The need to facilitate cooperation between different elements of the education community is established in the education law of the **Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña**. As explained above, the 'Local educational plans' encourage cooperation between schools and the local community with the aim of facilitating the integration of migrant students and their parents. To this end, many different initiatives are being implemented ranging from learning support measures to intercultural activities, including intercultural conferences, awareness raising activities open to the educational community, tales workshops that reflect cultural diversity, conferences on linguistic diversity, etc. The 'Local educational plans' also have an important function with regard to the establishment of networks of professionals providing psycho-social support in the context of the initial reception of migrant students as well as encouraging coexistence and inclusion in schools more generally.

In Germany (Brandenburg), Italy, Portugal and Slovenia, official documents highlight the importance of cooperation between schools and the local community in supporting migrant student integration, including their social integration. In these four education systems schools are, for example, encouraged to cooperate with local community partners to develop language and general learning support measures as well as after-school activities (mainly sports and cultural activities) that may also involve migrant students' parents/families.

In Austria and Finland, official documents on school cooperation do not specifically target migrant students, but recommend more generally that schools should cooperate with the local community in order to enhance school quality.

Finally, in France, Sweden and the United Kingdom (England), there are no official documents encouraging schools and teachers to cooperate with the local community.

Summary

This summary provides an overview of the main findings of this chapter and highlights the education systems with the most comprehensive policies in each thematic area: addressing students' holistic needs, supporting teachers in adopting a whole-child approach, and promoting a whole-school approach to migrant students' holistic needs (see Figure II.3.2).

In addressing the holistic needs of migrant students', the findings show that in the area of initial assessment, official documents in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Portugal, Finland and Sweden promote a more holistic approach addressing not only academic skills (competences in the language of instruction as well as in other subject areas) but also social and emotional needs. In most of the remaining education systems where official documents address the initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students the focus is on students' competences in the language of instruction (Germany – Brandenburg, Italy, Austria and the United Kingdom (England – although, English as an additional language proficiency assessment ceases to be a requirement from 2018/19)). In France, however, competences in other core subject areas such as mathematics are also taken into account.

Where the continuous assessment of students from migrant backgrounds is specifically addressed in official documents, the focus is almost exclusively on students' language competences. Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) is the only education system where social and interpersonal skills are also taken into account.

In addition to the learning support provided for all students with additional learning needs (especially through differentiated and/or individualised teaching and learning), top-level education authorities in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), France, Italy, Portugal and Slovenia promote some targeted measures to support the learning and progress of students from migrant backgrounds. However, only Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Portugal address aspects of learning that go beyond the cognitive to include, for example, social and motivational needs. In Germany (Brandenburg), Austria, Finland and Sweden, the learning support measures promoted do not target migrant students in particular but are available to all students in need of academic learning support.

In the context of extra-curricular activities, learning support for students from migrant backgrounds is advocated by top-level education authorities in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), France, Italy, Slovenia and Sweden. However, only Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy and Sweden highlight the role of extra-curricular activities in the social integration of migrant students.

Migrant students' social and emotional competences are included in the national curricula of seven education systems. However, Finland is the only education system where it is treated as a transversal competence to be taught across the whole curriculum. In two education systems, social and emotional competences are to be fostered through certain subjects (Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña and Slovenia), while elsewhere developing these competences is a general objective of education and schools must find suitable means of achieving it (France, Austria, Portugal and the United Kingdom – England).

Psycho-social support as a remedial measure is addressed to some extent in the official documents of all education systems except Germany (Brandenburg). In addition to the psycho-social support to be provided to all students, top-level education authorities in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Austria, Finland and Sweden have developed policies and practical measures to ensure that psycho-social support is adapted to the needs of students from migrant backgrounds.

The results above show that a whole-child approach is taken in several of the areas under discussion by the top-level education authorities in **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Portugal, Finland and Sweden** (see Figure II.3.2). In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), social and interpersonal needs are taken into account in official documents on continuous assessment, while learning support measures as well as extra-curricular activities cover social and motivational aspects. Psycho-social support is also adapted to the needs of students from migrant backgrounds. In Portugal, official documents on initial assessment highlight the importance of evaluating not only newly arrived migrant students' academic skills but also their social and emotional well-being, and this should be followed up with learning support to meet all these needs. The necessity for initial assessment to take into account social and emotional needs is also emphasised in official documents in Finland and Sweden. Additionally, both education systems continue to promote the social-emotional well-being of students from migrant backgrounds either by promoting the teaching of social-emotional competences as a transversal competence (Finland) or by providing targeted psycho-social support (Finland and Sweden).

Training and support for teachers for implementing a whole-child approach when integrating students from migrant backgrounds is included in the ITE competence framework in seven of the nine education systems where a framework exists (Germany – Brandenburg, Spain – Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña, France, Italy, Austria, Portugal and Slovenia). Specific attention is placed on teachers' competences related to teaching migrant students. However, migrant students' more holistic needs are only addressed in the teacher competence frameworks in Portugal and Slovenia. In Sweden and the United Kingdom (England), the main focus of the ITE competence frameworks is on developing teachers' capacity to understand the needs of all students, including those from migrant backgrounds.

Top-level education authorities in Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden organise or support CPD activities that aim to raise

teachers' awareness of and competency in addressing not only academic but also the social-emotional needs of students from migrant backgrounds. Elsewhere, CPD activities have a narrower focus – on the area of languages in France and Austria, and on the area of intercultural education in Portugal.

Teaching assistants can help classroom teachers integrate migrant students within the school. However, they are used systematically only in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña). These staff contribute to promoting the holistic needs of migrant students, including their academic progress as well as their social and emotional well-being. In Slovenia, there are no top-level regulations/recommendations regarding the use of teaching assistants. However, each class in basic and upper secondary education has a form teacher who also has a responsibility to help students integrate socially in school.

The results above show overall that top-level education authorities in **Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy, Portugal, Slovenia, Finland and Sweden** promote their teachers' capacity to take a whole-child approach by emphasising this aspect either through the ITE competences framework (Portugal and Slovenia) and/or through CPD activities (see Figure II.3.2). In Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), teaching assistants are also used to help promote migrant students' academic progress and social-emotional well-being.

Nine of the ten education systems (the exception being the United Kingdom – England), address the role and responsibilities of school heads in the context of a whole-school approach to meeting the holistic needs of students from migrant backgrounds. The same nine education systems provide CPD activities for the same purpose. However, only Sweden advocates specific training for school heads to increase their awareness about students who have experienced psycho-social problems, such as severe stress or trauma.

Collaborating with students' parents or families is essential in ensuring the successful integration of migrant students and this is acknowledged in the official documents of all education systems', except in the United Kingdom (England). The areas of parental involvement are most comprehensive in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) and Slovenia, where it is recommended that schools and teachers collaborate with parents not only on education issues but also in order to address the full range of health, social and emotional needs that may impact upon student development and progress in school.

Finally, in view of supporting the holistic needs of students from migrant backgrounds, official documents in Germany (Brandenburg), Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Italy, Austria, Portugal, Slovenia and Finland encourage schools to collaborate with other professionals and local organisations (e.g. social and health services, NGOs, etc.). However, the importance of this collaboration for promoting not only the academic development and progress of migrant students but also their psycho-social support needs is addressed only in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña).

The results above show that only the top-level education authorities in **Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña), Slovenia and Sweden** promote a whole-child, whole-school approach with regard to at least one of the policies/measures under discussion (see Figure II.3.2). In Sweden, this applies to the area of school leadership, in Slovenia it applies to parental involvement and in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) it concerns both parental involvement and cooperation with local organisations.

Figure II.3.2: Policies related to taking a whole-child approach in schools, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18

Education systems with:	Addressing students' holistic needs	Supporting teachers in adopting a whole-child approach	Promoting a whole-school approach to migrant students' holistic needs
comprehensive policies	ES (Cataluña), PT, FI, SE	DE (Brandenburg), ES (Cataluña), IT, PT, SI, FI, SE	ES (Cataluña), SI, SE
policies in certain areas	DE (Brandenburg), FR, IT, AT, SI, UK-ENG	FR, AT, UK-ENG	DE (Brandenburg), FR, IT, AT, PT, FI
no top level regulations/recommendations			UK-ENG

Source: Eurydice.

Country-specific note

United Kingdom (ENG): Since 2018/19, English as an additional language proficiency assessment is no longer required.

II.4: CONCLUSION

The second part of this report has analysed the top-level policies and measures of ten education systems on matters directly related to the integration into schools of students from migrant backgrounds. These include the initial assessment of newly arrived migrant students' knowledge and skills, the teaching and learning of the language of instruction and home language(s), the development of students' academic as well as social and emotional skills, the provision of intercultural education, the support given to teachers and school heads, and the involvement of parents and the wider school community.

For analytical purposes, these aspects have been examined in relation to two overarching dimensions – linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach to meeting migrant students' needs. Although these two dimensions have been analysed separately, this does not imply that one is more important than the other or that one can be left out – they are two sides of the same coin.

A vast array of academic research literature has been presented which highlights the importance of each and every area examined. It is therefore clear that in order to address the integration of students from migrant backgrounds into schools in a comprehensive and systematic way, all areas need to be given careful attention.


It should be noted that the general context within which education systems operate certainly has a bearing on the nature of the top-level policies and measures under investigation. The contextual factors include the policy priorities of governments, the countries of origin of migrant populations, and also the particular characteristics of the education system in question such as the degree of (de-)centralisation. However, it has not been possible to take all these contextual factors into account in this analysis.

Figure II.4.1, presenting an overview of the analysis' results, shows the emphasis placed by all ten education systems on the two main dimensions – linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach. Finland and Sweden stand out as they place the greatest emphasis on both dimensions. With regard to the diversity dimension, both education systems have developed a specific curriculum for teaching the language of instruction as an additional/second language. This programme can be followed by any student throughout their school education. Both education systems have also designed a curriculum for the teaching of home languages. In Sweden, students' home languages are part of the comprehensive assessment process each newly arrived migrant student undergoes when entering the school system. In Finland, this teaching takes place within a curriculum framework that encourages plurilingualism for all learners and raises students' language awareness. Some teachers of home languages are born in Finland or Sweden, and are consequently educated and trained there. Furthermore the supply of home language teachers is organised by local level public authorities. Finally, intercultural education has a strong position in the curriculum as an overarching principle in Sweden and as a cross-curricular theme in Finland. In the latter, in 2018, specific funds have been provided to organise CPD courses on cultural diversity, including intercultural education.

Both Finland and Sweden also have very comprehensive policies and measures related to the whole-child dimension. They take a holistic approach (i.e. meeting the academic as well as the social and emotional needs of newly arrived migrant students) to initial assessment procedures and emphasise that the psycho-social support offered in schools should be targeted at the specific needs of migrant students. In Sweden, official documents recommend that additional learning support as well support for social integration should be provided through extra-curricular activities while the Finnish curriculum views the development of social and emotional competences as a transversal competence. Both Finland and Sweden's top-level education authorities organise or support CPD activities to improve

their teachers' ability to implement a whole-child approach in these areas; and in Sweden, there is also a CPD course to raise school heads' awareness of the holistic needs of migrant students.

Figure II.4.1: Emphasis of policies relating to linguistic and cultural diversity and the whole-child approach, primary, general secondary education and IVET (ISCED 1-3), 2017/18



Source: Eurydice.

Policies and measures in Germany (Brandenburg) and especially in Austria are strong on the diversity dimension; however, they do not stand out in terms of the whole-child approach.

