Alliances for Inclusion

cross-sector policy synergies and inter-professional collaboration in and around schools

An independent report authored for the European Commission

Professor Anne Edwards (University of Oxford) and Dr. Paul Downes (St. Patrick's College, Dublin City University)

on behalf of the NESET network of experts

Report identity and acknowledgements

This is an independent expert report commissioned by and prepared for the European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture. It has been authored by **Professor Anne Edwards** (Director of Research, Department of Education, University of Oxford) and **Dr. Paul Downes** (Director, Educational Disadvantage Centre, St. Patrick's College, Dublin City University) on behalf of the NESET network of experts.

Other members of the NESET network and other experts in this field provided input and comments on drafts. These include: Pepka Boyadjieva, Marian Brattman, Alan Dyson, Ramon Flecha, Bente Hagtvet, Marie-Paule Jollec, Dagmar Kutsar, Ides Nicaise, Andrey Nonchev, Claudie Rault, Stefanie Schmachtel, Liz Todd, Dolf van Veen, Willem Wardekker, and Boyan Zahariev. Particular thanks are due to Will Baker for some data sorting in the early stages of compiling this report.

All responsibility for the choice, analysis and interpretation of the data and for the opinions presented in this report lies with the authors.

Available for free downloading at: www.nesetweb.eu

The **NESET network of experts** is an independent team of academics supporting the European Commission with expertise on social aspects of education and training.

NESET reports provide evidence and policy guidance emerging from research. Forthcoming titles include:

- ➤ *Tackling drop-out and non-completion in higher education*
- ➤ *Student Motivation: how to re-engage young people disengaged from education and training*
- ➤ *Positive discrimination in European education systems –lessons from of area-based initiatives*

Education policies alone cannot tackle educational disadvantage. Cross-sector synergies are required, to link what schools can do with what employment, finance, youth, health, justice, housing, welfare and other services can offer.

This report shows examples of how this objective might be achieved in practice.

Table of Contents

Foreword

Education policies alone cannot disrupt inter-generational cycles of deprivation and tackle educational disadvantage. Cross-sectoral approaches are required, to link education and training policies with what employment, finance, youth, health, justice, housing, welfare and other services can offer.

This is a key message emerging from the Commission's 2006 Communication "Efficiency and Equity in European Education and Training Systems" and from the May 2010 Council Conclusions on the social dimension of education and training.

Such co-ordinated, multi-strand approaches, sustained consistently over time, are difficult for policy makers and challenge the professions involved. Yet, they may offer the best approach to preventing or mitigating the impact of multiple and cumulative disadvantage on people's educational experiences and life chances.

Some EU Member States have moved some way towards such an approach, often as part of their early school leaving prevention strategies or overall lifelong learning strategies, and have established multi-service collaborations where professionals with different areas of responsibility work together to support disadvantaged children and adults.

This report suggests that centring such a multi-faceted response to vulnerability on and around schools, the only universal service where the well-being of children and young people can be regularly monitored, would seem a wise step towards achieving universal active inclusion. It has attempted to:

a) identify examples of multi-service interventions where there is robust evidence of successful outcomes for disadvantaged children and young people; and

b) reveal the conditions for success.

It shows that, while "education cannot compensate for society", schools have an important part to play in tackling vulnerability through **early intervention** and the sustained support of vulnerable children and young people. They are well placed to understand the dynamic nature of social exclusion, to recognise the continuum of need, to spot when a child becomes vulnerable and to act. Many acknowledge this broader role, but many need help making a success of it. The report provides policy guidance to this end.

A key message from this report is that the work of schools in tackling vulnerability should be located within **wider strategies** for equality and inclusion that recognise the need to address the economic and social conditions in which exclusion arises. The same message emerges strongly from the "Social Investment package" the European Commission put forward last February. Within that package, the Recommendation *Investing in Children: breaking the cycle of disadvantage* calls for a holistic approach and for multi-dimensional action against disadvantage and exclusion. Increased vulnerability due to the current economic crisis makes this an urgent matter.

The present report is a timely contribution to the implementation of the Recommendation. It shows, with evidence, how effective cross-sectoral synergies and multi-strand attacks on the local determinants of educational disadvantage can be designed and implemented. Also, that this approach is fully compatible with coordinated macro-level policy efforts to tackle disadvantage and inequality at source.

As the report explains, cross-sectoral approaches do not necessarily demand additional resources so much as that existing resources are used in a different way. They imply a shift in focus away from dealing with manifest problems towards ***preventive*** work and away from slow-moving and tightly rationed crisis responses towards ***early intervention***. Above all, they imply a move away from fragmented action by separate actors towards *coordinated* –and therefore more efficient– interventions. Such approaches, therefore, can either *save costs* or *free up existing resources* for dealing with a wider range of issues –they can thus contribute to **smart spending** at a time resources are scarce.

The report suggests that such approaches should be **integral** rather than peripheral to education systems. That they should not be seen as optional extras to the core business of education systems, supported in the economic good times, but dispensable when times are hard.

This work suggests that what is now needed is a **strong over-arching conceptual framework** to underpin and help shape national policies for active inclusion. Such a framework can usefully guide the work of schools with vulnerable young people: it can bring national policies in different sectors into alignment, facilitate cross-sectoral work at local level, and monitor its outcomes in appropriate ways. This should be a framework, not a cage.

Through its recent "Social Investment" initiative, the European Commission has taken the lead in articulating such a broad guiding framework to encourage and support cross-sectoral approaches in Member States. The present report helps us visualise how these objectives might be achieved in practice in and around schools.

Brussels, May 2013

Jan Truszczyński
Director-General
European Commission's Directorate-General for Education and Culture

Executive Summary

1. Schools cannot work alone to disrupt intergenerational cycles of deprivation and tackle educational disadvantage. A combination of factors beyond schools limits educational opportunities and life chances.

2. This means that **cross-sector strategies** are required, to link what schools can do with what other sectors such as employment, health, finance, justice, housing, youth and welfare can offer.

3. The complexity of vulnerability calls for more systemic, "ecological" responses which involve interventions in families and communities alongside help for children and young people.

4. Difficult as they may be for policy makers, co-ordinated, multi-strand approaches sustained consistently over time may offer the best approach to preventing or mitigating the impact of multiple and cumulative disadvantage on people's educational experiences and life chances.

5. That these responses should be closely linked to schools, the only universal service where the well-being of children and young people can be regularly monitored would seem a wise step towards achieving universal inclusion.

6. Preventative multi-service interventions in and around schools are easiest to achieve if backed by national policies that promote inter-sectoral synergies from policy, through implementation to delivery. These synergies need to overcome strong historical boundaries between different services and professions.

7. Policy-led co-location of the different services is not sufficient. Efforts are needed to support genuine inter-professional collaborations at the point of service delivery.

8. Some EU Member States have moved some way towards such an approach, often as part of their early school leaving prevention strategies or overall lifelong learning strategies, and have established multi-service collaborations where professionals with different areas of responsibility work together to support disadvantaged children and adults.

9. This review has examined synergies across policy fields and in multi-professional partnerships, at local and regional levels in Europe, which aim at articulating interventions with education and training. It has attempted to: a) identify examples of multi-service interventions where there is robust evidence of successful outcomes for disadvantaged children and young people; and b) reveal the conditions for success.

10. The LSB teams (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) in the Netherlands, the "Team around the Child" initiative in the UK and the "Social Workers in Schools" in Sweden are successful, innovative examples of such multi-professional synergies created in and around education. These all focus primarily on helping children to be prepared to take advantage of schooling.

11. Other interventions such as the *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elbe Island Training Offensive) in Hamburg, the *One Square Kilometre of Education* in Berlin or *On-Track* in England, include schools as important partners in wider "ecological" attacks on deprivation. Others, such as some *extended* or *community schools* in Belgium and England are based *in* schools and offer enrichment experiences to children and families.

12. Cross-sectoral approaches are likely to make their greatest contribution within the context of a *holistic and equitable* view of education as being about holistic and equitable learner development.

13. Cross-sectoral approaches and inter-professional collaborations are easier to establish with statist or directive forms of governance (in which services are provided directly by the state, national and/or local) than with more delegated modes which rely mainly on monitoring.

14. Such approaches do not necessarily demand additional resources so much as that existing resources are used in a different way. Therefore, they can either *save costs* or *free up existing resources* for dealing with a wider range of issues thus contributing to "smart spending".

15. Funding for cross-sectoral approaches should be considered a priority in the effort to reach the Europe 2020 target of 10% early school leaving across the EU.

16. Such multi-faceted approaches must not be sacrificed simply because they are harder to evaluate. They need national or regional support and funding commitment and take time before outcomes can be produced as evidence of success.

17. Single-service and longer-term systemic multi-strand approaches can be complementary. The *Familiscope* in Ireland is a good example.

18. Responsive changes in practices in and around schools are necessarily sensitive to local conditions, making simple generalisations from interventions about what works difficult. Attention should therefore be paid to the principles and values underpinning interventions.

19. **A robust overarching conceptual framework** is urgently needed to help shape the development of national policies for active inclusion. Such a framework can usefully guide the work of schools with vulnerable young people: it can bring national policies from different sectors into alignment, facilitate cross-sectoral work at local level, and help monitor its outcomes in appropriate ways. Such a framework cannot and should not be over-prescriptive, but it can give administrations and practitioners in Member States a set of conceptual tools for thinking about how cross-sectoral approaches might be developed in their contexts.

Резюме

1. Училищата не могат сами да прекъснат предаващата се от поколение на поколение спирала на социална несправедливост и да се справят с неравноправието в образованието. Комбинация от фактори, които надхвърлят рамките на училището, ограничава образователните и житейските възможности.

2. Това означава, че са необходими **междусекторни стратегии**, които да свържат това, което училищата могат да направят, с това, което могат да предложат други сектори, като трудовата заетост, здравеопазването, финансите, правосъдието, жилищното настаняване, политиките за младежта и благосъстоянието.

3. Сложните проблеми, свързани с *уязвимостта*, се нуждаят от по-системен, многообхватен подход, който включва дейности в семействата и общностите, заедно с предоставяната помощ на децата и младите хора.

4. Макар и вероятно трудни за политиците, координираните, многосекторни подходи, които се поддържат последователно във времето, могат да се окажат най-добрият начин за предотвратяване или намаляване на въздействието на натрупаните и многобройни пречки пред образователните и житейските възможности на хората.

5. Осъществяването на близка връзка между този подход и училищата — единствената универсална услуга, където благосъстоянието на децата и младите хора може да бъде редовно следено — изглежда интелигентна стъпка към постигането на универсално социално включване.

6. Превантивната намеса на различни служби във и около училищата се провежда най-лесно, ако се подкрепя от национални политики за насърчаване на междусекторните стратегически синергии — от създаването на политиката, през изпълнението до постигането на резултати. Тези междусекторни синергии трябва да преодолеят силното историческо разделение между различните служби и професии.

7. Водено от политически съображения прегрупиране на различните служби не е достатъчно. Необходими са усилия в подкрепа на истинско междупрофесионално сътрудничество при предоставянето на услугите.

8. Някои държави членки на ЕС са постигнали определен напредък в това отношение, често в рамките на стратегията си за предотвратяване на преждевременното напускане на училище или общите стратегии за ученето през целия живот, и са установили сътрудничество между службите, при което служители от различни професионални области работят съвместно в подкрепа на деца и възрастни в неравностойно положение.

9. В това изследване е направен преглед на синергии на различни политики и партньорства между различни професии на местно и регионално равнище в Европа, целящи формулирането на действия в областта на образованието и обучението. В него се прави опит да се: а) открият примери за действия на различни служби, за които има солидни доказателства, че са дали положителни резултати в полза на децата и младите хора в неравностойно положение; и б) установят условията за постигането на положителни резултати.

10. Екипите на LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) в Нидерландия, инициативата "Team around the Child" ("Екип около детето") в Обединеното кралство и Social Workers in Schools ("Социални работници в училище") в

Швеция са примери за подобни успешни и иновативни синергии между различни професии, създадени във и около образованието. Те се съсредоточават предимно върху подпомагане на подготовката на децата да извлекат полза от училището.

11. Други инициативи като *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Инициатива за обучение на острови в Елба) в Хамбург и One Square Kilometer of Education (*Един квадратен километър образование*) в Берлин или *On-Track* в Англия включват училищата като важни партньори в по-широките многообхватни действия срещу социалната неравнопоставеност. Други, като някои "*разширени*" или "*общностни*" училища в Белгия и Англия, се намират *на територията на* училищата от формалната система и предлагат палитра от възможности за деца и семействата им.

12. Вероятно е междусекторните подходи да дадат своя най-голям принос в контекста на *холистичното и равнопоставящо разбиране за* образованието, осигуряващо цялостно и равнопоставено развитие на учещите се.

13. Междусекторните подходи и междупрофесионалното сътрудничество се създават по-лесно при преки форми на управление (при които услугите се предоставят пряко от държавните органи, на национално и/или местно равнище) в сравнение с по-делегирани методи, които се основават предимно на наблюдение.

14. Подобни подходи не изискват непременно толкова допълнителни ресурси,колкото използването на съществуващите ресурси по различен начин. Ето защо те могат или да доведат до икономии на разходи, или да освободят съществуващи ресурси за повече дейности и така да допринесат за "интелигентно изразходване на ресурсите".

15. Финансирането на междусекторните подходи следва да се счита за приоритет в усилията за постигане на целта на стратегия "Европа 2020" за намаляване на преждевременно напускащите училище в ЕС до 10 %.

16. Подобни многостранни подходи не трябва да се избягват само защото по-трудно подлежат на оценка. Те се нуждаят от национална или регионална подкрепа и ангажимент за финансиране и им е нужно време преди резултати от тях да могат да послужат като доказателство за успех.

17. Единичните и по-дългосрочните системни многостранни подходи могат да се допълват. *Familiscope* в Ирландия е добър пример.

18. Положителните промени в практиките във и около училищата са подвластни на местните условия, което затруднява опростените обобщения за резултатността на определено действие. Ето защо трябва да се обърне внимание на принципите и ценностите, които стоят зад действията.

19. Необходима е **стабилна цялостна концептуална рамка**, която да подпомогне оформянето и разработването на национални политики за активно приобщаване. Такава рамка може да даде полезни насоки в работата на училища с уязвими млади хора: чрез нея по подходящ начин може да се сближат националните политики от различни сектори, да се улесни междусекторната работа на местно равнище и да се подкрепи наблюдението на резултатите от тази работа. Подобна рамка не може и не трябва да е прекалено нормативна, но може да предостави на администрациите и специалистите в държавите членки набор от концептуални инструменти за начините за разработване на междусекторни подходи в техния конкретен контекст.

Shrnutí

1. Prolomení kruhu deprivace a znevýhodnění ve vzdělávání, který zasahuje několik generací, nelze ponechávat jen na školách. Možnosti vzdělávání a životní příležitosti omezuje více činitelů, které rámec škol přesahují.

2. To znamená, že jsou zapotřebí **strategie jdoucí napříč odvětvími**, které spojí práci škol s tím, co přinášejí další sektory, jako je zaměstnání, zdravotnictví, finance, justice, bydlení, politika mládeže a sociální zabezpečení.

3. Složitost problematiky zranitelnosti vyžaduje systémová a komplexní řešení, která kombinují působení v rodinách a komunitách s pomocí adresovanou dětem a mládeži.

4. Koordinovaný a mnohostranný přístup, který vyžaduje, aby byl důsledně uplatňován po určitou dobu, a z hlediska koncepce se jeví jako složitý, může být nejúčinnější cestou k prevenci nebo zmírňování dopadů, jež má vícečetné a kumulované znevýhodnění na vzdělávací možnosti a životní příležitosti.

5. Zapojit do této reakce školu, která je jedinou univerzální službou, v jejímž rámci lze náležitě dohlížet na kvalitu života dětí a mládeže, se zdá jako rozumný postup k dosažení všeobecného začlenění.

6. Preventivní opatření v podobě různých služeb poskytovaných přímo školami nebo ve spojení s nimi se nejsnáze uskutečňují, pokud jsou založena na vnitrostátních strategiích, které podporují součinnost mezi odvětvími od koncepce politiky přes její provádění až po dosažení výsledků. V zájmu tohoto společného působení je třeba překonat historicky hluboce zakořeněné předěly mezi různými službami a profesemi.

7. Politicky zakotvená koexistence různých služeb nestačí. Při poskytování těchto služeb je třeba usilovně podporovat přirozenou spolupráci mezi profesemi.

8. Některé členské státy EU již v tomto směru učinily první kroky – často jako součást strategií proti předčasnému ukončování školní docházky či obecných strategií celoživotního učení – a zavedly formy spolupráce mezi službami, v jejichž rámci společně působí profesionálové odpovídající za různé oblasti, aby pomáhali znevýhodněným dětem a dospělým.

9. Tento přezkum se zabývá součinností, která existuje mezi různými oblastmi politiky a při spolupráci různých profesí na místní a regionální úrovni v Evropě, jejímž cílem je realizovat opatření prostřednictvím vzdělávání a odborné přípravy. Přezkum se pokouší: a) o nalezení příkladů opatření, do nichž je zapojeno několik služeb najednou, s prokazatelným přínosem pro znevýhodněné děti a mládež, a b) o zjištění předpokladů vedoucích k úspěchu.

10. Mezi úspěšné a inovativní příklady součinnosti různých profesí v rámci vzdělávání patří *LSB Teams* (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) v Nizozemsku, iniciativa *Team around the Child* ve Spojeném království nebo švédský projekt spočívající v nasazení sociálních pracovníků do škol. Cílem všech uvedených opatření je především připravit děti tak, aby dokázaly optimálně využít své školní docházky.

11. Další opatření v oblasti vzdělávání, jako je *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* v Hamburku, *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* v Berlíně nebo projekt *On-Track* v Anglii, zapojují školy jako důležité partnery v širším a komplexním boji proti deprivaci. Další iniciativy, jako jsou některé rozšířené školy (*extended schools*) nebo komunitní školy v Belgii a Anglii, působí *v rámci* škol a dětem i rodinám nabízejí další obohacující zážitky.

12. Meziodvětvové koncepce jsou nejpřínosnější, fungují-li v kontextu *celostního a rovnostářského* pojetí vzdělávání, kdy je cílem komplexní rozvoj jedince v duchu vzájemné rovnosti.

13. Meziodvětvové koncepce a spolupráce různých profesionálů se snáze realizují v podmínkách státního či hierarchického řízení (kdy jsou služby poskytovány přímo na státní, národní a/nebo místní úrovni) než v podmínkách řízení vykonávaného v přenesené pravomoci, které se opírá především o dohled.

14. Tyto koncepce nemusí ani tak vyžadovat další zdroje jako spíše změnu využití zdrojů stávajících. Mohou tedy náklady buď ušetřit, nebo uvolnit prostředky, které jsou k dispozici, na řešení širšího spektra problémů, a přispět tak k optimalizaci výdajů.

15. Financování meziodvětvových koncepcí by mělo být považováno za prioritu při snahách o splnění cíle strategie Evropa 2020 spočívajícím ve snížení předčasného ukončování školní docházky na 10 % v celé EU.

16. Skutečnost, že se meziodvětvové koncepce hůře vyhodnocují, nesmí být překážkou. Je potřeba je podpořit a financovat na státní nebo regionální úrovni. Jejich úspěšnost lze doložit až po určité době.

17. Koncepce založené na jediné službě a dlouhodobé, systematické a mnohostranné koncepce se mohou vzájemně doplňovat. To dobře dokládá iniciativa nazvaná *Familiscope* z Irska.

18. Změny postupů ve školách a v souvislosti s nimi musí citlivě reagovat na místní podmínky; vyvodit prosté zobecnění ohledně toho, co funguje, je tudíž obtížné. Pozornost by se tedy měla věnovat zásadám a hodnotám, z nichž opatření vycházejí.

19. Je naléhavě potřeba vytvořit **pevný zastřešující koncepční rámec**, který by napomáhal při vývoji vnitrostátních politik aktivního začleňování. Tento rámec by mohl být vodítkem pro práci škol se zranitelnými mladými lidmi: může uvádět do souladu vnitrostátní politiky z různých odvětví, usnadňovat meziodvětvovou činnost na místní úrovni a náležitými způsoby pomáhat při monitorování výsledků. Tento rámec nemůže a neměl by být nadměrně preskriptivní, ale může dát správním orgánům i odborníkům v členských státech soubor koncepčních nástrojů pro úvahy o tom, jak lze meziodvětvový přístup rozvíjet v jejich podmínkách.

Resumé

1. Skoler kan ikke arbejde på egen hånd for at afhjælpe langvarige afsavn, der strækker sig over generationer, og håndtere uddannelsesmæssige skævheder. Der er et samspil af faktorer uden for skolelivet, der begrænser uddannelses- og fremtidsmuligheder.

2. Det betyder, at der er brug for **tværsektorielle strategier** for at forbinde det, skolerne kan gøre, med det, andre sektorer som beskæftigelse, sundhed, finansvæsen, retsvæsen, boligsektoren, ungdomsområder og velfærd kan tilbyde.

3. Komplekse problemer med sårbarhed kræver mere systemiske, "økologiske" løsninger, hvor man kombinerer indsatse i familier og lokalsamfund med hjælp til børn og unge.

4. Selv om koordinerede vidtfavnende fremgangsmåder, der understøttes på lang sigt, er vanskelige for politikerne, kan de være den bedste måde til at forebygge eller mildne virkningen af flere og kumulative skævheder inden for personers uddannelsesforløb og fremtidsmuligheder.

5. Disse løsninger bør gennemføres i et nært samspil med skolerne, den eneste universelle tjenesteydelse, hvor børn og unges trivsel regelmæssigt kan overvåges, således at der kan opnås universel inklusion.

6. Forebyggende interventioner, der omfatter flere sektorer, på og omkring skoler, kan nemmest gennemføres, hvis de støttes af nationale politikker, der styrker synergier mellem sektorer, fra beslutningsfasen over implementering til levering. Disse tværsektorielle synergier skal derfor overvinde stærke historiske adskillelser mellem forskellige tjenester og erhverv.

7. Topstyret samhusning af de forskellige tjenester er ikke nok. Der er brug for en indsats, der understøtter reelt tværfagligt samarbejde der, hvor tjenesten leveres.

8. Nogle EU-medlemsstater har bevæget sig hen mod en sådan fremgangsmådefremgangsmåder, ofte som led i deres strategier til at modvirke skolefrafald eller opnå livslang læring, og har etableret samarbejde mellem flere tjenester, hvor fagfolk med forskellige ansvarsområder arbejder sammen for at støtte ugunstigt stillede børn og voksne.

9. I denne rapport har vi undersøgt synergier på tværs af politik- og fagområder, på lokalt og regionalt niveau i Europa, hvor man søger at opbygge samarbejde med uddannelsessektoren. Undersøgelsen har forsøgt at: a) kortlægge eksempler på samarbejde mellem flere tjenester, hvor der er stærke beviser på positive resultater for ugunstigt stillede børn og unge og b) klarlægge betingelserne for positive resultater.

10. LSB-holdene (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) i Nederlandene, tiltaget *Team around the Child* i Storbritannien og samarbejdet mellem skoler og socialrådgivere i Sverige er vellykkede, innovative eksempler på sådanne tværfaglige synergier, der er oprettet i og omkring uddannelse. Disse fokuserer alle hovedsageligt på at hjælpe børn til at kunne drage fordel af undervisningen.

11. Andre initiativer som *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Uddannelsesindsats på øen i Elben) i Hamburg, *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* (En kvadratkilometers uddannelse) i Berlin eller *On-Track* i England inddrager skoler som vigtige partnere i bredere "økologiske" indsatser over for afsavn. Andre tiltag som visse *udvidede* skoler eller skoler i lokalsamfundene i Belgien og England foregår *på* skoler og tilbyder berigende oplevelser for børn og familier.

12. Tværsektorielle fremgangsmåder har de bedste muligheder for at bidrage inden for et *holistisk* og *ligeligt* syn på uddannelse, der drejer sig om at fremme elevernes holistiske og ligelige udvikling.

13. Det er nemmere at oprette tværsektorielle fremgangsmåder og tværfagligt samarbejde med statsstyrede regeringsformer (hvor tjenester leveres direkte af staten på nationalt og/eller lokalt niveau) end med former med mere delegering, der hovedsageligt bygger på overvågning.

14. Sådanne tilgange kræver ikke nødvendigvis flere ressourcer, men snarere at eksisterende ressourcer anvendes på en anden måde. Derfor kan de enten *give besparelser* eller *frigøre eksisterende ressourcer* til at håndtere et bredere udvalg af problemer, og de bidrager på den måde til mere effektiv udnyttelse af ressourcer.

15. Finansiering af tværsektorielle fremgangsmåder bør ses som en prioritet i indsatsen for at nå Europa 2020-målet på 10 % for skolefrafald i hele EU.

16. Sådanne flerdimensionelle fremgangsmåder må ikke opgives, blot fordi det er vanskeligt at evaluere dem. De kræver national eller regional støtte og finansieringstilsagn, og det tager tid, før resultaterne kan fremstilles som bevis for succes.

17. Fremgangsmåder, der omfatter en enkelt tjeneste, og langsigtede systemiske fremgangsmåder, der inddrager mange områder, kan supplere hinanden. Det er *Familiscope* i Irland er et godt eksempel på.

18. Responsive ændringer i praksis på og omkring skoler er nødvendigvis påvirket af lokale forhold, hvilket gør det vanskeligt at generalisere om hvilken form for intervention der virker. Derfor bør man være opmærksom på principperne og værdierne bag interventionerne.

19. Der er akut behov for **en solid overordnet begrebsramme** til at bidrage til at forme udviklingen af nationale politikker om aktiv inklusion. Sådan en ramme kan være nyttig som vejledning for skolernes arbejde med udsatte unge. Den kan afpasse nationale politikker for forskellige sektorer, lette tværsektorielt arbejde på lokalt niveau og hjælpe med at overvåge resultater på egnede måder. Sådan en ramme kan ikke og bør ikke være overdrevent normativ, men den kan give forvaltninger og fagfolk i medlemsstaterne nogle begrebsmæssige redskaber til at overveje, hvordan tværsektorielle fremgangsmåder kan udvikles i deres omgivelser.

Zusammenfassung

1. Schulen allein können mehrere Generationen umfassende Deprivationszyklen und Bildungsbenachteiligungen nicht durchbrechen. Bildungs- und Lebenschancen werden durch eine Kombination schulexterner Faktoren eingeschränkt.

2. Deshalb sind **sektorübergreifende Strategien** erforderlich, um das, was Schulen leisten können, mit Maßnahmen in anderen Bereichen (z. B. Beschäftigung, Gesundheitswesen, finanzielle Unterstützung, Justiz, Wohnungswesen, Jugend und soziale Sicherheit) zu verknüpfen.

3. Komplexe Gefährdungsprobleme erfordern umfassende Ansätze, die u. a. Maßnahmen in Familien und Gemeinschaften sowie die Unterstützung von Kindern und jungen Menschen umfassen.

4. Koordinierte, mehrgleisige Ansätze sind zwar eine Herausforderung für die Politik, dürften jedoch – sofern sie konsequent über längere Zeit umgesetzt werden – die beste Methode sein, um Mehrfachbenachteiligungen, die den Bildungsweg und die Lebenschancen von Menschen beeinträchtigen, zu verhindern oder abzumildern.

5. Eine weise Entscheidung für einen Schritt in Richtung allgemeiner Inklusion wäre es, die Schulen eng in solche Ansätze einzubinden, da Schulen als einzige universelle Dienstleistung die Möglichkeit haben, das Wohlergehen von Kindern und jungen Menschen regelmäßig zu verfolgen.

6. Präventive, verschiedene Dienstleistungen einbeziehende Interventionen in und im Umfeld von Schulen lassen sich am einfachsten durchführen, wenn sie sich auf nationale Politiken stützen, die in allen Phasen – von der politischen Entscheidungsfindung über die Verwirklichung bis zu den Ergebnissen – auf die Ausschöpfung sektorübergreifender Synergien ausgerichtet sind. Um solche Synergien zu erreichen, müssen hohe, historisch gewachsene Barrieren zwischen verschiedenen Dienstleistungen und Berufsgruppen überwunden werden.

7. Eine von der Politik angestoßene räumliche Zusammenlegung verschiedener Dienste reicht nicht aus. Vielmehr müssen Anstrengungen unternommen werden, um eine echte Zusammenarbeit der unterschiedlichen Berufsgruppen bei der Dienstleistungserbringung zu erreichen.

8. Einige EU-Mitgliedstaaten haben erste Schritte in Richtung eines solchen Ansatzes getan (oft im Rahmen ihrer Schulabbruch-Präventionsstrategien oder ihrer allgemeinen Strategien für lebenslanges Lernen) und zu diesem Zweck dienststellenübergreifende Kooperationen eingeführt, bei denen Fachleute aus unterschiedlichen Zuständigkeitsbereichen gemeinsam an der Förderung benachteiligter Kinder und Erwachsener arbeiten.

9. Im Rahmen der vorliegenden Untersuchung wurde analysiert, wie Synergien über Politikfelder hinweg und innerhalb von multidisziplinären Partnerschaften auf lokaler, regionaler und europäischer Ebene bei der Konzeption von Maßnahmen unter Einbeziehung der allgemeinen und beruflichen Bildung ausgeschöpft werden.

Es wurde versucht, a) Beispiele für multidisziplinäre Maßnahmen mit nachweislich positiven Ergebnissen für benachteiligte Kinder und Jugendliche sowie b) die Voraussetzungen für ihren Erfolg zu ermitteln.

10. Erfolgreiche, innovative Beispiele für die Nutzung solcher multidisziplinärer Synergien innerhalb und im Umfeld der Bildung sind die *LSB Teams* (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) in den Niederlanden, die Initiative *Team around the Child* im Vereinigten Königreich sowie der Einsatz von Sozialarbeitern in schwedischen Schulen. Sie alle zielen in erster Linie darauf ab, die Kinder so zu unterstützen, dass sie voll von ihrem Schulbesuch profitieren können.

11. Bei anderen Maßnahmen, wie der Hamburger *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln,* der Berliner Initiative *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* oder *On-Track* aus England, agieren Schulen als wichtige Partner im Rahmen breit angelegter und umfassender Projekte gegen Benachteiligungen. Wieder andere Maßnahmen sind *in* den Schulen angesiedelt und bieten Kindern und Familien bereichernde Erfahrungen. Beispiele hierfür sind die *Extended Schools* in England und die Gemeinschaftsschulen in Belgien.

12. Im Kontext eines *ganzheitlichen, gerechtigkeitsorientierten* Bildungsansatzes dürften sektorübergreifende Konzepte den größten Beitrag leisten, um eine ganzheitliche, ausgewogene Entwicklung der Lernenden zu erreichen.

13. Multidisziplinäre Konzepte und berufsgruppenübergreifende Kooperationen lassen sich in staatlich gelenkten, hierarchischen Verwaltungssystemen (bei denen Leistungen direkt von staatlichen Stellen auf nationaler und/oder lokaler Ebene erbracht werden) leichter verwirklichen als in Systemen, die stärker auf die Übertragung von Befugnissen mit staatlicher Überwachung setzen.

14. Solche Ansätze erfordern nicht unbedingt zusätzliche Ressourcen, da vorhandene Ressourcen auf andere Art und Weise eingesetzt werden. Somit können sie sogar *Kosten sparen oder zuvor gebundene Ressourcen freisetzen*, so dass ein breiteres Problemspektrum behandelt und zugleich ein Beitrag zu einer intelligenten Ausgabenstrategie geleistet werden kann.