Top-level education authorities in both education systems provide home language teaching; in Austria, they have developed a specific curriculum. In both countries, some teachers of home languages are native-born, and they are consequently educated and trained there. The supply of home language teachers is organised by each country's public authorities at the level of the *Länder*. In addition, the teaching of the language of instruction has a strong focus in both countries – language awareness is taught as

a transversal competence across the whole curriculum and students are made aware of the linguistic components of the language and how the language as a structure functions. In Austria, since 2018, all students (native-born and migrants alike) entering the school system must be assessed in German in a standardised way. Finally, intercultural education features as a cross-curricular theme in Germany (Brandenburg) and Austria.

In contrast to the situation in Germany (Brandenburg) and Austria, policies and measures relating to diversity are not distinctive in Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña); however, the education system stands out with regard to its whole-child approach. Here emphasis is put on the holistic needs of migrant students in various areas, including their initial and continuous assessment, the learning support measures provided in and outside the classroom, and the provision of targeted psycho-social support. Moreover, teachers' capacity to address not only the academic but also the social-emotional needs of students from migrant backgrounds is encouraged through CPD activities organised or supported by the top-level education authorities. Finally, in official documents, an emphasis is put on ensuring that teachers and schools cooperate with migrant students' parents as well as with local organisations in order to meet students' academic, social and emotional needs.

In terms of the comprehensiveness of the whole-child approach, Spain (Comunidad Autónoma de Cataluña) is followed by Portugal and Slovenia. While these latter education systems also do not stand out with regard to the diversity dimension, their policies and measures address migrant students' holistic needs in at least some areas. In Portugal, migrant students' social and emotional needs are considered in the area of initial assessment and in the subsequent learning support provided in mainstream classes. Moreover, migrant students' overall well-being including their sense of being accepted are elements addressed in the ITE competence framework. In Slovenia, teacher competences related to migrant students' holistic needs are encouraged both through the ITE competence framework as well as through relevant CPD activities; moreover, official documents recommend collaboration with parents to promote students' academic and social-emotional development and well-being.

France and the United Kingdom (England) have developed specific policies and measures to support the teaching of the language of instruction. For instance, in the United Kingdom (England), all teachers are expected to develop all students' spoken language, reading, writing and vocabulary as integral parts of every subject. For students with English as an additional language, teachers are expected to plan teaching opportunities to help them develop their English. In France, the national curriculum states specifically that every teacher should be a language model for all students. Furthermore, top-level education authorities have defined competence levels for the purpose of the continuous assessment of migrant students' language skills in French.

In Italy, official documents highlight the importance of peer education and support, particularly with the help of second generation students who act as guides or tutors for newly arrived migrant students. Extra-curricular activities are also encouraged as a means of supporting migrant students' learning and social integration, including through the involvement of the students' families.

GLOSSARY

I. Definitions

Asylum seekers: are persons who have submitted an application for international protection or the children of an applicant who have been included in the application.

Children and young people from migrant backgrounds: refers here to newly arrived/first generation, second generation or returning migrant children and young people. Their reasons for having migrated (e.g. economic or political) may vary, as may their legal status – they may be citizens, residents, asylum seekers, refugees, unaccompanied minors or irregular migrants. Their length of stay in the host country may be short- or long-term, and they may or may not have the right to participate in the formal education system of the host country. Migrant children and young people from within and outside of the EU are taken into account but the report excludes those from ethnic minority backgrounds who have been living in the host country for more than two generations (see also **migrant students**).

Compensatory education: refers here to programmes helping young people over compulsory school age who, for a variety of reasons, never attended school or left school early, to acquire equivalent educational attainment.

Content-based subject teacher: a teacher of any curriculum subject other than languages.

Continuing professional development (CPD): refers to in-service training undertaken throughout teachers' careers that allows them to broaden, develop and update their knowledge, skills and attitudes. It may be formal or non-formal and include both subject-based and pedagogical training. Different formats are offered such as courses, seminars, peer observation and support from teacher networks. In certain cases, CPD activities may lead to supplementary qualifications.

Differentiated teaching and assessment: (also known as differentiated learning or, within education circles, simply, differentiation) is a teaching approach that involves providing students of different abilities in the same class with different avenues of learning in terms of: acquiring content; processing, constructing, or making sense of ideas; and developing teaching materials and assessment tools/materials that enable all students within a class to learn effectively, regardless of differences in ability.

Extra-curricular activities: are activities taking place in schools or linked to schools but outside the realm of the normal curriculum and the regular class timetable. These activities are generally voluntary.

First generation migrant students: are children and young people born outside of the host country (their country of current residence) to parents also born outside the host country, who participate in the formal education system of the host country.

Formative assessment: refers to the assessment of student progress throughout a course of study. Its main aim is to identify learning needs and to adjust teaching and learning accordingly. Formative assessment is usually devised and administered by teachers, but it can also take the form of a national test.

Group-based learning support: refers here to a form of additional learning support provided to (small) groups of students in order to achieve the expected learning outcomes.

Guidance (materials): are any official documents or statements provided by top-level education authorities to support teachers and/or schools in implementing defined objectives.

Home language: is the language mostly spoken at home by migrant students. It differs from the language of instruction used in the school context. In most cases, the home language is also students' first language or mother tongue.

Impact assessment: refers to national reports, research and analyses of 'what works', which have been carried out or commissioned by official education authorities. Different types of research or analysis, including experimental studies collecting sample data from schools, other research by public agencies, universities or think tanks may also be used to assess the impact of a policy or measure.

Individualised learning support: aims to respond to the individual needs of students, in order to achieve the expected learning outcomes. It places the students at the centre of the learning process and aims to provide tailor-made solutions responding to individual needs.

Intercultural education (and activities): promotes the understanding of different people and cultures. It includes teaching that accepts and respects the normality of diversity in all areas of life. It seeks to explore, examine and challenge all forms of stereotypes and xenophobia, while promoting equal opportunity for all.

Intercultural mediator: a person who supports the integration of migrant students in school. They may also have interpreting and translation duties, e.g. in parent-teacher meetings and/or help to develop links between students, home, school and/or the local community more generally.

Initial assessment: refers here to the assessment of newly arrived migrant students' prior learning (knowledge, skills and competences) and support needs with regard to languages, learning of other subject areas and social-emotional well-being as they first enter/start school in the host country.

Initial teacher education (ITE): comprises both pre-service, general education together with professional training. The general component gives student teachers a thorough knowledge of one or more subjects as well as a broader education, while the professional training component provides them with both a theoretical and practical insight into their future profession. In addition to courses in psychology and teaching methods, it usually includes unremunerated in-school placements. Initial teacher education excludes the induction phase except in cases where professional training only takes place during this phase.

(School-based) IVET: refers here to ISCED levels 2 and/or 3 pathways that include at least part-time school-based education which may alternate with periods of practical work experience in the workplace. These programmes may be offered in schools or other educational institutions.

Language awareness: refers to a person's sensitivity to a conscious awareness of the nature of language and its role in human life (Donmall, 1985). In other words, it makes people aware that language is a formal system with its own rules and that its use varies depending on the context and purpose (e.g. apologising to a friend vs. to one's manager; convincing one's brother vs. one's representative in the local government).

Language of instruction taught as a second/additional language: refers to the teaching of the language of instruction to students for whom it is not their first/home language.

Local authorities: have responsibilities within territorial areas below regional level. They may comprise elected representatives or they may be administrative divisions of central authorities.

Migrant students (or students from migrant backgrounds): refers here to children and young people from migrant backgrounds who participate in the formal education system of the host country.

Monitoring: refers here to a process of collecting and analysing information in order to check system performance in relation to goals and standards, and to enable any necessary changes to be made. The range of data used may include, for instance, the results of school self-evaluation, external examinations or other national assessments, specially prepared performance indicators or outcomes of international evaluations (including PIRLS, TIMSS, PISA, etc.).

Newly arrived migrant students: refers here to first generation migrant children and young people who, as they enter the formal education system of the host country, may qualify for additional support measures to assist their integration into schools (e.g. preparatory classes, additional classes in the language of schooling, etc.). The timeframe for considering these children and young people as 'newly arrived migrant students' and the additional support measures provided to them vary between countries.

Preparatory classes: are separate classes or lessons for newly arrived migrant students where they are given intensive language teaching and, in some cases, an adapted curriculum for other subjects with the intention of preparing them to move quickly into mainstream classes. Students may attend preparatory classes for some lessons only (while participating in mainstream classes during the rest of the school day) or for the entire school day, usually for a limited period before being fully integrated into mainstream classes with other students. Depending on the country, the classes may also be called 'introductory', 'transition' or 'reception' classes.

Psycho-social support: refers here to a variety of services provided in schools or linked to schools aiming to support migrant students (and their families) to cope with adversity. It may address their emotional/mental, physical/health, social or other needs, and aims to build resilience in children. It may be provided in the reception phase and/or throughout a child's schooling.

Residence permit: any authorisation to stay in the host country issued by national authorities that is valid for at least 3 months. In the case of an EU Member State, a residence permit allows third country nationals to stay legally in its territory. Residence permits may be issued for educational, family, employment, asylum or other reasons but they do not necessarily include the right to work.

Responsibility of local authorities/schools: means that, according to official documents, top-level education authorities delegate the duty for making decisions on a given policy area to local authorities or schools.

Returning migrant students: are children and young people returning to their country of citizenship after having been international migrants in another country and who participate in the formal education system of their country of citizenship.

Second generation migrant students: are children and young people born in their country of current residence who have at least one foreign-born parent (first generation) and who participate in the formal education system of the host country.

Social and emotional competences: refers to a set of knowledge and skills promoting children's ability to manage feelings and friendships, solve problems and cope with difficulties. They are essential life skills that support well-being and positive mental health. Children, who have developed social and emotional competences find it easier to manage themselves, relate to others, resolve conflict, and feel positive about themselves and the world around them.

Strategy: an official policy document developed by top-level authorities in an effort to achieve an overall goal. A strategy can comprise a vision, identify objectives and goals (qualitative and quantitative), describe processes, authorities and people in charge, identify funding sources, make recommendations, etc.

Teaching assistant: support staff (or fully qualified teachers) who help classroom teachers provide support for students.

Top-level (authority, regulations/recommendations, etc.): is the highest level of authority with responsibility for education in a given country, usually located at national (state) level. However, for Belgium, Germany, Spain and the United Kingdom, the *Communautés*, *Länder*, *Comunidades Autónomas* and devolved administrations respectively are responsible for all or most areas relating to education. Therefore, these administrations are considered as the top-level authority for the areas where they hold the responsibility, while for the ones for which they share the responsibility with the national (state) level, both are considered to be top-level authorities. In the report, the policy documents (i.e. regulations, recommendations, strategies, action plans, guidance material, etc.) issued by the top-level education authorities are referred to as 'official documents'. Depending on their status, they could be mandatory or not.

Unaccompanied minors: refers here to children and young people (considered to be minors according to national regulations) who are born outside their country of current residence and who arrive in the host country unaccompanied by a responsible adult, or are left unaccompanied after they have entered the host country.

Whole-child approach: requires taking a holistic approach to education. It means creating learning environments that not only promote academic knowledge and skills but also the social and emotional competences and well-being of individual students. It aims to ensure that each child is healthy, safe, engaged, supported and challenged.

Whole-school approach: refers to a combination of policy approaches and initiatives to tackle educational disadvantage in which the entire school community (school leaders, teachers and other staff, learners, parents and families) engages in a cohesive, collective and collaborative action, in partnership with external stakeholders, professionals and services.

II. ISCED Classification

The International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED) has been developed to facilitate comparisons of education statistics and indicators across countries on the basis of uniform and internationally agreed definitions. The coverage of ISCED extends to all organised and sustained learning opportunities for children, young people and adults, including those with special educational needs, irrespective of the institutions or organisations providing them or the form in which they are delivered. The first statistical data collection based on the new classification (ISCED 2011) took place in 2014 (text and definitions adopted from UNESCO, 1997, UNESCO/OECD/Eurostat, 2013 and UNESCO/UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2011).

ISCED 0: Pre-primary education

Programmes at level 0 (pre-primary), defined as the initial stage of organised instruction, are designed primarily to introduce very young children to a school-type environment, i.e. to provide a bridge between the home and a school-based atmosphere. Upon completion of these programmes, children continue their education at level 1 (primary education).

ISCED level 0 programmes are usually school-based or otherwise institutionalised for a group of children (e.g. centre-based, community-based, home-based).

Early childhood educational development (ISCED level 010) has educational content designed for younger children (in the age range of 0 to 2 years). Pre-primary education (ISCED level 020) is designed for children aged at least 3 years.

ISCED 1: Primary education

Primary education provides learning and educational activities typically designed to provide students with fundamental skills in reading, writing and mathematics (i.e. literacy and numeracy). It establishes a sound foundation for learning, a solid understanding of core areas of knowledge and fosters personal development, thus preparing students for lower secondary education. It provides basic learning with little specialisation, if any.

This level begins between 5 and 7 years of age, is compulsory in all countries and generally lasts from four to six years.

ISCED 2: Lower secondary education

Programmes at ISCED level 2, or lower secondary education, typically build upon the fundamental teaching and learning processes which begin at ISCED level 1. Usually, the educational aim is to lay the foundation for lifelong learning and personal development that prepares students for further educational opportunities. Programmes at this level are usually organised around a more subject-oriented curriculum, introducing theoretical concepts across a broad range of subjects.

This level typically begins around the age of 11 or 12 and usually ends at age 15 or 16, often coinciding with the end of compulsory education.

ISCED 3: Upper secondary education

Programmes at ISCED level 3, or upper secondary education, are typically designed to complete secondary education in preparation for tertiary or higher education, or to provide skills relevant to employment, or both. Programmes at this level offer students more subject-based, specialist and in-depth programmes than in lower secondary education (ISCED level 2). They are more differentiated, with an increased range of options and streams available.

This level generally begins at the end of compulsory education. The entry age is typically age 15 or 16. Entry qualifications (e.g. completion of compulsory education) or other minimum requirements are usually needed. The duration of ISCED level 3 varies from two to five years.

ISCED 4: Post-secondary non-tertiary education

Post-secondary non-tertiary programmes build on secondary education to provide learning and educational activities to prepare students for entry into the labour market and/or tertiary education. It typically targets students who have completed upper secondary (ISCED level 3) but who want to improve their skills and increase the opportunities available to them. Programmes are often not significantly more advanced than those at upper secondary level as they typically serve to broaden rather than deepen knowledge, skills and competences. They are therefore pitched below the higher level of complexity characteristic of tertiary education.

ISCED 5: Short-cycle tertiary education

Programmes at ISCED level 5 are short-cycle tertiary education, and are often designed to provide participants with professional knowledge, skills and competences. Typically, they are practice-based and occupation-specific, preparing students to enter the labour market. However, these programmes may also provide a pathway to other tertiary education programmes.

Academic tertiary education programmes below the level of a Bachelor's programme or equivalent are also classified as ISCED level 5.

ISCED 6: Bachelor's or equivalent level

Programmes at ISCED level 6 are at Bachelor's or equivalent level, which are often designed to provide participants with intermediate academic and/or professional knowledge, skills and competences, leading to a first degree or equivalent qualification. Programmes at this level are typically theory-based but may include practical elements; they are informed by state of the art research and/or best professional practice. ISCED 6 programmes are traditionally offered by universities and equivalent tertiary educational institutions.

ISCED 7: Master's or equivalent level

Programmes at ISCED level 7 are at Master's or equivalent level, and are often designed to provide participants with advanced academic and/or professional knowledge, skills and competences, leading to a second degree or equivalent qualification. Programmes at this level may have a substantial research component but do not lead to the award of a doctoral qualification. Typically, programmes at this level are theory-based but may include practical components and are informed by state of the art research and/or best professional practice. They are traditionally offered by universities and other tertiary educational institutions.

ISCED 8: Doctoral or equivalent level

Programmes at ISCED level 8 are at doctoral or equivalent level, and are designed primarily to lead to an advanced research qualification. Programmes at this ISCED level are devoted to advanced study and original research and are typically offered only by research-oriented tertiary educational institutions such as universities. Doctoral programmes exist in both academic and professional fields.

For more information on the ISCED classification, see <http://uis.unesco.org/sites/default/files/documents/international-standard-classification-of-education-isced-2011-en.pdf> [accessed June 2018].

REFERENCES

- Ahad, A., Benton, M., 2018. *Mainstreaming 2.0. How Europe's Education Systems can Boost Migrant Integration*. Integration Futures Working Group. Migration Policy Institute Europe. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/EduMainstreaming2.0-FINAL.pdf> [Accessed 6 June 2018].
- Allen, K., Kern, M.L., 2017. *School Belonging in Adolescents. Theory, Research and Practise. Springer Briefs in Psychology*. [pdf] Available at: <https://link.springer.com/content/pdf/10.1007%2F978-981-10-5996-4.pdf> [Accessed 6 June 2018].
- Arnot, M., Pinson, H., 2005. *The education of asylum-seeker and refugee children: A study of LEA and school values, policies and practices*. Cambridge: Faculty of Education, University of Cambridge. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.educ.cam.ac.uk/people/staff/arnot/AsylumReportFinal.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2018].
- Axelsson, M., Magnusson, U., 2012. Flerspråkighet och kunskapsutveckling. In: K. Hyltenstam, M. Axelsson and I. Lindberg, eds. *Flerspråkighet – en forskningsöversikt*. (Vetenskapsrådets rapportserie 5: 2012.) Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, pp. 247-367.
- Bailey, A.L. et al., 2007. Further specifying the language demands of school. In: A.L. Bailey, ed. *The language demands of school: Putting academic English to the test*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, pp. 103-156.
- Basch, C.E., 2010. Healthier students are better learners: A missing link in school reforms to close the achievement gap. *Equity Matters: Research Review No. 6*. [pdf] Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED523998.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2018].
- Brunello, G., De Paola, M., 2017. *School Segregation of Immigrants and its Effects on Educational Outcomes in Europe*. EENEE Analytical Report No. 30. [pdf] Available at <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/73d66b98-f738-11e6-8a35-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> [Accessed 7 June 2018].
- Bunar, N., 2017. *Migration and Education in Sweden: Integration of Migrants in the Swedish School and Higher Education Systems*. NESET II ad hoc question No 3/2017. [pdf] Available at: <http://nesetweb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Migration-and-Education-in-Sweden.pdf> [Accessed 7 June 2018].
- Bush, B., 2011. Trends and innovative practices in multilingual education in Europe: An overview. *International Review of Education. Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 57(5-6), pp. 541-549.
- Campani, G., 2014. Intercultural curriculum in neo-nationalist Europe. *Studi sulla formazione, [S.l.]*, pp. 77-97. [Online] Available at <http://www.fupress.net/index.php/sf/article/view/15035> [Accessed 5 June 2018].
- Cefai, C. et al., 2014. Circle time for social and emotional learning in primary school. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 32(2), pp. 116-130.
- Cefai, C., 2008. *Promoting resilience in the classroom: A guide to developing pupils' emotional and cognitive skills*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Council of Europe, 2015. *The language dimension in all subjects. A handbook for curriculum development and teacher training*. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.ecml.at/coe-docs/language-dimensions-subjects-EN.pdf> [Accessed 4 June 2018].

Cummins, J., 2001. *Bilingual Children's Mother tongue: Why is it important for education?* [pdf] Available at: http://www.lavplu.eu/central/bibliografie/cummins_eng.pdf [Accessed 12 June 2018].

Cummins, J., Baker, C. and Homberger, N.H., 2001. *An Introductory Reader to the Writings of Jim Cummins. Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Cummins, J., 2009. Transformative Multiliteracies Pedagogy: School-based Strategies for Closing the Achievement Gap. *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners*, 11 (2), pp. 38-56.

Cummins, J., 2012. The intersection of cognitive and sociocultural factors in the development of reading comprehension among immigrant students. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 25(8), pp. 1973-1990.

Donmall, B.G. ed., 1985. *Language awareness*. London: CLIT.

Duarte, J., 2011. Migrants' educational success through innovation: The case of the Hamburg bilingual schools. *International Review of Education. Journal of Lifelong Learning*, 57(5-6), pp. 631-649.

Durlak, J.E. et al., 2011. The impact of enhancing students social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development*, 82(1), pp. 405-432.

Goodenow, C., 1993. Classroom belonging among early adolescent students: Relationships to motivation and achievement. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 13(1), pp. 21-43. [pdf] Available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/> [Accessed 7 June 2018].

Ellis, E.M., 2012. Language awareness and its relevance to TESOL. *University of Sydney Papers in TESOL*, 7, pp. 1-23.

European Commission, 2007. Commission staff working document 'Towards more knowledge-based policy and practice in education and training', SEC (2007)1098.

European Commission, 2008. *Green Paper - Migration & mobility: challenges and opportunities for EU education systems*. SEC(2008) 2173. COM(2008) 423 final. [Online] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/7a1f2071-3a01-4ced-ae9-dbf9310f6da3/language-en> [Accessed 5 June 2018].

European Commission. 2013. *Study on education support to newly arrived migrant children*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission, 2015. *Language teaching and learning in multilingual classrooms*. [pdf] Available at: http://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/languages/library/studies/multilingual-classroom_en.pdf [Accessed 25 July 2018].

European Commission, 2017a. *How culture and the arts can promote intercultural dialogue in the context of the migratory and refugee crisis*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.

European Commission, 2017b. *Migrants in European schools. Learning and maintaining languages. Thematic report from a programme of expert workshops and peer learning activities (2016-17)*. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/c0683c22-25a8-11e8-ac73-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-67513028> [Accessed 25 July 2018].

European Commission, 2017c. *Preparing teachers for diversity. The role of initial teacher education. Final Report to DG Education, Youth, Sport and Culture of the European Commission*. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/b347bf7d-1db1-11e7-aeb3-01aa75ed71a1/language-en> [Accessed 25 July 2018].

- European Commission, 2017d. *Rethinking language education and linguistic diversity in schools. Thematic report from a programme of expert workshops and peer learning activities (2016-17)*. [pdf] Available at: <https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/de1c9041-25a7-11e8-ac73-01aa75ed71a1/language-en/format-PDF/source-69196245> [Accessed 25 July 2018].
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice/Cedefop, 2014. *Tackling Early Leaving from Education. and Training in Europe: Strategies, Policies and Measures. Eurydice and Cedefop Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2015. *The Teaching Profession in Europe: Practices, Perceptions, and Policies. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017a. *Compulsory Education in Europe – 2017/18. Eurydice Facts and Figures*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017b. *Key Data on Teaching Languages at School in Europe – 2017 Edition. Eurydice Report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017c. *The Structure of the European Education Systems. – 2017/18. Schematic Diagrams. Eurydice Facts and Figures*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2017d. *Support Mechanisms for Evidence-Based Policy-Making in Education*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission/EACEA/Eurydice, 2018. *Teaching Careers in Europe. Access, Progression and support. Eurydice report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Parliament. Directorate-General for Internal Policies. Policy Department B: Structural and Cohesion Policies. Education and Culture, 2017. Research for CULT Committee - Migrant Education: Monitoring and Assessment.Study. [pdf] Available at: [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/585903/IPOL_STU\(2017\)585903_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2017/585903/IPOL_STU(2017)585903_EN.pdf) [Accessed 11 October 2018].
- Eurostat, 2018. *Migrant integration statistics introduced*. [Online] Available at:http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migrant_integration_statistics_introduced [Accessed June 2018].
- Farrington, C.A., et al., 2012. *Teaching adolescents to become learners – The role of non cognitive factors in shaping school performance: A critical literature review*. Chicago, IL: Consortium on Chicago School Research. [pdf] Available at: <https://consortium.uchicago.edu/sites/default/files/publications/Noncognitive%20Report.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2018].
- Fass, D., Hajisoteriou, C. and Angelides, P., 2014. Intercultural education in Europe: policies, practices and trends. *British Educational Research Journal*, 40(2), pp. 300-318.
- Fisher, M., De Bell, D., 2007. Approaches to parenting. In: D., De Bell, ed. *Public health practice and the school-age population*. London: Hodder Arnold. [pdf] Available at: <http://www.sirius-migrationeducation.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/MPG-Back-to-School-Responding-to-the-needs-of-newcomer-refugee-youth.pdf> [Accessed 23 March 2018].