15. Die Bereitstellung von Mitteln für sektorübergreifende Konzepte sollte mit Blick auf das Europa-2020-Ziel, den Anteil der Schulabbrecher EU-weit auf 10 % zu verringern, als Priorität eingestuft werden.

16. Die Schwierigkeit der Evaluierung solcher mehrdimensionalen Konzepte sollte der Umsetzung dieser Konzepte nicht im Wege stehen. Hierfür werden Unterstützung vonseiten nationaler oder regionaler Stellen sowie Finanzierungszusagen benötigt. Bis Erfolgsbelege in Form greifbarer Ergebnisse vorliegen, braucht es Zeit.

17. Monodisziplinäre Ansätze und längerfristigere, systembezogene mehrdimensionale Konzepte können sich gegenseitig ergänzen. *Familiscope* in Irland ist hierfür ein gutes Beispiel.

18. Wie sich die Verfahren in und im Umfeld von Schulen verändern, hängt notwendigerweise von den lokalen Bedingungen ab, so dass sich die Erkenntnisse aus solchen Maßnahmen – was funktioniert und was nicht – nicht einfach verallgemeinern lassen. Daher sollte man auf die Grundsätze und Werte achten, auf die sich solche Maßnahmen stützen.

19. Es wird dringend ein **stabiler übergeordneter konzeptioneller Rahmen** benötigt, um die Entwicklung nationaler Strategien zur aktiven Inklusion zu unterstützen. Ein solcher Rahmen könnte den Schulen als wertvolle Orientierungshilfe für ihre Arbeit mit benachteiligten jungen Menschen dienen. Er könnte die Kohärenz nationaler Strategien aus unterschiedlichen Bereichen verstärken, die sektorübergreifende Arbeit auf lokaler Ebene erleichtern und ein geeignetes Monitoring der Ergebnisse gewährleisten. Ein solcher Rahmen kann und sollte keine übermäßig präzisen Vorgaben enthalten, doch er kann Verwaltungen und Praktikern eine Reihe von Konzepten an die Hand geben, die ihnen die Entwicklung sektorübergreifender Maßnahmen ermöglichen, die auf ihre spezifische Situation abgestimmt sind.

Σύνοψη

1. Το σχολείο δεν είναι ικανό από μόνο του να διασπάσει το διαγενεακό κύκλο της υστέρησης/μειονεξίας και να αντι-μετωπίσει τις εκπαιδευτικές ανισότητες. Οι δυνατότητες για εκπαίδευση και για μια αξιοπρεπή ζωή περιορίζονται από ένα συνδυασμό παραγόντων που υπερβαίνουν τα όρια του σχολείου.

2. Αυτό σημαίνει ότι απαιτούνται **δια-τομεακές στρατηγικές** (cross-sector strategies), προκειμένου να συνδεθεί αυτό που μπορεί να επιτύχει το σχολείο, με όσα μπορούν να προσφέρουν άλλοι τομείς όπως η απασχόληση, η υγεία, η οικονομία, η δικαιοσύνη, η στέγαση, η νεολαία και η κοινωνική πρόνοια.

3. Η πολυπλοκότητα των προβλημάτων που ενυπάρχουν στην έννοια "ευπαθής" υπαγορεύουν την ανάγκη για μια συστημικότερη, "οικολογική" αντιμετώπιση, στην οποία παράλληλα με την παροχή βοήθειας στα παιδιά και τους νέους περιλαμβάνονται και παρεμβάσεις προς την οικογένεια και την κοινότητα.

4. Όσο δύσκολο και αν φαίνεται, η χάραξη μιας τέτοιας συντονισμένης, πολυεπίπεδης, βιώσιμης και με διάρκεια πολιτικής, ίσως και να αποτελεί τη σοφότερη προσέγγιση για την πρόληψη και τον περιορισμό των πολλαπλών και συσσωρεύμενων μειονεκτημάτων στην εκπαιδευτική εμπειρία του ανθρώπου και στις δυνατότητες που του δίνονται για μια αξιοπρεπή ζωή.

5. Το να συνδεθούν όλες αυτές οι παρεμβάσεις στενά με το σχολείο, το μόνο γενικής εμβέλειας φορέα παροχής υπη-ρεσιών που παρακολουθεί στενά το επίπεδο ζωής των παιδιών και των νέων, ίσως να αναδειχθεί ως το πιο σοφό βήμα για την αντιμετώπιση των εκπαιδευτικών ανισοτή-των και συνακόλουθα τη διεύρυνση της κοινωνικής ένταξης.

6. Τέτοιες σύνθετες παρεμβάσεις πρόληψης γύρω από και μέσα στη σχολική κοινότητα επιτυγχάνονται ευκολότερα αν υποστηριχθούν από εθνικές πολιτικές που να προβλέπουν και να προωθούν τις συνέργιες μεταξύ διαφορετικών τομέων, τόσο στο στάδιο του σχεδιασμού τους, όσο και κατά τη διάρκεια της εφαρμογής τους. Οι συνέργιες αυτές θα πρέπει, ωστόσο, να υπερβούν ισχυρά ιστορικά εμπόδια μεταξύ των εμπλεκομένων υπηρεσιών και κλάδων.

7. Δεν αρκεί η συστέγαση των διαφορετικών πολιτικών και διοικητικών υπηρεσιών. Απαιτείται προσπάθεια για τη στήριξη μιας γνήσιας και αποτελεσματικής συνεργασίας μεταξύ υπηρεσιών από διαφορετικούς τομείς στο σημείο ακριβώς που παρέχεται η από κοινού υπηρεσία.

8. Ορισμένα κράτη μέλη της ΕΕ συχνά, είτε στο πλαίσιο της στρατηγικής τους για την πρόληψη της πρόωρης εγκατάλειψης του σχολείου, είτε της γενικής στρατηγικής τους για τη διά βίου μάθηση, έχουν προχωρήσει ως ένα βαθμό προς μια τέτοια κατεύθυνση και έχουν καθιερώσει συνέργιες μεταξύ διαφορετικών υπηρεσιών, στις οποίες επαγγελματίες από διαφορετικούς κλάδους συνεργά-ζονται για να υποστηρίξουν μειονεκτούντα παιδιά και ενήλικες.

9. Στο πλαίσιο αυτής της μελέτης διερευνήθηκαν συνέργιες μεταξύ διαφόρων τομέων πολιτικής και επαγγελματικών κλάδων, σε τοπικό και περιφερειακό επίπεδο στην Ευρώπη, οι οποίες αποβλέπουν στη διασύνδεση τους με την εκπαίδευση και την κατάρτιση. Η μελέτη αυτή επιχείρησε: α) να εντοπίσει τεκμηριωμένα παραδείγματα επιτυχημένων πολλαπλών παρεμβάσεων για παιδιά και νέους που βρίσκονται σε μειονεκτική θέση, και β) να αναδείξει τους παράγοντες της επιτυχίας τους.

10. Οι ομάδες LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) στις Κάτω Χώρες, η πρωτοβουλία "Team around the Child" στο Ηνωμένο Βασίλειο και η πρωτοβουλία "Κοινωνικοί λειτουργοί στα σχολεία" στη Σουηδία αποτελούν επιτυχή και καινοτόμα παραδείγματα, τέτοιων πολυκλαδικών συνεργιών γύρω από και μέσα στο σχολείο. Αυτές οι συνέργιες αποσκοπούν κυρίως να βοηθήσουν τα παιδιά να προετοιμαστούν καλύτερα ώστε να ωφεληθούν όσο το δυνατό περισσότερο από τη φοίτησή τους στο σχολείο.

11. Άλλες παρεμβάσεις όπως η *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (δράση της νήσου Έλβα για την κατάρτιση) στο Αμβούργο, η δράση *One Square Kilometre of Education* στο Βερολίνο, ή η δράση *On-Track* στην Αγγλία, περιλαμβάνουν συνέργιες μεταξύ σχολείων, που λειτουργούν ως βασικοί εταίροι σε μια ευρύτερη "οικολογική" αντιμετώπιση του φαινομένου της υστέρησης/μειονεξίας. Άλλες μορφές παρέμβασης, όπως ορισμένα *ολοήμερα σχολεία* ή τα *community schools* στο Βέλγιο και την Αγγλία, ενερ-γοποιούνται *μέσα* στα ίδια τα σχολεία και προσφέρουν πλουσιότερες εκπαιδευτικές εμπειρίες στα παιδιά και τις οικογένειές τους.

12. Οι διατομεακές προσεγγίσεις είναι πιθανό να συμβάλλουν περισσότερο αν λειτουργήσουν στο πλαίσιο μιας *ολιστικής και κοινωνικά δίκαιης* προσέγγισης για την εκπαίδευση, που θεωρεί ότι κυρίαρχος στόχος της εκπαίδευσης είναι η συνολική και κοινωνικά δίκαιη ανάπτυξη των εκπαιδευό-μενων.

13. Οι διατομεακές προσεγγίσεις και οι διακλαδικές συνέργιες επιτυγχάνονται ευκολότερα στο πλαίσιο πιο συγκεντρω-τικών μορφών διακυβέρνησης (όπου οι υπηρεσίες παρέχονται άμεσα από το κράτος, σε εθνικό ή/και τοπικό επίπεδο) παρά στο πλαίσιο πιο αποκεντρωμένων συστη-μάτων που βασίζονται κυρίως στην επιτήρηση.

14. Οι προσεγγίσεις αυτές δεν απαιτούν κατ' ανάγκη επιπλέον πόρους, αλλά απαιτούν διαφορετική χρήση των διαθέσι-μων πόρων. Συνεπώς, αυτές οι προσεγγίσεις μπορούν *είτε να μειώσουν το κόστος, είτε να απελευθερώσουν υφιστά-μενους πόρους* για την αντιμετώπιση ενός ευρύτερου φάσματος προβλημάτων, συμβάλλοντας σε μια πιο "έξυπνη διαχείριση των πόρων".

15. Η χρηματοδότηση για διατομεακές προσεγγίσεις θα πρέπει να θεωρηθεί ως προτεραιότητα στην προσπάθεια για την επίτευξη του Ευρωπαϊκού στόχου για της μείωση της πρόωρης αποχώρησης από το σχολείο στο 10 % στα κράτη μέλη της Ε.Ε.

16. Τέτοιες πολύπλευρες προσεγγίσεις δεν πρέπει να θυσιάζονται απλώς και μόνον επειδή είναι πιο δύσκολο να αξιολογηθούν. Χρειάζονται εθνική ή περιφερειακή υπο-στήριξη, δέσμευση για χρηματοδότηση, και πίστωση χρόνου, έως ότου εμφανιστούν τα αποτελέσματα με τα οποία αποδεικνύεται η επιτυχία τους.

17. Η παροχή υπηρεσιών μιας κατεύθυνσης με μακροπρό-θεσμες, συστημικές και πολυδιάστατες προσεγγίσεις μπορούν να είναι συμπληρωματικές. Η δράση *Familiscope* στην Ιρλανδία αποτελεί ένα καλό τέτοιο παράδειγμα.

18. Οι οποιεσδήποτε αλλαγές στις υιοθετούμενες πρακτικές μέσα και γύρω από το σχολείο θα πρέπει να ανταποκρί-νονται στις τοπικές συνθήκες και ιδιαιτερότητες. Είναι δύσκολο να καταλήξει κάποιος σε γενικά συμπεράσματα για το τι λειτουργεί και τι όχι. Θα πρέπει να δοθεί ιδιαίτερη προσοχή στις αρχές και τις αξίες στις οποίες στηρίζονται οι παρεμβάσεις.

19. Πρέπει να διαμορφωθεί άμεσα ένα ισχυρό γενικό εννοιολογικό πλαίσιο που θα βοηθήσει στη χάραξη εθνικών πολιτικών με στόχο την ενεργό ένταξη. Ένα τέτοιο πλαίσιο μπορεί να κατευθύνει επωφελώς το έργο των σχολείων για το πώς θα στηρίξουν τους ευάλωτους νέους: μπορεί να ευθυγραμμίσει τις εθνικές πολιτικές στους διάφορους τομείς, να διευκολύνει τη διακλαδική δουλειά σε τοπικό επίπεδο και να συμβάλει στην παρακολούθηση των αποτελεσμάτων των παρεμβάσεων με κατάλληλους τρόπους. Ένα τέτοιο πλαίσιο δεν μπορεί και δεν πρέπει να είναι υπέρμετρα περιοριστικό, αλλά μπορεί να προσφέρει στις δημόσιες υπηρεσίες και στους εμπλεκόμενους επαγγελματίες σε όλα τα κράτη μέλη της Ε.Ε. ένα εργαλείο προβληματισμού για το πως θα αναπτύξουν τις διατομεακές προσεγγίσεις στο δικό τους πλαίσιο αναφοράς.

Resumen

1. La escuela no puede actuar en solitario para romper los ciclos intergeneracionales de pobreza y abordar los desequilibrios en materia de educación. Una combinación de factores que va más allá de la escuela limita las oportunidades educativas y de tener éxito en la vida.

2. Esto significa que hacen falta **estrategias intersectoriales** para conectar lo que la escuela puede hacer con lo que pueden ofrecer otros sectores, como el empleo, la sanidad, las finanzas, la justicia, la vivienda, la juventud y la asistencia social.

3. La compleja problemática de la vulnerabilidad exige unas respuestas más "ecológicas" y sistémicas, es decir, respuestas más generales que incluyan la intervención en familias y comunidades, junto con la ayuda a niños y jóvenes.

4. Por muy difícil que resulten para los responsables de las políticas, los enfoques coordinados multifacéticos sostenidos coherentemente a lo largo del tiempo pueden ser la mejor manera de evitar o atenuar los efectos de las desventajas múltiples y acumulativas en la experiencia educativa y las oportunidades vitales de las personas.

5. Conseguir que estas medidas estén estrechamente relacionadas con la escuela, el único servicio universal en el que puede supervisarse regularmente el bienestar de niños y jóvenes, parece un paso acertado para lograr una inclusión universal.

6. Las intervenciones preventivas multiservicios en la escuela y su entorno son más fáciles de realizar si están respaldadas por políticas nacionales que promuevan sinergias intersectoriales desde el diseño de las políticas hasta su concretización, pasando por su ejecución. Es necesario que estas sinergias intersectoriales traspasen fronteras históricas muy arraigadas entre distintos servicios y profesiones.

7. No basta con una coubicación de los distintos servicios dirigida por las políticas. Es necesario realizar esfuerzos para apoyar una verdadera colaboración interprofesional en el lugar en que se prestan los servicios.

8. Algunos Estados miembros de la UE han realizado algunos avances hacia tal enfoque, a menudo como parte de sus estrategias de prevención del abandono educativo temprano o de estrategias generales de aprendizaje permanente, y han establecido colaboraciones multiservicios, en las que profesionales con distintos ámbitos de responsabilidad trabajan juntos para apoyar a niños y adultos desfavorecidos.

9. Esta revisión ha examinado las sinergias entre diversos ámbitos de actuación y en asociaciones multiprofesionales tanto a nivel regional como local en Europa, con el objetivo de articular las intervenciones en la educación y la formación. Asimismo, ha intentado: a) identificar ejemplos de intervenciones multiservicios en los que existen pruebas fehacientes de buenos resultados para niños y jóvenes desfavorecidos; y b) poner de manifiesto las condiciones para el éxito.

10. Los equipos LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) de los Países Bajos, la iniciativa "Equipo en torno a la infancia", del Reino Unido, y los "Trabajado-res sociales en la escuela", de Suecia, son ejemplos acertados e innovadores de este tipo de sinergias multiprofesionales creadas en el ámbito de la educación y su entorno. Todos ellos se centran principalmente en ayudar a los niños a prepararse para aprovechar su escolarización.

11. Otras intervenciones, como la *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Ofensiva de formación de las islas del Elba), en Hamburgo; *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* (Un kilómetro cuadrado de educación), en Berlín; u *On-Track* (En marcha), en Inglaterra, incluyen a centros escolares como socios importantes en unas ofensivas con un sentido más "ecológico" contra la pobreza. Otras iniciativas, como algunas escuelas *ampliadas* o *comunitarias* de Bélgica e Inglaterra tienen su base *en* la escuela y ofrecen experiencias enriquecedoras a los niños y sus familias.

12. Es probable que donde más aporten los enfoques intersectoriales sea en el contexto de una visión *de conjunto y equitativa* de la educación, pues se trata del desarrollo de conjunto y equitativo del alumno.

13. Es más fácil establecer enfoques intersectoriales y una colaboración interprofesional con formas de gobernanza estatales o dirigistas (en las que la administración pública nacional o local presta los servicios directamente) que con formas más delegadas que se basan principalmente en la supervisión.

14. Estos enfoques no requieren necesariamente recursos adicionales, sino que se utilicen los existentes de forma distinta. Por ello, pueden bien *ahorrar costes* o bien *liberar recursos existentes* para hacer frente a una mayor variedad de cuestiones, contribuyendo así a un "gasto inteligente".

15. La financiación para enfoques intersectoriales debe considerarse una prioridad en el esfuerzo por alcanzar el objetivo de Europa 2020 de situar en un 10 % el porcentaje de abandono escolar prematuro en toda la UE.

16. Tales enfoques multifacéticos no deben sacrificarse por ser más difíciles de evaluar. Requieren un apoyo nacional o regional y un compromiso de financiación, y necesitan tiempo para dar resultados que indiquen su éxito.

17. Los enfoques de servicio único y los enfoques multifacéticos sistémicos a largo plazo pueden ser complementarios. *Familiscope,* en Irlanda, es un buen ejemplo de ello.

18. Los cambios adecuados en las prácticas en la escuela y su entorno son necesariamente sensibles a las condiciones locales, por lo que es difícil hacer generalizaciones simples a partir de intervenciones concretas sobre qué es lo que funciona. Por tanto, debe prestarse atención a los principios y valores en que se basan las intervenciones.

19. **Se necesita urgentemente un sólido marco conceptual general** para ayudar a configurar la elaboración de las políticas nacionales para una inclusión activa. Dicho marco puede servir para orientar el trabajo de la escuela en favor de los jóvenes vulnerables: puede alinear las políticas nacionales de diferentes sectores, facilitar el trabajo intersectorial a nivel local y ayudar a supervisar sus resultados de forma apropiada. Dicho marco no puede y no debe ser excesivamente prescriptivo, pero puede proporcionar a las administraciones y los profesionales de los Estados miembros un conjunto de herramientas conceptuales para reflexionar sobre cómo pueden elaborarse enfoques intersectoriales en sus distintos contextos.

Kokkuvõte

1. Koolid ei suuda üksinda tõkestada ühelt põlvkonnalt teisele kanduvat tõrjutust ega lahendada haridusliku ebavõrdsuse probleeme. Haridusvõimaluste ja elus ette tulevate võimaluste kasutamist takistavad mitmesugused koolivälised asjaolud.

2. See tähendab, et vaja on **sektoriüleseid strateegiaid**, mis võimaldaksid siduda koolide tegevuse muude valdkondadega, nagu tööhõive, tervishoid, rahandus, õiguskaitse, eluase, noorsootöö ja heaolu.

3. Keerulise haavatavusega probleemid nõuavad süsteemset ja "ökoloogilist" lahendust, mis perekonna ja kogukonna toetamise kõrvalt aitab ka lapsi ja noori.

4. Selleks, et vältida või leevendada mitmekordset ja kumulatiivset kahjulikku mõju inimeste haridusele ja eluväljavaadetele, on vaja koordineeritud, mitmetahulist ja järjepidevat lähenemisviisi, kuigi poliitikakujundajate jaoks võib selle rakendamine tunduda keeruline.

5. Üldise kaasatuse saavutamiseks tundub mõistlik siduda kõnealune lähenemisviis tihedalt kooliga, sest hariduse andmine on ainus universaalteenus, mis võimaldab laste ja noorte heaolu korrapäraselt jälgida.

6. Mitut valdkonda hõlmavate ennetavate teenuste pakkumist koolis ja kooliväliselt on lihtsam korraldada, kui riigi poliitika toetab asjakohaste nõuete kehtestamisest rakendamiseni, soodustades valdkondadgahelist sünergiat.

7. Poliitikast juhitud erinevate teenuste ümberjaotamine ei ole piisav. On vaja teha jõupingutusi, et toetada teenuste osutamisel tõelist kutsealade vahelist koostööd.

8. Mõned ELi liikmesriigid on kohati sellise lähenemisviisi suunas liikunud. Sageli on see osa liikmesriigi strateegiast ennetamaks varajast koolist välja langemist või elukestva õppe korraldamiseks ning liikmesriik on sisse seadnud teenusteülese koostöö mitme vastutusala spetsialistide vahel, et toetada ebasoodsas olukorras olevaid lapsi ja täiskasvanuid.

9. Käesoleva läbivaatuse raames uuriti poliitikavaldkondade sünergiat ning kohaliku ja piirkondliku tasandi kutsealade ülest partnerlust Euroopas, mille eesmärk on koordineerida meetmeid hariduse ja koolituse valdkonnaga. Läbivaatuse eesmärk oli a) leida näiteid teenuseüleste meetmete kohta, mille puhul on olemas usaldusväärsed tõendid edukatest tulemustest ebasoodsas olukorras olevate laste ja noorte jaoks ning b) teha kindlaks tingimused edu saavutamiseks.

10. LSB-rühmad (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) Madalmaades, Ühendkuningriigi algatus "Team around the Child" ning Rootsis "Sotsiaaltöötajad koolides" on edukad ja innovaatilised näited kutsealade ülesest sünergiast haridussüsteemis ja selle ümber. Kõik need algatused on eelkõige keskendunud laste abistamisele, et nad oskaksid haridusvõimalustest igakülgselt kasutada.

11. Sellistes algatustes nagu *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* Hamburgis, *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* Berliinis või *On-Track* Inglismaal, on koolid olulised partnerid ulatuslikumas "ökoloogilises" võitluses tõrjutusega. Mõned koolid, nagu näiteks huvi- ja kogukonnakoolid Belgias ja Ühendkuningriigis tegutsevad kooliruumides ning nende eesmärk on pakkuda lastele ja peredele rikastavaid kogemusi.

12. Valdkonnaülene lähenemisviis on eriti tõhus terviliku ja tasakaalustatud haridussüsteemi loomisel, mis tagab õppija terviliku ja tasakaalustatud arengu.

13. Valdkonnaülest lähenemisviisi ja kutsealade ülest koostööd on lihtsam rakendada riikliku haldusmudeliga (teenuseid osutab riik, piirkondlik ja/või kohalik haldusüksus) kui delegeeritud mudelitega, mis tuginevad peamiselt järelevalvele.

14. Sellise lähenemisviisi puhul ei ole enamasti vaja täiendavaid vahendeid, kuid on vaja muuta olemasolevate ressursside kasutust. Seega on võimalik kas säästa kulusid või vabastada olemasolevaid vahendeid, et tegeleda laiema teemaderingiga, toetades seega arukat kulutamist.

15. Sektoriülese lähenemisviisi rahastamine on esmatähtis samm strateegia "Euroopa 2020" eesmärkide saavutamisel, mille kohaselt tuleb koolist väljalangenute osatähtsust vähendada kogu ELis 10 %ni.

16. Mitmekülgseid lähenemisviise ei tohi kõrvale heita lihtsalt sellepärast, et nende tulemusi on keerulisem hinnata. Sellised algatused vajavad riiklikku või piirkondlikku toetust ja rahaliste kohustuste võtmist. Edu tõendavate tulemuste avalduseks tuleb võtta aega.

17. Üksik teenus ja pikaajalised süsteemsed mitmetahulised lähenemisviisid võivad üksteist täiendada. Hea näide selle kohta on Iirimaa projekt *Familiscope.*

18. Asjakohased muudatused koolis ja kooliväliselt peavad tingimata arvestama kohalike tingimustega, mistõttu on keeruline teha üldistusi selle kohta, et millised meetmed toimivad. Tähelepanu tuleks seega pöörata meetmeid toetavatele põhimõtetele ja väärtustele.

19. Kiiresti on vaja **tugevat üldist põhimõtete raamistikku**, et aidata välja töötada riiklik poliitika aktiivse kaasatuse saavutamiseks. Selline raamistik oleks kasulikuks suuniseks koolidele keerulises olukorras olevate noortega tegelemisel. See võiks aidata ühtlustada riiklikku poliitikat eri sektorites, hõlbustada valdkonnaülest koostööd kohalikul tasandil ning lihtsustada tulemuste asjakohast seiret. Selline raamistik ei tohiks teha liialt ettekirjutusi, kuid see peaks andma liikmesriikide haldusasutustele ja ettevõtjatele teatava arvu põhimõttelisi vahendeid, et mõelda, kuidas saaks sektoriülest lähenemisviisi rakendada kohalikus kontekstis.

Tiivistelmä

1. Koulut eivät voi toimia yksinään sukupolvelta toiselle periytyvän huono-osaisuuden katkaisemisessa ja koulutuksellisen huono-osaisuuden torjumisessa. Koulun ulkopuoliset eri tekijät rajoittavat sekä koulutus- että elämänmahdollisuuksia.

2. Tämän vuoksi tarvitaan **monialaisia strategioita**, joilla yhdistetään se, mitä koulut voivat tehdä, ja se, mitä muilla sektoreilla on tarjottavana; näitä ovat esimerkiksi työllisyys, terveys, rahoitus, oikeus, asuminen, nuoriso ja sosiaalihuolto.

3. Haavoittuvaan asemaan liittyvät monimuotoiset ongelmat edellyttävät systemaattisempia, laajoja ja kattavia ratkaisuja, joihin kuuluu perheissä ja yhteisöissä toteutettavien toimien ohella lapsille ja nuorille annettava apu.

4. Vaikka koordinoidut, monialaiset lähestymistavat, joita toteutetaan johdonmukaisesti ajan kuluessa, voivat olla vaikeita päätöksentekijöille, ne voivat tarjota parhaan tavan estää tai lieventää niitä vaikutuksia, joita monimuotoisella ja kumuloituvalla vähäosaisuudella on ihmisten koulutuskokemuksiin ja elämänmahdollisuuksiin.

5. Se, että nämä toimenpiteet olisi liitettävä läheisesti kouluihin – ainoaan yleiseen palveluun, jossa lasten ja nuorten hyvinvointia voidaan seurata säännöllisesti – vaikuttaisi viisaalta askeleelta yleisen osallisuuden saavuttamiseksi.

6. Ennaltaehkäisevät monia palveluja yhdistävät toimenpiteet kouluissa ja niihin liittyen ovat helpoimmin toteutettavissa, jos niiden tukena on kansallinen politiikka, jolla edistetään eri sektoreiden välistä synergiaa toimintalinjojen laadinnasta aina täytäntöönpanoon ja toteutukseen asti. Tätä sektoreiden välistä synergiaa tarvitaan ylittämään eri palvelujen ja ammattialojen vahvat historialliset rajat.

7. Poliittisesti ohjattu eri palvelujen yhteissijoittelu ei riitä. Tarvitaan tukea aidolle ammattiryhmien väliselle yhteistyölle palvelujen tarjoamispisteessä.

8. Jotkin EU:n jäsenvaltiot ovat siirtyneet jonkin verran kohti tällaista lähestymistapaa, usein osana strategioitaan, joilla ehkäistään koulunkäynnin keskeyttämistä tai edistetään yleisesti elinikäistä oppimista, ja ne ovat perustaneet monialaisia yhteistyömalleja, joissa eri aloista vastaavat ammattilaiset työskentelevät yhdessä epäedullisessa asemassa olevien lasten ja aikuisten tukemiseksi.

9. Tässä katsauksessa on tutkittu synergiaa eri toiminta-alojen välillä ja monia ammattialoja yhdistävissä kumppanuussuhteissa paikallis- ja aluetasolla Euroopassa, kun tavoitteena on ollut niveltää toimenpiteet koulutus-toimintaan. Pyrkimyksenä on ollut a) esittää esimerkkejä monialaisista toimenpiteistä, joista on vankkaa näyttöä vähäosaisille lapsille ja nuorille koituneesta hyödystä ja b) paljastaa onnistumisen edellytykset.

10. Onnistuneita ja innovatiivisia esimerkkejä tällaisesta monia ammattiryhmiä yhdistävästä synergiasta koulutustoiminnan piirissä ja siihen liittyen ovat LSB-tiimit (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) Alankomaissa, "Team around the Child" -aloite Yhdistyneessä kuningas-kunnassa ja kouluissa toimivat sosiaalityöntekijät Ruotsissa. Näissä kaikissa keskitytään ensisijaisesti auttamaan lapsia, jotta nämä saisivat valmiudet hyödyntää koulunkäyntiä.

11. Muissa toimenpiteissä, joita ovat esimerkiksi koulutusaloite *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* Hampurissa, *One Square Kilometre of Education* Berliinissä tai *On-Track* Englannissa, otetaan koulut mukaan tärkeinä kumppa-neina, kun pyritään laajempaan ja kattavampaan toimintaan huono-osaisuuden torjumiseksi. Jotkin toimenpiteet, kuten Belgian ja Englannin *laajennetut* tai *yhteisölliset koulut*, toimivat *kouluissa* ja tarjoavat rikastuttavia kokemuksia lapsille ja perheille.

12. Eri aloja yhdistävien lähestymistapojen suurin vaikutus to-teutuu todennäköisesti *kokonaisvaltaisen ja tasapuolisen* koulutusnäkemyksen puitteissa, jossa koulutus nähdään oppijan kokonaisvaltaisena ja tasapuolisena kehittymisenä.

13. Eri aloja yhdistävät lähestymistavat ja ammattiryhmien väliset yhteistyösuhteet on helpompi luoda valtion-johtoisin tai määräävin hallintomuodoin (joissa palveluja tarjoavat suoraan valtio ja kansalliset ja/tai paikalliset toimijat) kuin hajautetummin muodoin, jotka perustuvat pääasiassa seurantaan.

14. Tällaiset lähestymistavat eivät välttämättä niinkään vaadi lisäresursseja vaan sitä, että olemassa olevia resursseja käytetään eri tavalla. Sen vuoksi niillä voidaan joko *säästää kustannuksia* tai *vapauttaa olemassa olevia resursseja* laajempien asiakokonaisuuksien käsittelyyn, mikä edistää "älykästä varainkäyttöä".

15. Monialaisten lähestymistapojen rahoitusta olisi pidettävä etusijakohteena pyrittäessä saavuttamaan Eurooppa 2020 -tavoite, joka on koulun keskeyttämisen vähentäminen 10 prosenttiin koko EU:ssa.

16. Tällaisista monitahoisista lähestymistavoista ei pidä luopua vain sen vuoksi, että niiden arviointi on vaikeampaa. Ne tarvitsevat kansallista tai alueellista tukea ja sitoutumista rahoitukseen, ja ne vievät aikaa, ennen kuin saadaan tuotoksia, jotka ovat näyttönä onnistumisesta.

17. Yhden palvelun lähestymistavat ja pidemmän aikavälin sy-steemiset monialaiset lähestymistavat voivat olla toisiaan täydentäviä. Irlannin *Familiscope* on tästä hyvä esimerkki.

18. Reagointiin perustuvat käytänteiden muutokset kouluissa ja niiden toimintaympäristöissä vastaavat väistämättä paikallisiin olosuhteisiin, minkä vuoksi on vaikeaa tehdä yksinkertaisia yleistyksiä siitä, mitkä toimenpiteet ovat toimivia. Siksi olisi kiinnitettävä huomiota toimenpiteiden taustalla vaikuttaviin periaatteisiin ja arvoihin.