Gabrieli, C., Ansel, D. and Krachman, S. B., 2015. *Ready to be counted: The research case for education policy action on non-cognitive skills*. Boston, MA: Transforming Education. [pdf] Available at: https://www.caseli.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/ReadytoBeCounted_Release.pdf

[Accessed 15 May 2018].

Garcia, O., 2009. *Bilingual education in the 21st Century: A global perspective*. Malden, MA and Oxford: Basil/Blackwell.

Halinen, I., Harmanen, M. and Mattila, P., 2015. *Making Sense of Complexity of the World Today: Why Finland is Introducing Multiliteracy in Teaching and Learning*. [pdf] Available at: https://www.oph.fi/download/173262_cidree_yb_2015_halinen_harmanen_mattila.pdf

[Accessed 15 May 2018].

Hamilton, P.L., 2013. It's not all about academic achievement: Supporting the social and emotional needs of migrant worker children. *Pastoral Care in Education*, 31(2), pp. 173-190.

Hek, R., 2005. *The experiences and needs of refugee and asylum seeking children in the UK: A literature review*. Nottingham: DFES Publications. [pdf] Available at: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/5398/1/RR635.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2018].

Heppt, B. et al., 2014. The Role of Academic-Language. Features for reading comprehension of language-minority students and students from low-SES Families. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 50(1), pp. 61-82.

Herdina, P., Jessner, U., 2002. *A dynamic model of multilingualism: Perspectives of change in psycholinguistics*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Herzog-Punzenberger, B., Le Pichon-Vorstman, E. and Siarova, H. *Multilingual Education in the Light of Diversity: Lessons Learned, NESET II report*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, 2017. [pdf] Available at: <http://nesetweb.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/Multilingualism-Report.pdf> [Accessed 25 July 2018].

Huddleston, T., Wolffhardt, A., 2016. Back to school: Responding to the needs of newcomer refugee youth.

Hunt, P et al., 2015. A Whole School Approach: Collaborative Development of School Health Policies, Processes, and Practices. *Journal of School Health*, 85(11), pp. 802-809.

Hyltenstam, K., Milani, T., 2012. Flerspråkighetens sociopolitiska och sociokulturella ramar. In: K. Hyltenstam, M. Axelsson and I. Lindberg, eds. *Flerspråkighet – en forskningsöversikt*. (Vetenskapsrådets rapportserie 5:2012). Stockholm: Vetenskapsrådet, pp. 17-152.

Jones, D.E., Greenberg, M., and Crowley, M., 2015. Early social-emotional functioning and public health: The relationship between kindergarten social competence and future wellness. *American Journal of Public Health*, 105(11), pp. 2283-2290.

Kirova, A., Prochner, L., 2015. Otherness in Pedagogical Theory and Practice: The Case of Roma. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 61(4), pp. 381-398.

Koehler, C., 2017. *Continuity of learning for newly arrived refugee children in Europe*. NESET II ad hoc question No. 1/2017.


Krachman, S.B, LaRocca, R. and Gabrieli, Ch., 2018. Accounting for the whole child. *Educational Leadership*, pp. 28-34.

- Lanas, M., 2014. Failing intercultural education? 'Thoughtfulness' in intercultural education for student teachers. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 37(2), pp. 171-182.
- Le Pichon, E., 2016. *New Patterns of migration. New needs*. Draft Input Paper for Thematic Panel on rethinking literacies and language learning in Brussels 11 July 2016.
- Maslow, A.H., 1943. *A Theory of Human Motivation*. Originally published in *Psychological Review*, 50, pp. 370-396.
- Magnusson, U., 2013. Paradigms in Swedish as a Second Language – Curricula for Primary School and Secondary School in Swedish as a Second Language. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(1), pp. 61-82.
- Maslow, A.H., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-96. [pdf] Available at: <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm> [Accessed 15 May 2018].
- Mariani, L., 1997. Teacher support and teacher challenge in promoting learner autonomy. *Perspectives: A Journal of TESOL Italy*, 2, pp. 15-18.
- Moffitt, T.E. et al., 2011. A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 108(7), pp. 2693-2698. Available at: <http://www.pnas.org/content/108/7/2693> [Accessed 15 May 2018].
- Network of Experts in Social Sciences and Education and Training 2008. *Education and migration strategies for integrating migrant children in European schools and societies. A synthesis of research findings for policy-makers; An independent report submitted to the European Commission by the NESSE network of experts*.
- Nilsson, J., Axelsson, M., 2013. "Welcome to Sweden...": Newly arrived students' experiences of pedagogical and social provision in introductory and regular classes. *International Electronic Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(1), pp. 137-164.
- Nilsson, J., Bunar, N., 2016. Educational responses to newly arrived students in Sweden: Understanding the structure and influence of post-migration ecology. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 60(4), pp. 399-416.
- OECD, 2004. *Learning for tomorrow's world: First results from PISA 2003*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD, 2009. *What works in immigrant education*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD, 2015. *Immigrant students at school: Easing the journey towards integration*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD, 2016. *PISA 2015 Results (Volume I): Excellence and Equity in Education*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- OECD, 2018. *The Resilience of Students with an Immigrant Background. Factors that shape well-being*. OECD Reviews of Migrant Education. Paris: OECD Publishing.
- Popov, O., Stureson, E., 2015. Facing the pedagogical challenge of teaching unaccompanied refugee children in the Swedish school system. *Problems of education in the 21st century*, 64, pp. 66-74.
- Porto, M., 2013. Language and intercultural education: an interview with Michael Byram. *Pedagogies: An International Journal*, 8(2), pp. 143-162.

- Reakes, A., 2007. The education of asylum seekers: Some UK case studies. *Research in Education*, 77(1), pp. 92-107.
- Roffey, S., 2016. Building a case for whole-child, whole school wellbeing in challenging contexts. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 33(2), pp. 30-42.
- Rutter, J., 2006. *Refugee children in the UK*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Santos, M.A. et al., 2016. Academic performance of native and immigrant students: A study focused on the perception of family support and control, school satisfaction, and learning environment. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7 (1560).
- Schnepf, S., 2007. Immigrants' educational disadvantage: an examination across ten countries and three surveys. *Journal of Population Economics*, 20(3), pp. 527-545.
- Sinkkonen, H.-M., Kyttälä, M., 2014. Experiences of Finnish teachers working with immigrant students. *European Journal of Special Needs Education*, 29(2), pp. 167-183.
- Sirin, S.R., 2005. Socioeconomic status and academic achievement: A meta-analytic review of research. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(3), pp. 417-453.
- Slade, S., Griffith, D., 2013. A whole child approach to student success. *KEDI Journal of Educational Policy, Special issue*, pp. 21-35.
- Sugarman, J., Morris-Lange S. and McHugh, M. 2016. *Improving Education for Migrant-Background Students: a Transatlantic Comparison of School Funding*. Washington D.C, Migration Policy Institute.
- Svalberg, Agneta M-L., 2007. Language awareness and language learning. *Language Teaching*, 40 (4), pp. 287-308.
- Taylor, S., Sidhu, R.K., 2012. Supporting refugee students in schools: What constitutes inclusive education? *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 16(1), pp. 39-56.
- Thomas, W.P., Collier, V., 1997. *School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students*. Washington DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.
- Trasberg, K., Kond, J., 2017. Teaching new immigrants in Estonian schools – Challenges for a support network. *Acta Paedagogica Vilnensia*, 38, pp. 90-100.
- Van Driel, B., Darmody, M. and Kerzil, J., 2016. *Education policies and practices to foster tolerance, respect for diversity and civic responsibility in children and young people in the EU*. NESET II report. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- Voight, A., Austin, G. and Hanson, T., 2013. *A climate for academic success: How school climate distinguishes schools that are beating the achievement odds* (Full report). San Francisco: WestEd. [pdf] Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED559741.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2018].
- Weare, K., 2002. *Promoting mental, emotional, and social health: A whole school approach*. London: Routledge.
- Wirén, E., 2013. *Migrants in Education – what factors are important? A study of European countries participating in TIMSS2007*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. [pdf] Available at: <http://publications.jrc.ec.europa.eu/repository/bitstream/JRC77646/lbna25742enn.pdf> [Accessed 15 May 2018].

ANNEX

Top-level criteria used to identify children and young people from migrant backgrounds, 2017/18 (Figure I.1.1)



Source: Eurydice.

(*) = The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Top-level bodies coordinating policies to support the educational integration of migrant students, 2017/18: (Dedicated body for coordinating integration policies – Figure I.1.6)

BE nl	Flemish Commission on Integration http://integratiebeleid.vlaanderen.be/commissie-integratiebeleid
DE	'Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration' (Federal Government Commissioner for Migrants, Refugees and Integration) https://www.integrationsbeauftragte.de/Webs/IB/DE/Home/home_node.html
HR	'Stalno povjerenstvo za provedbu integracije stranaca u hrvatsko društvo' (Permanent Commission for Implementation of Integration of Foreigners into Croatia Society) https://ljudskaprava.gov.hr/integracija-stranaca-u-hrvatsko-drustvo/643
IE	Migrant Integration Strategy – Monitoring and Coordination Body http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/Migrant_Integration_Strategy-en
RO	(Coordination Group for the Implementation of the National Strategy on Immigration) http://igi.mai.gov.ro/sites/all/themes/multipurpose_zymphonies_theme/images/pdf/Hotarare5722008.pdf
SI	(Government Office for the support and integration of immigrants) http://www.uoim.gov.si/en/
UK-SCT	New Scots Strategy Core Group http://www.migrationscotland.org.uk/
CH	'Secretariat d'État aux migrations' (SEM) (State Secretariat for Migration) https://www.sem.admin.ch/sem/fr/home/themen/integration/politik/weiterentwicklung.html
NO	(Directorate for Integration and Diversity) https://www.imdi.no/en/
RS	'Komesarijat za izbeglice i migracije' (Commissariat for Refugees and Migration) http://www.kirs.gov.rs/articles/aboutus.php?lang=ENG

Statistical Note

The report contains statistical data from the PIRLS 2016 and the ICCS 2016 data bases. All PIRLS and ICCS statistical data presented in graphics in the text together with the standard errors and the explanatory notes are available below.

PIRLS 2016

PIRLS 2016 (Progress in International Reading Literacy Study) assesses the achievement of students in reading and collects considerable background information on how education systems provide educational opportunities for their students, as well as information on the factors that influence how students use these opportunities.

The PIRLS target population is the grade that represents four years of schooling, counting from the first year of ISCED Level 1, which corresponds to the fourth grade in most countries.

The first edition of PIRLS took place in 2001. PIRLS 2016 was the fourth cycle of the study. Over 60 countries participated in PIRLS 2016 from all over the world, including 25 European education systems (Belgium – French and Flemish Communities, Bulgaria, Czechia, Denmark, Germany, Ireland, Spain, France, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, the Netherlands, Austria, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Slovakia, Finland, Sweden, United Kingdom – England and Northern Ireland, and Norway).

The PIRLS 2016 background data includes information on students' home environment and school climate. The data about the context of learning is collected through contextual questionnaires completed by students, their parents, teachers and school heads.

The contextual questionnaires are available at:

<https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/questionnaires/index.html>

The PIRLS 2016 International Database is available at:

<https://timssandpirls.bc.edu/pirls2016/international-database/index.html>

ICCS 2016

The ICCS (International Civic and Citizenship Study) investigates how young people are prepared for undertaking their roles as citizens. It reports on students' level of civic knowledge, their understanding of issues related to civics and citizenship and their civic attitudes and engagements. ICCS also collects a range of contextual data, including from students, their teachers and school heads about the school climate, home and community support.

The ICCS 2016 target population is grade 8, provided that the average age of students at this year level is 13.5 years or above.

ICCS was established in 2009. ICCS 2016 is the second cycle of the study. In 2016, 24 countries participated in the study, among them 15 European education systems (Belgium – Flemish Community, Bulgaria, Germany – North Rhine Westphalia, Denmark, Estonia, Croatia, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, the Netherlands, Slovenia, Finland, Sweden and Norway).

The ICCS 2016 database is available at:

<https://iccs.iea.nl/resources/data.html>

Standard errors

PIRLS 2016 and ICCS 2016, just like any other large-scale education surveys (OECD/PISA, IEA/TIMSS, etc.), only look at a representative sample of the target populations. Generally, an infinite number of possible samples of a given size exist for any given population. It follows that from one sample to another, estimates made for a population parameter (an average, a percentage, a correlation, etc.) can vary. The standard error associated with any estimation of a population parameter quantifies this sampling uncertainty. Based on this estimated parameter and its respective standard error, it is possible to construct the confidence interval that reflects by how much the value calculated from a sample may vary. Accordingly, let us suppose a difference in average between native and non-native students of 15 and that its standard error is 5. The confidence interval, with a type 1 error of 5 %, is equal to $[15 - (1.96 \times 5); 15 + (1.96 \times 5)]$, i.e. approximately [5; 25]. So, if in the population, the difference between native and non-native is equal to 0, then it means that we have fewer than 5 chances out of 100 of drawing a sample from that population where the difference between these two populations would be in absolute value equal to or higher than 15. Therefore, it is quite unlikely that this sample has been drawn from a population with no difference. Thus, in the population, there is certainly a difference between native and non-native.

All the standard errors recorded in this report were calculated using resampling methods and following the methodology of various technical documents of the PIRLS and ICCS surveys.

The standard errors of the statistical tables are listed in the tables below.

Cronbach's α for internal consistency

Quite often in the report several variables have been synthesised either in the form of an average or in the form of a sum. To make sure that certain information is not grouped when it should not be, Cronbach's α is calculated. This index, which varies from 0 to 1, evaluates internal consistency of the measure, i.e. its unidimensionality. The more unidimensional the measure, the more the index tends towards 1.

For each index created in this way, we have verified both at the level of each country and at the European level, whether the index's value meets scientific standards, i.e. in the context of non-cognitive data, whether its value is above 0.60.

Every index with values below 0.60 is not considered.

Six indices have been derived from the two studies for the purposes of this report. The table below shows the items that make up these various indices, as well as Cronbach's α value, calculated at the European level.

Composition of the indices and the Cronbach's α value

Name	Questions	α
4th grade students' sense of school belonging	PIRLS 2016 Student questionnaire G12, items A to E	>0.70
4th grade students' bullying experiences	PIRLS 2016 Student questionnaire G13, items A to H	>0.80
Parents' views on school	PIRLS 2016 Parent questionnaire Q9, items A to F	>0.80
School heads' perception on parental involvement	PIRLS 2016 School questionnaire Q13, items F to I	>0.60
8th grade students' sense of school belonging	ICCS 2016 Student questionnaire Q19, items A to I	>0.80
8th grade students' bullying experiences	ICCS 2016 Student questionnaire Q20, items A to F	>0.70

Socio-economic status index

As stated by Sirin (2005), 'socioeconomic status is probably the most widely used contextual variable in education research'. SES can be assessed by a variety of different combinations of variables: (i) father and /or mother level of education, (ii) father and/or mother occupation, (iii) family income, home possession and (iv) cultural possession at home.

Since 2000, the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA, OECD, 2004) computes an Economic, Social and Cultural Status index (ESCS) that consists of a statistical combination of (i) the highest international socio-economic index of occupational status of the father or mother (ii) the highest level of education of the father or mother converted into years of schooling, and (iii) the number of books at home as well as access to home educational and cultural resources.

In the IEA Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS), a composite index is not included in the international released database. However, in the student questionnaire, students had to report on the number of books in their home environment.

Table 1, based on the PISA 2012 data, presents, per EU country, the percentage of explained variance in performance in mathematic explained respectively by the ESCS index and by the number of books at home.

Table 1: Percentage of explained variance in performance in reading respectively by ESCS, the number of books at home and the difference in R².

	ESCS	books	Difference		ESCS	books	Difference
AT	0.16	0.20	-0.04	IS	0.07	0.11	-0.04
BE	0.20	0.15	0.04	IT	0.10	0.14	-0.04
BG	0.22	0.20	0.02	LI	0.08	0.10	-0.02
CH	0.13	0.16	-0.04	LT	0.14	0.13	0.00
CZ	0.16	0.19	-0.03	LU	0.18	0.22	-0.03
DE	0.17	0.19	-0.02	LV	0.15	0.11	0.04
DK	0.17	0.15	0.02	NL	0.12	0.14	-0.02
ES	0.16	0.19	-0.03	NO	0.07	0.13	-0.05
EE	0.09	0.14	-0.05	PL	0.17	0.16	0.01
FI	0.09	0.13	-0.04	PT	0.20	0.18	0.02
FR	0.23	0.25	-0.02	RO	0.19	0.16	0.03
UK	0.13	0.20	-0.08	RS	0.12	0.13	-0.01
EL	0.16	0.12	0.04	SK	0.25	0.26	-0.01
HR	0.12	0.12	0.00	SI	0.15	0.16	-0.01
HU	0.23	0.27	-0.04	SE	0.11	0.16	-0.05
IE	0.14	0.20	-0.06				

On average, the number of books at home explains 17 % of the variance in student performance in mathematics, while the composite index only explains 15 %. This example perfectly illustrates the efficiency of the number of books at home to capture the economic, cultural and social dimension of the family environment.

Table 2: Percentage of native-born and foreign-born among 4th grade students, 2016 (Figures 18 and 22)

	Native-born 4th grade students				Foreign-born 4th grade students			
	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH
Ø	96.1	(0.12)	0	0	3.9	(0.12)	0	0
BE fr	90.9	(0.79)	0	0	9.1	(0.79)	0	0
BE nl	94.0	(0.61)	0	0	6.0	(0.61)	0	0
BG	97.7	(0.29)	0	0	2.3	(0.29)	0	0
CZ	97.6	(0.27)	0	0	2.5	(0.27)	0	0
DK	94.9	(0.45)	0	0	5.1	(0.45)	0	0
DE	96.1	(0.41)	0	0	3.9	(0.41)	0	0
IE	91.4	(0.70)	0	0	8.7	(0.70)	0	0
ES	95.3	(0.34)	0	0	4.7	(0.34)	0	0
FR	96.1	(0.43)	0	0	3.9	(0.43)	0	0
IT	96.6	(0.35)	0	0	3.4	(0.35)	0	0
LV	98.6	(0.16)	0	0	1.4	(0.16)	0	0
LT	98.0	(0.28)	0	0	2.0	(0.28)	0	0
HU	98.3	(0.27)	0	0	1.7	(0.27)	0	0
MT	96.2	(0.28)	0	0	3.8	(0.28)	0	0
NL	96.3	(0.48)	0	0	3.7	(0.48)	0	0
AT	93.8	(0.51)	0	0	6.2	(0.51)	0	0
PL	98.8	(0.20)	0	0	1.2	(0.20)	0	0
PT	95.7	(0.44)	0	0	4.3	(0.44)	0	0
SI	95.1	(0.67)	0	0	4.9	(0.67)	0	0
SK	98.1	(0.23)	0	0	1.9	(0.23)	0	0
FI	96.2	(0.44)	0	0	3.8	(0.44)	0	0
SE	93.6	(0.52)	0	0	6.4	(0.52)	0	0
UK-ENG	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
UK-NIR	93.0	(0.76)	0	0	7.0	(0.76)	0	0
NO	93.2	(0.52)	0	0	6.8	(0.52)	0	0

Ø - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

FLAG STUD – value '1' indicates that fewer than 30 students answered the question and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 30 or more students answered the question; thus data can be reported.

FLAG SCH – value '1' indicates that fewer than 5 schools answered the question, and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 5 or more schools answered the question; thus data can be reported.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 3: Difference in the sense of school belonging and experience of bullying between 4th grade foreign-born and native-born students, 2016 (Figure 18)

	Difference in well-being after controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference in feeling of insecurity after controlling for SES	SESTAT		Difference in well-being after controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference in feeling of insecurity after controlling for SES	SESTAT
Ø	0.15	(0.09)	0.36	(0.15)	HU	-0.35	(0.49)	0.21	(0.77)
BE fr	0.39	(0.22)	-0.13	(0.45)	MT	-0.41	(0.23)	0.82	(0.61)
BE nl	0.25	(0.20)	0.36	(0.42)	NL	0.07	(0.38)	-0.10	(0.77)
BG	-0.54	(0.30)	0.90	(0.66)	AT	0.11	(0.21)	0.43	(0.45)
CZ	0.37	(0.27)	-0.22	(0.29)	PL	-0.43	(0.41)	0.09	(0.80)
DK	0.18	(0.22)	0.21	(0.37)	PT	-0.17	(0.20)	0.44	(0.42)
DE	0.39	(0.37)	1.00	(0.52)	SI	0.25	(0.35)	1.18	(0.97)
IE	-0.25	(0.23)	0.64	(0.32)	SK	-0.36	(0.39)	1.32	(0.75)
ES	-0.02	(0.22)	0.52	(0.35)	FI	0.41	(0.17)	0.68	(0.38)
FR	0.29	(0.24)	-0.08	(0.39)	SE	0.00	(0.21)	-0.38	(0.24)
IT	-0.19	(0.29)	0.42	(0.48)	UK-ENG	:	:	:	:
LV	0.18	(0.32)	0.82	(0.76)	UK-NIR	0.29	(0.21)	0.28	(0.49)
LT	-0.01	(0.26)	-0.45	(0.54)	NO	0.26	(0.18)	0.01	(0.28)

Values that are statistically significantly ($p < .05$) different from zero are indicated in bold.