19. Tarvitaan kiireesti **vankkaa ja kattavaa käsitekehystä** auttamaan aktiivista osallistamista koskevien kansallisten toimintalinjojen kehittämisessä. Tällainen kehys voi ohjata koulujen työskentelyä heikossa asemassa olevien nuorten parissa: se voi auttaa sovittamaan yhteen kansallisia toimintalinjoja eri sektoreilla, helpottaa monialaista työtä paikallisella tasolla ja auttaa seuraamaan sen tuotoksia soveltuvilla tavoilla. Tällainen kehys ei voi olla eikä sen pitäisi olla liian määräävä, mutta se voi antaa jäsenvaltioiden hallintoelimille ja käytännön työtä tekeville joukon käsitteellisiä välineitä, joiden avulla voidaan pohtia, miten monialaisia lähestymistapoja voitaisiin kehittää niiden toimintaympäristössä.

Résumé

1. Les écoles ne réussiront pas, toutes seules, à rompre le cycle intergénérationnel de reproduction de la pauvreté et à éliminer toutes les inégalités dans l'éducation. Ce sont des facteurs extérieurs aux écoles qui, conjointement, limitent les possibilités d'éducation des individus ainsi que leurs perspectives d'avenir.

2. Il convient par conséquent que des **stratégies transsectorielles** soient mises en œuvre pour articuler ce que les établissements scolaires peuvent accomplir à ce que peuvent offrir d'autres secteurs tels que ceux de l'emploi, de la santé, de la finance, de la justice, du logement, de l'aide à la jeunesse et des services sociaux.

3. Des problèmes complexes de vulnérabilité requièrent des solutions plus systémiques et plus "écologiques" qui comportent des interventions auprès des familles et des communautés tout en apportant de l'aide aux enfants et aux jeunes.

4. Si difficiles qu'elles puissent se présenter pour les décideurs politiques, des actions coordonnées, pluridimensionnelles et soutenues de façon cohérente dans le temps, peuvent constituer la meilleure solution pour prévenir ou atténuer l'impact des désavantages multiples et cumulatifs des individus sur leurs expériences éducatives et leurs perspectives de vie.

5. Pour que l'inclusion concerne tous, il conviendrait de rattacher étroitement ces actions aux écoles, le seul service pour tous où le bien-être des enfants et des jeunes puisse faire l'objet d'un suivi régulier.

6. Des interventions multiservices de prévention dans et autour des écoles réussiront davantage dans la mesure où celles-ci s'inscrivent dans des politiques nationales qui promeuvent des synergies intersectorielles stratégiques, depuis le stade de l'élaboration des mesures considérées jusqu'à leur mise en place effective, en passant par la phase de mise en œuvre. Ces synergies intersectorielles doivent pouvoir surmonter des cloisonnements tenaces, d'origine historique, qui séparent les différents services et professions.

7. Le regroupement dûment pensé et programmé des différents services à l'œuvre ne pourra pas s'avérer suffisant. Il conviendra de travailler en outre à la promotion de véritables collaborations interprofessionnelles sur le lieu où le service est offert.

8. Certains États membres de l'UE se sont dans une certaine mesure ralliés à ces vues, le plus souvent dans le cadre de leurs stratégies de prévention du décrochage scolaire précoce ou dans celui des stratégies globales d'apprentissage tout au long de la vie. Ils ont mis en place des collaborations interservices dans lesquelles des professionnels de différents horizons collaborent pour venir en aide aux enfants et aux adultes défavorisés.

9. La présente analyse s'est penchée sur les synergies entre les différents domaines d'action et dans les partenariats multi-professionnels tendant, à l'échelon local et régional en Europe, à coordonner les interventions avec l'enseignement et la formation. Elle s'est employée à : a) repérer des exemples d'interventions interservices pour lesquelles il existe des preuves solides de résultats positifs pour les enfants et jeunes défavorisés; et b) déterminer quelles sont les conditions à réunir pour leur réussite.

10. Les équipes de soutien LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) aux Pays-Bas, l' "équipe autour de l'enfant" au Royaume-Uni et les "travailleurs sociaux dans les écoles" en Suède sont autant d'exemples novateurs de réussite de ces synergies multi-professionnelles suscitées à l'intérieur et autour de l'éducation. Elles se concentrent toutes essentiellement sur la manière d'aider l'enfant à tirer le meilleur parti de sa scolarité.

11. D'autres interventions, telles que la *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (offensive de formation de l'île d'Elbe) à Hambourg, le *kilomètre carré de l'éducation* à Berlin ou *On-Track* (en route) en Angleterre, associent les écoles en tant que partenaires prépondérants dans de vastes attaques "écologiques" contre la misère. D'autres initiatives, comme certaines "écoles prolongées" ou "écoles élargies" en Belgique et en Angleterre sont implantées au sein même des établissements scolaires pour offrir plus de possibilités d'épanouissement aux enfants et à leur famille.

12. C'est à la condition d'une vision holistique et équitable de l'éducation centrée autour de l'apprenant que les approches transsectorielles peuvent le mieux faire valoir leur contribution.

13. Il est plus facile de mettre en place des actions transsectorielles ainsi que des collaborations interprofessionnelles lorsque la gouvernance est de type étatique ou dirigiste (auquel cas les services sont assurés directement par l'État, au niveau national et/ou local) de préférence à une gouvernance plus caractérisée par la délégation et la décentralisation, opérant essentiellement à travers une activité de suivi (monitoring).

14. De telles approches ne requièrent pas nécessairement des ressources supplémentaires; il suffit plutôt d'utiliser différemment les ressources existantes. Elles permettent soit de *réduire les coûts*, soit de *mobiliser les ressources existantes* pour faire face à un éventail de problèmes plus large et contribuer ainsi à "dépenser intelligemment".

15. Le financement des actions transsectorielles devrait être considéré comme une priorité en vue d'atteindre l'objectif de la stratégie Europe 2020 consistant à limiter le décrochage scolaire précoce à un taux de 10 % dans l'ensemble de l'UE.

16. Il ne faut pas renoncer aux actions pluridimensionnelles de ce type pour la simple raison qu'elles sont plus difficiles à évaluer. Il convient de les soutenir et de les financer au niveau national ou régional et de leur laisser le temps de produire des résultats permettant d'affirmer leur succès.

17. La méthode du service unique et celle des actions pluridimensionnelles systémiques à long terme peuvent être complémentaires. *Familiscope*, en Irlande, en est un bon exemple.

18. Les changements de pratiques adaptatifs, à l'intérieur et autour des écoles, réagissent forcément aux paramètres locaux, ce qui devrait dissuader de procéder à des généralisations hâtives basées sur les interventions et sur ce qui marche. Par conséquent, l'attention devrait plutôt se porter sur les principes et les valeurs qui inspirent ces interventions.

19. Un **solide cadre conceptuel global** favorisant l'élaboration de politiques nationales de l'inclusion active est nécessaire de toute urgence. Un tel cadre peut guider utilement le travail des écoles avec les jeunes les plus vulnérables: il peut harmoniser les politiques nationales de différents secteurs, faciliter le travail transsectoriel au niveau local, et contribuer à un suivi adéquat des résultats de ce dernier. Un tel cadre ne peut et ne doit pas être trop contraignant; cependant il peut offrir aux administrations et aux professionnels des États membres un ensemble d'outils conceptuels leur permettant de réfléchir à la manière dont des actions transsectorielles pourraient être pensées dans leur propre contexte.

Összefoglaló

1. Az iskolák egymagukban nem tudják megszüntetni a nemzedékek óta öröklődő hátrányokat, és kezelni az oktatás terén kialakult egyenlőtlenségeket. Számos iskolán kívüli tényező együttes hatása korlátozza az egyének tanulási lehetőségeit és életesélyeit.

2. Ez azt jelenti, hogy szükség van olyan **ágazatközi stratégiák kidolgozására**, amelyek összekötik az iskola és az egyéb – pl. foglalkoztatási, egészségügyi, pénzügyi, igazságügyi, lakhatási, ifjúságpolitikai vagy jóléti – szektorok cselekvési lehetőségeit.

3. A kiszolgáltatott egyének összetett problémáira módszeresebb, átfogóbb válaszokat kell adni, amelyek a gyermekek és fiatalok segítése mellett a családot és a közösséget is megcélozzák.

4. Bármilyen nehéz feladatot is jelent a politikusok számára, csakis összehangolt, többsíkú és hosszú távon következetesen fenntartott koncepcióval lehet optimálisan megelőzni, illetve enyhíteni az egyén oktatási- és életesélyeit csökkentő többszörös, halmozott hátrányokat.

5. Mivel az iskola az egyetlen olyan egyetemes szolgáltatás, amely rendszeresen nyomon tudja követni a gyermekek és fiatalok jólétének alakulását, a fent említett intézkedéseket érdemes szorosan összehangolni az oktatás területével, hiszen ez fontos lépés a mindenkit befogadó társadalom megvalósítása felé.

6. Az iskolai és iskola körüli szakmaközi megelőző fellépések akkor érik el legkönnyebben a céljukat, ha olyan tagállami politikák állnak mögöttük, melyek az intézkedések kidolgozásától a megvalósulásukig támogatják az ágazatközi szinergiákat. Ezeknek az ágazatközi szinergiáknak át kell törniük a különböző területek és szakmák között hosszú idők során kialakult erős falakat.

7. A különböző területek politikailag vezérelt összekapcsolása nem elegendő. Erőfeszítéseket kell tenni azért, hogy valódi szakmaközi együttműködések alakuljanak ki ott, ahol ez adott szolgáltatás megvalósul.

8. Néhány uniós tagállam már sikeres lépéseket tett e koncepció irányába, többnyire a korai iskolaelhagyás megelőzését vagy az élethosszig tartó tanulást szolgáló stratégiájuk részeként, és olyan szakmaközi együttműködéseket hoztak létre, ahol különböző területekért felelős szakemberek közösen támogatják a hátrányos helyzetű gyerekeket és felnőtteket.

9. Ez a dokumentum áttekinti, milyen politikai területeken átnyúló és szakmaközi partnerségekben megnyilvánuló szinergiák alakultak ki Európában helyi és regionális szinten az oktatás és képzés területén megvalósuló fellépések összehangolása érdekében. A tanulmány céljai a következők voltak: a) megnevezni a szakmaközi fellépések olyan példáit, amelyek egyértelműen bizonyított pozitív eredménnyel jártak a hátrányos helyzetű gyermekek és fiatalok szempontjából; valamint b) feltárni a sikeres fellépés feltételeit.

10. A hollandiai tanulás- és magatartássegítő szolgálatok (LSB teams, *Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*), az Egyesült Királyság *Team around the Child* ("Gyermeksegítő Közösség") kezdeményezése, illetve a svédországi "iskolai szociális munkások" sikeres, innovatív példák az iskolai vagy iskola körüli szakmaközi szinergiákra. Valamennyi főként arra összpontosít, hogy segítsen a gyerekeknek kiaknázni az iskola nyújtotta előnyöket.

11. Más intézkedések – például a Hamburgban indított *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elba-szigeti Képzési Offenzíva), a berlini *Egy Négyzetkilométernyi Oktatás* program, vagy az angliai *On-Track* ("Sínen") kezdeményezés a szegénység elleni tágabb, átfogóbb szemléletű fellépések fontos partnerekként kezelik az iskolákat. Ismét más programok, mint a belgiumi és angliai *kibővített* avagy *közösségi iskolák* magukban az *iskolákban* működnek, a gyermekek és családjuk számára is hasznos tapasztalatot kínálva.

12. Az ágazatközi koncepciók olyan *holisztikus és méltányos* felfogásban tudnak a legnagyobb eredménnyel járni, amely a tanulók holisztikus és méltányos fejlesztését tekinti az oktatás végcéljának.

13. Könnyebb ágazat- és szakmaközi együttműködéseket kialakítani állami vagy központosított irányítási formák esetén (ahol a szolgáltatást közvetlenül az állam, a nemzeti és/vagy helyi hatóságok biztosítják), mint a főként az oktatásfelügyeletre támaszkodó decentralizált rendszerekben.

14. E koncepciók nem feltétlenül igényelnek többletforrásokat, csupán másként kell felhasználni a meglévő forrásokat. Ezért *költségmegtakarítást* is jelenthetnek, illetve *meglévő forrásokat szabadíthatnak fel*, mivel tágabb problémakörökkel foglalkoznak, és ily módon hozzájárulnak az források takarékos felhasználásához.

15. Az ágazatközi koncepciók támogatását prioritásnak kell tekinteni, hogy teljesülhessen az Európa 2020 stratégia célja, mely szerint 10%-ra kell csökkentjen a korai iskolaelhagyók arányát az EU-ban.

16. Az ilyen többrétű koncepciókat nem szabad csak azért feláldozni, mert nehezebb kiértékelni az eredményeiket. E programoknak a nemzeti és regionális hatóságok támogatására és pénzügyi kötelezettségvállalására van szüksége, és kellő időt kell hagyni arra, hogy eredményeik révén bizonyítható legyen sikerességük.

17. Az egyszerű és a hosszabb távú, rendszerszintű szakmaközi koncepciók kiegészíthetik egymást. Jó példa erre az Írországban létrejött *Familiscope* program.

18. Az iskolákban és iskolák körül kialakult gyakorlatok dinamikus megváltoztatása szükségszerűen erősen függ a helyi körülményektől, így nehéz a fellépések eredményét általánosságban értékelni. Ezért külön figyelmet kell fordítani a fellépések mögött meghúzódó elvekre és értékekre.

19. Az aktív beilleszkedésre irányuló nemzeti politikák létrehozásának elősegítése érdekében sürgősen ki kell dolgozni **egy szilárd, átfogó koncepciós keretet**. Egy ilyen általános keret hasznos lehet a kiszolgáltatott helyzetű gyerekek érdekében végzett iskolai munkához: egymáshoz igazíthatja a különböző szektorokban nemzeti szinten működő politikákat, megkönnyítheti a helyi szintű ágazatközi munkát, és segíthet megfelelően nyomon követni az eredményeket. E keret nem tud és nem is szabhat túl szigorú korlátokat, de számos elméleti eszközt adhat a tagállamok adminisztrációinak és szakembereinek kezébe, hogy továbbgondolhassák ágazatközi koncepcióik fejlődésének irányait az adott kontextusban.

Riassunto

1. Le scuole non possono operare da sole per rompere i cicli intergenerazionali di povertà ed eliminare le disuguaglianze dell'istruzione. Una combinazione di fattori esterni alle scuole limita le possibilità d'istruzione degli individui e le loro prospettive di vita.

2. Ciò significa che è necessario adottare **strategie transettoriali** volte a stabilire un collegamento tra ciò che gli istituti scolastici possono fare e ciò che possono offrire altri settori come quello dell'occupazione, della salute, della finanza, della giustizia, degli alloggi, degli aiuti alla gioventù e dei servizi sociali.

3. Problemi complessi di vulnerabilità richiedono soluzioni più sistemiche ed "ecologiche" che implicano interventi presso le famiglie e le comunità, fornendo al tempo stesso un aiuto ai bambini e ai giovani.

4. Per quanto possano essere difficili per i decisori politici, gli approcci coordinati e pluridimensionali, sostenuti in modo coerente al tempo, possono rappresentare il miglior modo di prevenire o di mitigare l'impatto degli svantaggi molteplici e cumulativi degli individui sulle loro esperienze educative e le loro prospettive di vita.

5. Al fine di ottenere un'inclusione per tutti, sembra opportuno collegare strettamente tali risposte alle scuole, il solo servizio universale in cui il benessere dei bambini e degli adolescenti può essere regolarmente monitorato.

6. È più facile porre in essere interventi multiservizio di prevenzione all'interno e intorno alle scuole se queste sono sostenute da politiche nazionali in grado di promuovere sinergie intersettoriali strategiche, dalla realizzazione sino alla fornitura del servizio. È necessario che queste sinergie intersettoriali superino le forti barriere storiche tra i diversi servizi e professioni.

7. Un raggruppamento di vari servizi incentrato sulle azioni da intraprendere non è sufficiente. È necessario lavorare alla promozione di vere e proprie collaborazioni interprofessionali sul luogo in cui il servizio è offerto.

8. Alcuni Stati membri dell'UE hanno realizzato progressi verso questo tipo di approccio, spesso nel quadro delle loro strategie di prevenzione dell'abbandono scolastico precoce o di strategie globali di apprendimento permanente, e hanno posto in essere collaborazioni multiservizi nelle quali professionisti con diversi settori di responsabilità collaborano per sostenere i bambini e gli adulti svantaggiati.

9. Questo riesame ha analizzato le sinergie a livello locale e regionale in Europa tra i vari settori d'azione e nelle partnership multiprofessionali volte a coordinare gli interventi con il settore dell'istruzione e della formazione. Il suo scopo è stato: a) individuare esempi di interventi multiservizi per i quali esistono prove solide di risultati positivi per i bambini e i giovani svantaggiati; e b) determinare le condizioni del successo.

10. I "gruppi di sostegno all'apprendimento e al comportamento" nei Paesi Bassi (LSB teams), il "gruppo intorno al bambino" nel Regno Unito e i "lavoratori sociali nelle scuole" in Svezia sono altrettante iniziative che si sono realizzate con successo e costituiscono esempi innovativi di queste sinergie multiprofessionali generate all'interno e intorno al settore dell'istruzione. Esse sono tutte principalmente concentrate sull'aiuto ai bambini affinché essi possano trarre vantaggio dalla scolarità.

11. Altri interventi, come il *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (offensiva di formazione delle isole dell'Elba) ad Amburgo, *il chilometro quadrato dell'istruzione* a Berlino o la *On-Track* (in strada) in Inghilterra, associano le scuole in quanto partner importanti in ampi attacchi ecologici contro la miseria. Altri interventi, come alcune "scuole prolungate" o scuole finanziate da enti locali in Belgio e in Inghilterra sono basati all'interno delle scuole ed offrono esperienze di arricchimento ai bambini e alle famiglie.

12. Gli approcci transettoriali sono in grado di dare il loro massimo contributo nel quadro di una visione globale ed equa dell'istruzione che ha per scopo lo sviluppo olistico ed equo dell'alunno.

13. Gli approcci transettoriali e le collaborazioni interprofessionali sono più facili da realizzare attraverso forme di governance statali o dirigiste (in cui i servizi sono forniti direttamente dallo stato, a livello nazionale e/o locale) che non facendo ricorso a modalità con un maggiore livello di delega che si basano principalmente sul monitoraggio.

14. Tali approcci non richiedono necessariamente risorse aggiuntive ma consistono piuttosto nel realizzare in modo diverso le risorse attualmente disponibili. Di conseguenza, è possibile sia realizzare *economie sui costi,* sia *liberare risorse esistenti* per fronteggiare un più ampio ventaglio di problemi e contribuire in tal modo a "spendere in modo intelligente".

15. Il finanziamento delle azioni transettoriali dovrebbe essere considerato come una priorità al fine di raggiungere l'obiettivo della strategia Europa 2020 consistente nel limitare l'abbandono scolastico precoce al 10% nell'insieme dell'UE.

16. Non bisogna rinunciare alle azioni multidimensionali di questo tipo solo per il fatto che sono più difficili da valutare. È necessario sostenerle a livello nazionale o regionale, impegnando fondi a loro favore e lasciando loro il tempo di produrre risultati che consentano di provare il loro successo.

17. Il metodo del servizio unico e quello delle azioni multidimensionali sistemiche possono essere complementari. *Familiscope,* in Irlanda, ne è un buon esempio.

18. I cambi reattivi nelle prassi all'interno e intorno alle scuole subiscono necessariamente l'influenza delle condizioni locali, rendendo difficile giungere, partendo dagli interventi, a semplici generalizzazioni in merito a ciò che funziona. Dovrebbe pertanto essere dedicata attenzione ai principi e ai valori che sottendono gli interventi.

19. È urgentemente necessario **un solido quadro concettuale globale** in grado di contribuire all'elaborazione di politiche nazionali di inclusione attiva. Tale quadro può guidare utilmente il lavoro delle scuole con i giovani più vulnerabili: può armonizzare le politiche nazionali di vari settori, facilitare il lavoro transettoriale a livello locale e contribuire a controllare i suoi risultati in modo adeguato. Tale quadro non può e non deve essere eccessivamente vincolante ma può dare alle amministrazioni e ai professionisti degli Stati membri un insieme di strumenti concettuali che consentano loro di avviare una riflessione sul modo in cui gli approcci transettoriali potrebbero essere sviluppati nel loro contesto.

Santrauka

1. Jei norime užkirsti kelią iš kartos į kartą patiriamam skurdui ir pašalinti mokytis trukdančias nepalankias sąlygas, vien mokyklų veiklos nepakaks. Mokymosi ir apskritai gyvenimo galimybes riboja ir įvairūs su mokykla nesusiję veiksniai.

2. Tai reiškia, kad reikia **tarpsektorinių strategijų**, pagal kurias mokyklų veikla būtų susiejama su kitų sektorių, pavyzdžiui, užimtumo, sveikatos, finansų, teisingumo, būsto, jaunimo ir socialinio aprūpinimo, veikla.

3. Sudėtingos pažeidžiamumo problemos reikalauja sistemingesnio, "ekologiškesnio" atsako ir šeimų bei bendruomenių intervencijos siekiant padėti vaikams ir jaunimui.

4. Kad ir kaip sunku politikams būtų tą pasiekti, koordinuojamos daugiaaspektės ilgalaikės programos gali būti tinkamiausias būdas užkirsti kelią sudėtinėms ir kumuliacinėms nepalankioms aplinkybėms, susijusioms su mokymosi ir apskritai gyvenimo galimybėmis, ar sušvelninti jų poveikį.

5. Išmintingas žingsnis siekiant visuotinės įtraukties būtų glaudžiai susieti šią veiklą su mokykla – vienintele visuotine institucija, kurioje galima reguliariai stebėti vaikų ir jaunimo gerovę.

6. Prevencinę daugialypę intervenciją mokyklose ir už jų ribų būtų lengviausia pasiekti, jei ją remtų nacionaliniai politikai, kurie, formuodami politiką, vykdydami veiklą ir siekdami rezultatų, skatintų tarpsektorinę sinergiją. Tokia sektorių saveika galima tik įveikus tvirtas, istoriškai susiklosčiusias įvairių tarnybų ir profesijų veiklos ribas.

7. Politinio įvairių tarnybų paskirstymo nepakanka. Reikia dėti daugiau pastangų, kad būtų paremtas tikras įvairių profesijų atstovų bendradarbiavimas teikiant paslaugas.

8. Kai kurios ES valstybės narės iš dalies jau vadovaujasi tokiu požiūriu, neretai įtraukdamos jį į savo mokyklos nebaigimo prevencijos strategijas ar mokymosi visą gyvenimą strategijas, ir plėtoja daugialypį bendradarbiavimą: įvairių sričių specialistai dirba drauge, kad paremtų nepalankioje padėtyje atsidūrusius vaikus ir suaugusiuosius.

9. Šioje apžvalgoje nagrinėta vietos ir regioninio lygmens Europos įvairių politikos sričių ir profesijų partnerystės sinergija, kuria siekiama apibrėžti galimą intervenciją švietimo ir mokymo srityje. Apžvalgoje visų pirma siekta: a) nustatyti daugialypės intervencijos, davusios akivaizdžiai pozityvių rezultatų nepalankioje padėtyje esantiems vaikams ir jaunuoliams, pavyzdžių ir b) atskleisti sėkmingo įgyvendinimo sąlygas.

10. LSB *Learning and Behavioural Support Teams* (Nyderlandai), "Team around the Child" (Jungtinė Karalystė) ar "Social Workers in Schools" (Švedija) – sėkmingi, novatoriški švietimo sistemoje ir už jos ribų plėtojamos profesijų sinergijos pavyzdžiai. Visose šiose iniciatyvose daugiausia dėmesio skiriama vaiko pasirengimui naudotis mokymosi teikiamomis galimybėmis.

11. Kitose iniciatyvose, kaip antai *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (*Elbe Island Training Offensive*) (Hamburgas), *One Square Kilometre of Education* (Berlynas) ar *On-Track* (Anglija), mokyklos laikomos svarbiomis partnerėmis kovojant su skurdu platesniame, "ekologiniame" kontekste. Belgijoje ir Anglijoje veikia prailgintos dienos grupės ar bendruomenės mokyklos, paprastai įsikuriančios mokyklų patalpose ir siūlančios įvairios praturtinančios veiklos tiek vaikams, tiek jų šeimoms.

12. Tarpsektorinė veikla veikiausiai labiausiai prisidėtų prie *holistinio ir nešališko* požiūrio į švietimą, kuriame būtų skatinamas holistinis ir nešališkas besimokančio asmens tobulėjimas.

13. Tarpsektorinę veiklą ir įvairių profesijų atstovų bendradarbiavimą lengviau plėtoti vadovaujantis steitizmu ar nurodomojo pobūdžio valdymu (kai paslaugos teikiamos tiesiogiai valstybės, nacionaliniu ir (arba) vietos lygmeniu), o ne delegavimo būdais, kurie grindžiami daugiausia stebėsena.

14. Tokiai veiklai vykdyti nebūtinai reikia papildomų išteklių, tačiau turimus išteklius reiktų skirstyti kitaip. Taigi, ji gali padėti *sutaupyti lėšų* arba išlaisvinti turimus *išteklius*, kad būtų sprendžiamos įvairesnės problemos ir taip prisidedama prie išmanaus lėšų panaudojimo.

15. Tarpsektorinės veiklos finansavimą reikėtų laikyti prioritetu siekiant strategijos „Europa 2020" tikslo – sumažinti ES mokyklos nebaigiančių asmenų skaičių iki 10 proc.

16. Tokių daugialypių metodų nederėtų atsisakyti vien dėl to, kad juos sunkiau įvertinti. Juos reikia remti ir finansuoti nacionaliniu ir regioniniu lygmeniu ir kantriai laukti rezultatų, kuriuos būtų galima laikyti sėkmės ženklu.

17. Jį papildyti gali vienalypiai ir ilgalaikiai sisteminiai daugiaaspekčiai metodai. Puikus pavyzdys – Airijos *Familiscope.*

18. Žinoma, iš to kylantys praktikos pokyčiai mokyklose ir už jų ribų labai priklauso nuo vietos sąlygų, todėl labai sunku daryti bendro pobūdžio išvadas, kokio pobūdžio intervencija yra sėkminga. Todėl daugiausia dėmesio reikėtų skirti principams ir vertybėms, kuriais grindžiama intervencija.

19. Reikia skubiai sukurti **tvirtą, visiems aktualią ir konceptualią sistemą**, kuri padėtų formuoti nacionalinę aktyvios įtraukties politiką. Tokia sistema būtų naudingas "vedlys" mokykloms, dirbančioms su nepalankioje padėtyje atsidūrusiais jaunuoliais, nes ji padėtų suderinti įvairių sektorių politiką, palengvintų vietos lygmens tarpsektorinę veiklą, ir padėtų vertinti rezultatus tinkamiausiais būdais. Tokia sistema negali būti pernelyg norminanti, tačiau ji gali suteikti valstybių narių administracijoms ir specialistams konceptualių priemonių, kurios padėtų plėtoti tarpsektorinius metodus konkrečiomis aplinkybėmis.

Kopsavilkums

1. Skolas nevar panākt starppaaudžu nabadzības apburtā loka pārraušanu un tikt galā ar skolēnu nelabvēlīgo situāciju izglītības ziņā tikai saviem spēkiem. Skolēnu izglītības iespējas un turpmākās izredzes ierobežo vairāki faktori, kas saistīti ar apstākļiem ārpus skolas.

2. Ir nepieciešamas **starpnozaru stratēģijas**, kas ļautu izveidot saikni starp skolu iespējām kaut ko mainīt un citu nozaru – kā piemēram, nodarbinātības, veselības, finanšu, mājokļu, jaunatnes un labklājības – pasākumiem.

3. Ar neaizsargātību saistīto sarežģīto problēmu risināšanai nepieciešami vairāk sistēmisku, visaptverošu risinājumu, kas ietver intervences ģimenēs un kopienās, līdztekus ar palīdzību bērniem un jauniešiem.

4. Lai gan politikas veidotājiem var būt sarežģīti izstrādāt koordinētas, daudzpusīgas pieejas, tās konsekventi īstenotas ilgstošā laika periodā, var izrādīties labākā metode, kas novērš vai mazina daudzējādu un kumulatīvu nelabvēlīgu apstākļu ietekmi uz cilvēku izglītības iespējām un nākotnes izredzēm.

5. Šo risinājumu cieša saistība ar skolām – vienīgo universālo pakalpojumu, kurā bērnu un jauniešu labklājību var regulāri uzraudzīt – šķiet saprātīgs veids, kā veicināt vispārējas iekļaušanas panākšanu.

6. Preventīvas daudzpakalpojumu intervences skolās un saistībā ar skolām ir vieglāk īstenojamas, ja to pamatā ir valsts politika, kas sekmē starpnozaru sinerģiju visos darbības posmos no īstenošanas līdz rezultātu sasniegšanai. Šai starpnozaru sinerģijai jāpārvar stipras vēsturiski izveidojušās robežas starp dažādiem pakalpojumiem un profesijām.

7. Ar politikā balstītu dažādu pakalpojumu apvienošanu vien nepietiek. Ir vajadzīgi centieni atbalstīt patiesu sadarbību starp dažādu jomu speciālistiem pakalpojuma sniegšanas vietā.

8. Dažas ES dalībvalstis ir nedaudz tuvinājušās šādai pieejai – bieži savās priekšlaicīgas mācību pārtraukšanas novēršanas stratēģijās vai vispārējās mūžizglītības stratēģijās – un ir izveidojušas daudzpakalpojumu sadarbību, kad dažādu jomu speciālisti darbojas kopā, lai atbalstītu bērnus un pieaugušos, kas atrodas nelabvēlīgos apstākļos.

9. Šajā pārskatā aplūkota sinerģija starp dažādām politikas jomām un vairāku jomu speciālistu partnerībās vietējā un reģionālā līmenī Eiropā, un tā mērķis ir sasaistīt intervences ar izglītību un apmācību. Tajā ir mēģināts: a) identificēt daudzpakalpojumu intervenču piemērus, kas sniedz pārliecinošus pierādījumus par sekmīgiem rezultātiem attiecībā uz bērniem un jauniešiem, kuri atrodas nelabvēlīgos apstākļos; b) atklāt sekmīgas darbības nosacījumus.

10. Mācīšanās un uzvedības atbalsta grupas (LSB teams, (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) Nīderlandē, iniciatīva *Team around the Child* ("Grupa, kas darbojas bērna labā") Apvienotajā Karalistē un "Sociālie darbinieki skolās" Zviedrijā ir sekmīgi, novatoriski piemēri šādai vairāku jomu sinerģijai izglītībā un saistībā ar to. Visu šo

iniciatīvu galvenā uzmanība veltīta tam, lai palīdzētu sagatavot bērnus pēc iespējas lielāka ieguvuma gūšanai no izglītības.

11. Citas intervences – piemēram, *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elbas salu aktīvas apmācības pasākums) Hamburgā, "Izglītības kvadrātkilometrs" Berlīnē vai *On-Track* ("Uz ceļa") Anglijā – iekļauj skolas kā nozīmīgus partnerus plašākā visaptverošā nabadzības novēršanas procesā. Citas, piemēram, dažas *paplašinātas jeb kopienas skolas* Beļģijā un Anglijā, bāzējas *skolās* un piedāvā bagātinošu pieredzi bērniem un ģimenēm.

12. Starpnozaru pieejas varētu būt noderīgākās *holistiska un vienlīdzīga* izglītības kontekstā, jo tās ir vērstas uz holistisku un vienlīdzīgu studējošo personu attīstību.

13. Starpnozaru pieejas un sadarbību dažādu jomu speciālistu vidū ir vieglāk izveidot tad, ja darbojas valsts vadītas vai hierarhiskas pārvaldības formas (kurās pakalpojumus tieši sniedz valsts – vai nu valsts, vai vietējā mērogā), nekā tad, ja tiek īstenotas deleģētas pārvaldības formas, kas balstās galvenokārt uz uzraudzību.

14. Šādu pieeju īstenošanai nav obligāti nepieciešami papildu resursi, ja vien esošie resursi tiek izmantoti atšķirīgā veidā. Tāpēc, izmantojot tās, var vai nu *ietaupīt līdzekļus*, vai *atbrīvot esošos resursus*, lai varētu risināt plašāku problēmu loku, tādējādi sniedzot ieguldījumu "saprātīgā līdzekļu tērēšanā".

15. Finansējums starpnozaru pieejām būtu jāuzskata par prioritāti, lai sasniegtu stratēģijas "Eiropa 2020" mērķi – 10 % mācību priekšlaicīgas pārtraukšanas gadījumu ES.

16. No šādām daudzdimensionālām pieejām nav jāatsakās tikai tāpēc, ka tās ir grūtāk novērtēt. Tām ir nepieciešams valsts vai reģionāls atbalsts un apņemšanās nodrošināt finansējumu, un tām vajadzīgs laiks rezultātu panākšanai, kas var pierādīt to sekmīgumu.

17. Viena pakalpojuma pieeja un ilgtermiņa sistēmiska daudzpusēja pieeja var papildināt viena otru. Labs piemērs tam ir *Familiscope* Īrijā.

18. Izmaiņas skolu praksē un ar tām saistītajā darbībā, ir saistītas ar vietējiem apstākļiem, veicot vienkāršotus vispārinājumus no intravencēm par to, kas sagādā grūtības. Tāpēc jāpievērš uzmanība principiem un vērtībām, kas ir intervenču pamatā.

19. Ir steidzami nepieciešams **stabils vispārējs konceptuāls ietvars**, kas palīdzētu pilnveidot valstu politiku aktīvas iekļaušanas sekmēšanai. Šāds **ietvars**var sniegt lietderīgas norādes attiecībā uz to, kā skolās strādāt ar neaizsargātiem jauniešiem: ar tā palīdzību var saskaņot valstu politiku dažādās nozarēs, atvieglot starpnozaru darbu vietējā līmenī un palīdzēt atbilstīgā veidā uzraudzīt tā rezultātus. Šāds **ietvars**nevar būt pārāk regulamentējošs, un tam tādam nav jābūt, taču tas var sniegt dalībvalstu administrācijām un tiem, kas darbojas praksē, konceptuālu rīku kopumu, kas palīdzētu viņiem domāt par to, kā var izstrādāt starpnozaru pieejas attiecīgās valsts kontekstā.

Sommarju eżekuttiv

1. L-iskejjel ma jistgħux jaħdmu waħedhom biex jiġu interroti ċ-ċikli ta' privazzjoni minn ġenerazzjoni għall-oħra u biex jiġu indirizzati l-iżvantaġġi edukattivi. Hemm ġabra ta' fatturi lil hinn mill-iskola li jirrestrinġu l-opportunitajiet edukattivi u l-għażliet tal-ħajja.

2. Dan ifisser li jinħtieġu strateġiji transettorjali, biex jorbtu dak li jistgħu jagħmlu l-iskejjel ma' dak li setturi oħra bħas-setturi tal-impjiegi, tas-saħħa, tal-finanzi, tal-ġustizzja, tad-djar, taż-żgħażagħ u tal-protezzjoni soċjali jistgħu joffru.

3. Problemi kumplessi ta' vulnerabbiltà jeżiġu tweġibiet aktar sistemiċi u "ekoloġiċi" li jinvolvu l-interventi fil-familji u fil-komunitajiet, flimkien ma' għajnuna għat-tfal u għaż-żgħażagħ.

4. Minkejja id-diffikulta għal dawk li jfasslu l-politiki, l-ikkordinar ta' approċċi fformati minn ħafna komponenti, li jiġu implimentati b'konsistenza tul iż-żmien jistgħu jkunu l-aħjar approċċ għall-prevenzjoni jew għat-taffija tal-impatt ta' żvantaġġi multipli u kumulattivi fuq l-esperjenzi edukattivi u l-opportunitajiet tal-ħajja tan-nies.

5. Li dawn it-tweġibiet għandu jkollhom rabta mil-qrib mal-iskejjel, li huma l-uniċi postijiet fejn l-benesseri tat-tfal u taż-żgħażagħ huwa segwit b' mod regolari, jidher li jkun pass għaqli biex tinkiseb l-inklużjoni universali.

6. L-aħjar mod li jirnexxu l-interventi ta' prevenzjoni minn ħafna servizzi fl-iskejjel u madwarhom huwa li jkunu sostnuti minn politiki nazzjonali li jippromwovu sinerġiji intersettorjali fl-istadji kollha, mill-politika sal-implimentazzjoni u fl-aħħar sat-twassil. Dawn is-sinerġiji intersettorjali jridu jegħlbu demarkazzjonijiet storiċi qawwijin bejn is-servizzi u l-professjonijiet differenti.

7. Il-kolokazzjoni tas-servizzi differenti mmexxija mill-politika mhiex biżżejjed. Hemm bżonn ta' sforz biex ikunu appoġġati kollaborazzjonijiet ġenwini interprofessjonali fil-punt ta' servizz fejn titwassal l-għajnuna.

8. Għadd ta' Stati Membri tal-UE għamlu xi progress lejn dan it-tip ta' approċċ, ħafna drabi bħala parti mill-istrateġiji tagħhom biex jipprevjenu t-tluq bikri mill-iskola jew mill-istrateġiji ġenerali tat-tagħlim tul il-ħajja, u stabbilixxew kollaborazzjonijiet bejn is-servizzi differenti, fejn professjonisti minn oqsma differenti ta' responsabbiltà jaħdmu flimkien biex jappoġġaw tfal u adulti żvantaġġati.

9. Din l-analiżi eżaminat is-sinerġiji bejn l-oqsma politiċi u fis-sħubiji multiprofessjonali fil-livelli lokali u reġjonali fl-Ewropa, li għandhom l-għan li jikkoordinaw l-interventi mal-edukazzjoni u t-taħriġ. L-analiżi pprovat li: a) tidentifika eżempji ta' interventi ta' servizzi differenti fejn hemm evidenza konkreta ta' riżultati tajbin għal tfal u żgħażagħ żvantaġġati; u b) tippreżenta l-kundizzjonijiet li wasslu għas-suċċess.

10. It-timijiet LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) fl-Olanda, l-inizjattivi "Team around the Child" fir-Renju Unit, u "Social Workers in Schools" fl-Isvezja, huma eżempji innovativi u li rnexxew ta' sinerġiji multiprofessjonali maħluqin fl-edukazzjoni u madwarha. Dawn kollha jiffukaw primarjament fuq li jgħinu biex jippreparaw lit-tfal biex jieħdu kemm jistgħu mis-sistema skolastika.

11. Interventi oħrajn, bħalma huma l-*Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Il-kampanja tat-Taħriġ tal-Gżira ta' Elbe) f'Hamburg, il-*One Square Kilometre of Education* f'Berlin, jew *On-Track* fl-Ingilterra, jinkludu l-iskejjel bħala msieħba importanti f'attakki "ekoloġiċi" aktar wesgħin fuq il-privazzjoni. Oħrajn, bħal ċerti *skejjel estiżi* jew *tal-komunità* fil-Belġju u fl-Ingilterra huma bbażati *fl*-iskejjel u joffru esperjenzi ta' arrikkiment lit-tfal u lill-familji.

12. L-approċċi transettorjali wisq probabbli li jagħtu l-akbar kontribut tagħhom fil-kuntest ta' perspettiva tal-edukazzjoni li hija *olistika u ekwa* bħala kontribut lejn l-iżvilupp olistiku u ekwu ta' dawk li qegħdin jitgħallmu.

13. Huwa aktar faċli li jiġu stabbiliti approċċi transettorjali u l-kollaborazzjonijiet interprofessjonali b'forom ta' governanza statista jew waħda li tiddirieġi (fejn is-servizzi jingħataw direttament mill-istat, nazzjonali u/jew lokali) milli b'forom li jiddelegaw iżjed u jiddependu prinċipalment fuq is-sorveljanza.

14. Dawn l-approċċi iżjed jużaw ir-riżorsi li jkun hemm diġà b'mod differenti milli jeżiġu riżorsi addizzjonali. Għalhekk, dawn jistgħu jew *jiffrankaw l-ispejjeż* jew *jeħilsu riżorsi eżistenti* biex jindirizzaw medda usa' ta' kwistjonijiet, u b'hekk jikkontribwixxu għall-"infiq intelliġenti".

15. Il-finanzjament għall-approċċi transettorjali għandu jitqies bħala prijorità fl-isforzi biex tintlaħaq il-mira tal-Ewropa 2020 ta' 10% ta' tluq bikri mill-iskola madwar l-UE.

16. Dawn l-approċċi ta' ħafna dimensjonijiet ma għandhomx jiġu sagrifikati sempliċiment għaliex huwa aktar diffiċli biex tevalwahom. Huma jeħtieġu l-appoġġ nazzjonali jew reġjonali u impenn ta' finanzjament u jieħdu ż-żmien qabel ma jkun jistgħu jiġu murija riżultati li jikkonfermaw is-suċċess.

17. L-approċċ ta' servizz uniku u dak sistemiku magħmul minn ħafna komponenti fuq terminu ta' żmien itwal jistgħu jiġu kkomplementati. Eżempju tajjeb ta' dawn huwa l-*Familiscope* fl-Irlanda.

18. Tibdil responsiv fil-prattiċi fl-iskejjel u madwarhom ta' bilfors ikunu sensittivi għall-kundizzjonijiet lokali, u għalhekk huwa diffiċli li wieħed jiġġeneralizza mill-esperjenza tal-interventi, dwar x'jaħdem l-aħjar. Għalhekk trid tingħata attenzjoni lill-prinċipji u l-valuri li fuqhom ikunu bbażati l-interventi.

19. Huwa meħtieġ b'urġenza qafas b'saħħtu li jiġbor kollox f'daqqa biex jgħin fit-tifsil tal-iżvilupp ta' politiki nazzjonali favur l-inklużjoni attiva. Qafas ta' dan it-tip jista' jkun gwida utli fil-ħidma tal-iskejjel ma' żgħażagħ vulnerabbli: jista' jallinja politiki nazzjonali dwar setturi diversi, jiffaċilita l-ħidma transettorjali fil-livell lokali, u jgħin b'modi xierqa fis-sorveljanza tar-riżultati tagħha. Dan it-tip ta' qafas ma jistax ikun u ma għandux ikun preskrittiv iżżejjed, madankollu jista' joffri sett ta' għodda konċettwali biex l-amministrazzjonijiet u l-prattikanti fl-Istati Membri jkunu jistgħu jaħsbu dwar kif jistgħu jiġu żviluppati approċċi transettorjali fil-kuntesti individwali tagħhom.

Samenvatting

1. Scholen kunnen niet in hun eentje intergenerationele achterstandscycli doorbreken en de onderwijsachterstand aanpakken. De onderwijskansen en de kansen in het verdere leven worden beperkt door een combinatie van buitenschoolse factoren.

2. Er zijn **sectoroverschrijdende strategieën** nodig om een verbinding te vormen tussen wat scholen kunnen doen en wat andere sectoren zoals werkgelegenheid, gezondheid, financiën, justitie, huisvesting, jeugd en welzijn kunnen bieden.

3. Complexe kwetsbaarheidsproblemen vragen meer systemische, "ecologischer" acties, onder meer interventie in gezinnen en gemeenschappen en hulp voor kinderen en jongeren.

4. Hoewel dit voor beleidsmakers geen gemakkelijke oplossing is, lijkt een volgehouden gecoördineerde en multidimensionale benadering de beste aanpak om de gevolgen van een meervoudige en cumulatieve achterstand op het vlak van onderwijs en kansen te voorkomen of te verminderen.

5. Onderwijs is de enige algemene dienst waar het welzijn van kinderen en jongeren regelmatig kan worden gecontroleerd. Het lijkt dan ook een verstandige stap richting volledige inclusie om scholen nauw bij deze acties te betrekken.

6. Preventieve interventies in en rond scholen waarbij meerdere diensten betrokken zijn, zijn het gemakkelijkst te realiseren als ze worden gesteund door nationaal beleid dat sectoroverschrijdende synergieën bevordert, van beleid via tenuitvoerlegging tot praktijk. Deze sectoroverschrijdende synergieën moeten sterke, historisch gegroeide grenzen tussen verschillende diensten en beroepen overwinnen.

7. Beleidsgestuurd groeperen van verschillende diensten volstaat niet. Er zijn inspanningen nodig om echte interprofessionele samenwerking op het vlak van dienstverlening te ondersteunen.

8. Sommige lidstaten van de EU hebben al enkele stappen naar een dergelijke aanpak gezet, vaak in het kader van preventiestrategieën voor voortijdig schoolverlaten of algemene strategieën voor een leven lang leren, en hebben een samenwerking tussen verschillende diensten opgezet waarbij professionals met diverse verantwoordelijkheden samenwerken om kansarme kinderen en volwassenen te helpen.

9. In Europa zijn op lokaal en regionaal niveau synergieën onderzocht tussen beleidsterreinen en multiprofessionele partnerschappen die interventies willen koppelen aan onderwijs en opleiding. De bedoeling was: a) voorbeelden te vinden van interventies door meerdere diensten samen waarbij succesvolle resultaten voor kansarme kinderen en jongeren kunnen worden aangetoond; en b) de voorwaarden voor succes te onthullen.

10. De LSB-teams (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) in Nederland, het "Team around the Child"-initiatief in het VK en de "maatschappelijk werkers op school" in Zweden zijn succesvolle, innovatieve voorbeelden van multiprofessionele synergieën in en rond het onderwijs. Deze projecten leggen in de eerste plaats de nadruk op het helpen van kinderen zodat zij voordeel uit onderwijs kunnen halen.

11. In andere projecten zoals *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Opleidingscampagne Elbe-eilanden) in Hamburg, *Eén vierkante kilometer onderwijs* in Berlijn of *On-Track* in Engeland zijn scholen belangrijke partners in een brede, "ecologische" aanpak van achterstand. Nog andere projecten, zoals de *Brede Scholen* in België en Engeland, lopen *in* scholen en bieden kinderen en gezinnen een verrijkende ervaring.

12. Sectoroverschrijdende benaderingen kunnen de grootste bijdrage leveren in de context van een *holistische en eerlijke* kijk op onderwijs, waarbij het gaat om een holistische en eerlijke ontwikkeling van de leerling.

13. Een sectoroverschrijdende aanpak en interprofessionele samenwerking kunnen gemakkelijker worden georganiseerd met van staatswege of centraal aangestuurde bestuursvormen (waarbij diensten rechtstreeks door de staat op nationaal en/of lokaal niveau worden verleend) dan door systemen die meer gebaseerd zijn op overdracht van bevoegdheden en controle.

14. Een dergelijke aanpak vereist niet zozeer meer middelen, maar de bestaande middelen moeten anders worden gebruikt. Zo kunnen *kosten worden bespaard* of *bestaande middelen worden vrijgemaakt* om een groter aantal onderwerpen aan te pakken. Dit draagt bij tot "slim uitgeven".

15. Financiering van sectoroverschrijdende benaderingen moet voorrang krijgen om een van de Europa 2020-doelstellingen te kunnen halen, namelijk de vroegtijdige schooluitval in de EU beperken tot 10 %.

16. Dergelijke veelzijdige benaderingen moeten niet simpelweg worden opgegeven omdat ze moeilijker te beoordelen zijn. Ze moeten op nationaal of regionaal niveau worden gesteund en gefinancierd, en ze moeten genoeg tijd krijgen om succesvolle resultaten op te leveren.

17. Een aanpak met één afzonderlijke dienst en een systemische, multidimensionale aanpak op langere termijn kunnen elkaar aanvullen. De *Familiscope* in Ierland is daarvan een goed voorbeeld.

18. Om de schoolpraktijk voortdurend op de context af te stemmen, moet worden ingespeeld op lokale omstandigheden, waardoor het niet eenvoudig is om algemene conclusies te trekken over wat werkt en wat niet. Daarom moet er aandacht zijn voor de onderliggende beginselen en waarden van de interventies.

19. Er is dringend nood aan een **stevig overkoepelend conceptueel kader** dat de ontwikkeling van een nationaal beleid voor actieve inclusie mee vormgeeft. Dergelijk kader kan een nuttige leidraad vormen voor scholen die met kwetsbare jongeren werken: nationaal beleid in diverse sectoren kan onderling worden afgestemd, op lokaal niveau kunnen sectoroverschrijdende werkzaamheden worden gefaciliteerd en de resultaten kunnen naar behoren worden gecontroleerd. Dergelijk kader kan en mag niet te dwingend zijn, maar het kan overheidsdiensten en professionals in de lidstaten een aantal conceptuele instrumenten aanreiken, zodat ze kunnen nadenken over hoe ze aan hun eigen omstandigheden aangepaste sectoroverschrijdende benaderingen kunnen ontwikkelen.

Streszczenie

1. W ramach wysiłków na rzecz przerwania międzypokoleniowego powtarzania się ubóstwa i rozwiązywaniem trudności edukacyjnych szkoły nie mogą zostać pozostawione same sobie. Możliwości kształcenia i możliwości rozwoju uczniów ograniczane są przez szereg czynników pozaszkolnych.

2. Oznacza to potrzebę **strategii obejmujących wiele obszarów, aby zbudować pomost** pomiędzy możliwościami działania szkół i tym, co mogą wnieść inne dziedziny, takie jak obszary zatrudnienia, zdrowia, wymiaru sprawiedliwości, gospodarki, mieszkaniowy, zajmujący się sprawami młodzieży i socjalny.

3. Złożone problemy uczniów w trudnej sytuacji społecznej wymagają "środowiskowych" działań obejmujących w rodzinach i społecznościach przy jednoczesnej pomocy dla dzieci i młodzieży.

4. Całościowe, wszechstronne i długofalowe przedsięwzięcia mogą oczywiście być dla decydentów trudne, mogą one jednak stanowić najlepszy sposób, aby zapobiegać skutkom nawarstwiających się i złożonych czynników wpływających ujemnie na kształcenie i możliwości rozwoju młodych ludzi lub żeby te skutki łagodzić.

5. W ramach celu, jakim jest dążenie do powszechnego włączenia społecznego, ścisłe powiazanie tych działań ze szkołą, jedynym środowiskiem umożliwiającym rzeczywistą poprawę warunków nauczania dzieci i młodzieży, wydaje się być odpowiednim postępowaniem.

6. Profilaktyczne, wszechstronne działania w środowisku szkolnym i okołoszkolnym najłatwiej prowadzić, jeśli wspierane są one polityką państwa ułatwiającą wykorzystanie strategii obejmującej wiele obszarów od chwili podejmowania decyzji, poprzez jej wdrażanie, aż do skutku końcowego działań. Wykorzystanie takich zbieżności miedzy dziedzinami wymaga przezwyciężenia silnie zakorzenionych w przeszłości podziałów pomiędzy różnymi służbami i zawodami.

7. Podporządkowanie rozmaitych służb wspólnej polityce nie wystarczy. Potrzebne są wysiłki, aby wesprzeć rzeczywistą współpracę pomiędzy różnymi obszarami zawodowymi na końcu wdrażania ww. działań.

8. Niektóre państwa członkowskie UE uczyniły już na tej drodze pewne postępy, nierzadko w związku z wprowadzeniem w życie strategii zapobiegania przedwczesnemu kończeniu nauki lub uczenia się przez całe życie. W państwach tych podjęto współpracę między różnymi dziedzinami polegającą na wspólnych działaniach mających na celu wsparcie znajdujących się w niekorzystnym położeniu dzieci i osób dorosłych.

9. W niniejszym sprawozdaniu przyjrzano się zbieżnościom występującym w Europie pomiędzy różnymi dziedzinami polityki, także tymi wynikającymi ze współpracy między różnymi obszarami zawodami, na poziomie lokalnym i regionalnym, których celem jest działań politycznych z kształceniem i szkoleniem. Celem sprawozdania było zgromadzenie przykładów działań na rzecz dzieci i młodzieży będących w niekorzystnym położeniu, w których uczestniczyły były różne służby i które zakończyły

się bezspornym powodzeniem oraz określenie warunków koniecznych do uzyskania takiego wyniku.

10. Zespoły zajmujące się pomocą edukacyjną i wychowawczą (LSB teams) w Holandii, brytyjska inicjatywa "Team around the Child" ("Zespół pomocy dziecku"), czy obecność pracowników społecznych w szwedzkich szkołach to przykłady udanych nowoczesnych przedsięwzięć wykorzystania takich płynących ze współpracy między różnymi obszarami zawodowymi w środowisku szkolnym i okołoszkolnym. Wszystkie te przykłady dotyczą działań ukierunkowanych na pomaganie dzieciom, tak, aby lepiej mogły korzystać z nauczania w szkole.

11. W innych działaniach, takich jak "Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln" (Inicjatywa szkoleniowa Elbeinseln) w Hamburgu, "Kilometr kwadratowy edukacji" w Berlinie, czy "On-Track" ("Na dobrej drodze") w Anglii, szkoły są ważnym partnerem w szerzej zakrojonej walce z ubóstwem. Jeszcze inne przykłady, takie jak *extended schools* i *community schools* w Belgii i w Anglii działają w szkołach i oferują zajęcia dodatkowe dla dzieci i rodzin.

12. Programy obejmujące wiele dziedzin wniosą prawdopodobnie największy wkład w ramach *całościowego i zrównoważonego* spojrzenia na edukację, jako że chodzi w nich o wszechstronny i zrównoważony rozwój uczniów.

13. Programy obejmujące wiele dziedzin i współpraca obejmująca różne obszary zawodowe są łatwiejsze do tworzenia z pomocą scentralizowanych i odgórnych sposobów zarządzania, (w których władze na szczeblu państwowym lub lokalnym zapewniają dane świadczenia), niż z wykorzystaniem bardziej zdecentralizowanych sposobów opierających się głównie na śledzeniu wyników.

14. Takie podejście nie musi oznaczać konieczności korzystania z dodatkowych środków, wystarczy w inny sposób wykorzystywać środki już dostępne. Dlatego też mogą one oznaczać *oszczędności* lub *lepsze wykorzystanie dostępnych już środków*, jako że stawianie czoła większej ilości zadań prowadzi do "lepszego zarządzania środkami".

15. Zapewnienie środków finansowych na programy obejmujące wiele dziedzin powinno być traktowane, jako cel nadrzędny strategii "Europa 2020", jakim jest obniżenie poziomu wczesnego kończenia nauki w całej UE do 10 %.

16. Z takich wielostronnych programów nie wolno rezygnować tylko dlatego, że ich ocena jest trudna do przeprowadzenia. Wymagają one wsparcia i zapewnienia środków finansowych na szczeblu krajowym i regionalnym, a także czasu, zanim będzie można osiągnąć wyniki i uzyskać dowody celowości projektu.

17. Programy oparte na działaniu jednotorowym i zaplanowane na dłuższy okres wielostronne inicjatywy systemowe mogą stanowić cenny dodatek. Dobrym przykładem na to jest *Familiscope* w Irlandii.

18. Zmiana sposobu nauczania w szkołach i w środowisku okołoszkolnym uzależnione są od lokalnych warunków, co utrudnia ogólną ocenę stopnia powodzenia działań. Dlatego też nie należy tracić z pola widzenia zasad i wartości, na których działania są oparte.

19. Aby pomóc w tworzeniu krajowych programów politycznych na rzecz aktywnego włączenia potrzebne są **solidne nadrzędne ramy koncepcyjne**. Takie ramy koncepcyjne mogą skutecznie pomóc szkołom w organizacji pracy z młodzieżą w trudnej sytuacji społecznej: mogą pomóc w kierowaniu krajowymi działaniami politycznymi w różnych dziedzinach, ułatwić współpracę między nimi na szczeblu lokalnym i pomóc w śledzeniu jej wyników w odpowiedni sposób. Takie ramy nie mogą i nie powinny zawierać zbyt dużej ilości szczegółów, ale mogą stanowić dla administracji i odpowiedzialnych za działania podmiotów w państwach członkowskich zasób narzędzi pomocnych w wypracowywaniu międzysektorowego podejścia w odpowiednich warunkach.

Resumo

1. As escolas não podem agir sozinhas ao procurar quebrar os ciclos intergeracionais de privação e eliminar as desvantagens educativas. Uma combinação de fatores alheios às escolas limita as oportunidades educativas e as oportunidades de vida.

2. Tal significa que são necessárias **estratégias intersetoriais**, para articular a ação possível das escolas com aquilo que outros setores como o emprego, a saúde, as finanças, a justiça, a habitação, a juventude e a segurança social podem oferecer.

3. Problemas complexos de vulnerabilidade exigem respostas mais sistémicas e "ecológicas" que envolvam intervenções nas famílias e nas comunidades juntamente com a ajuda prestada às crianças e aos jovens.

4. Apesar de difíceis para os decisores políticos, as abordagens coordenadas, pluridimensionais e sustentadas de forma consistente ao longo do tempo podem ser a melhor forma de prevenir ou atenuar o impacto de desvantagens múltiplas e cumulativas nas experiências educativas e nas oportunidades de vida das pessoas.

5. A estreita articulação destas respostas com a ação das escolas, que garantem o único serviço universal em que o bem-estar das crianças e dos jovens pode ser acompanhado de forma regular, parece ser uma medida prudente rumo a uma inclusão universal.

6. As intervenções preventivas que envolvem vários serviços, no contexto da escola e em redor dela, são mais fáceis de assegurar se forem apoiadas por políticas nacionais que promovam sinergias intersetoriais desde a elaboração das políticas à sua implementação e à prestação efetiva desses serviços. Para possibilitar as sinergias intersetoriais, é preciso superar a clivagem histórica que existe os serviços e profissões.

7. Não é suficiente uma partilha de locais por diferentes serviços imposta a nível político. São necessários esforços para apoiar uma verdadeira colaboração interprofissional ao prestar os serviços.

8. Alguns Estados-Membros da UE registaram progressos a favor desta abordagem, frequentemente no âmbito das suas estratégias de prevenção do abandono escolar precoce ou das estratégias gerais de aprendizagem ao longo da vida, e desenvolveram formas de colaboração plurisserviços, em que profissionais com diferentes competências trabalham em conjunto na prestação de apoio a crianças e adultos desfavorecidos.

9. O estudo analisou as sinergias entre os diferentes domínios de competência e as parcerias pluriprofissionais, existentes aos níveis local e regional na Europa, que visam articular as várias intervenções com o setor da educação e formação. O estudo procurou: a) identificar exemplos de intervenções plurisserviços com resultados positivos claros para as crianças e os jovens de meios desfavorecidos; e b) revelar as condições necessárias para ter êxito.

10. As equipas LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) nos Países Baixos, a iniciativa "Team around the Child" no Reino Unido e a ação "Social Workers in Schools" na Suécia são exemplos bem-sucedidos e inovadores deste tipo de sinergias pluriprofissionais desenvolvidas no contexto da

escola e em redor dela. Todas visam fundamentalmente ajudar as crianças a preparar-se, para poderem beneficiar plenamente da escolaridade.

11. Outras intervenções, como a iniciativa de formação na Ilha de Elba *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* em Hamburgo, *One Square Kilometre of Education* em Berlim ou *On-Track* em Inglaterra, recorrem à colaboração das escolas enquanto importantes parceiros de uma ação "ecológica" mais ampla de combate à privação. Outras ainda, como em algumas *escolas com atividades extracurriculares* ou *escolas comunitárias* na Bélgica e em Inglaterra, as intervenções ocorrem nas *próprias* escolas e oferecem experiências enriquecedoras às crianças e famílias.

12. O pleno contributo das abordagens intersetoriais depende de uma *visão holística* e *equitativa* da educação enquanto desenvolvimento holístico e equitativo do seu destinatário.

13. As abordagens intersetoriais e a colaboração interprofissional são mais fáceis de estabelecer com formas de governação em que o Estado assume um papel mais interventivo e dirigista (em que os serviços são prestados diretamente pelo Estado, ao nível nacional e/ou local), do que através de uma governação baseada na delegação de funções, destinada essencialmente a garantir a sua monitorização.

14. Tais abordagens não requerem necessariamente recursos adicionais, uma vez que os recursos existentes são utilizados de uma forma diferente. Por conseguinte, podem *poupar custos* ou *libertar recursos existentes* para lidar com um conjunto mais vasto de questões e contribuir assim para uma despesa mais inteligente.

15. O financiamento das abordagens intersetoriais deve ser considerado uma prioridade no esforço para atingir o objetivo da estratégia "Europa 2020", ou seja, reduzir para 10 % para o abandono escolar precoce em toda a UE.

16. As abordagens multifacetadas não devem ser prejudicadas simplesmente por serem mais difíceis de avaliar. Necessitam de apoio nacional ou regional e de um compromisso de financiamento, e requerem tempo até poderem apresentar resultados como prova de sucesso.

17. As abordagens monosserviço e as abordagens sistémicas pluridimensionais a mais longo prazo podem ser complementares. *Familiscope* na Irlanda é disso um bom exemplo.

18. As mudanças introduzidas nas práticas utilizadas no contexto da escola e redor dela têm necessariamente de ser sensíveis às condições locais, o que dificulta a simples generalização das intervenções de sucesso. É pois importante respeitar os princípios e os valores subjacentes a essas intervenções.

19. É urgente garantir **um quadro conceptual geral sólido** que ajude a determinar o desenvolvimento das políticas nacionais a favor da inclusão ativa. Esse quadro pode orientar o trabalho desenvolvido pelas escolas junto dos jovens vulneráveis: pode garantir um maior alinhamento das políticas nacionais dos diferentes setores, facilitar o trabalho intersetorial a nível local e ajudar a controlar os resultados de uma forma mais adequada. O quadro não pode nem deve ser demasiado prescritivo, mas pode fornecer às administrações e aos profissionais dos Estados-Membros um conjunto de ferramentas conceptuais para refletirem sobre a melhor forma de desenvolver abordagens intersetoriais nos respetivos contextos.

Rezumat

1. Școlile nu pot acționa singure în încercarea de a întrerupe ciclurile de sărăcie dintre generații și de a combate dezavantajele educaționale. O combinație de factori externi școlilor limitează oportunitățile educaționale și șansele de viață.

2. Acest lucru înseamnă că este nevoie de **strategii intersectoriale** pentru a corela ceea ce pot face școlile cu ceea ce pot oferi alte sectoare, cum ar fi ocuparea forței de muncă, sănătatea, finanțele, justiția, locuințele, tineretul și bunăstarea socială.

3. Problemele complexe de vulnerabilitate necesită reacții mai sistemice și mai "ecologice", care implică intervenții în familii și comunități pe lângă ajutorul acordat copiilor și tinerilor.

4. Oricât de dificile ar fi pentru factorii de decizie politică, abordările coordonate, pluridimensionale, susținute în mod coerent de-a lungul timpului pot fi cea mai bună formă de a preveni sau atenua impactul dezavantajelor multiple și cumulative asupra experiențelor educaționale și șanselor de viață ale oamenilor.

5. Corelarea strânsă a acestor răspunsuri cu acțiunea din școli, singurul serviciu universal în care bunăstarea copiilor și a tinerilor poate fi monitorizată periodic, ar părea să fie un pas înțelept în direcția realizării unei incluziuni universale.