Ø - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 4: Percentage of 4th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016 (Figures 19, 22 and 23)

	Students speaking the language of instruction at home				Students NOT speaking the language of instruction at home				
	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	
Ø	84.2	(0.30)	0	0	Ø	15.6	(0.30)	0	0
BE fr	77.9	(1.00)	0	0	BE fr	22.1	(1.00)	0	0
BE nl	76.33	(1.03)	0	0	BE nl	23.8	(1.03)	0	0
BG	82.6	(1.99)	0	0	BG	17.4	(1.99)	0	0
CZ	92.4	(0.44)	0	0	CZ	7.6	(0.44)	0	0
DK	89.1	(0.83)	0	0	DK	10.9	(0.83)	0	0
DE	83.4	(0.95)	0	0	DE	16.6	(0.95)	0	0
IE	88.6	(0.94)	0	0	IE	11.4	(0.94)	0	0
ES	70.7	(1.33)	0	0	ES	29.3	(1.33)	0	0
FR	84.3	(0.79)	0	0	FR	15.7	(0.79)	0	0
IT	83.7	(0.86)	0	0	IT	16.3	(0.86)	0	0
LV	87.5	(0.93)	0	0	LV	12.5	(0.93)	0	0
LT	89.1	(0.91)	0	0	LT	10.9	(0.91)	0	0
HU	97.6	(0.40)	0	0	HU	2.4	(0.40)	0	0
MT	69.0	(0.73)	0	0	MT	31.0	(0.73)	0	0
NL	82.6	(1.14)	0	0	NL	17.4	(1.14)	0	0
AT	81.3	(0.99)	0	0	AT	18.7	(0.99)	0	0
PL	96.4	(0.43)	0	0	PL	3.6	(0.43)	0	0
PT	91.5	(0.55)	0	0	PT	8.5	(0.55)	0	0
SI	87.8	(1.43)	0	0	SI	12.2	(1.43)	0	0
SK	86.4	(1.25)	0	0	SK	13.6	(1.25)	0	0
FI	89.4	(1.00)	0	0	FI	10.6	(1.00)	0	0
SE	86.2	(0.97)	0	0	SE	13.8	(0.97)	0	0
UK-ENG	84.0	(0.91)	0	0	UK-ENG	16.0	(0.91)	0	0
UK-NIR	93.6	(0.56)	0	0	UK-NIR	6.4	(0.56)	0	0
NO	88.3	(0.70)	0	0	NO	11.7	(0.70)	0	0

Ø - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

FLAG STUD – value '1' indicates that fewer than 30 students answered the question and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 30 or more students answered the question; thus data can be reported.

FLAG SCH – value '1' indicates that fewer than 5 schools answered the question, and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 5 or more schools answered the question; thus data can be reported.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 5: Difference in the sense of school belonging and experience of bullying between 4th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016 (Figure 19)

	Difference in well-being after controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference in feeling of insecurity after controlling for SES	SESTAT
Ø	0.20	(0.05)	-1.20	(0.09)
BE fr	0.30	(0.17)	-0.83	(0.25)
BE nl	0.81	(0.12)	-1.46	(0.21)
BG	0.13	(0.16)	0.18	(0.44)
CZ	0.80	(0.18)	-1.63	(0.34)
DK	0.35	(0.17)	-0.83	(0.25)
DE	0.22	(0.17)	-0.71	(0.26)
IE	-0.20	(0.18)	-0.76	(0.19)
ES	0.19	(0.12)	-1.10	(0.21)
FR	0.29	(0.14)	-1.03	(0.23)
IT	0.69	(0.21)	-1.53	(0.29)
LV	0.52	(0.21)	-1.62	(0.39)
LT	0.90	(0.15)	-1.66	(0.31)
HU	1.30	(0.44)	-2.09	(0.82)
MT	0.49	(0.10)	-0.90	(0.22)
NL	0.66	(0.19)	-1.13	(0.26)
AT	-0.09	(0.16)	-1.20	(0.29)
PL	0.72	(0.34)	-0.74	(0.42)
PT	0.50	(0.15)	-1.91	(0.35)
SI	0.16	(0.17)	-1.09	(0.31)
SK	0.14	(0.27)	-0.83	(0.27)
FI	0.46	(0.19)	-1.09	(0.19)
SE	0.45	(0.15)	-0.77	(0.25)
UK-ENG	0.07	(0.13)	-0.74	(0.25)
UK-NIR	0.66	(0.21)	-1.28	(0.44)
NO	0.22	(0.18)	-1.13	(0.30)

Values that are statistically significantly ($p < 0.05$) different from zero are indicated in bold.

Ø - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 6: Percentage of native-born and foreign-born among 8th grade students, 2016 (Figure 20)

	Native-born 8th grade students				Foreign-born 8th grade students			
	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH
Ø	93.7	(0.31)	0	0	6.3	(0.31)	0	0
BE nl	91.5	(0.90)	0	0	8.5	(0.90)	0	0
BG	99.0	(0.22)	0	0	1.0	(0.22)	0	0
DK	95.2	(0.37)	0	0	4.8	(0.37)	0	0
EE	97.9	(0.38)	0	0	2.1	(0.38)	0	0
HR	97.8	(0.34)	0	0	2.2	(0.34)	0	0
IT	92.6	(0.58)	0	0	7.4	(0.58)	0	0
LV	98.4	(0.32)	0	0	1.6	(0.32)	0	0
LT	98.6	(0.29)	0	0	1.4	(0.29)	0	0
MT	92.2	(0.43)	0	0	7.8	(0.43)	0	0
NL	95.9	(0.50)	0	0	4.1	(0.50)	0	0
SI	96.1	(0.42)	0	0	3.9	(0.42)	0	0
FI	96.5	(0.47)	0	0	3.5	(0.47)	0	0
SE	88.3	(0.82)	0	0	11.7	(0.82)	0	0
NO	91.9	(0.46)	0	0	8.1	(0.46)	0	0
DE-NRW	95.0	(0.67)	0	0	5.0	(0.67)	0	0

Ø - refers to the average of 15 European education systems participating in the survey.

FLAG STUD – value '1' indicates that fewer than 30 students answered the question and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 30 or more students answered the question; thus data can be reported.

FLAG SCH – value '1' indicates that fewer than 5 schools answered the question, and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 5 or more schools answered the question; thus data can be reported.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of ICCS 2016.

Table 7: Difference in the sense of school belonging and experience of bullying by peers between 8th grade foreign-born and native-born students, 2016 (Figure 20)

	Difference in well-being after controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference in feeling of insecurity after controlling for SES	SESTAT
Ø	0.10	(0.15)	0.54	(0.10)
BE nl	-0.52	(0.27)	0.71	(0.24)
BG	-3.19	(1.41)	1.00	(0.87)
DK	-0.04	(0.28)	0.20	(0.20)
EE	-0.09	(0.65)	0.47	(0.52)
HR	0.46	(0.80)	0.34	(0.58)
IT	0.14	(0.23)	0.67	(0.17)
LV	0.31	(0.60)	0.92	(0.51)
LT	1.30	(0.83)	0.26	(0.49)
MT	-1.07	(0.33)	0.19	(0.26)
NL	-0.96	(0.63)	1.03	(0.34)
SI	0.01	(0.41)	0.05	(0.30)
FI	-0.18	(0.45)	0.57	(0.37)
SE	0.51	(0.29)	-0.02	(0.27)
NO	0.06	(0.26)	0.21	(0.20)
DE-NRW	-1.09	(1.20)	0.40	(0.40)

Values that are statistically significantly ($p < .05$) different from zero are indicated in bold.

Ø - refers to the average of 15 European education systems participating in the survey.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of ICCS 2016.

Table 8: Percentage of 8th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016 (Figure 21)

	8th grade students speaking the language of instruction at home				8th grade students not speaking the language of instruction at home			
	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH
Ø	86.3	(0.56)	0	0	13.7	(0.56)	0	0
BE nl	83.9	(1.17)	0	0	16.1	(1.17)	0	0
BG	88.8	(1.57)	0	0	11.2	(1.57)	0	0
DK	94.9	(0.52)	0	0	5.1	(0.52)	0	0
EE	94.9	(0.59)	0	0	5.1	(0.59)	0	0
HR	98.7	(0.23)	0	0	1.3	(0.23)	0	0
IT	81.3	(1.06)	0	0	18.6	(1.06)	0	0
LV	90.0	(1.56)	0	0	10.0	(1.56)	0	0
LT	95.2	(0.97)	0	0	4.8	(0.97)	0	0
MT	71.1	(0.73)	0	0	28.9	(0.73)	0	0
NL	92.0	(1.19)	0	0	8.1	(1.19)	0	0
SI	93.9	(0.68)	0	0	6.1	(0.68)	0	0
FI	95.4	(0.51)	0	0	4.6	(0.51)	0	0
SE	86.3	(1.26)	0	0	13.7	(1.26)	0	0
NO	91.4	(0.75)	0	0	8.6	(0.75)	0	0
DE-NRW	81.9	(1.35)	0	0	18.1	(1.35)	0	0

Ø - refers to the average of 15 European education systems participating in the survey.

FLAG STUD – value '1' indicates that fewer than 30 students answered the question and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 30 or more students answered the question; thus data can be reported.

FLAG SCH – value '1' indicates that fewer than 5 schools answered the question, and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 5 or more schools answered the question; thus data can be reported.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of ICCS 2016.

Table 9: Difference in the sense of belonging and experience of bullying by peers between 8th grade students who speak the language of instruction at home and those who do not, 2016 (Figure 21)

	Difference in well-being after controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference in feeling of insecurity after controlling for SES	SESTAT
Ø	0.32	(0.14)	-0.57	(0.11)
BE nl	0.31	(0.27)	-0.15	(0.17)
BG	0.35	(0.44)	-0.46	(0.34)
DK	0.56	(0.33)	-0.04	(0.20)
EE	0.38	(0.51)	-0.14	(0.22)
HR	0.39	(0.73)	-0.81	(0.72)
IT	0.48	(0.21)	-0.75	(0.16)
LV	-0.04	(0.44)	-0.72	(0.19)
LT	-0.28	(0.38)	-0.96	(0.49)
MT	1.20	(0.17)	-0.18	(0.15)
NL	1.16	(0.32)	-0.60	(0.25)
SI	0.44	(0.48)	-0.50	(0.32)
FI	0.70	(0.40)	-0.20	(0.38)
SE	-0.41	(0.33)	-0.35	(0.28)
NO	0.15	(0.26)	-0.40	(0.17)
DE-NRW	0.90	(0.55)	-0.09	(0.25)

Values that are statistically significantly ($p < .05$) different from zero are indicated in bold.

Ø - refers to the average of 15 European education systems participating in the survey.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of ICCS 2016.

Table 10: Differences in parents' perception of their child's schooling, depending on whether their 4th grade child was born in the host country or not, and the language spoken at home, 2016 (Figure 22)

	Differences perception between parents of foreign-born and parents of native-born, after controlling for SES	SESTAT	Differences in perception between parents of students not speaking the language of instruction at home and those who do, after controlling for SES	SESTAT
Ø	0.59	(0.09)	0.33	(0.06)
BE fr	0.89	(0.22)	0.47	(0.16)
BE nl	0.96	(0.19)	0.85	(0.13)
BG	0.12	(0.32)	-0.01	(0.32)
CZ	1.10	(0.32)	0.04	(0.21)
DK	0.28	(0.33)	0.40	(0.25)
DE	1.24	(0.34)	0.60	(0.21)
IE	-0.10	(0.15)	-0.01	(0.12)
ES	0.18	(0.21)	-0.24	(0.12)
FR	1.06	(0.20)	0.34	(0.15)
IT	0.34	(0.30)	0.19	(0.13)
LV	-0.52	(0.50)	0.26	(0.22)
LT	-0.68	(0.59)	0.14	(0.16)
HU	0.20	(0.49)	0.39	(0.36)
MT	-0.02	(0.16)	-0.14	(0.06)
NL	0.60	(0.33)	0.45	(0.20)
AT	0.48	(0.30)	0.58	(0.17)
PL	-0.21	(0.53)	-0.13	(0.31)
PT	0.17	(0.20)	0.11	(0.16)
SI	0.72	(0.26)	0.44	(0.16)
SK	-0.25	(0.46)	0.15	(0.28)
FI	0.50	(0.22)	0.43	(0.15)
SE	0.16	(0.28)	0.14	(0.21)
UK-ENG	:	:	:	:
UK-NIR	0.01	(0.24)	-0.06	(0.25)
NO	0.31	(0.26)	0.45	(0.15)

Values that are statistically significantly ($p < .05$) different from zero are indicated in bold.