6. Intervențiile preventive care implică diverse servicii în cadrul și în jurul școlilor sunt cel mai ușor de realizat dacă sunt susținute de politici naționale care promovează sinergii intersectoriale, de la etapa de elaborare a politicilor până la punerea în aplicare și prestarea efectivă a acestor servicii. Aceste sinergii intersectoriale trebuie să depășească granițele istorice puternice între diferitele servicii și profesii.

7. O coabitare în aceleași locații a diferitelor servicii, impusă la nivel politic, nu este suficientă. Sunt necesare eforturi pentru a sprijini o veritabilă colaborare interprofesională la punctul de prestare a serviciilor.

8. Unele state membre ale UE au înregistrat progrese în direcția unei astfel de abordări, adesea ca parte a strategiilor lor de prevenire a abandonului școlar timpuriu sau a strategiilor generale de învățare pe tot parcursul vieții și au dezvoltat forme de colaborare între diverse servicii în care specialiști cu diferite domenii de responsabilitate colaborează pentru a sprijini copiii și adulții defavorizați.

9. Acest studiu a examinat sinergiile dintre diferitele domenii de politică și parteneriatele pluriprofesionale la nivel local și regional în Europa, care urmăresc corelarea intervențiilor cu educația și formarea. Scopul acestuia a fost: a) să identifice exemple de intervenții ale mai multor servicii atunci când există dovezi clare de reușită pentru copiii și tinerii defavorizați; și b) să dezvaluie condițiile necesare pentru reușită.

10. Echipele LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) din Țările de Jos, inițiativa "Team around the Child" din Regatul Unit și acțiunea "Social Workers in Schools" din Suedia constituie exemple inovatoare încununate de succes de sinergii pluriprofesionale create în cadrul și în jurul educației. Toate acestea se concentrează în primul rând pe ajutorul oferit copiilor pentru a fi pregătiți să profite la maximum de școlarizare.

11. Alte intervenții, cum ar fi *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* din Hamburg, *One Square Kilometre of Education* din Berlin sau *On-Track* din Anglia recurg la colaborarea cu școlile ca parteneri importanți ai unei acțiuni "ecologice" mai ample de combatere a sărăciei. În alte situații, cum ar fi cazurile unor *școli cu activități extracuriculare* sau *școli comunale* din Belgia și Anglia, intervențiile au loc chiar în cadrul școlilor și oferă experiențe bogate copiilor și familiilor.

12. Abordările intersectoriale sunt susceptibile de a contribui cel mai mult la aceste eforturi în contextul unei perspective *holistice și echitabile* asupra educației, întrucât acest tip de abordare vizează chiar dezvoltarea holistică și echitabilă a cursanților.

13. Abordările intersectoriale și colaborările interprofesionale sunt mai ușor de stabilit cu forme de guvernare etatiste sau bazate pe linii directoare (în care serviciile sunt prestate direct de către stat, la nivel național și/sau local) decât cu o guvernare orientată mai mult pe delegarea funcțiilor și care se bazează în principal pe monitorizare.

14. Astfel de abordări nu necesită neapărat resurse suplimentare, cu condiția ca resursele existente să fie utilizate în mod diferit. Prin urmare, acestea fie pot *face economii de costuri* fie pot *elibera resursele existente* pentru a răspunde la o gamă mai largă de aspecte, contribuind astfel la un mod mai "inteligent" de a cheltui.

15. Finanțarea abordărilor intersectoriale ar trebui considerată prioritară în efortul de a atinge obiectivul Strategiei Europa 2020, și anume de reducere la 10 % a proporției de abandon școlar timpuriu în UE.

16. Astfel de abordări pluridimensionale nu trebuie să fie sacrificate doar pentru că sunt mai greu de evaluat. Acestea au nevoie de sprijin național sau regional și de un angajament de finanțare și necesită o anumită perioadă de timp înainte de a da roade.

17. Abordările monoserviciu și abordările sistemice pluridimensionale pe termen lung pot fi complementare. Inițiativa *Familiscope* din Irlanda este un exemplu bun.

18. Modificările introduse în practicile din cadrul și din jurul școlilor trebuie să fie neapărat sensibile la condițiile locale, făcând dificilă simpla generalizare a intervențiilor de succes. Prin urmare, ar trebui să se respecte principiile și valorile care stau la baza intervențiilor.

19. Este imperios necesar să se garanteze **un cadru conceptual general solid** care să contribuie la determinarea dezvoltării politicilor naționale în favoarea incluziunii active. Un astfel de cadru poate orienta activitatea desfășurată în școli cu tinerii vulnerabili: acesta poate garanta o mai mare aliniere a politicilor naționale din diferite sectoare, poate facilita munca intersectorială la nivel local și poate contribui la monitorizarea rezultatelor într-un mod adecvat. Un astfel de cadru nu poate și nu ar trebui să fie excesiv de prescriptiv, dar poate oferi administrațiilor și specialiștilor din statele membre un set de instrumente conceptuale pentru a reflecta la modul în care ar putea fi dezvoltate abordările intersectoriale în contextele lor.

Zhrnutie

1. Prelomenie kruhu deprivácie a znevýhodnenia vo vzdelávaní, ktorý zasahuje niekoľko generácií, nemožno ponechať len na školy. Možnosti vzdelávania a životné príležitosti obmedzuje viacero faktorov, ktoré presahujú rámec škôl.

2. Znamená to, že sú potrebné **medzirezortné stratégie** v záujme prepojenia práce škôl s tým, čo ponúkajú ďalšie rezorty, ako napríklad rezort zamestnanosti, zdravotníctva, financií, justície, bývania, politiky mládeže a sociálneho zabezpečenia.

3. Zložité problémy zraniteľnosti si vyžadujú systematickejšie, "ekologickejšie" reakcie pozostávajúce z intervencií v rodinách a komunitách, ako aj z pomoci pre deti a mladých ľudí.

4. Napriek svojej zložitosti z hľadiska tvorcov politík môžu byť koordinované, mnohostranné, dlhodobo a konzistentne využívané prístupy tým najlepším nástrojom na to, aby sa zabránilo vplyvu početných a nabaľujúcich sa nevýhod na vzdelávacie možnosti a životné príležitosti ľudí alebo aby sa tento vplyv zmiernil.

5. Zdá sa, že správnym krokom k univerzálnemu začleneniu detí a mladých ľudí do vzdelávania je úzke prepojenie týchto prístupov so školami, ktoré predstavujú jedinú univerzálnu službu, v ktorej možno kvalitu života detí a mládeže ľudí pravidelne monitorovať.

6. Preventívne zásahy na úrovni viacerých rezortov, uskutočnené v školách a mimo nch sa môžu vykonávať najľahšie, ak sú podporované národnými politikami, ktoré podporujú synergiu medzi rezortmi, a to od fázy tvorby politiky cez fázu jej vykonávania až po fázu dosahovania výsledkov. Tieto medzirezortné synergie musia prekonať silné historické hranice medzi rôznymi rezortmi a odborníkmi.

7. Samotné spolupôsobenie rôznych rezortov, aj keď ukotvené v stratégiách, však nestačí. Je potrebné vynaložiť úsilie na podporu skutočnej spolupráce medzi odborníkmi pri poskytovaní služieb.

8. Niektoré členské štáty EÚ sa už posunuli smerom k poskytovaniu takýchto služieb, často v rámci svojich stratégií na predchádzanie predčasnému ukončovaniu školskej dochádzky alebo v rámci všeobsahujúcich stratégií celoživotného vzdelávania, a zaviedli platformy spolupráce medzi viacerými rezortmi, napríklad v podobe spoločného riešenia odborníkov z rôznych odvetví v oblasti podpory detí a dospelých zo znevýhodneného prostredia.

9. V rámci tohto preskúmania sa posúdili synergie v rôznych oblastiach politiky a v partnerstvách spolupráce medzi odborníkmi na miestnej a regionálnej úrovni v Európe, ktoré sú zamerané na prepojenie intervencií so vzdelávaním a odbornou prípravou. Cieľom preskúmania bolo: a) určiť príklady medzirezortných intervencií tam, kde existujú presvedčivé dôkazy o úspešnom vplyve na znevýhodnené deti a mládež; a b) zistiť, za akých podmienok možno dosiahnuť úspechy.

10. *LSB teams* (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) v Holandsku, iniciatíva *Team around the Child* v Spojenom kráľovstve a *Social Workers in Schools* vo Švédsku sú úspešnými inovačnými príkladmi takýchto medzirezortných synergií, ktoré vznikli v oblasti vzdelávania, a ktoré presahujú jej hranice. Všetky uvedené iniciatívy sa zameriavajú predovšetkým na pomoc deťom, aby boli pripravené využiť výhody, ktoré im poskytuje vzdelanie.

11. Do ďalších intervencií, ako napríklad *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elbe Island Training Offensive) v Hamburgu, *One Square Kilometre of Education* v Berlíne alebo *On-Track* v Anglicku, sú zapojené školy ako dôležití partneri v rámci širších, "ekologických" snáh v boji proti deprivácii . Ďalšie iniciatívy, ako napríklad niektoré *rozšírené* alebo *komunitné školy* v Belgicku a Anglicku, sa realizujú priamo *v* školách a deťom a rodinám ponúkajú hodnotné skúsenosti.

12. Medzirezortné riešenia pravdepodobne budú najväčším prínosom v kontexte prístupu založeného na *holistickom a spravodlivom* pohľade na vzdelávanie, v rámci ktorého sa na vzdelávanie hľadí ako na komplexný a všestranný rozvoj vzdelávanej osoby.

13. Medzirezortné riešenia a spoluprácu medzi odborníkmo možno ľahšie zaviesť štátnymi alebo direktívnymi formami riadenia (na základe ktorých sa služby poskytujú priamo štátom na národnej a/alebo miestnej úrovni) ako formami s určitou mierou delegovania, ktoré spočívajú hlavne na monitorovaní.

14. Takéto riešenia si nemusia nevyhnutne vyžiadať dodatočné zdroje, ak sa už existujúce budú využívať iným spôsobom. Môžu preto buď *ušetriť náklady,* alebo *uvoľniť existujúce zdroje*, aby sa mohol riešiť rozšírený okruh oblastí, a tým sa prispelo k "inteligentnému vynakladaniu výdavkov".

15. Finančné prostriedky na medzirezortné riešenia by sa v úsilí o dosiahnutie cieľa stratégie Európa 2020, ktorým je znížiť úroveň predčasného ukončenia školskej dochádzky pod 10% v celej EÚ, mali považovať za prioritu.

16. Takéto viacaspektové riešenia sa nesmú zavrhnúť len preto, že je ťažšie ich vyhodnocovať. Pri týchto riešeniach je potrebná národná alebo regionálna podpora a zároveň fnančná podpora, a na dosiahnutie výsledkov potvrdzujúcich ich úspešnosť sa im musí poskytnúť určitý čas.

17. Rezortné a dlhodobejšie, systémové, mnohostranné riešenia môžu byť pozitívnym doplnkom. Dobrým príkladom je *Familiscope* v Írsku.

18. V dôsledku citlivých reakcií na rôzne podnety, ako napríklad miestne podmienky, dochádza v školách a mimo nej k zmenám v praxi. Preto je pri intervenciách ťažké dospieť k jednoduchým zovšeobecneniam o tom, čo funguje. Pozornosť by sa preto mala venovať princípom a hodnotám, z ktorých intervencie vychádzajú.

19. S cieľom pomôcť pri formovaní rozvoja národných politík na podporu aktívneho začleňovania je naliehavé vypracovať **robustný strešný strategický rámec.** Takýto rámec môže byť užitočný pri usmerňovaní práce škôl so zraniteľnými mladými ľuďmi: mohli by sa ním zosúladiť národné politiky rôznych rezortov , uľahčiť medzirezortná práca na miestnej úrovni a mohol by byť nápomocný pri vhodnom monitorovaní dosiahnutých výsledkov. Takýto rámec nemôže a nemal by byť príliš určujúci, ale môže správnym orgánom a odborníkom v členských štátoch poskytnúť súbor koncepčných nástrojov na úvahu o tom, ako vypracovať medzirezortné riešenia špecifické pre daný kontext.

Povzetek

1. Šole ne morejo same prekiniti medgeneracijskih krogov pomanjkanja in odpraviti prikrajšanosti v izobraževanju. Kombinacija dejavnikov zunaj šole omejuje možnosti izobraževanja in življenjske priložnosti.

2. To pomeni, da **so potrebne medsektorske strategije**, da bi zmogljivosti šole povezali z zmogljivostmi drugih sektorjev, kot so zaposlovanje, zdravstveno varstvo, finance, pravosodje, reševanje stanovanjskega vprašanja, mladina in socialno varstvo.

3. Zaradi kompleksne problematike ranljivosti so potrebne bolj sistematične, "ekološke" rešitve, ki vključujejo ukrepe v družinah in skupnostih ter pomoč za otroke in mlade.

4. Ne glede na to, kako težavni so morda za oblikovalce politik, lahko usklajeni, večstranski ukrepi, ki se dosledno izvajajo dlje časa, pomenijo najboljši pristop k preprečevanju ali zmanjševanju posledic večkratne in stopnjujoče se izključenosti za izobrazbo ljudi in njihove življenjske priložnosti.

5. Za dosego splošne vključenosti se zdi pametno te rešitve tesno povezati s šolo, edino univerzalno storitvijo, pri kateri se dobro počutje otrok in mladih lahko redno spremlja.

6. Preventivno ukrepanje, pri katerem sodeluje več različnih služb v šolah in v njihovi bližini, je najlažje doseči, če ga podpirajo nacionalne politike, ki spodbujajo medsektorske sinergije v vseh fazah – od sprejemanja odločitev prek njihovega izvajanja do zagotavljanja storitev. Te medsektorske sinergije morajo preseči močne zgodovinske meje med različnimi službami in poklici.

7. Prostorsko združevanje različnih služb na podlagi političnih usmeritev ne zadostuje. Treba si je prizadevati za pravo medsektorsko sodelovanje tam, kjer se storitev zagotavlja.

8. Nekatere države članice EU so šle v smeri takega pristopa, pogosto v okviru strategij za preprečevanje osipa ali splošnih strategij vseživljenjskega učenja, ter so vzpostavile sodelovanje med različnimi službami, pri katerem strokovnjaki z različnih področij sodelujejo, da bi nudili podporo prikrajšanim otrokom in odraslim.

9. Ta pregled je preučil sinergije na različnih področjih politike in v partnerstvih med različnimi poklicnimi skupinami na lokalni in regionalni ravni v Evropi, katerih cilj je oblikovanje ukrepov povezanih z izobraževanjem in usposabljanjem. Namen pregleda je bil: a) ugotoviti primere ukrepanja v okviru sodelovanja več različnih služb, pri katerem obstajajo solidni dokazi o uspešnih rezultatih za prikrajšane otroke in mladino, in b) odkriti pogoje za uspeh.

10. Uspešni, inovativni primeri takšnih sinergij, ki presegajo poklicne skupine in so nastale na področju izobraževanja in sorodnih področjih, so ekipe LSB (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) na Nizozemskem, pobuda *Team around the Child* v Združenem kraljestvu in *Social Workers in Schools* na Švedskem. Vse pobude se osredotočajo predvsem na to, kako bi otrokom lahko pomagali kar najbolje izkoristiti prednosti izobraževanja.

11. Drugi ukrepi, kot so *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* v Hamburgu, *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* v Berlinu ali *On-Track* v Angliji, vključujejo šole kot pomembne partnerje v širšem "ekološkem" odpravljanju pomanjkanja. Druge pobude, na primer *extended schools* v Angliji in *community schools* v Belgiji, se odvijajo v šolah in zagotavljajo bogate izkušnje otrokom in družinam.

12. Medsektorski pristopi bi lahko največ prispevali v okviru *celostne* in *pravične* vizije izobraževanja, saj je njihov cilj celosten in pravičen razvoj učenca.

13. Medsektorski pristopi in multidisciplinarno sodelovanje se lažje vzpostavijo skozi s strani države vodene, hierarhizirane oblike upravljanja (pri katerih storitve neposredno zagotavlja država na nacionalni in/ali lokalni ravni) kot pa z bolj delegiranimi načini, ki temeljijo predvsem na spremljanju.

14. Takšni pristopi nujno ne zahtevajo dodatnih sredstev, ampak drugačno uporabo obstoječih sredstev. Zato lahko *prihranijo stroške* ali *sprostijo obstoječe vire* za obravnavanje najrazličnejših zadev, s čimer prispevajo k "pametni porabi".

15. Financiranje medsektorskih pristopov je treba obravnavati kot prednostno nalogo pri prizadevanju za dosego cilja strategije Evropa 2020, in sicer 10 % osipa v EU.

16. Takih večstranskih pristopov ne bi smeli žrtvovati preprosto zato, ker so težje ocenljivi. Potrebujejo nacionalno ali regionalno podporo in zagotovitev financiranja, preteči pa mora nekaj časa, preden se rezultati lahko predložijo kot dokaz za uspeh.

17. Metoda ene službe in dolgoročni sistemski večstranski pristop se lahko medsebojno dopolnjujeta. *Familiscope* na Irskem je dober primer za to.

18. Lokalne razmere nujno vplivajo na odzivne spremembe v praksah v šolah in v njihovi bližini, zato je na podlagi takšnih ukrepov težko posploševati, kaj deluje in kaj ne. Pozornost je zato treba posvečati načelom in vrednotam, na katerih temeljijo ukrepi.

19. **Trden vseobsegajoči konceptualni okvir** je nujno potreben, da bi lažje razvili nacionalne politike za aktivno vključevanje. Tak okvir lahko koristno usmerja delo šol z ranljivimi mladimi: lahko uskladi nacionalne politike različnih sektorjev, olajša medsektorsko sodelovanje na lokalni ravni in pripomore k spremljanju njegovih rezultatov na ustrezen način. Tak okvir ne more in ne sme biti preveč predpisujoč, vendar lahko upravam in izvajalcem v državah članicah da nekatera konceptualna orodja za razmišljanje o tem, kako bi v skladu z lastnimi razmerami lahko razvili medsektorske pristope.

Sammanfattning

1. Skolorna kan inte på egen hand avhjälpa långvariga brister och ge eleverna bättre förutsättningar. Det finns flera faktorer utanför skolan som begränsar elevernas utbildnings- och framtidsmöjligheter**.**

2. Det krävs därför **sektorsövergripande strategier** för att koppla samman det som skolorna kan göra med vad andra sektorer kan erbjuda, t.ex. inom sysselsättning, hälsa, finans- och rättsväsen, boende, ungdomsfrågor och välfärd.

3. Utsatthet är ett komplicerat problem som kräver mer systemiska, "ekologiska" lösningar där man kombinerar insatser i familjer och samhällsgrupper och hjälp till barn och ungdomar.

4. Samordnade, mångsidiga och långvariga initiativ kan visserligen vara svåra att genomföra för beslutsfattarna, men det är ofta just det som behövs för att motverka de faktorer som påverkar människors utbildning och framtidsmöjligheter negativt.

5. Dessa initiativ bör genomföras i nära samarbete med skolorna, den enda plats där man regelbundet kan följa hur barn och ungdomar mår. På så sätt kan man på sikt inkludera alla.

6. Förebyggande insatser som omfattar flera sektorer, både inom skolorna och utanför, är lättast att genomföra om de åtföljs av en nationell strategi för samverkan. Man måste därför få bort de vattentäta skotten mellan olika tjänster och yrken.

7. Det räcker inte med en gemensam policy för de olika tjänsterna. Man måste också stödja konkret samarbete mellan olika yrkeskategorier på plats.

8. Vissa EU-länder har kommit en bit på vägen tack vare sina strategier för att förhindra att ungdomar hoppar av skolan eller för livslångt lärande. De har etablerat ett sektorsövergripande samarbete där personer med olika ansvarsområden arbetar tillsammans för att stödja missgynnade barn och vuxna.

9. I den här rapporten har vi tittat på lokala och regionala utbildningsprojekt där olika politikområden och yrkesgrupper samverkar. Rapporten har försökt kartlägga exempel på initiativ som omfattar flera tjänster och som har hjälpt missgynnade barn och ungdomar. Vi har också försökt redogöra för vilka faktorer som är viktiga för framgång.

10. LSB-grupperna (*Learning and Behavioural Support Teams*) i Nederländerna, initiativet *Team around the Child* i Storbritannien och samarbetet mellan skolor och socialarbetare i Sverige är lyckade exempel på ett innovativt utbildningssamarbete mellan olika yrkesgrupper. Alla dessa initiativ är i första hand inriktade på att hjälpa barnen att ta till sig undervisningen.

11. I andra initiativ som *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (utbildningsinitiativ i Hamburg), *Ein Quadratkilometer Bildung* (En kvadratkilometer utbildning) i Berlin eller *On-Track* i England är skolorna viktiga partner i bredare "ekologiska" insatser för att lösa problem och avhjälpa brister. Andra projekt som utvidgade skolor eller *Community schools* i England och Belgien verkar *i* skolorna och ger barnen och deras familjer berikande erfarenheter.

12. De sektorsövergripande initiativen ger bäst resultat om det finns en *holistisk och rättvis* syn på utbildning som handlar om att främja elevernas utveckling.

13. Det är lättare att utforma sektorsövergripande initiativ och samarbete mellan yrkesgrupper med direkt styrning (där tjänsterna tillhandahålls direkt av staten på nationell eller lokal nivå) än med mer delegering som framförallt bygger på övervakning.

14. Sådana initiativ kräver inte nödvändigtvis extra resurser, eftersom man kan använda befintliga resurser på nya sätt. Därför kan man antingen *spara pengar* eller *frigöra befintliga resurser* för att hantera flera olika frågor och därmed bidra till "smartare utgifter".

15. Finansiering av sektorsövergripande initiativ behövs för att nå Europa 2020-målet om att minska andelen elever utan gymnasiebetyg till 10 procent i hela EU.

16. Vi får inte ge upp dessa initiativ bara för att de är svårare att utvärdera. De kräver nationellt eller regionalt stöd och löften om finansiering och det tar tid innan vi kan se resultaten.

17. Initiativ med en enda tjänst eller mer långsiktiga systemiska initiativ som omfattar flera områden kan komplettera varandra. Det är *Familiscope* på Irland ett bra exempel på.

18. Förändringar inom och runt omkring skolorna påverkas naturligtvis av lokala förhållanden, vilket gör det svårt att göra några säkra bedömningar om vad som fungerar. Därför bör man vara särskilt uppmärksam på vilka principer och värderingar som ligger bakom initiativen.

19. Det finns ett akut behov av **en solid övergripande ram** som omfattar alla nationella åtgärder för aktiv inkludering. En sådan ram kan tjäna som vägledning för skolornas insatser när det gäller utsatta ungdomar. På så sätt kan man samordna åtgärder från olika sektorer samt underlätta lokalt sektorsövergripande arbete och uppföljning av resultaten. Ramen varken kan eller bör vara överdrivet tvingande, utan ge myndigheter och ansvarig personal i medlemsländerna idéer och verktyg för hur de själva kan utveckla sektorsövergripande metoder.

Chapter One

The Role of Education in Active Inclusion

1.1. Possibilities and limits

We live in difficult economic times. Progress towards social equality is faltering, indeed in numerous countries it is in reverse. In Europe, millions of people face years full of struggle and deprivation. Many of these are children. Urgent action is needed to challenge the wretched inevitability of these young people following their parents – and their grandparents – into poverty and social exclusion.

Education offers children a way out of poverty. Its professionals - more than doctors, social workers or welfare officers - are at the heart of children's daily lives. Excellent classroom teaching narrows the attainment gap between rich and poor, making a vital contribution towards social equality. But schools can do more in terms of both prevention and intervention to ensure that vulnerable children are able to take advantage of that excellent teaching.

Schools are well placed to spot the hurdles that deprivation places in the path of too many families. They are well placed to understand the dynamic nature of social exclusion, to recognise the continuum of need, to spot when a child becomes vulnerable and to act. Many acknowledge this broader role, but many need help making a success of it.

This is not just a challenge for schools. Their efforts are known to be enhanced when other services and professionals collaborate with them to help children leap exclusion's hurdles and focus again on their learning. Central government has a role too. "Joined-up" multi-service synergies in education are easiest to achieve if backed by "joined-up" national policies. Patience and financial commitment are also important. Social exclusion is complex and we need to know more about its root causes. But one thing we do know is that this complex phenomenon requires a sophisticated response. Governments that resort to quick fixes will be disappointed. Multi-layered, long-term interventions need time to produce results. This report examines *team working, local networks, inter-service working and multi-service responses*, as all of these terms are in common use. All of them involve inter-professional work; but the organisation of that work is different.

Housing, health, employment and welfare all have roles. It is not enough just to designate a desk for these services in schools. Instead, professional and organisational divides must be permanently cast aside for the sake of vulnerable young people. There has to be genuine multi-service collaboration. In pursuit of this, teachers, social workers, outreach care workers, therapists, nurses, speech and language therapists and housing officers need help learning to understand and appreciate each other's skills. They need help learning to work strategically together – for example, in the assessment of children's needs. With such help, their reward can be a powerful, co-ordinated response – centred on the child.

We know that this is not an impossible dream. The LSB teams in the Netherlands, the "Team around the Child" initiative in the UK, the social workers in schools in Sweden are successful, innovative examples of multi-service synergies created in and around education. We need more of them. Other noteworthy initiatives, for example, Hamburg's *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (the Elbe Island Training Offensive) involve

schools as important partners in wider attacks on deprivation. Similarly, community schools in Belgium, like extended schools in England, challenge exclusion on a broader front by trying to enrich families' lives.

The most common approach, though, is for a **single service** to work with a school to achieve a single aim – perhaps reducing bullying or persuading young people not to drop out. While it is relatively easy to measure the effectiveness of this approach, that does not mean it is the best or only solution for at-risk children. Single-service and broader, more "ecological", approaches can complement each other. Given the consensus that multi-service responses to social exclusion make a difference, they must not be sacrificed simply because they are harder to evaluate.

Obviously, we need to know "what works". However, it is also important not to fall into the trap of making simple generalisations from the evidence. All schools, just like the children they serve, are different. They need an overarching and shared set of principles and values to guide their work with vulnerable young people. But it must be a framework, not a cage. It is vital that they, and the services with whom they collaborate, are able to be sensitive to local circumstances.

Many schools are doing good work with vulnerable children. Now they need to accept and develop their role as a lynchpin in a multi-faceted, cross-sector world. They need to scrutinise their purpose and values in this world. They may want, for example, to look beyond examination results as a measure of how they are helping at-risk children. They may want to evaluate their relations with parents or to train their staff in conflict resolution.

Failing at school leaves a child at risk of wider social failure. All professionals involved with young people should appreciate just how fundamental education is in terms of transforming the lives of vulnerable children. They need to accept that working alongside this universal service is a legitimate use of their specialist skills.

The multi-faceted nature of risk requires a multi-faceted response. Centring such a response on and around schools, the only places that exist purely for children, is essential if we hope to prevent the social exclusion of millions of young people.

This review has examined synergies across policy fields and in multi-professional partnerships, at local and regional levels in Europe, which aim at articulating interventions with education and training. The intention has been to identify examples of successful interventions in order to inform policy development.

1.2. Education and active inclusion: defining the terms

The review acknowledges the importance of school-wide approaches to inclusive education and in particular teaching strategies aimed at narrowing achievement gaps between the more and less disadvantaged pupils. However, the primary focus will be why and how schools and other services work together to tackle the multifaceted nature of social exclusion.

The range of potential links of this kind is considerable. It is therefore useful to conceptualise them as falling into three broad approaches:

a) *Individualised* approaches in which sectors work together to tackle the disadvantages faced by particular learners or groups of learners in particular education settings. These might take the form, for instance, of multi-professional teams based in and around schools and working with learners who have been identified as being in some way "at risk".

b) Wider, *ecological* approaches where sectors work together to tackle the social and economic problems apparent in particular localities which give rise to the disadvantages experienced by individual learners. These might take the form, for instance, of area-based initiatives in which education providers, a range of other public services, community groups and business and industry work together to enrich the employment opportunities, or improve health, or tackle street crime in particular localities.

c) *Policy* approaches in which national or regional governments facilitate cross-sectoral work at local level, and bring national policies in different sectors into alignment. This might involve, for instance, developing policies to promote educational inclusion as part of a wide-ranging policy effort to tackle the social exclusion of marginalised groups, or developing childcare provision in schools as part of an effort to increase employment opportunities for parents.

Thinking of cross-sectoral links in this way is important because each of these different approaches has a contribution to make, and ideally they should support and enhance one another.

Prevention is therefore a key concept. The examples of working on social exclusion will centre on preventing exclusion through interventions with children and young people who are at risk of being unable to engage with, and contribute to, what society can offer. The analysis will recognise that "prevention" can also apply to protective safeguarding action taken to ensure that a child does not come to significant harm. Schools, as universal services, have a part to play in recognising the need for safeguarding and in rehabilitation (Appendix A); however, this higher level of risk will not be a focus.

The preventative work which will be discussed is aimed at breaking inter-generational cycles of disadvantage through building the capacity of children, their families and often their wider communities to engage fully in and with mainstream society. *Schools cannot achieve that aim alone; but their contribution is not only providing excellent classroom teaching.*

The report will examine social interventions which have involved schools in working with other services. **Intervention** is therefore another term that needs explanation. The Commission's recognition that schooling is the most important intervention in the lives of children and young people is reflected, for example, in its emphasis on inclusive schooling and its strategies to stem tendencies to leave school early (Commission Staff Working Paper 2010; Downes 2011a). Alongside these emphases is a growing recognition that schools need to work in collaboration with other services for children and young people if children are to be able to attend and engage with school.

Early intervention is the term most commonly associated with the inclusion agenda and has two accepted meanings. The 2011 Social Protection Committee report and the 2013 Commission's "Social Investment package" point to early childhood intervention in health and education as key to breaking an intergenerational cycle of poverty. These interventions are often multi-strand and will be discussed in this report. The other reading of early intervention does not limit itself to the early stages of a child's life, but involves intervening early when there are signs of vulnerability at any time in the life of a child or young person (Home Office 2000; Rutter 2007). This interpretation of early intervention also calls for multi-faceted responses.

The challenge that the second meaning offers provides a major rationale for multi-professional collaborative working around schools. Professions need to be able, at any stage in a child's life, to collaborate in looking across different domains such as housing, parental health etc., in order (i) to recognise the accumulated need that may result in a child's vulnerability and (ii) to collaborate in response to their joint interpretations of that need. It also recognises that vulnerability is a dynamic state: levels of risk can change in relation to changes in the environment in which the child is developing.

So far, the term used for collaboration across professional boundaries has been **multi-faceted**. Again some clarification is needed. This report will mention *team working, local networks, inter-service working and multi-service responses*, as all of these terms are in common use. All of them involve inter-professional work; but the organisation of that work is different.

Teams, whether they are single service or contain different professions, usually have a shared history and some common understandings from which they can work responsively with children and families towards shared goals. *Networks* may also have built up some degree of common knowledge and patterns of fluid inter-professional collaboration over time. *Inter-service* and *multi-service* work suggest stronger boundaries between services that come together to tackle the complex problems of social exclusion.

Many of the examples to be discussed consist of a mixture of team or network responses together with multi-service support. However, growing understandings of prevention and early intervention are leading to more systemic configurations of services where boundaries between agencies are being eroded. For example, in England, during the last decade, local systems of combined children's services have been established.