Ø - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 11: Percentage of 4th grade students with schools 1) >75 %, 2) 25-75 % and 3) <25 % of students speaking the language of instruction at home – 2016 (Figure 23)

	Students in schools with >75 % of students speaking the language of instruction at home				Students in schools with between 25-75 % of students speaking the language of instruction at home				Students in schools with <25 % of students speaking the language of instruction at home			
	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH	Percentage	SESTAT	FLAG_STUD	FLAG_SCH
∅	77.2	(0.97)	0	0	15.7	(0.81)	0	0	7.1	(0.70)	0	0
BE fr	72.8	(2.82)	0	0	17.9	(2.99)	0	0	9.4	(1.85)	0	0
BE nl	67.1	(3.66)	0	0	21.7	(3.02)	0	0	11.2	(2.58)	0	0
BG	68.9	(3.39)	0	0	11.9	(2.78)	0	0	19.2	(2.80)	0	0
CZ	99.0	(0.36)	0	0	0.6	(0.05)	1	1	0.4	(0.35)	0	1
DK	83.0	(2.70)	0	0	10.7	(2.33)	0	0	6.3	(1.76)	0	0
DE	55.5	(3.22)	0	0	33.6	(3.25)	0	0	10.8	(2.72)	0	0
IE	82.4	(3.47)	0	0	13.9	(3.23)	0	0	3.7	(1.67)	0	0
ES	70.8	(2.45)	0	0	20.1	(2.20)	0	0	9.1	(1.75)	0	0
FR	82.7	(2.97)	0	0	13.3	(2.49)	0	0	4.1	(1.83)	0	0
IT	90.6	(2.62)	0	0	9.5	(2.62)	0	0	:	:	:	:
LV	64.5	(2.32)	0	0	11.8	(2.55)	0	0	23.8	(1.64)	0	0
LT	96.6	(1.31)	0	0	3.0	(1.25)	0	0	0.4	(0.01)	1	1
HU	99.5	(0.43)	0	0	0.5	(0.43)	1	1	:	:	:	:
MT	81.0	(0.11)	0	0	18.3	(0.12)	0	0	0.7	(0.03)	1	1
NL	85.1	(3.08)	0	0	12.8	(2.84)	0	0	2.1	(1.43)	0	1
AT	56.7	(3.06)	0	0	31.2	(3.37)	0	0	12.0	(2.61)	0	0
PL	100.0	(0.00)	0	0	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
PT	97.1	(1.37)	0	0	0.3	(0.24)	0	1	2.6	(1.35)	0	0
SI	90.0	(3.43)	0	0	10.0	(3.43)	0	0	:	:	:	:
SK	91.7	(2.26)	0	0	5.3	(1.68)	0	0	3.0	(1.52)	0	0
FI	94.7	(1.64)	0	0	4.2	(1.24)	0	0	1.1	(1.09)	1	1
SE	73.9	(4.11)	0	0	16.5	(3.44)	0	0	9.6	(2.99)	0	0
UK-ENG	60.7	(3.28)	0	0	20.7	(2.73)	0	0	18.6	(3.23)	0	0
UK-NIR	92.2	(2.92)	0	0	3.5	(1.78)	0	1	4.4	(2.31)	0	1
NO	87.9	(2.76)	0	0	9.3	(2.46)	0	0	2.9	(1.46)	0	1

∅ - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

FLAG STUD – value '1' indicates that fewer than 30 students answered the question and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 30 or more students answered the question; thus data can be reported.

FLAG SCH – value '1' indicates that fewer than 5 schools answered the question, and thus the results will not be reported in related figures; value '0' indicates that 5 or more schools answered the question; thus data can be reported.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 12: Parental involvement in education, mean score points per school category 2016 (Figure 23)

	In school where >75 % students speaks the language of instruction at home (A)		In schools where 25-75 % students speaks the language of instruction at home (B)		In schools where <25 % students speaks the language of instruction at home (C)	
	Mean score points	SESTAT	Mean score points	SESTAT	Mean score points	SESTAT
∅	13.74	(0.07)	12.38	(0.19)	11.92	(0.29)
BE fr	13.44	(0.23)	12.36	(0.57)	8.54	(0.63)
BE nl	14.25	(0.23)	13.17	(0.48)	11.93	(0.48)
BG	13.65	(0.21)	12.20	(0.47)	9.05	(0.41)
CZ	12.42	((0.17)	•	•	•	•
DK	14.07	(0.20)	11.62	(0.44)	12.56	(0.47)
DE	14.75	(0.20)	12.73	(0.24)	10.28	(0.62)
IE	15.43	(0.24)	13.39	(0.76)	14.33	(2.46)
ES	14.10	(0.18)	12.60	(0.60)	12.56	(0.52)
FR	13.29	(0.27)	10.19	(0.61)	11.00	(1.07)
IT	13.34	(0.16)	12.56	(0.45)	:	:
LV	13.68	(0.21)	13.47	(0.46)	14.59	(0.33)
LT	14.27	(0.15)	11.39	(0.87)	•	•
HU	12.77	(0.18)	•	•	:	:
MT	14.94	(0.01)	14.80	(0.02)	•	•
NL	14.38	(0.20)	12.05	(0.48)	•	•
AT	14.86	(0.24)	13.10	(0.36)	10.83	(0.80)
PL	13.33	(0.21)	:	:	:	:
PT	12.68	(0.14)	•	•	13.42	(1.98)
SI	13.41	(0.19)	12.48	(0.58)	:	:
SK	12.85	(0.16)	10.25	(0.74)	8.95	(2.15)
FI	14.06	(0.17)	12.04	(0.81)	•	•
SE	13.85	(0.25)	12.00	(0.63)	13.41	(1.02)
UK-ENG	14.30	(0.30)	13.30	(0.55)	13.12	(0.52)
UK-NIR	15.23	(0.22)	17.21	(1.37)	•	•
NO	13.81	(0.20)	12.52	(0.62)	•	•

Explanatory note (Table 12)

∅ - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

• - signals that fewer than 30 students or fewer than 5 schools were in that category.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

Table 13: Differences in parental involvement in education, 2016 (Figure 23)

	Difference between A-B, without controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference between A-C, without controlling for SES	SESTAT	Difference between B-C, without controlling for SES	SESTAT
∅	1.35	(0.20)	1.82	(0.30)	0.46	(0.36)
BE fr	1.08	(0.62)	4.90	(0.67)	3.82	(0.79)
BE nl	1.09	(0.55)	2.33	(0.56)	1.24	(0.62)
BG	1.45	(0.51)	4.60	(0.45)	3.14	(0.68)
CZ	•	•	•	•	•	•
DK	2.45	(0.47)	1.51	(0.52)	-0.94	(0.63)
DE	2.01	(0.31)	4.47	(0.68)	2.45	(0.68)
IE	2.04	(0.80)	1.10	(2.49)	-0.94	(2.65)
ES	1.50	(0.65)	1.54	(0.58)	0.05	(0.77)
FR	3.11	(0.71)	2.30	(1.06)	-0.81	(1.28)
IT	0.78	(0.46)	:	:	:	:
LV	0.21	(0.53)	-0.91	(0.39)	-1.12	(0.56)
LT	2.88	(0.90)	•	•	•	•
HU	•	•	:	:	:	:
MT	0.14	(0.02)	•	•	•	•
NL	2.33	(0.52)	•	•	•	•
AT	1.76	(0.44)	4.03	(0.80)	2.27	(0.88)
PT	•	•	-0.74	(2.01)	•	•
SI	0.93	(0.62)	:	:	:	:
SK	2.59	(0.75)	3.90	(2.18)	1.31	(2.27)
FI	2.01	(0.86)	•	•	•	•
SE	1.85	(0.68)	0.45	(1.06)	-1.40	(1.13)
UK-ENG	1.00	(0.62)	1.18	(0.62)	0.18	(0.75)
UK-NIR	-1.97	(1.38)	•	•	•	•
NO	1.29	(0.64)	•	•	•	•

Values that are statistically significantly ($p < .05$) different from zero are indicated in bold.

∅ - refers to the average of 25 European education systems participating in the survey.

• - signals that fewer than 30 students or fewer than 5 schools were in that category.

Source: Eurydice, on the basis of PIRLS 2016.

EDUCATION, AUDIOVISUAL AND CULTURE EXECUTIVE AGENCY

Education and Youth Policy Analysis

Avenue du Bourget 1 (J-70 – Unit A7)
B-1049 Brussels
(<http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>)

Managing editor

Arlette Delhaxhe

Authors

Sogol Noorani (coordinator), Nathalie Baïdak, Anita Krémó and
Jari Riiheläinen, with the contribution of Teodora Parveva

External expert

Christian Monseur

Layout and graphics

Patrice Brel

Layout of the cover

Virginia Giovannelli

Production coordinator

Gisèle De Lel

EURYDICE NATIONAL UNITS

ALBANIA

Eurydice Unit
European Integration and International Cooperation
Department of Integration and Projects
Ministry of Education and Sport
Rruga e Durrësit, Nr. 23
1001 Tiranë

AUSTRIA

Eurydice-Informationsstelle
Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und
Forschung
Abt. Bildungsstatistik und -monitoring
Minoritenplatz 5
1010 Wien
Contribution of the Unit: Dr. Michaela Haller (external
expert)

BELGIUM

Unité Eurydice de la Communauté française
Ministère de la Fédération Wallonie-Bruxelles
Direction des relations internationales
Boulevard Léopold II, 44 – Bureau 6A/008
1080 Bruxelles
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

Eurydice Vlaanderen
Departement Onderwijs en Vorming/
Afdeling Strategische Beleidsondersteuning
Koning Albert II-laan 15
1210 Brussel

Contribution of the Unit: Eline De Ridder and Pieter-Jan De
Vlieger (coordination); experts from the Flemish Ministry
of Education and Training: Chama Rhellam,
Marieke Smeyers

Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Deutschsprachigen
Gemeinschaft
Ministerium der Deutschsprachigen Gemeinschaft
Fachbereich Ausbildung und Unterrichtsorganisation
Gospertstraße 1
4700 Eupen
Contribution of the Unit: Catherine Reinertz, Xavier Hurler
and Clara Jacquemart

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Ministry of Civil Affairs
Education Sector
Trg BiH 3
71000 Sarajevo
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

BULGARIA

Eurydice Unit
Human Resource Development Centre
Education Research and Planning Unit
15, Graf Ignatiev Str.
1000 Sofia
Contribution of the Unit: Svetomira Apostolova –
Kaloyanova (expert)

CROATIA

Agency for Mobility and EU Programmes
Frankopanska 26
10000 Zagreb
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

CYPRUS

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Culture
Kimonos and Thoukydidou
1434 Nicosia
Contribution of the Unit: Christiana Haperi;
expert: Danae Lordou Kaspari