This report will recognise the challenges that policies for service integration present to governments where specialist approaches to welfare policy have led to strong boundaries between welfare actors at national, regional and local levels. It will note that inter-professional collaborations are more easily achieved by strongly centralised governments which can implement policies to break through these boundaries by demanding co-location of services, or establishing local inter-professional partnerships outside established systems, than by more delegated systems which rely on local initiatives to erode the boundaries that maintain services as separate silos. It will also recognise that co-location needs to be supported by workforce development to enable collaboration and that free-standing partnerships need to be integrated into local systems if they are to be sustained.

The role of the State in articulating inter-professional collaborations raises important questions about the autonomy of schools within State systems and for policies that aim at engaging schools in early interventions. The report recognises that **education, training, employment, health and housing policies need to be inter-related**. It points to examples of this approach at the regional level in Germany and argues for the development of an over-arching framework for policy development that allows for some freedom of movement in response to local conditions.

The report focuses primarily on **schools** and their roles in policies aiming at active inclusion through inter-professional synergies. Engaging schools has its challenges. Collaborations in and around schools can be constrained by a narrow view of what leads to academic achievement. Schools frequently have tight boundaries which make collaboration difficult; work with targets that focus on pupils' academic achievement; and see excellent classroom teaching as the key lever to improving pupils' life chances.

The move towards active inclusion, emphasising engagement in society through participation and active citizenship, has the potential to disturb some of these assumptions about schooling. For example, the voices of pupils and parents are increasingly being heard in school-related initiatives. Some of the interventions to be discussed have come to see that working with families is not a matter of the school "colonising" the home (Edwards and Warin 1999; Mulkerrins 2007), but of schools acknowledging and working with the "funds of knowledge" (Moll 1990) that learners bring to the learning situation in school (Diez *et al.* 2011).

Recognising learners as people with lives beyond the school gates also means that vulnerable children cannot easily be parcelled into discrete needs and each need sent to different services which work independently. The 2011 Munro Review of Child Protection in the UK observed that 'child-centred' systems of services are needed. An earlier substantial UK discussion paper, which was produced by HM Treasury, focused more on prevention and emphasised the crucial role of schools in such a child-centred system. It argued: "A preventative schedule of support needs the full engagement of universal services, especially schools" (HM Treasury-DfES, 2007:20).

The examples to be discussed here will show how important schools, as a universal service, can be in these systems. This report will focus on how and why a broad range of inter-professional collaborations take place in and around schools and their implications for the wellbeing of children and young people.

1.3. What does the evidence look like?

Discussions will draw primarily on empirical studies and conceptualisations of school-related inter-professional collaboration which have taken place in Europe over the last ten years. These are augmented by studies from beyond Europe in order to expand themes revealed in the European developments. The studies include large scale evaluations of national initiatives aimed at identifying what works; accounts of local projects aimed at supporting their development; and research studies aimed at developing conceptualisations which might inform future developments.

The intention is to identify successful interventions in order to inform policy development. However, two limitations in many studies of interventions need to be noted. A major concern among evaluators is the difficulty in identifying the impact of specific preventative work within communities where other interventions are also likely to be in place, or where services work responsively on complex inter-related problems. There is therefore often a stronger focus on the evaluation of the processes of collaboration and the structures that support them, than on robust evidence of the impact of a specific intervention on outcomes for children.

These evaluations are reflecting a reality that needs to be recognised when formulating evidence-based policy. Process and structural indicators[1] can provide valuable information, about who services are reaching and how complex problems are being addressed, which can both inform policy and hold service providers to account.

The second limitation is the successful contextual embedding of many of the interventions that are examined. This necessary localism raises questions about the extent to which interventions in one cultural context can be transferred to another. Preventative work is inevitably culturally sensitive; practitioners work with the grain of history and local social and cultural capital. Consequently, this analytic report needs to attend to the organising ideas and principles in interventions, as well as to process and outcomes, in order to aid later translation and implementation.

---

[1] Interventions are frequently assessed against, process and structural indicators in addition to outcome indicators. *Process indicators* include changes in professional practices, user take-up, preventative work and access to basic rights which would include education. *Structural indicators* include legislation, codes of conduct, audit, opportunities for user participation and communication systems.

Appendix B lists the core studies which were interrogated in detail in order to identify concrete outcomes of inter-service work as well as obstacles and enablers. These studies were identified using European networks of researchers in the field of prevention and the work of schools and academic search engines. There are inevitable gaps among the projects discussed; but the intention is to begin to identify types of approach and their implications for schools, the services with whom they collaborate and children and families.

The core studies are classified on two dimensions in Appendix B: *focus* and *mode* of inter-professional collaboration. Focus was categorised as pre-school; school age; transition from school and post-school; and community. Work with families spanned all of these categories. Mode was categorised as team working; local networks; single service work requiring inter-professional support; and single service interventions alongside schools. Inter-sectoral and multi-professional work was evident, in some way, across most projects; for example, when team work was augmented by collaborations with other services.

Chapter Two

How Education Works with Other Services for Children and Young People

2.1. Introduction

An enhanced role for schools in the prevention of exclusion is breaking new ground. It extends the purposes of schooling beyond expectations of inclusive educational practices in classrooms. Schools are now positioned as one of several preventative services that should collaborate in both the recognition of vulnerability and in responses to it. The change demands that old expectations and organisational boundaries are disrupted and new ways of working formed.

The following questions are addressed in this chapter:

o *How do schools recognise and respond to children's vulnerability?*

o *What are the different types of inter-professional collaboration to be found in and around schools?*

o *What is the focus of collaborations and their intended outcomes?*

o *What are the links with families and communities and how do interventions take forward the active inclusion agenda?*

The intention is to identify how schools engage with other services and why they do it. The answers to the questions will allow some lessons to be drawn about the limitations and potentialities in the role of schools in inter-professional work.

2.2. Recognising and responding to children's vulnerability

This report focuses on inter-professional synergies and is not examining how schools recognise and respond to students' vulnerability by deploying their own staff within their own institutional boundaries.

The studies that are reviewed reveal three approaches to recognising risk of social exclusion and setting up school-related strategies to tackle it:

i. **Referral**: the school identifies a vulnerability in a student that cannot be dealt with by the school and calls on another service to take responsibility

ii. **Child-centred collaboration:** the school identifies a sign of vulnerability in a student and works with other professions to explore the extent of the vulnerability and to develop a joint response

iii. **Group targeting**: local priorities identify particular groups of children as vulnerable and schools become sites of targeted interventions

Referral is long-established in schools, involving them in sending children to speech therapists, counselling services etc. for additional help. The external service usually assumes responsibility for the child's specific vulnerability, refers the child to other services if necessary and offers an intervention. This approach, summarised by one practitioner as "passing on bits of the child" (Edwards *et al.* 2009), will not be categorised as an inter-sectoral or inter-professional synergy in which schools play an active part.

Child-centred collaboration can be categorised in this way. It has the advantage of starting by building a picture of accumulated vulnerability so that a robust assessment of risk can be made. Joint diagnosis also makes it more likely that the accumulated risk faced by a child or young person can be tackled in a coherent way by the relevant services. This approach can call for assessment tools which allow different services to contribute to the assessment and to the plans for dealing with vulnerability. The Common Assessment Framework (CAF) in England is one example of an assessment instrument that meets these requirements (CAFs are discussed in more detail in Chapter Four). Schools, as universal services which see children regularly, are one of the services that are most likely to initiate and orchestrate CAFs.

CAFs in turn have led to the creation of Teams Around a Child (TAC) which allow different specialists such as family workers, education welfare officers, and school psychologists to bring together their expertise to support children and their families. However, the terminology is slippery. TACs are often temporary teams, assembled from local service providers to meet the needs of a particular child. Child-centred inter-professional teams which are more permanent and more directly linked with specific schools are also under development, in a national pilot of LSB teams (i.e. Behavioural and Educational Support Teams), in the Netherlands (van Veen, 2011).

More "ecological", multi-strand approaches to prevention, which tackle both the difficulties the child presents and aspects of the conditions which gave rise to the difficulties, also finds strong support. The Reinke *et al.* (2009) review of US combined school and family interventions to prevent disruptive behaviour reported:

> In addition to targeting malleable risk and protective factors, successful programs tend to be multifaceted ecological models aimed at multiple domains changing institutions and environments as well as individuals (Reinke *et al.* 2009:34).

Group targeting is the most common approach in the studies that have been reviewed. There are two broad sub-categories of this approach. The first is a structural response, represented in the studies in Appendix B by *extended schools* in Belgium (where they are also called *community schools,* Joos *et al.* 2007) and in the UK (Cummings *et al.* 2011).

In these cases resources from other services are added to schools. The schools, in line with an "ecological" attack on social exclusion, are bases for offering additional opportunities and services to children and families. The school base means that potential users do not see the services as stigmatising. Schools may be involved in identifying need for specialist support, but in some models families can also self-refer or be referred by other services.

Another slightly different structural response is a local network with educational intentions. The example discussed in this report is *Le Réseau des Écoles de la Deuxième Chance* in France. This thriving national initiative, a network of networks, has established local groupings of political, economic and social partners who combine their resources to aid the employability of young people who leave school without qualifications. The emphasis is on assessment of **competence** rather than diplomas and the networks are organised locally to aim at: "Matching the intentions and needs of young people with the realities of the local employment market." (Statuts de L'Association Réseau E2C France 2004) (our translation).

Another example of work with this target group is the *Project for pupils who drop out of school* led by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy in Bulgaria (http:www.mlsp.government.bg), which aims at preventing school drop-out and providing internships for young people.

The other kind of group targeting, which does not involve new structures, sees schools as the agents of change and works through and with them to influence vulnerable groups. Targeting may be based on regional or national policy concerns such as the social inclusion of Roma children, early school leaving or health inequalities (Diez *et al.* 2011; Downes 2011b; Flecha *et al.* 2011).

The INCLUD-ED research project (2006-2011), funded within the European Union's Sixth Framework Programme for research, provides several examples of this approach. Schools are not involved in identifying the focal vulnerability, but co-operate with other actors in interventions with children and families, which are led by the external service and aim at promoting active inclusion. These interventions often take place in school settings, again avoiding stigmatising and enabling a wide reach.

INCLUD-ED has largely emphasised the development of inclusive practices within schools. However, it has also recommended that schools have a much wider role in tackling intergenerational poverty in order to meet their responsibility for ensuring active inclusion through enhancing academic performance among at-risk groups:

> Schools [should] create the conditions that encourage increased participation of families and communities in learning activities, curriculum development and evaluation, and school decision-making. Participation and training of families from vulnerable groups, such as migrants, cultural minorities, and of students with disabilities should be particularly encouraged as it directly impacts on their children's academic success.   (Scoopproject.org.uk: downloaded January 2013)

This kind of group targeting approach has tended to see schools as sites for preventative work that involves other services. These approaches have therefore largely limited themselves to taking advantage of schooling's position, as a universal service, to reach families where vulnerability is at the first and second levels of need (Appendix A).

However, there are glimpses, such as the INCLUD-ED suggestion, that there is some potential for widening schools' local responsibilities to families and communities (Gatt *et al.* 2011). If that were to be realised, the shifts in purposes and practices of schools and the demands on them as organisations would need to be recognised (Education Council of The Netherlands 2010; Edwards *et al.* 2010).

Another variation of group targeting focuses directly on practices in schools, for example anti- bullying initiatives, to prevent social exclusion through early school leaving. Downes (2011a) is a relevant account of this kind of preventative activity.

Of the three approaches outlined in this section, only child-focused collaboration takes advantage of teachers' regular proximity to children and their ability to recognise early signs of vulnerability so that a wider assessment of risk may be made and preventative action initiated before problems escalate.

2.3. Types of inter-professional collaboration in and around schools

Schools have long referred students with specific individual needs to discrete external services which give specialist support. These services include school psychology, mental health services, speech therapy and counselling. The services address a child's need and make few demands on schools, despite some efforts among psychologists to influence school-level responses in, for example, England and Denmark (Leadbetter 2011; Vassing 2011).

Another approach is exemplified by social pedagogues who work with vulnerable children, in for example, residential settings (Cameron 2004) and schools (Cohen *et al.* 2004; Kyriacou 2009). Although this seems a

promising approach in many ways, its lack of attention to broader contextual conditions of vulnerability has led to criticism (Coussée *et al.*2008).

In this section the focus is:

- schools' child-centred collaborations with, for example, inter-professional teams or social workers who are placed in schools; and

- fluid and responsive networking in local systems of specialist expertise which are geared at supporting the needs of individual children, for example, the emergent systems of inter-sectoral working to be found in combined children's services in England.

The role of the multi-professional *Youth Care Advisory Teams* (YCATs) (also known as LSB) in the Netherlands is now fairly well-established. They are seen as a crucial layer in the support available for those vulnerable students who require more help than can be offered by schools alone (Education Council of the Netherlands 2010). These teams are not external to a school, but attached to them and include school staff and "the school is in charge" (Dolf van Veen personal communication, October 2011). The position of the teams in relation to the schools therefore also requires child-centred approaches within schools to ensure a consistency of experience for children.

An early account of YCATs (Bongers *et al.* 2000) emphasised the value of a whole school approach to prevention which was placed within "the wider framework of multi-service schools" (p. 20). These **multi-service schools**, with support from national policy, are growing in number in the Netherlands. There are several models of multi-service arrangements with schools: ranging from community-based (75%) to school-based (15%). However, as van Veen observes (2011), rigorous studies on outcomes for children and families are lacking.

Van Veen's own recent evaluation of LSB-teams, which consist of a teacher or other school staff, a social worker, youth worker, school health care worker, police and truancy officer (Educational Welfare Officer in England), suggests that inter-professional collaboration is strengthened by establishing teams of complementary expertise with a clear focus on contributing to support structures for teaching and learning in schools and networks of schools.

Multi-professional attention to school practices is also at the core of a US initiative, *Behavioural Interventions and Supports* (PBIS) (Reinke *et al.* 2009), discussed by Downes (2011a). Downes concluded that multi-sectoral teams working in schools can offer an important strategic dimension to prevention of suspension and expulsion from school, through providing social, emotional and behavioural support services, including teacher conflict resolution skills and diversity training, as well as alternative strategies to suspension.

The 21 regional LSB pilots examined by van Veen have improved achievement, well-being and service delivery in most of the sites. However, he notices a tension that points once again to the broader preventative role of schools. The LSB teams need to balance "primary prevention, selective prevention and interventions" (van Veen 2011). Professional energy is inevitably drawn to the more demanding cases.

This tension is also seen in the re-organisation of children's services in England, which aims at promoting prevention through intervention at the early signs of vulnerability (Edwards and Daniels 2012). A great deal of the preventative work observed in that study occurs at the top end of Level Two (Appendix A), at the expense of lower level early interventions. The reason for this lies in the very nature of preventative work, namely that the problems are almost invariably more complex than they first appear.

The National Evaluation of the Children's Fund (Edwards *et al.* 2006) described successful preventative practice as "lifting the stone". Early preventative activity can very quickly reveal highly complex difficulties requiring a range of professional responses. Preventative services often become overwhelmed by "net-widening" and higher levels of identified needs (Brandon *et al*. 2006; Churchill 2011). These revelations elevate the problem to Level Two and call for the orchestrated expertise of a multi-professional team.

The involvement of social workers is not new in the pre-school educational provision that is offered as a preventative service for vulnerable young children. But stronger connections between social work and mainstream schooling are now being implemented. Bolin (2011) outlines a type of collaboration in Sweden which she terms *school social interventions* (p. 20). These include teams which implement collaboration between teachers, social workers, students and their families. The *Resource Schools* in which this happens are "new arenas for interprofessional collaboration" (p. 20) which aim at preventing the escalation of pupils' problems.

While the Swedish examples are backed by national policy, the English example of social workers in schools was a recent pilot project set up by the Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC). The project implemented and compared two approaches. The first method placed each social worker for 50% of their time in a school, where they could undertake preventative work with self-referring families who had been encouraged to work with them by the teachers. The second approach set up small teams of social workers and family workers who worked flexibly with specific schools to give support to families where children were at risk of eventual social exclusion through, for example, poor attendance or parental ill-health. Both the Swedish and the English approaches enabled social work skills to be brought to bear on Level Two problems (Appendix A). This focus relieved schools of those demands and allowed expert efforts to be made to keep the child out of Level Three risk and the statutory requirements that then would come into play in the English case.

The more fluid responses from local networks are still under development across Europe, where reports indicate the difficulties involved in opening up the boundaries around schools and changing their entrenched practices. In England, the Children Act (DfES 2004) required Local Authorities to integrate their services for children (Edwards *et al.* 2009; Glenny and Roaf 2008), seeing it as a ten year project. However, schools had a great deal of independence from Local Authorities, which has meant that their relationship with other services is often still marked by firm boundaries.

There has been some blurring of boundaries between schools and other services in England. It has occurred through the use of school-funded non-teaching staff who work as learning mentors and student support workers to provide extra help for vulnerable pupils. **Learning mentors** and **student support workers** are increasingly likely to be the people who initiate the Common Assessment Framework discussed in section 2.2. They are therefore usually the school-based practitioners who liaise with other services on preventative work. Their lack of training for this work remains a concern (Edwards *et al.* 2010; Gunter 2007) and will be discussed in Chapter Four.

A Common Assessment Framework (CAF) often leads to establishing a Team Around a Child (TAC, see section 2.2) which is made up of expertise tailored to the needs of the child and which can offer a co-ordinated response. Responses include specific specialist interventions and then support once the intervention ends. A school, through, for example, a student support worker who co-ordinates the CAF, is a partner in the TAC and has a role to play in building the strength of the child.

The need for a key person to lead collaborations was also observed by the Education Council of the Netherlands in its advice to the Education Minister in 2010:

> [We should] strive towards a situation where young people who require help are assigned a single professional to assist, coach and mentor them. This should preferably be done in a context where one of the agencies involved has overall responsibility and provides the coordinating professional.

The importance of key contacts for children and families has been highlighted by the complexity of service integration and the need to keep support stable while systems are being re-configured.

Combining children's services in England has involved major top-down government-led disruptions in funding, management systems, organisational structures and not least professional identities. However it is evident across a number of studies that inter-professional collaboration has enhanced professionals' sense of their core expertise. Being clear about what they bring to collaboration and being able to articulate that to others has led to a strong sense of specialist expertise among all the professions involved including teachers (Edwards 2010).

Studies also make it clear that local collaborations need groundwork. Bongers *et al.* (2000) suggest that a history of collaboration in a locality helps when establishing more focused systems. Examples of this kind point to the need for a policy framework that allows for local differences in readiness and capacity for inter-sectoral synergies.

The Education Council of The Netherlands in 2010 similarly argued for a broader role for schools to be based in local needs:

> Schools should be asked to place the many activities that they already perform in a broader context, to make a conscious decision in favour of a programme of extended education, and to give shape to this in accordance with local circumstances.

Local capacity can extend beyond schools and other welfare services. Although some kind of extended education is evident in the Netherlands with 76% of secondary schools involved in some way in 2010, the Council also suggests that, given the academic pressure on teachers, there is a need for third party help. "Other external parties, such as the social elite and businesses, could also contribute more to education than they may now perhaps realise".

2.4. The focus of collaborations and their intended outcomes

Collaborations in and around schools ultimately aim at engaging students with education. One approach is to focus specifically on changing what schools do. A large number of early intervention activities, such as *Let's make school attractive to young people* in Bulgaria, aim at altering school practices to enhance the inclusion of vulnerable groups. Others focus on changing family practices specifically in relation to education, for example in the pre-school period, through *Early Learning Parent Partnerships* in England (Evangelou *et al.* 2008); while others aim at a mutual changing of practices in both families and schools (Diez *et al.* 2011). These initiatives usually work with a specific target group, such as Roma or "hard-to-reach" families, which is seen as socially deprived and at risk of social exclusion.

The second broad approach is more wide-ranging and individually responsive to personal accumulations of disadvantage. The *Familiscope* project in Ireland is a well-established example of this strategy (Downes 2004; 2011a). Based in an area of high social deprivation in Dublin, it brings together specialist services such as speech therapy, family support and specific proven interventions such as *Incredible Years* (Gardner *et al.* 2006) as resources for improving the life chances of vulnerable children and families.

A recent Familiscope initiative has focused on speech and language therapists working as part of a multidisciplinary team based in schools with children, teachers and parents. The 29 teachers in four schools who were surveyed in an evaluation noted benefits which included: giving confidence to quiet, withdrawn children, improving their peer interaction, facilitating their engagement in class and overcoming a fear of failure that stopped them trying to learn. Other benefits observed by teachers were an improved ability of pupils to follow "2-3 step directions" with consequent benefits for in-class behaviour, as well as improved phonemic and syllable awareness. This system-level work focused on developing teachers' language strategies through child language groups, collaborative classroom delivery (speech and language therapist and teacher), informal advice consultation on language difficulties, informal teacher support in the classroom, teacher workshops, as well as direct speech support for the child (Familiscope 2011, see also Hayes et al., 2012).

There are also examples of reconceptualising an educational problem so that the broader causes are acknowledged and extra resources made available. Recognising the mental health determinants of early school leaving is one example (Downes 2007, 2010). Freudenberg and Ruglis (2007:3) outline the core argument: "Simply reframing the school dropout as a health issue has the potential to bring new players into the effort". Student concerns about mental health issues being dealt with on the school site because of personal embarrassment and loss of privacy is another reason for reframing (Downes 2004; Morgan and Hayes 2004; Downes and Maunsell 2007). As is parents' unwillingness to engage with schools' mental health programmes (Langley *et al.* 2011).

In order to address these constraints, multi-professional arrangements with a preventative health focus and which include schools have sometimes operated with partnership models, which bring together school, community and home. The review of these models by Fiks and Leslie (2010) notes that evaluation of partnerships tends to be case study or formative action research: "but large-scale systematic evaluation of model process and outcomes has rarely taken place" (p. 49).

The problem of evaluating multi-professional preventative work is widespread. A review of preventative interventions in the early years in the UK (Allen 2011) assessed the quality of evidence on the impact of the interventions and produced a list of initiatives that met their criteria: almost all were delivered by single services. The situation is the same at school-age. For example, targeting and evaluation is easier for single-focus initiatives that aim at engaging specific groups of children and young people with education.

Generalising from evaluations of these studies is also difficult, and not only because of the inevitable sampling error built into real world interventions. These projects set targets related to local conditions and intentions and are often implemented flexibly by responding to the strengths and needs of participants. For example, Diez *et al.* (2011) notes how an intervention with Roma families changed as practitioners came to understand the cultural capital of the families they were working with.

One implication of recognising the local sensitivity of interventions is the need for practitioners to work with data in order to make evidence-informed decisions about adjusting practices. Several Combined Children's Services in England see evidence-informed front-line decision-making as a priority. Front-line workers are required to be clear about both process and outcome objectives and to gather data on them (Daniels and Edwards 2012). Inevitably process data such as footfall, frequently serve as proxies for outcomes. But also family case records are being systematically analysed to show, for example, time taken before the family leaves an intervention. These analyses are providing useful indications of success and are used in internal formative evaluations within combined services.

Specific interventions such as the Webster Stratton *Incredible Years* intervention with parents (Gardner *et al.* 2006) are already validated interventions and, provided that programme fidelity is adhered to, should

more easily demonstrate an impact. However Incredible Years is not a multi-sectoral response, but a specialist intervention, for example offered in Familiscope as one of several services. The array of services presents difficulties for evaluating the overall impact of Familiscope. Its evaluations have focused on discrete elements such as speech therapy; or on perceptions of the project through a teacher survey

Ghate *et al.* (2008) have observed in the context of <u>On-Track</u>, a multi-sectoral neighbourhood intervention aimed at crime reduction among young people, that making strong inferences about the linear impact of one intervention on a complex problem is extremely difficult. Yet evaluators do point to qualitative evidence of how interventions like Familiscope and the Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC) social work pilots are filling gaps by, for example, working with "hard-to-reach" families through a family outreach strategy and placing support around a family so it can engage with the school in productive ways.

In this context, the evaluation of the 21 pilot <u>LSB teams</u> in the Netherlands is among the most robust (van Veen 2011). It suggests that a multi-professional team that sustains specialist professional expertise to contribute to a continuum of care is sound model. Key factors that distinguish this model from the provision of services based on systems of referral to external agencies are (i) the team is oriented to the purposes of schooling and supports young people so that they can take advantage of schooling and (ii) the schools recognise the adjustments they need to make to support the student.

Achieving active inclusion is a broad goal and a relatively new one. It is being tackled in a wide variety of ways, which are often exploratory. Approaches reflect local histories, needs and possibilities for action. They demand confident evidence-informed decision-making by the front-line staff, who are responsively addressing local needs. Research is therefore focusing more on describing and conceptualising new ways of working than on assessing measureable outcomes.

A crucial point, when seeking clear evidence of outcomes, is that the nature of preventative work means that as it proceeds it can reveal more need than initially identified. Easy to achieve measures of the effects a single intervention are in danger of encouraging quick fixes at the expense of longer term multi-professional examinations of the root causes of intergenerational deprivation. We know that attention to outcomes provides a cohering focus for inter-professional collaborations in children's services (Daniels and Edwards 2012). We suggest that professions should work to a shared set of outcomes, based on a shared analysis of the causes of disadvantage and understandings of their respective roles in tackling it.

Schools therefore need to work with other specialist services to both recognise and respond to these broader problems. The *Learning for Interagency Working* study of changing professional practices in children's services (Edwards *et al*. 2009; Edwards 2010) found that inter-professional collaborations were as important when diagnosing difficulties as they were when responding to needs. Work on interpretation expands the problem to be tackled and widens the scope for professional action.

2.5. Links with families and communities to take forward the active inclusion agenda

The rationale for broadening the scope of the preventative role of schools is to see students as people with lives beyond the school gate, with both problems and strengths. This view of learners can help schools to move beyond deficit accounts of troubled children and to recognise the "funds of knowledge" (Moll 1990) that students bring to schools (Spring 2007), so that they can adapt their practices accordingly. Recognition and reciprocity are fundamental to pupils' engagement with schooling and active inclusion. They are risk-reducing by-products of inter-professional collaborations that should not be underestimated.

However, the focus in this section is on how schools, families and communities collaborate to configure children's life trajectories towards active inclusion. Where it occurs, this collaboration is based on a cultural explanation of child development which sees the child as nested within his or her immediate family which is in turn embedded within the practices of the community. It is an "ecological" account of development, which underpinned the US *Head Start* programme and its long-term social inclusion gains. Configuring developmental trajectories to promote active inclusion therefore involves interventions at the levels of family and community as well as with the student in school.

In England the implementation of the *Sure Start* initiative has echoed *Head Start*. It is a pre-school intervention which has been community-based, with inter-professional co-located teams. It has worked with carers and families as well as children. The National Evaluation of *Sure Start* (NESS) has used longitudinal and comparative data to demonstrate positive outcomes for child development, home environment, parenting, engagement with services and rating of the neighbourhood indicators (NESS 2011).

Sure Start outcomes have been influenced by multi-professional collaborations, and contextual factors including: effective partnership working and leadership; inter-professional collaborations, particularly between health, social services and education; accessible services; good staff retention, recruitment, training and supervision; high quality services; services for parents, families and communities as well as for children; effective strategies to identify higher need families; non-stigmatising and empowering professional-service user relationships and outreach activities (Belsky *et al.* 2007).

Sure Start's links with schools are usually with nursery school provision and its success has provided a basis for the more recent development of inter-professional Children's Centres for pre-fives in England. These offer integrated early education and childcare alongside child and family health services, family support services, outreach services and connect with Job Centre Plus, adult education providers and welfare benefit services. A national evaluation of Children's Centres (2009-2015) is currently underway.

Interpreting early intervention as intervention in the early years has also led to an array of approaches in England, all seeking short-term project funding. For example, the ELPP study (Evangelou *et al.* 2008) examined the impact of 19 voluntary agencies and their different "parent as educators" interventions on pre-school children and their parents over one year. The interventions were supported by short-term funding. All of them prioritised responsiveness over programme fidelity and many of them were implemented by volunteers with limited training.

A systematic review of parenting support in the international literature (Moran *et al.* 2004; Moran and Ghate 2005) also pointed to the need for well-qualified staff. The review found definitions of parenting support to be diverse and evidence of "what works" to be "patchy".

They also observed that parents who "drop out" of provision are those with multiple and over-lapping problems i.e. those who require inter-professional support. They then argued that an ecological approach needs to be taken at a national level, along with the recognition that parenting programmes alone will not solve the problems of poverty. Of particular relevance to this report is their conclusion:

> Until we have greater understanding of the mechanisms involved in the onset and maintenance of family problems (and family well-being), we cannot develop fully appropriate interventions to address them. Thus further research aimed at theory building is also needed to pave the way for the development of services, in addition to robust evaluation. (Moran and Ghate 2005:334)

The policy problem of the "hard-to-reach" family exemplifies the lack of analysis of the root problems of intergenerational deprivation (Boag-Munroe and Evangelou 2010). Debates on this topic centre on:

whether the families are self-excluding; whether services are insufficiently oriented to reaching out to those who do not present themselves as service 'users'; and how to address their multiple needs.

Here the role of schooling as a universal service which is able to identify signs of vulnerability is potentially valuable. However, as the efforts to create more community-oriented schools in the Netherlands and Belgium demonstrate, schools need encouragement at a policy level to see the whole child and not simply a pupil who is failing to meet school standards.

The framework for _community schools_ in Belgium (Joos *et al.* 2007) illustrates how capacity building is a feature of its model:

> Within a Community school, partners from different organisations and sectors who are willing to commit themselves, start actively looking for possible connections and opportunities, common goals, shared concerns and joint actions, in order to realise a broad and qualitative support of children's and youngsters' development. A variety of partners thus add their expertise and individuality to the network and allow the Community school to grow along with the evolutions within the different social sectors. The main partners in that respect are the children and youngsters themselves, as well as their parents because they know their children best. In any case, parents play a key role in the learning and life of their children and in their relations with the environment and other partners. (Joos *et al.* 2007 downloaded January 2013)

However, the evaluation after three years was high on optimism and low on evidence of outcomes:

> At the end of the three year period, we questioned all pilot projects (coordination and partners) about the impact they perceived from participating in Community Schools. They felt a clear impact on the levels and quality of cooperation as well as on the range and quality of activities. Almost everyone feels that Community Schools can be a useful tool in realising more and better chances for children, although there are still a lot of issues to tackle. (Joos 2010 downloaded January 2013)

Bulgaria, on the other hand, provides an example of community engagement that is part of local culture but is also supported by central government funding.

> In the field of culture and extracurricular activities schools traditionally work with the so-called chitalishte (cultural clubs). We can call chitalishte one of the oldest civil society organizations in Bulgaria. There are hundreds of chitalishte across Bulgaria most of them funded with small yearly amounts by the ministry of culture. They are community based, work closely with schools in the organization of extracurricular and out of school activities. Cultural clubs often also have small public libraries. It is difficult to say which agency has the leading role in each specific case. But it should be noted that in small settlements these old cultural clubs are often the only place offering some activities for the free time of students as well as adults. (Zahariev personal communication October 2011)

Cummings *et al.* (2011) in their account of _Extended Schools_ in England note how easily schools employ deficit models of parents and communities, seeing education as the solution. Drawing on the work of Ebersöhn and Eloff (2006) on community development, Cummings *et al.* argue that schools should instead take an assets-based approach and focus on the capacities and resources of the communities they serve.

This starting point positions people as potential "co-producers of the solutions to their problems" (p. 126). Building the agency, or capacity to engage, of potential service users was also pursued in the *Learning in and for Interagency Working* study (Edwards *et al.* 2009; Edwards 2010) and in an account of resilience as a capacity to act on and shape one's own world (Edwards and Mackenzie 2005; Edwards 2007). It provides a sound basis for linking prevention to active inclusion.