CZECHIA

Eurydice Unit
Centre for International Cooperation in Education
Dům zahraniční spolupráce
Na Poříčí 1035/4
110 00 Praha 1
Contribution of the Unit: Helena Pavlíková,
Marcela Máchová and Andrea Turynová;
experts: Jaromíra Šindelářová (Jan Evangelista Purkyně
University), Lukáš Seifert (Ministry of Education, Youth and
Sports)

DENMARK

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Higher Education and Science
The Danish Agency for Research and Higher Education
Bredgade 40
1260 København K
Contribution of the Unit: The Ministry of Education and the
Ministry of Higher Education and Science

ESTONIA

Eurydice Unit
Analysis Department
Ministry of Education and Research
Munga 18
50088 Tartu
Contribution of the Unit: Kersti Kaldma (coordination);
experts: Kersti Kivirüüt and Viivian Jõemets (chief experts,
General Education Department, Ministry of Education and
Research)

FINLAND

Eurydice Unit
Finnish National Agency for Education
P.O. Box 380
00531 Helsinki
Contribution of the Unit: Katri Kuukka (Counsellor of
Education), Leena Nissilä (Counsellor of Education),
Pirjo Karhu (Senior Adviser), Hanna Laakso (Senior
Adviser), Olga Lappi (Senior Adviser)

FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

National Agency for European Educational Programmes
and Mobility
Porta Bunjakovec 2A-1
1000 Skopje
Contribution of the Unit: Dejan Zlatkovski

FRANCE

Unité française d'Eurydice
Ministère de l'Éducation nationale et de la Jeunesse (MENJ)
Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et
de l'Innovation (MESRI)
Direction de l'évaluation, de la prospective et de la
performance (DEPP)
Mission aux relations européennes et internationales
(MIREI)
61-65, rue Dutot
75732 Paris Cedex 15
Contribution of the Unit: Hélène Demesy (expert),
Anne Gaudry-Lachet (MENJ-MESRI)

GERMANY

Eurydice-Informationsstelle der Länder im Sekretariat der Kultusministerkonferenz
Taubenstraße 10
10117 Berlin
Contribution of the Unit: Thomas Eckhardt

GREECE

Eurydice Unit
Directorate of European and International Affairs
General Directorate for International, European Affairs,
Education for Greeks Abroad, Intercultural Education
Ministry of Education, Research and Religious Affairs
37 Andrea Papandreuou Str. (Office 2172)
15180 Maroussi (Attiki)
Contribution of the Unit: Panagiota Karkaletsis (Hellenic
Ministry of Education, Research & Religious Affairs/
European Union Unit); Nikoletta Chardalia (Hellenic Ministry
of Education, Research & Religious Affairs/Unit of
Coordination and Monitoring of Refugee Education)

HUNGARY

Hungarian Eurydice Unit
Educational Authority
10-14 Szalay utca
1055 Budapest
Contribution of the Unit: Róza Szabó (head of Department,
Educational Authority)

ICELAND

Eurydice Unit
The Directorate of Education
Víkurbær 3
203 Kópavogur
Contribution of the Unit: Hulda Skogland (expert,
Department of Analysis, Directorate of Education) and
Hulda Karen Danielsdóttir (expert, Department of
Assessment, Directorate of Education)

IRELAND

Eurydice Unit
Department of Education and Skills
International Section
Marlborough Street
Dublin 1 – DO1 RC96
Contribution of the Unit: Patricia Sheehan (Assistant
Principal Officer, Social Inclusion, Department of Education
& Skills)

ITALY

Unità italiana di Eurydice
Istituto Nazionale di Documentazione, Innovazione e
Ricerca Educativa (INDIRE)
Agenzia Erasmus+
Via C. Lombroso 6/15
50134 Firenze
Contribution of the Unit: Alessandra Mochi; experts: Vinicio
Ongini (Direzione generale per lo studente, l'integrazione, la
partecipazione. Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e
della Ricerca) in collaboration with Lisa Stillo (Centro ricerca
educazione interculturale e formazione allo sviluppo
(CREIFOS), Dipartimento scienze della formazione,
Università di Roma Tre)

LATVIA

Eurydice Unit
State Education Development Agency
Valņu street 1 (5th floor)
1050 Rīga
Contribution of the Unit: Olita Arkle (expert)

LIECHTENSTEIN

Informationsstelle Eurydice
Schulamts des Fürstentums Liechtenstein
Austrasse 79
Postfach 684
9490 Vaduz
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

LITHUANIA

Eurydice Unit
National Agency for School Evaluation of the Republic of
Lithuania
Geležinio Vilko Street 12
03163 Vilnius
Contribution of the Unit: Ona Čepulėnienė

LUXEMBOURG

Unité nationale d'Eurydice
ANEFORÉ ASBL
eduPôle Walferdange
Bâtiment 03 - étage 01
Route de Diekirch
7220 Walferdange
Contribution of the Unit: Elisabeth Reisen,
Marco de Oliveira, Louise Crosby (experts)

MALTA

Eurydice National Unit
Directorate for Research, Lifelong Learning and
Employability
Ministry for Education and Employment
Great Siege Road
Floriana VLT 2000
Contribution of the Unit: Jane Farrugia Buhagiar,
Joanne Bugeja

MONTENEGRO

Eurydice Unit
Vaka Djurovica bb
81000 Podgorica
Contribution of the Unit: Mubera Kurpejović and
Biljana Mišović

NETHERLANDS

Eurydice Nederland
Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap
Directie Internationaal Beleid
Rijnstraat 50
2500 BJ Den Haag
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

NORWAY

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education and Research
AIK-avd., Kunnskapsdepartementet
Kirkegata 18
P.O. Box 8119 Dep.
0032 Oslo
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

POLAND

Polish Eurydice Unit
Foundation for the Development of the Education System
Aleje Jerozolimskie 142A
02-305 Warszawa
Contribution of the Unit: Experts: Agata Gajewska-
Dyszkiewicz, Katarzyna Paczuska (Educational Research
Institute, Warsaw, Poland); Coordination: Beata Piatos
(Polish Eurydice Unit)

PORTUGAL

Unidade Portuguesa da Rede Eurydice (UPRE)
Ministério da Educação e Ciência
Direção-Geral de Estatísticas da Educação
Av. 24 de Julho, 134
1399-054 Lisboa
Contribution of the Unit: Isabel Almeida; outside the Unit:
Joint responsibility.

ROMANIA

Eurydice Unit
National Agency for Community Programmes in the Field of
Education and Vocational Training
Universitatea Politehnică București
Biblioteca Centrală
Splaiul Independenței, nr. 313
Sector 6
060042 București
Contribution of the Unit: Veronica – Gabriela Chirea in
cooperation with expert Eugen Stoica (Ministry of National
Education)

SERBIA

Eurydice Unit Serbia
Foundation Tempus
Ruze Jovanovic 27a
11000 Belgrade
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

SLOVAKIA

Eurydice Unit
Slovak Academic Association for International Cooperation
Křížkova 9
811 04 Bratislava
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

SLOVENIA

Eurydice Unit
Ministry of Education, Science and Sport
Education Development Office
Masarykova 16
1000 Ljubljana
Contribution of the Unit: Saša Ambrožič Deleja and Barbara
Kresal Sterniša; experts: Stanka Lunder Verlič and
Mija Javornik (Ministry of Education, Science and Sport)

SPAIN

Eurydice España-REDIE
Centro Nacional de Innovación e Investigación Educativa
(CNIIE)
Ministerio de Educación y Formación Profesional
c/ Torrelaguna, 58
28027 Madrid
Contribution of the Unit: Rubén Fernández Alonso (Servicio
de Evaluación Educativa. Dirección General de Ordenación
Académica e Innovación Educativa. Consejería de
Educación y Cultura del **Principado de Asturias**), Antoni
Bauzá Sampol y Javier Real Vila (Institut d'Avaluació i
Qualitat del Sistema Educatiu. Conselleria d'Educació i
Universitat de **Illes Balears**), Mariemma González Martín
(Servicio de Equidad, Igualdad y Orientación Educativa de
la Dirección General de Innovación y Equidad Educativa.
Consejería de Educación de **Castilla y León**), M^a Isabel
Rodríguez Martín (Servicio de Ordenación Académica,

Documentación y Evaluación de **Castilla-La Mancha**),
María José Sánchez Merino y Anna Sambola López
(Subdirecció General de Llengua i Plurilingüisme del
Departament d'Ensenyament de la **Generalitat de
Catalunya**), Manuel Carrapiso Araújo, Mónico Cañada
Gallardo, Jesús Andrés Serrano Diego, Silvia Rodríguez
Oliva, María Moreno Sierra y Eugenia López Cáceres
(Secretaría General de Educación. Consejería de
Educación y Empleo de la Junta de **Extremadura**), León
Bendayán Montecatine (Dirección Provincial de Educación
de la **Ciudad de Ceuta**), la Dirección General de Atención a
la Diversidad y Calidad Educativa de la Consejería de
Educación, Juventud y Deportes de la **Región de Murcia**, y
la Dirección General de Educación del Gobierno de **La
Rioja**. Marta Crespo Petit, Rocío Arias Bejarano y Elena
Vázquez Aguilar (Eurydice España-REDIE)

SWEDEN

Eurydice Unit
Universitets- och högskolerådet/
The Swedish Council for Higher Education
Box 450 93
104 30 Stockholm
Contribution of the Unit: Joint responsibility

SWITZERLAND

Eurydice Unit
Swiss Conference of Cantonal Ministers of Education (EDK)
Speichergasse 6
3001 Bern
Contribution of the Unit: Alexander Gerlings

TURKEY

Eurydice Unit
MEB, Strateji Geliştirme Başkanlığı (SGB)
Eurydice Türkiye Birimi, Merkez Bina 4. Kat
B-Blok Bakanlıklar
06648 Ankara
Contribution of the Unit: Osman Yıldırım Uğur;
expert: Associate Por. Dr. Kemal Sinan Özmen

UNITED KINGDOM

Eurydice Unit for England, Wales and Northern Ireland
National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER)
The Mere, Upton Park
Slough, Berkshire, SL1 2DQ
Contribution of the Unit: Maureen Heron and
Sharon O'Donnell (NFER Associate)

Eurydice Unit Scotland
Learning Directorate
Scottish Government
2-C North
Victoria Quay
Edinburgh EH6 6QQ
Contribution of the Unit: Gary Walsh (Scottish Government),
Stephen Edgar (Education Scotland), Maria Walker
(Glasgow City Council)

Integrating Students from Migrant Backgrounds into Schools in Europe: National Policies and Measures

This Eurydice report investigates what top-level education authorities across Europe do to promote the integration of students from a migrant background in schools (in the reference year 2017/18). It presents a comparative mapping of a wide range of national policies and measures aimed at placing newly arrived migrant students in schools and addressing their language, learning and psycho-social support needs. It also offers a deeper analysis of some of the key policies that can enable schools to be welcoming for students from diverse linguistic and cultural backgrounds and to take into account students' social and emotional well-being in order to create an optimal state for their learning and development.

The report focuses on top-level regulations and recommendations covering primary, general lower and upper secondary education as well as school-based initial vocational education and training.

Information covers 42 education systems, including the 28 EU Member States as well as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Switzerland, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey.

The Eurydice Network's task is to understand and explain how Europe's different education systems are organised and how they work. The network provides descriptions of national education systems, comparative studies devoted to specific topics, indicators and statistics. All Eurydice publications are available free of charge on the Eurydice website or in print upon request. Through its work, Eurydice aims to promote understanding, cooperation, trust and mobility at European and international levels. The network consists of national units located in European countries and is co-ordinated by the EU Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency. For more information about Eurydice, see <http://ec.europa.eu/eurydice>.