However, engagement between schools and parents is, for the most part, oriented to enlisting parents as supporters of school values and giving them the skills that enable them to support their children's learning. Examples of ecological approaches that involve schools are therefore limited. There is clearly scope for a broader reconceptualisation of the role of schools in strengthening community capacity in line with an assets-based approach.

One example is the *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elbe Island Training Offensive) in Hamburg. Here schools are seen as central to a large-scale community regeneration project. Schools have learnt to network to integrate provision and to look out to their roles in a community which is changing around them. The efforts have been summarised as follows:

> After three years of the Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln, an interim balance can be drawn: educational facilities see themselves more and more as part of a development strategy for the entire district. They are sharpening their profiles and strengthening cooperations in order to arrive at an integrated collective service for the learning landscape as a whole. In this way, the chances for the educational facilities to be perceived as a significant location factor grow. During the profiling of the services, intensive work was dedicated to ensuring that the educational facilities have an integrative effect and support all types of talent—and in all age groups. (downloaded from http://www.jovis.de/media/pdf/ibaHHprojekte.pdf, January 2013)

The Hamburg initiative has made considerable demands on schools, requiring them to collaborate for the benefit of the community rather than consider their own institutional needs (Schmachtel in progress). The current state of collaboration has taken time, it has been necessary to build shared goals and identify how practices needed to change in order to achieve them. But the strategy of placing integrated educational provision at the centre of community regeneration offers an interesting model. The changes are still underway so are yet to be evaluated for long-term outcomes.

Another example of a tightly network intervention with a central focus on education is the *One Square Kilometre of Education*, initiated in Berlin in 2006 by the Freudenberg Foundation, Karl-Konrad-and Ria-Groeben Foundation and RAA Berlin in cooperation with the Berlin Senate Department for Education, Science and Research. There are now two projects in Berlin and the idea was extended to Wuppertal, Herten and Mannheim in 2009. Evaluation so far is through monitoring and self-evaluation.

The *One Square Kilometre of Education* approach centres on five questions:

a. How can processes of education in a city district be organized so that they can be integrated, interconnected and ensure the success of children and adolescents?

b. How can the quality in day-care centres, youth welfare centres and schools be improved and controlled with the participation – if possible – of all groups involved?

c. How can the participation of parents be ensured?

d. Under what conditions can different approaches be integrated in and transferred from the program?

e. How can municipalities, state administrative offices, foundations and civic society cooperate in this connection? (http://www.ein-quadratkilometer-bildung.org/stiftung/english/downloaded January 2013)

Each initiative has a "binding and regulated cooperation with the public authorities", which varies according to local regulatory needs. Importantly, in all three projects, municipal control groups have been established to aid integration. Both German initiatives illustrate how schools can be built into a local partnership and contribute to partnership goals.

The _On-Track_ initiative in England was also based on a partnership model involving schools. The funding was short-term (2000-2008) and the aim was a neighbourhood-based approach to reducing youth crime. The target group was children aged 4-13 and an ecological strategy was adopted to bring together education, health, social services, youth offending teams and voluntary organisations. The evaluation of *On-Track* for the period 2003-2006 (Ghate *et al.* 2008) found that education agencies were by far the largest source of referrals to On-Track for intervention (35% in total).

The evaluation also noted that multi-professional working was slow to start and, like the National Evaluation of the Children's Fund (Edwards *et al.* 2006), it found that strong local project leadership was essential to sustaining a focus. Evidence of impact was "mixed" with the clearest evidence on improvements in parents' beliefs in their capacity to cope; a finding which was reflected in children's reports of their interactions with their parents. The short-time scale and the massive shifts in professional practices required meant that there was no evidence of crime reduction among children and young people. However, the process impact on families should not be underestimated. The study reported greater take up of other services and informal sources of support among *On-Track* families.

The building of new and sustained social capital among families was observed in a Scottish study of parenting support (Zeedyk *et al.* 2007) and is at the core of the influential US analysis of the "Unanticipated Gains" of social capital that mothers derive from engaging with child-care centres (Small 2009). Small labels his analysis "the organizational embeddedness perspective" (p. 177), arguing that it approaches the building of social capital from a new starting point "the organizational contexts that guide or give meaning" to people's actions (p. 177). He proposes that organisations such as schools, churches etc. need to attend to the institutional conditions that allow parents and carers to build the networks that sustain their engagement in and with society.

His approach is again "ecological", but focusing on small changes in behaviour in established institutional practices:

> The organizational perspective links this micro-level process [everyday interactions etc.] to the macro-level structures that ultimately affect them. In this respect, it constitutes a *meso-level approach to social inequality,* one that seeks regularities in how people interact, obtain information, trust others, respond to obligations, acquire supportive services, and secure everyday material goods…. (Small 2009:190-191)

The insights from this analysis do not lead to the structural changes or the targeted interventions outlined so far. But they do reflect some of the capacity building intentions behind efforts to open up the boundaries of schools through community or extended schools in Belgium and England; or a looking outwards that marks the Dutch multi-service schools. They are also compatible with an assets-based approach to tackling deprivation.

Evidence from the National Evaluation of the Children's Fund (Edwards *et al.* 2006) supports Small's analysis and raises questions about targeting and community capacity. First it found that simply taking children and young people seriously, listening to them and acting on their ideas increased children's sense of effectiveness and their active participation in projects. Second it observed that the success of targeted interventions depended, in part at least, on the capacity of local communities to embrace them.

A notion of "readiness" was used analytically to explain what happened when community-based interventions demanded too much of hard-pressed families and opportunities were not taken up. It argued that attention may need to be paid to building community capacity if the marginalised are not to remain sidelined. The small-scale but systemic changes in interactions indicated by Small may be part of a solution to local capacity building. Here again schools as universal services have a major part to play.

An overview of the role of schools in developing area-based initiatives (Dyson and Kerr, 2011) outlined what an area initiative can do and how it should be a coherent and grounded attack on deprivation:

> As they develop their own initiatives, there is much schools, local authorities and their partners can learn about how to be effective from previous area-based approaches. Finding ways to 'bend' existing resources in the area may be more effective in the long-term than relying on additional funds. Having some alignment with broader policy approaches is likely to be an important strategy for attracting partners, identifying multiple levers for change, and multiplying impacts. Local people will also need to be involved. Ensuring that decisions are made on the basis of a real understanding of how local people see their lives and the place where they live, and what they feel needs to happen, may be more effective than trying to recruit them to formal decision making bodies. (p. 2)

2.6. Summary of how Education works with other services

1) Schools as universal services are well-placed to identify early signs of vulnerability.

2) School practices tend towards sustaining tight institutional boundaries.

3) Evidence from The Netherlands suggests that when inter-professional teams are set up to work with the purposes and priorities of schools they provide examples of successful multi-professional synergies.

4) A great deal of inter-professional collaboration in and around schools is "work in progress" without robust evidence of outcomes for children and young people.

5) Process and structural indicators can provide valuable information, about who services are reaching and how complex problems are being addressed, which can both inform policy and hold service providers to account.

6) The complexity of prevention, its sensitivity to local conditions and the responsive nature of the work makes the evaluation of specific multi-sectoral activities extremely difficult.

7) More comprehensive, "ecological" approaches to disrupting cycles of deprivation which aim at capacity building in communities and families can involve schools, but require schools to recognise the "whole child".

8) Schools have a potentially important role in efforts at community regeneration as well as in ensuring that young people attend school and achieve academically.

9) Community and extended schools, which aim at the rounded development of children, have the potential to develop student capacity to engage and active inclusion.

10) Schools can help to build local capacity and parents' social capital through attention to how they help foster local networks and engage with parents.

Chapter Three

Enablers and Obstacles to Schools' Engagement with Other Services

3.1. Introduction

The following questions are addressed in this chapter:

- o *Why and for what period of time are these interventions funded?*

- o *What are the lessons about targeting and commissioning?*

- o *What are the implications of national cultures and local practices for shaping inter-professional synergies?*

- o *What are the implications for policy development?*

The intention is to examine the conditions that lead to sustainable and effective interventions aimed at disrupting cycles of deprivation and engaging children and young people with society.

3.2. The funding and time-scale of inter-professional interventions

This review has been marked by the shortage of robust longitudinal evaluations that evidence the impact of collaborative practices which are based around schools and focused on children and young people. One reason is that these practices are still under development and evaluations, often with action research frameworks, have been set up to support their implementation rather than focus on outcomes. Another reason is that funding is usually short-term and centred on specific policy initiatives such as preventing early school-leaving, or the inclusion of specific groups of children in schools.

Both reasons point to fundamental gaps in the knowledge about inter-professional synergies around schools which is needed to inform policy. We know too little about how good inter-professional collaborations occur; and more often than not projects focus on solutions without doing the analysis of the root causes that Moran and Ghate (2005) suggested was needed (see section 3.5). Churchill makes a similar point is her overview of recent preventative work in the UK:

> Labour [i.e. the previous government] invested in …early intervention... However there was limited progress in the degree to which specialist and targeted child and family welfare services were able to respond to needs earlier and promote child and family well-being. This related to the scale of social problems, contested nature of policy objectives and limited conceptualisation of implementation challenges. (Churchill 2011, no page number)

As the INCLUD-ED European research programme has indicated, short-term solution-oriented funding is found across Europe. In England, under the previous government, it led to a strong reliance on voluntary actors in preventative work, as they could adapt to the different demands of project funding. Recent cuts to Local Authority budgets and reduced project funding have meant that these actors are experiencing a significant loss of income.

The vulnerability of income streams and demands on staff have been noted even in the Netherlands, where there have been substantive and successful changes in how schools work with other services (van Veen 2011 and section 2.3), The Education Council of The Netherlands made the following observation in 2010:

> Problems in organising extended education appear to lie, for instance, in the opaque system of temporary subsidies which can have an adverse impact on the continuity of the activities. Apart from these issues concerning the availability of funding, issues concerning the efforts made by teaching staff and by students and pupils also play an important role. Both have limits that need to be monitored. (downloaded January 2013)

There appears to be a vicious circle of lack of confidence in the potential impact of initiatives that then leads to short-term funding aimed at specific solutions, which in turn inhibits comprehensive analyses of problems, substantive systemic change and longitudinal evaluations. Participants in the December 2011 workshop "Working together for equity"[2] argued strongly for funding that was sufficiently long-term to allow teams to take forward the systems level changes needed to produce evidence of benefits for children, young people and their families.

One factor inhibiting investment in prevention is its cost-benefit when aimed at lower levels of vulnerability. Current arguments for the cost-benefit of the preventative services are based mainly on fictional cases, estimations or statements of faith. However, the RAND Corporation has undertaken a more systematic approach (Karoly *et al.* 2005). The team concluded:

> There is some evidence that the economic returns from investing in early intervention programs are larger when programs are effectively targeted. In the Nurse-Family Partnership home visiting program, the effects were larger for a higher-risk sample of mothers. Consequently, the return for each dollar invested was $5.70 for the higher-risk population served but only $1.26 for the lower-risk population. This finding indicates that it is not reasonable to expect the returns we report for specific programs serving specific disadvantaged populations to apply when the same program serves a different population. In particular, we would not expect to see the same returns in a universal program, e.g., a state-run preschool program open to all, although net benefits from such universal programs may still be positive and the associated benefit-cost ratios may still exceed1. (Karoly *et al.* summary xviii)

The link between accurate targeting of a specific single focus intervention and evidence of outcomes is once again made. The danger is that the weight of evidence for single focus interventions (see Allen 2011 for examples), as useful as it might be, can lead policy makers to see these interventions as the only solution. As this report has already indicated, vulnerability is multi-faceted and dynamic, changing as people's situations alter. Single focus interventions may not tackle the nested complexity revealed by ecological analyses of the causes of deprivation. Interventions should both support and enhance each other and therefore need to be embedded within a broad policy framework to enable that to happen.

Single focus interventions can also inhibit assets-led capacity building initiatives. Churchill (2011) suggests that while *Sure Start* and the Children's Fund invested directly in voluntary-statutory partnerships, other policies based on "evidence-based 'proven' interventions, posed a major threat to grassroots voluntary sector activities and provision". These include playgroups and locally devised parenting programmes which have reduced in number as a result (Lewis 2003; Moran *et al.* 2004).

---

[2] In the context of the consultation symposium *Measures to Combat Educational Disadvantage –a European consultation symposium* organised by the European Commission in Brussels on 8-9 December 2011.

Downes has also suggested that outcomes driven policies may tempt services to filter out the most marginalised children, young people and families. The groups that experience multiple disadvantages are likely to be most resistant to at least short-term outcome gains (Downes 2007). Evangelou *et al.* (2008) made a similar point, but for a different reason, when they reported that services which were using short-term funding were anxious about establishing relationships with the most hard-to-reach families, for fear of not being able to sustain the connections once funding ended.

3.3. Lessons for targeting and commissioning

"Ecological" analyses of risk and prevention present challenges to those responsible for designing or commissioning services. For example, mental health issues, including depression, anxiety, disruptive behaviour disorders, eating disorders, or post-traumatic stress disorder, can negatively impact on a child's school success, as well as general well-being (Kessler 2009; World Health Organization 2003); while children living in low-income families are especially vulnerable to mental health difficulties (Annie E. Casey Foundation 2009; US Department of Health and Human Services 2001). Evidence also suggests that the emotional support needs of withdrawn students, who are at risk of early school leaving, may be missed by teachers compared with those students displaying and externalising problems through aggression (Doll 1996; Downes 2004, 2011c; Irish Parliament and Senate Report 2010).

The UK Treasury outlined advice for commissioning for preventative services as follows:

> Wider social and environmental costs and benefits for which there is no market price also need to be brought into any assessment. They will often be more difficult to assess but are often important and should not be ignored simply because they cannot easily be costed. (HM Treasury 2003)

Processes for commissioning services are now being developed which link the required outcomes of discrete service provision to the outcomes of other agencies. The advice given by Aked and Steed (2009), based on a report *Backing the Future: why investing in children is good for us all* produced in England by The New Economics Foundation with "Action for Children", lists the following features of good commissioning:

- Focus on outcomes not outputs
- Factor in well-being
- Include a range of social, environmental and economic objectives
- Use outcome indicators
- Measure the distance travelled (by the target group)
- Calculate the social return on investment
- Provide adequate funding for measurement
- Provide adequate funding for measurement beyond consultation
- Measure with service users

England represents a mixture of statutory expectations (for schooling and safeguarding) and a degree of local autonomy over the provision of lower level preventative services. Consequently, attention to how commissioning gives direction to service integration is an important aspect of the inter-professional synergies around schools.

The importance of local commissioning varies across Europe. An international comparison of service integration, undertaken by the English National Foundation for Educational Research (NFER), observed the differences between what they described as statist and subsidiarity approaches to provision:

> Integration is structurally more straightforward in systems where the state is more active as a direct provider. Where the state commissions or regulates the work of others there is the possibility of a greater degree of fragmentation that is less conducive to integration… Scandinavian countries are typically statist. Major European countries such as France and Germany have a subsidiarity tradition.   (NFER 2010:45)

The central government has given English schools a high degree of independence in how they manage their finances, leaving Local Authorities with little financial leverage to direct their activities. Schools may fit tangentially with locally commissioned services and, through their independence, illustrate how a mixture of funding mechanisms can inhibit service integration.

However, schools can be helpful units when planning and targeting services. Hughes and Fielding (2006), working with evidence from the National Evaluation of the Children's Fund, observed that targeting methods were frequently limited by the data available. They found that schools were therefore often a central feature in decisions on where to place targeted services; and school data were frequently used as proxies for information on the wards (the smallest unit of community) in which they were located. Sometimes schools were linked in "community clusters" (p. 35), so that services worked with several schools and local commissioning requirements listed "links with schools".

Rationales for choosing school sites included both ease of access and lack of stigma. Nonetheless, schools did not always become more outward-looking as a result. Hughes and Fielding also noted that interventions which involved direct collaboration with school staff focused on the direct needs of the schools, for example bullying.

The 2010 NFER report concluded that England has gone further along the route to service integration (apart from with schools) than most countries. The reason is the Children Act (DfES 2004), which demanded a complete reconfiguration of services for children to enable inter-professional working, but excluded schools.

Despite these advances in England there is still work to be done on mechanisms for commissioning personalised responses which follow and support vulnerable children and young people. Personalised responses involving commissioning at the level of the individual is currently much more evident in adult services in England than children's (Needham 2010).

Needham's account of recent developments at the local level gives some optimism for how a more child-centred approach may be built into an ecological approach to prevention. The example she discusses is the *Total Place* initiative which did not survive the 2010 change in government. It was implemented through a series of pilot studies in 2009 and took a whole community approach to service provision. She explains how respondents to her study welcomed it:

> Local strategic partnerships are leading on the Total Place initiative, aimed at approaching service funding in a more creative and integrated way to remove duplicated funding across different agencies in a locality (see www.localleadership.gov.uk/totalplace). Many interviewees highlighted the coherence between personalization and Total Place, in reimagining local service provision and breaking down traditional service silos to rebuild provision around users. 'Personalization offers an ideal set of technologies to enable a Total Place strategy to work—because it offers a flexible framework for putting resources in the hands of citizens, families and communities'. (Needham 2010: 29)

Developing systems of targeting and commissioning for inter-professional collaborations remains work in progress. This section has focused largely on England because of the advances made towards service integration there. In addition, its mixture of statutory expectation, school independence and local commissioning, together with its attention to targeted interventions and more personalised approaches within an ecological view of prevention, reveal the topics to be addressed more generally, if schools are to benefit from engaging with emerging local inter-professional synergies.

3.4. The implications of national cultures and local practices for shaping inter-professional synergies

The 2010 NFER international comparison of service integration observed how national political, funding and legal systems affected provision. Statism or subsidiarity was the organising principle. The present report quotes at length from the 2010 document as it gives useful indications of other local enablers and obstacles:

- **Statist systems**, in which services are provided directly by the state (national and/or local), tend to have the highest levels of integration. This especially occurs in Nordic counties, where local authorities directly run the services, in co-located or adjacent offices.

- In France, where there is a mixed system of provision from the state and from the voluntary sector, the child support social worker for the local authority becomes the key link person between agencies. A disadvantage of this approach is a feeling amongst the link social worker of being kept "out of the loop" by their specialist colleagues. They can simply become the broker of inter-professional service provision. It would seem, therefore, that this is not the same as the role of the lead professional in England, who is a core member of the team working for the child.

- In **subsidiarity** dominated structures, such as in Germany, where services are decentralised and provided by the voluntary sector and local actors, co-ordination of services is more difficult. The services are felt to be highly accessible to professional and families, but there is little integration between them. (pp. 28-29)

The report then asks:

• *Is the system centred on child protection or on prevention and family support?*

— Systems that focus on prevention seem better equipped to maintain a focus on the family as a whole, and to allow actors to work together, than systems that focus on child protection. In countries that focus on prevention and family support, the time that practitioners spend on communication and exercising professional judgement is valued at a strategic level.

— Where child protection is the underlying orientation of the whole system, a response from practitioners of self-protection is heightened. This tends to discourage communication and collaboration with other agencies.

• *Is the legal/court system adversarial or inquisitorial?*

— In adversarial systems, such as in England, there is a need to gather evidence for cases. Whilst this may produce clarity, it can result in high referral rates and a high expenditure on investigation and assessment of child protection cases in comparison to expenditure on prevention and early intervention (this has been reported for Australia, for example, where mandatory reporting is the main mechanism for ensuring inter-sectoral communication).

— In inquisitorial systems, such as in France, there is more emphasis on problem solving and early intervention and prevention (p. 29).

Mulgan has pointed to some of the challenges of the policy shift to networks and projects and away from 'traditional structures' (2005:179). These include the need for 'horizontal structures [which] are essential to complement vertical ones' (p.184), and notes that ensuing erosions of autonomy are "almost certainly to be resisted" (p. 187). By horizontal structures Mulgan meant new ways of enabling connections to be made between different specialist professionals across organisational boundaries at each level of organisational hierarchies; the vertical structures are those that are typically found in hierarchical organisations such as schools and social work. We suggest that Mulgan is half right about structures and certainly correct about resistance and horizontal structures are not a sufficient response to these new demands, not least because of the ensuing resistance. Instead attention needs to be paid to the work that is done to achieve horizontal linkages. Christensen and Lægreid (2007) get closer to the challenges of synergy. Horizontal working, they argue, needs "cooperative effort and cannot be easily imposed from the top down" so that "The role of a successful reform agent is to operate more as a gardener than as an engineer or an architect" (Christensen and Lægreid 2007:1063).

Resistance and entrenched practices that are unreflectively sustained, despite agreement on new institutional purposes, are a persistent problem in all the research on organisational change. The 2008 Audit Commission report on inter-professional work in Children's Trusts in England observed that inter-professional collaborations were occurring among front-line staff despite the organisations in which they worked.

The *Learning in and for Interagency Working* study (Edwards *et al.* 2009) came to the same conclusion. Labelling it "rule-bending", the research team argued that small infringements of established service protocols, in order to help a child, were the first signs that organisational practices needed to change and that changes in work practices should be noticed and, if appropriate, nurtured.

Attention to rule-bending subsequently became the focus of an intervention study with senior leaders in children's services funded by the LG Group (Edwards and Daniels 2012). There the intention has been to provide analytic tools for systemic reflection on the purposes of multi-sectoral working and how current organisational practices sustain or contradict them.

The LG Group study suggests that schools need to recognise their broader purposes in the active inclusion agenda and value connections with the local welfare services. This advice may not always be welcomed. An earlier study (Edwards *et al.* 2010) found that English secondary schools avoided contradictions between the academic and well-being purposes of schooling. This was achieved through a division of labour that delegated well-being to unqualified non-teaching staff.

One way of trying to avoid rule-bending is to establish new systems with new rules which are aimed at new purposes. Local partnerships such as the *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* in Hamburg and *Le Réseau des Écoles de la Deuxième Chance* found across France have offered new solutions to vexing problems and have led to new collaborations focused on new goals. But new partnerships are not an easy solution. They take time to establish and can run the risk of not being embedded in the systems that might be able to sustain them long-term.

An example, of the wastage that can arise if partnerships don't connect with statutory services was the Children's Fund in England. It was set up prior to the 2004 Children Act. New local strategic partnerships were established alongside Local Authority systems as catalysts to promote the moves to integrated working that Local Authorities found difficult to make.

The National Evaluation of the Children's Fund (Edwards *et al.* 2006) looked at all 159 local partnerships and studied 18 in depth. It found that those partnerships which grasped the new preventative purposes of the Fund and built strong local legitimacy on the basis of working responsively with users, did so at the expense of collaborating with local statutory services and Local Authorities. Consequently, when funding ended, the legacies of these "successful" partnerships, such as commissioning systems, were lost. At the very least, short-term initiative funding should be accompanied by attempts at mobilising the knowledge being generated, so that it can be shared.

Organisational obstacles are only one element of resistance to inter-professional synergies. Professional practices and the motives that shape them are another. That topic will be discussed in Chapter Four when workforce implications are examined. Challenges to professional identities are inevitable in systemic change making Christensen and Lægreid's gardening role an important one at the local level.

3.5. Implications for policy

Although inter-professional collaborations are easier to establish with statist or directive forms of governance than with more delegated modes, policy-led co-location is not sufficient. Efforts are needed to support inter-professional collaborations and overcome resistance.

More work is needed to reveal the root causes of exclusion so that it can be tackled long-term and systemically through well-funded initiatives that recognise the need to address the economic and social conditions in which exclusion arises. Increasing inequities due to the current economic crisis make such action urgent.

Joined up responses require support from joined-up government. Ecological, multi-layered long-term interventions, such as the *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elbe Island Training Offensive) in Hamburg, or the Berlin "One Square Kilometre of Education" initiative, need national or regional support and take time before outcomes can be produced as evidence of success.

Attention should be paid to the principles and values under-pinning interventions through building a robust over-arching conceptual framework for the development of policies for active inclusion. This framework should include attention to articulating education to the labour market to prevent later problems of adult exclusion (Brown *et al.* 2010). It should also aim at building capacity for systematic organisational self-evaluation to ensure that avoidable gaps such as those that exist between services for looked after children and education services (Kutsar *et al., 2012*) are filled.

This framework also needs to recognise key issues identified in the European Commission Staff Working Paper (2011) on early school leaving which adopts a holistic approach to early school leaving, giving cognisance to the need for emotional supports:

> Difficulties at school often have their roots outside. Solving problems at school cannot be done effectively without tackling the range of problems that put children in difficulty, which can include drug or alcohol use, sleep deficits, physical abuse and trauma. Some of the most successful measures have been those which provide a holistic solution by networking different actors and so support the whole person.

It further needs to incorporate key aspects such as those in the Annex to the relevant Council Recommendation 2011, such as the following:

At the level of the school or training institution strategies against early school leaving are embedded in an overall school development policy. They aim at creating a positive learning environment, reinforcing pedagogical quality and innovation, enhancing teaching staff competences to deal with social and cultural diversity, and developing anti-violence and anti-bullying approaches...

Targeted individual support, which integrates social, financial, educational and psychological support for young people in difficulties. It is especially important for young people in situations of serious social or emotional distress.

An important set of guiding principles to also inform this framework emerge from the recent Commission (2013) recommendations for investment in children through "multidimensional strategies", where its "horizontal principles" include commitments to:

- Tackle child poverty and social exclusion through integrated strategies that go beyond ensuring children's material security...

- Maintain an appropriate balance between universal policies...and targeted approaches, aimed at supporting the most disadvantaged

- Ensure a focus on children who face an increased risk due to multiple disadvantage...

- Sustain investment in children and families...

3.6. Summary of enablers and obstacles to schools' engagement with other agencies

1) Short-term funding of targeted initiatives limits impact and evidence of impact.

2) Too little attention is paid to identifying the root causes of vulnerability and how services may be configured alongside schools to respond to them.

3) Lack of attention to root causes of vulnerability can lead to solution-focused fixes which can leave schools dealing with a child's underlying problems once an intervention has ended.

4) Cost-benefit analyses are difficult to do, particularly for preventative activities.

5) Centrally directed "statist" approaches are more likely to achieve service integration than those which operate through 'subsidiarity'. National policies are therefore needed to encourage schools' integration.

6) Schools' data are helpful when targeting interventions to localities.

7) Schools are recognised as good sites for the delivery of targeted preventative services.

8) There are signs that child-centred personalised approaches to tackling vulnerability can be compatible with commissioning processes that are close to the point of service delivery.

9) The "Total Place" initiative in England indicated that personalised prevention is compatible with wider ecological approaches to tackling deprivation.

10) Partnerships between local service providers that are not connected to established local systems can have limited impact on those systems.

11) We still lack an over-arching policy framework for tackling social exclusion.

Chapter Four

Some Resource Implications of Inter-professional Work in and around Schools

4.1. Introduction

In this chapter the following two questions are addressed:

o *What are the lessons about the workforce to be derived from these interventions?*

o *How can emerging tools for collaboration around schools, such as common assessments, assist active inclusion?*

The intention is to identify what inter-professional work demands from practitioners; how organisations can support child-centred collaborations; and how the use of assessments and other technologies can assist in creating a capacity for active inclusion.

4.2. Workforce development

While in some EU Member States there has been increased investment in preventative work (Boddy *et al.* 2009; Mc Auley *et al.* 2006), there has not been a concomitant investment developing a workforce which is prepared for early intervention and inter-professional collaborations.

A Children's Workforce Development Council (CWDC) review of the workforce implications of prevention, which was based on an analysis of twenty evaluations of interventions in the UK (Edwards and Stamou 2009), concluded:

> Although there is strong evidence of a workforce that is re-orienting its work to make early interventions to prevent later problems for children, young people and their families, it seems that there are still lessons that employing organisations can learn from these changing practices. One lesson in relation to the workforce demands of preventative work is the need for strong support for workforce training and development to take forward these new practices. (Edwards and Stamou, 2009:22)

The importance of workforce quality is seen clearly in a substantive US study of the relationship between the organisation of services for children and outcomes. Qualitative and quantitative data were collected over three years on services provided to 250 children by 32 public children's service offices in 24 counties in Tennessee. A quasi-experimental, longitudinal design was used to assess the effects of inter-organisational service coordination. The study revealed that:

> … organizational climate (including low conflict, cooperation, role clarity, and personalization) is the primary predictor of positive service outcomes (the children's improved psychosocial functioning) and a significant predictor of service quality. In contrast, interorganizational coordination had a negative effect on service quality and no effect on outcomes. (Glissen and Hemmelgarn, 1998:401)

These findings are an argument for **flexibility of response** and **personalised approaches** to prevention and protection. Outcomes are better when professionals are able to exercise professional judgements when supporting vulnerable children and over co-ordination can be detrimental.

Flexibility in inter-professional preventative work is important for two reasons:

i.   practitioners need to collaborate in response to the unfolding complexity of children's problems;

ii.   vulnerability is a dynamic state, therefore a child will move both up and down the hierarchy of need outlined in Appendix A.

The rule-bending discussed in section 4.4 indicates how overly hierarchal organisational structures can inhibit flexible professional responses. However, a focus on agreed outcomes for children, young people and families can provide a coherence to inter-professional work (Daniels and Edwards 2012)

An analysis of evaluations for the present study reveals the need for two kinds of workforce development to enhance professional judgement in inter-professional work in and around schools:

i.   the work-based development of a form of relational expertise which enables practitioners to recognise the expertise of others and to attune their professional responses to those of others;

ii.   specialist training for those workers such as learning mentors, student support workers and others who lack a recognised knowledge base which is relevant to their work.

Relational expertise is a capacity to recognise and work with the expertise of others and to contribute to the expertise that is available within a system. It reflects what was observed in a series of studies of inter-professional work by Edwards and colleagues, many of which have been cited in this review (Edwards 2010). Relational expertise appears to underpin inter-professional flexibility. It is based on the exercise of informed professional responsibility and is an expertise that is in addition to core expertise as, for example, a teacher or educational psychologist.

Other connected ideas are (i) relational agency i.e. working together to expand understanding of a problem and to respond to it (Edwards 2009); and (ii) common knowledge i.e. knowing and respecting the motives that shape different professional practices. Common knowledge is crucial to the exercise of both relational expertise and relational agency (Edwards 2010; 2011).

Common knowledge is built in inter-professional meetings where "what matters", i.e. the motives that shape practices for each practitioner, is made explicit as they discuss cases or plan changes in services. Meetings need to be structured so that meanings are shared, professional dialects are translated and taking the standpoint of the other is encouraged. Bolin (2011) has identified a similar feature in collaborations between Swedish social workers and school staff. She terms the phenomenon doing "common grounds". She explains: "these aspects are i) the aspect of 'structuring collaboration', ii) the aspect of 'collaborative technologies' and iii) the aspect of 'constructing collaborative relations." (Bolin 2011:126).

Common knowledge is a vital ingredient for collaboration in established inter-professional teams (Middleton 1996; Schensul et al., 2006). It enables an aligning of practices when practitioners are working on complex problems. If teams are new, or if collaboration is through flexible responses tailored to each case, efforts to build common knowledge are needed. Van Veen's (2011) observation that the Dutch LSB teams are oriented to the purposes of schooling illustrates the importance of aligning the purposes of practices in inter-professional work.

The *Learning in and for Interagency Working* study (Edwards *et al.* 2009) identified what practitioners needed to know and do for inter-professional work. One feature was to be able to take a pedagogic stance at work i.e. to help others understand what matters in one's work and how responses might be mutually aligned. These findings suggest that continuing professional development for specialist practitioners needs to be work-based and involve potential collaborators in making the motives that shape their practices clear to others.

The need for focused training for workers whose knowledge base is thin is more country-specific. In the UK short-term funding and a reliance on the voluntary sector has led to what Gunter has described as the "endlessly trainable workforce" (Gunter 2007). These are generally women workers who are obliged to follow project funding and may move from work with vulnerable adults, to preparing parents to educate their children, to drug prevention work (Evangelou *et al.* 2008).

Schools are not exempt. Edwards *et al.* (2010) found that the demands of inter-professional collaborations had led to appointing welfare workers who were often former teaching assistants or school office staff to work with vulnerable children and liaise with other services. The workforce implications of extending care roles has also been highlighted by Coussée *et al.* (2008) in their critique of a too rapid embracing of social pedagogy.

This report is not making a case for generalist practitioners, quite the reverse. It is suggesting that the additional expertise required for working with others when following a child's trajectory needs to be recognised and developed. The problem of workforce preparation returns us to the need for a better understanding of the nature of prevention and the work involved which based on a systematic scoping of the causes of social exclusion.

4.3 Assessment tools and their implications for collaboration and active inclusion

The orchestration of responses to vulnerability has led to increased attention to collaborative assessments. These are particularly relevant to the active inclusion agenda and the role of schools, as they can be designed as tools which include school staff, other specialists and parents in joint work on a child's trajectory. However tools are not always used in the way designers intended.

A 2006 report on the English Common Assessment Framework (CAF) pilots (Brandon *et al.* 2006), found the main role of the Lead Professional responsible for a CAF assessment was co-ordinating services rather than joint assessment. Co-ordination focused on managerial activities: encouraging practitioners to attend CAF meetings, chairing meetings and following up plans with practitioners and families. Actual assessment was small part of the role. Joint and informed assessment has also been downplayed in the assessment of parenting support needs. A 2009 Joseph Rowntree Foundation study of the assessment of parenting support needs across health, education and family practitioners (Kellett and Apps 2009) found a strong reliance on "gut instinct" when assessing support needs, particularly among health and family support workers.

Part of the problem has been workforce development. Brandon *et al.* found that CAFs were led mainly by practitioners from the education and health sectors. They noted that although there was an expectation that NVQ level 3 should be a minimum qualification for leading a CAF assessment, this was not always the case. They therefore pointed to the problem of using staff who knew the families best, but were not well-qualified, to take the leading role in assessments. A similar tension between local know-who and substantive professional knowledge was observed in Edwards *et al.* (2010) in relation to unqualified welfare workers in English schools.

The use of Common Assessment Frameworks (CAF) suggests some confusion over its preventative purpose. White *et al.* (2008) analysed 280 CAF forms in four Local Authorities in the early days of its implementation. They found that the use of CAF was not leading to earlier interventions as they tended to be used with children with higher levels of need. A more recent study (Statham and Smith, 2010) showed that when a CAF was used for preventative purposes, it was often used by schools to identify special educational needs i.e. a broader analysis of problems was not undertaken.

The CAF is an example of an assessment tool that was introduced nationally. The intention was an ecological analysis of a child in a family in order to enable the family to become part of the solution to the child's vulnerability. Its relatively restricted use, at least initially, is a reminder that tools will be appropriated to the demands of systems: using tools for new purposes calls for changes in practices and in the systems which sustain those practices.

As the 2008 Audit Commission noted, it was the organisational systems that were obstructing English inter-professional collaborations. Again the Dutch LSB teams point a way forward. They work with schools which are committed to multi-sectoral working and in turn they work with "what matters" for the schools. Aligning the motives of the different collaborating professions through the development of common knowledge between professionals and between their organisations seems crucial. It therefore calls for systems-level work that reveals and challenges the purposes of practices in schools as a pre-requisite for productive multi-professional synergies aimed at active inclusion. These systems need to be embedded in policy frameworks that support them.

Recognising that vulnerability may be a dynamic state is also a challenge for assessment tools. Frost and Stein (2009) remind us that changing outcomes for children and young people cannot always be captured by what they term "official" measurements. Discussing assessing the progress of young people in care they argue:

> …for those young people who remain in long-term care these official outcome measures fail to recognise the progress made by them, including major achievements such as getting back into education, furthering leisure interests and vocational skills, and, often for the first time, developing consistent, positive and trusting relationships with adults. (Frost and Stein 2009: 317)

Frost and Stein then argue for progress measures of what is happening to young people at different points in time which incorporate their views of their well-being. "Such an approach could enable us to recognise the severe and hazardous journey many young people have travelled and the efforts of those who have helped them, as well as improving understanding of the complex roots and reasons for their vulnerability" (p. 317).

As well as pointing to current weak understanding of the roots of vulnerability, Frost and Stein are suggesting that assessments of outcomes should be tailored to progress made. While this would better reflect the success of work with vulnerable young people, it could be costly exercise and a measurement challenge.

That such an approach is needed in the assessment of the socio-emotional and personal "assets" aspects of progress is reflected in efforts within the private sector. One example is "Key Developmental Assets" (KDA) developed by a private international welfare actor based in the UK to be used by adults working with children who are in 'out of home care':

> The KDA recording system is strengths-based, and focuses on nurturing the positive experiences, relationships, opportunities, and personal qualities that people need to develop. The framework is grounded in research with emphasis on child and adolescent development, risk prevention and resiliency.

> (Downloaded from http://www.keydevelopmentalassets.com/January 2013)

It seems that work is needed on the assessment of need and on progress across the domains that contribute to a capacity for active inclusion. Monitoring systems are therefore needed to set attainment outcomes in a broader context of measures of engagement with learning, well-being and life chances. Work underway in Germany on assessing the emotional aspects of learning offer an interesting pointer in this direction (Pekrun *et al.* 2011).

Key issues for such potential monitoring systems have been identified in the Commission's (2013) recent recommendations for investment in children. These include recognition of the need to 'Improve education systems' impact on equal opportunities' through priorities to:

> Create an inclusive learning environment by strengthening the link between schools and parents...

> ...prepare teachers for social diversity; deploy special cultural mediators and role models to facilitate the integration of Roma and children with an immigrant background

The Commission's (2013) commitment to "Improve the responsiveness of health systems to address the needs of disadvantaged children" highlights the importance of the need to "devote special attention" to children with "mental health problems", inter alia, as well as to "invest in prevention particularly during early childhood years". Furthermore, this Commission (2013) framework seeks to "enhance family support" and "promote quality, community-based care". All of this offers strong resonance with investment in inter-professional collaboration as part of a multifaceted prevention and early intervention approach. Of the outcome indicators listed in the Annex to the Commission document (2013) the ones relating to early school leaving ("Early leavers from education and training: Population aged 18-24 years with lower secondary education at most and not in further education or training") and mental health ("young people 15-24 with depressive syndrome") are especially relevant to this framework.

Such a framework would need to be supplemented by a range of structural indicators to guide strategic interventions. Structural indicators are basically yes/no answers (UN Rapporteur on the Right to Health 2006) where varying degrees of evidence could be required for assertion of the presence of a given indicator (Downes 2013b). Structural indicators are enduring yet potentially malleable features of a system and are relatively less expensive to document (Downes 2013b). These could include dimensions such as services that offer a) a continuum of care, b) stakeholder representation such as for distinct disadvantaged groups that are being sought to be reached, c) specific implementation plans for bullying prevention, c) specific alternatives to suspension and expulsion from school, d) an outreach strategy for supporting marginalised families, e) teacher professional development for conflict resolution and diversity skills.

4.4. Summary of some of the resource implications of inter-professional work around schools

1) Informed professional judgement is an important element in inter-professional collaborations.

2) Professional knowledge needs to be enhanced by an additional capacity to recognise, contribute to and work with the expertise that is distributed across local systems.

3) This relational expertise can be developed at work by noting and respecting what matters for each profession: creating common understandings of the motives that shape professional practices will help collaboration.

4) Where a secure professional knowledge base is missing it needs to be developed: know-who is not a substitute for know-what and know-how.

5) Training in the use of collaborative assessment tools needs to focus on enabling co-ordinated assessments of the presenting problems and not simply on co-ordinating responses.

6) New assessment tools can be appropriated to old ways of working and fail to become levers for change.

7) The implementation of collaborative assessments needs to be accompanied by systems-level analyses of organisational purposes and the implications of the new tools.

8) Assessments need to recognise the dynamic aspects of vulnerability and record the progress made by children and young people.

9) Work is needed, at both design and implementation levels, on assessment of need and on progress across the domains that contribute to a capacity for active inclusion.

Chapter Five

Summary of Ways Forward

This chapter provides:

- o a brief overview of the lessons to be learnt from the examination of current and recent collaborations;

- o suggestions for future research and development in the field; and

- o some guidance to inform the development of inter-professional synergies in and around schools.

5.1. Lessons learnt

The nature of vulnerability

- Inter-professional collaboration to promote active inclusion is an emerging area of work. Its rationale lies in recognising that problems of social exclusion are usually multi-faceted and require an inter-professional response.

- Vulnerability to social exclusion is a condition that can occur at any time in child's life. A child's support needs will therefore change: children's need for support will decrease as well as increase. However, preventative work frequently involves revealing more problems than initially identified.

Responding to vulnerability

- Complex problems of vulnerability call for more systemic, "ecological" responses which involve interventions in families and communities alongside help for children and young people. Schools therefore have a potentially strong part to play in these interventions as part of a local ecology.

- Single-service interventions (such as, for example, anti-bullying initiatives) that demand strong programme fidelity and address one aspect of vulnerability currently produce the most robust evidence on outcomes. This report is not suggesting one approach should be expanded at the expense of the other. Single-service and longer-term systemic ("ecological") approaches can be complementary.

- Broader, "ecological" responses call for careful articulation between policies for specialist services at national regional and local levels. They are more difficult to evaluate and evidence of "what works" in them is often necessarily "situated". However, they should not be dismissed.

The implications for schools

- Education, as a universal service, has a crucial role to play in (a) identifying early signs of vulnerability in young people and alerting other services to the need for early intervention; and (b) assisting children to readjust to education once problems are reduced.

- Schools can benefit from the division of labour that comes with inter-professional synergies and provide an important base for service provision. For example, Roma families, at least in some reported contexts, find schools to be convenient and non-stigmatising sites for families.

Current challenges to understanding and developing inter-professional collaborations around schools

- The articulation of policies for education, employment, health, housing, training and welfare is lacking or weak in most countries.

- Schools are often described as having strong boundaries and need help with institutional self-analysis which can identify and overcome these boundaries. This will enable them to recognise their role in providing "ecological" responses to inter-generational deprivation.

- Part of the problem is "scaling up" interventions. Responsive changes in practices in schools are necessarily sensitive to local conditions, making generalisations from interventions difficult. Moreover, the methodological challenges to evaluating what works best is not helped by the relatively short time-scales of many interventions and evaluations. Most interventions with vulnerable groups are often short-term, preventing the collection of longitudinal evidence of change and giving insufficient time to build trust and work with the most hard-to-reach groups.

  In general, evidence of change usually focuses on the measurement of outcomes more than on the assessment of progress. But active inclusion is a process goal aimed at longer-term economic benefit for all. Evidence of steps towards active inclusion should therefore also reflect the process aspects of the goal.

- In developing interventions, work is needed, at both design and implementation levels, on assessment of need and on progress across the domains that contribute to a capacity for active inclusion. Evidence of impact is needed at the point of service delivery to enable responsive adjustments. In addition, practitioners need to be able to gather and interpret evidence on children's progress in order to inform their own practices in multi-professional arrangements.

- This means that inter-professional working calls for an enhancing of professional expertise. For expert practitioners it is a matter of developing relational expertise. For those without a relevant knowledge base it also calls for either new training or benchmarking of the minimum qualifications for this kind of work.

Implications for policy

- It would appear that inter-professional collaborations are easier to establish with statist or directive forms of governance than with subsidiarity or delegated modes. This suggests that **an over-arching framework for policy development** that brings together all relevant directorates and services is urgently needed to build on lessons from across Europe and elsewhere. This would build on key messages from the Commission's (2013) Recommendation "Investing in children", as well as the Commission (2011) and Council (2011) documents on early school leaving prevention.

- There is a need to focus on potentially relevant malleable risk and protective factors for a multidisciplinary response to ESL. There is not one single generalisable ideal model or specific list of disciplinary professionals but a European framework of key structural indicators could be established to guide such models (Downes 2013a).

- Systems need to be established locally and nationally to ensure that lessons learnt from short-term initiatives and pilots about structures and processes are not lost and can contribute to local policy formation. Attention also needs to be paid to strategies for workforce development: building relational expertise among professionals and core knowledge among workers who rely more on local contextual knowledge than on understanding the specific needs of children and young people.

5.2. Future research and development

A consistent theme across the evaluations studied is how little is known about the fundamental causes of the vulnerability that is being tackled. Personalised approaches that can follow a child's trajectory and deal with difficulties as they are revealed can get closer to fundamental causes. However, the targeting of specific interventions is often relatively crude because of a lack of local data and because it does not address the breadth of reasons for vulnerability.

There is a need to share expertise on (i) targeting to build a better knowledge base on methods and data sources; and (ii) the causes of vulnerability. Both might be precursors to a pan-Europe study of sources of vulnerability and how they might be recognised.

Both *Head Start* and *Sure Start* have shown that the prevention of social exclusion and disruption of cycles of deprivation require longitudinal funding and evaluations that can capture long-term effects. The same is inevitably true of interventions with older children. A sharing of expertise on the design of evaluations to produce a shared knowledge base on design, which can inform those who commission evaluations, would be helpful. A more mutually compatible approach to evaluations might also lead to a shareable data-base on the effects of ecological approaches to disrupting cycles of deprivation, that have taken local conditions into account.

An ecological approach to prevention needs to attend to how schools learn to work with other services. In countries where school leadership is regarded as important, there is scope for studies of how that might be developed to enable schools to take their place in a broader response to prompting the active inclusion of children and young people.

Current concern with outcomes for children and young people needs to focus on the assessment of progress made as well as on the measurement of outcomes such as examination success. Research is needed to refine forms of assessment which are formative i.e. aimed at supporting individual development and can also be used as robust indications of steps towards a capacity for active inclusion.

5.3.   Guidance to inform the development of inter-professional synergies in and around schools

Schools can benefit from divisions of labour that enable teams of experts to support children and families so that they are able to take advantage of schooling. Recognising that school failure can be a sign of a wider vulnerability can help schools focus on their core mission of teaching and learning.

Schools may need to recognise and prepare staff for making some responsive adjustments to the priorities of other agencies. Adjustments are likely to be needed in both targeted interventions to improve engagement with schooling among marginalised groups and in personalised interventions with individual vulnerable children. Discussions about the principles of active inclusion and the wider role of education in enabling it will be helpful.

Inter-professional work calls for a secure professional knowledge-base and the ability to develop relational forms of expertise. Recognising and contributing to local systems of distributed expertise is an important aspect of such inter-professional synergies. Workforce development therefore needs to be an element in developing synergies.

Schools will not need to make many changes to become increasingly alert to signs of vulnerability. But there will be some staff development implications: for example, understanding that children move up and down a continuum of need as circumstances alter, and developing the conflict resolution skills.

The work of Small (2009) on how schools can create the conditions for interactions with parents which will develop local social capital call attention to the need for (a) whole-school approaches to working with parents; and (b) a sharing of beliefs about relationships with parents across all agencies involved with the school.

5.4. Policy recommendations

- Schools have an important part to play in tackling vulnerability through early intervention and the sustained support of vulnerable children as well as being sites for multi-sectoral interventions. The multi-professional LSB teams attached to schools in the Netherlands are a good example of this approach.

- Schools cannot work alone to overcome social and economic inequities. The work of schools in tackling vulnerability should be located within wider strategies for equity and inclusion. The current economic crisis makes this an urgent matter. One example of where such work is needed rapidly is in strategies for the prevention of early school leaving.

- More work is needed to reveal the root causes of exclusion so that it can be tackled long-term and systemically.

- Ecological attacks on deprivation, which include schools, have high face-validity. Long-term evaluations of ecological approaches to vulnerability are needed to provide stronger evidence.

- A reliance on strong evidence from single-focus interventions is understandable, but should not be at the expense of the development of systemic attacks on social exclusion. Process and structural indicators can provide valuable information, about who services are reaching and how complex problems are being addressed, which can both inform policy and hold service providers to account. Systems need to be established to ensure that lessons to be learnt about structures and processes from short-term initiatives are not lost.

- It needs to be recognised that responsive changes in practices in and around schools are necessarily sensitive to local conditions, making simple generalisations about what works in prevention difficult. Attention should be paid to the principles and values underpinning interventions.

- Inter-sectoral collaborations are easier to establish with statist or directive forms of governance than with more delegated modes which rely mainly on monitoring.

- Joined-up working needs joined-up government at every level.

- "Ecological" multi-layered long-term interventions, such as the "Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln" (Elbe Island Training Offensive) in Hamburg, or the "One Square Kilometre of Education" intervention

initiated in Berlin need national or regional support and take time before outcomes can be produced as evidence of success.

• All of these conclusions point to the urgent **need for an over-arching framework** to help shape national responses to a set of problems that, despite local variation, have some common themes.

5.5. Concluding notes

There are exciting but emergent examples of inter-professional synergies around schools. These include the *LSB teams* in the Netherlands, *Team around the Child* in the UK and social workers in Swedish schools. These all focus primarily on helping children to be prepared to take advantage of schooling.

Other interventions such as the *Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln* (Elbe Island Training Offensive) in Hamburg, the *One Square Kilometre of Education* in Berlin or *On-Track* in England, include schools as important partners in wider ecological attacks on deprivation. Others, such as some *extended* or *community schools* in Belgium and England are based in schools and offer enrichment experiences to children and families.

However, the most common form of intervention is for single services to work with schools to help them to encourage the engagement of marginalised groups to, for example, prevent early school leaving. This review certainly supports the European Commission's view that the prevention of early school leaving is crucial and suggests that funding for multi-strand approaches should be considered a priority in reaching the EU2020 target of 10% early school leaving across the EU.

Despite concerns about how outcomes are more easily recognised in single focus interventions than in more ecological approaches, this report is not suggesting one approach should be expanded at the expense of the other. Single-service and more "ecological" approaches can be complementary. The *Familiscope* project in Ireland shows how a mixed portfolio of specific interventions can be responsive and beneficial. Equally, for those children who are chronic non-attenders at school, there is merit in a strategic approach to outreach for family support for early school leaving prevention, working with hard-to-reach families.

The multi-faceted and dynamic nature of vulnerability means that inter-professional responses are essential for many at-risk children and young people. That these responses should be centred on or in schools, the only universal service where the well-being of children and young people can be regularly monitored, would seem a wise step towards achieving universal active inclusion. **What is now needed is a strong guiding framework on how that might be achieved.**

References

Aked, J. & Steed, S. (2009). *A guide to commissioning children's services for better outcomes*. London: New Economics Foundation.

Allen, G (2011). *Early intervention: the next steps*. London: DfE.

Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2009). *2009 Kids count data book: State profiles of wellbeing.* Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Audit Commission (2008). *Are we there yet? Improving Governance and Resource Management in Children's Trusts*, Local Government National Report. London: Audit Commission.

Boag-Munroe, G. & Evangelou, M. (2010).From hard to reach to how to reach: a systematic review of the literature on hard-to-reach families *Research Papers in Education*1–31, iFirst Article.

Belsky, J., Barnes, J. & Melhuish, E. (2007).*The national evaluation of Sure Start: does area-based early intervention work?*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Boddy, J., Statham J., Smith, M., Ghate D., Wigfall V, & Hauari H. (2009). *International perspectives on parenting support: non English language sources*, Research Report DCSF RR114, University of London: Institute for Education.

Bolin. A. (2011). *Shifting subordination co-located interprofessional collaboration between teachers and social workers.* PhD Thesis - Gothenburg: Göteborgs Universitet

Bongers, C., Kloprogge, J., van Veen, D. & Walraven, G. (2000). *Combating social exclusion in the Netherlands: the cases of Arnhem and Amsterdam*. Utrecht: Sardes Educational Services.

Brandon, M., Howe, A., Dagley, V., Salter, C., Warren, C. & Black, J. (2006). *Evaluating the Common Assessment Framework and Lead Professional Guidance and implementation in 2005-6.*DfES Research Report 740. Nottingham: DfES

Brown, P., Lauder, H. & Aston, D. (2010). *The global auction: the broken promises of education, jobs and incomes.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cameron, C. (2004). Social pedagogy and care: Danish and German practice in young people's residential care, *Journal of Social Work,* 4 92), 133-151.

Christensen, T., Laegreid, P. (2007). The whole of government approach to public service reform. *Public Administration Review,* November/December, 1059-1066

Churchill, H. (2011). *Wither the social investment state? Early intervention, prevention and children's services reform in the new policy context.* Paper presented at the Social Policy Association International conference 'Bigger Societies, Smaller Governments?' University of Lincoln.

Cohen, B., Moss, P, & Petrie, P. (2004). *A new deal for children; re-forming children's services?* Bristol: Policy Press.

Coussée, F., Bradt, L., Roose, R. & de- Bouverne, B. (2008). The emerging social pedagogical paradigm in UK child and youth care: *dues ex machine* or walking the beaten path, *British Journal of Social Work,* (advance access pp. 1-17).

Cummings, C., Dyson, A. & Todd, L. (2011).*Beyond the school gates.* London:Routledge.

Daniels, H. & Edwards, A. (2012).*Leading for Learning: how the intelligent leader builds capacity*. Nottingham UK: National College for School Leadership

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004).*The Children Act,* London: HMSO.

Diez, J., Gatt, S. & Racionero, S. (2011).Placing immigrant and minority family and community members at the school's centre: the role of community participation, *European Journal of Education: research, development and policy,* 46 (2), (online version downloaded January 2013).

Doll, B. (1996). Prevalence of psychiatric disorders in children and youth: an agenda for advocacy by school psychology. S*chool Psychology Quarterly*, 11, 20-47.

Downes, P. (2004). *Psychological support services for Ballyfermot: Present and future*. Commissioned Research Report. Ballyfermot, Dublin: URBAN.

Downes, P. (2007). Why SMART outcomes ain't always so smart… In P. Downes & A Gilligan (eds.). *Beyond educational disadvantage.* Dublin: Institute of Public Administration. pp. 57-69

Downes, P. (2010). *'It's the heart stupid'- emerging priority issues for prevention of early school leaving: a solution-focused approach*. Presentation at Belgian EU Presidency Conference "Breaking the cycle of disadvantage – Social inclusion in and through education". September 28th and 29th 2010. Ghent, Belgium.

Downes, P. (2011a). *Multi/Interdisciplinary teams for early school leaving prevention: Developing a European Strategy informed by international evidence and research.* NESET (Network of Experts on Social Aspects of Education and Training) Report, University of Cardiff.

Downes, P. (2011b). *A systems level focus on access to education for traditionally marginalised groups in Europe: comparing strategies, policy and practice in twelve European countries.* Report for European Commission as Comparative Report for subproject 5 of European Commission Sixth Framework Project 'Towards a lifelong learning society: The contribution of the education system' (LLL2010). Dublin: Educational Disadvantage Centre.

Downes, P. (2011c). The neglected shadow: European perspectives on emotional supports for early school leaving prevention, *The International Journal of Emotional Education*, 3, (2), 3-36

Downes, P. (2013a). Developing multi-agency and cross- sector synergies in and around education: Future steps for meeting the EU 2020 10% target for early school leaving prevention. Presentation to the European Commission Directorate General for Education and Culture, *Thematic Working Group on Early School Leaving*, January 28, 2013.

Downes, P. (2013b). *Beyond inert systems for access to education in Europe: A framework and agenda for system change*. Dordrecht: Springer (forthcoming)

Downes, P. & Maunsell, C. (2007). Count us in: Tackling early school leaving in South West Inner City Dublin, An integrated response. Dublin: South Inner City Community Development Association (SICCDA)

Dyson, A. & Kerr, K. (2011).*Taking action locally: schools developing innovative area initiatives.* Manchester: University of Manchester Centre for Equity in Education.

Ebersöhn, I. & Eloff, I. (2006). Identifying asset-based trends in sustainable programmes which support vulnerable children. *South African Journal of Education*, 26, 457-72.

Education Council of the Netherlands (2011).*Extended education* http://www.onderwijsraad.nl/upload/english/publications/extended-education.pdf (downloaded January 2013)

Edwards, A. (2007). Working collaboratively to build resilience: a CHAT approach, *Social Policy and Society.*6 (2), 255-265.

Edwards, A. (2009). Relational agency in collaborations for the wellbeing of children and young People, *Journal of Children's Services,* 4 (1), 33-43.

Edwards, A. (2010). *Being an expert professional practitioner: the relational turn in expertise,* Dordrecht, Springer.

Edwards, A. (2011) Building Common Knowledge at Boundaries between Professional Practices, *International Journal of Educational Research,* (50) 33-39.

Edwards, A, Barnes, M., Plewis, I. & Morris, K. (2006).*Working to prevent the social exclusion of children and young people: final lessons from the National Evaluation of the Children's Fund,* Research Report 734. London: DfES

Edwards, A., Daniels, H., Gallagher, T., Leadbetter, J. & Warmington, P. (2009). *Improving inter-professional collaborations: multi-agency working for children's wellbeing*. London: Routledge.

Edwards, A. & Daniels, H. (2012). The knowledge that matters in professional practices, *Journal of Education and Work.* 25 (1) 39-58.

Edwards, A., Lunt, I. &Stamou, E. (2010). Inter-professional work and expertise: new roles at the boundaries of schools, *British Educational Research Journal,* 36 (1), 27-45.

Edwards, A. & Mackenzie L. (2005). Steps towards participation: the social support of learning trajectories, *International Journal of Lifelong Education,* 24 (4), 287-30

Edwards, A. &Stamou, E. (2009).*The development of preventative practices in England: implications for the children's workforce.* DCSF: Children's Workforce Development Council

Edwards, A. &Warin, J. (1999). Parental involvement in raising pupils' achievement in primary schools: Why Bother? *Oxford Review of Education,* 25 (3), 325-341.

European Commission, DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, Social Investment: *Commission urges Member States to focus on growth and social cohesion*, 20/02/2013: http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?langId=en&catId=1044&newsId=1807&furtherNews=yes

European Council Recommendation on policies to reduce Early School Leaving. 10544/11, 7th June 2011

European Commission Staff Working Paper *Reducing Early School Leaving*. Accompanying document to the Proposal for a Council Recommendation on policies to reduce Early School Leaving. 26th January 2011

European Commission Recommendation (2013). *Investing in children: Breaking the cycle of disadvantage*. 20.2.2013 C (2013) 778 final.

Evangelou, M., Sylva, K., Edwards, A. & Smith, T. (2008). *Supporting parents in promoting early learning,* Research Report 039, London: DCSF.

Familiscope (2011). *Internal evaluation of speech and language therapists support for schools based on teachers' and principals' responses.* Dublin, Ballyfermot: Familiscope.

Fiks, A.G. & Leslie, LK. (2010). Partnership in the treatment of childhood mental health problems: a paediatric perspective. *School Mental Health,* 2, 93–101

Flecha, A., Garcia, R. & Rudd, R. (2011). Using health literacy in school to overcome inequalities, *European Journal of Education: research, development and policy,* 46 (2), (online version downloaded January 2013).

Frost, N. & Stein, M. (2009). Outcomes of integrated working with children and young people (Editorial) *Children and Society*. 23, 315–319

Gardner, F., Burton, J. & Klimes, I. (2006). Randomised controlled trial of a parenting intervention in the voluntary sector for reducing child conduct problems: outcomes and mechanisms of change *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* , 47(11), 1123-1132.

Gatt, S., Ojala, M. & Solar, M. (2011). Promoting social inclusion counting with everyone: learning communities and INCLUD-ED. *International Journal of Sociology of Education,* 21(1), 33-47.

Ghate, D. ,Asmussen. K., Tang, Y. & Hauari, H. (2008). *'On Track' phase two national evaluation reducing risk and increasing resilience -how did 'On Track' work?* London: Policy Research Bureau.

Glenny, G. & Roaf, C. (2008). *Multiprofessional communication: making systems work for children.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Glisson, C. and Hemmelgarn, A. (1998). The effects of organizational climate and interorganizational coordination on the quality and outcomes of children's service systems', *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 22 (5), 401-421.

Gunter, H. (2007). Remodelling the school workforce in England: a study in tyranny, *Journal for Critical Education Policy Studies,* 5(1), 1-11.

Hayes, N., Keegan, S. and Goulding, E. (2012*). Evaluation of the speech and language therapy service of Tallaght West Childhood Development Initiative. Dublin: Childhood Development Initiative (CDI).*

HM Treasury (2003). *Green Book* (London: HM Treasury).

Available at http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/data_greenbook_index.htm

HM Treasury and DfES (2007).*Policy review for children and young people: a discussion paper*, London: HM Treasury.

Home Office (2000).*Report of Policy Action Team 12: Young People,* London: Home Office.

Hughes, N. & Fielding, A. (2006).*Targeting preventative services for children: experiences from the Children's Fund. RR No 777.*London: DfES

Irish Parliament and Senate Report (2010). Staying in education: A new way forward. School and out-of-school factors protecting against early school leaving. Houses of the Oireachtas Joint Committee on Education and Skills. Dublin: Government Publications

Joos, A. (2010). *Extended schools in Flanders (Belgium), situation January 2010.* (downloaded from www.continyou.org.uk/**school**/files/Flanders, January 2013

Joos, A., Ernalsteen, V., Lanssens, A., & Engels, M. (2007). Community schools in Flanders and Brussels: framework for development (downloaded from http://www.ond.vlaanderen.be/bredeschool/visie/visietekst-brede-school-Eng.pdf, January 2013).

Kellet, J. & Apps, J. (2009).*Assessment of parenting and parenting support need. A study of four professional groups*, York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Karoly.L., Kilburn, M R. & Cannon, J. (2005). *Early childhood interventions: proven results, future promise.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

Katz, I. & Hetherington, R. (2006). Co-operating and communicating: a European perspective on integrating services for children, *Child Abuse Review*, 15 (6), 429–39.

Kessler, R. (2009). Identifying and screening for psychological and comorbid medical and psychological disorders in medical settings, *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 65(3), 253–267.

Kyriacou, C. (2009). The five dimensions of social pedagogy within schools, *Pastoral care in Education,* 27 (2), 101-108.

Kutsar, D. & Helve, H. (2012) *Social inclusion of socially excluded youth: more opportunities, better access and higher solidarity* – policy review of the youth research cluster on social inclusion for the European Commission DG Research.

Leadbetter, J. (2011). Change and development in the professional practice of educational psychologists in the UK, in H. Daniels & M. Hedegaard (eds.).*Vygotsky and special educational needs.* London: Continuum pp. 128-149.

Lewis, J. (2003). Developing early years childcare in England, 1997–2002: the choices for (working) mothers. *Social Policy and Administration*. 37 (3), 219–38.

McAuley, C, Pecora, P & Rose, W (eds.) (2006).Enhancing the well-being of children and families through effective interventions.*International Evidence for Practice.* London: Jessica Kingsley pp 46-57.

Middleton, D. (1996). Talking work: argument, common knowledge and improvisation, in Y. Engeström & D. Middleton (eds.). *Cognition and communication at work.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp. 233-256.

Moll, L.(ed.) (1990) *Vygotsky and education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Moran, P., Ghate, D. & Van der Merwe, A. (2004). *What works in parenting support: a review of the international evidence*, London: DfES RR574, London: DfES.

Moran, P. & Ghate, D. (2005).The effectiveness of parenting support, *Children and Society,* 19, 329-336.

Morgan, M. & Hayes, C. (2004). *Evaluation report on Suaimheas project*. Dublin: Dublin Inner City Area Partnership.

Mulgan, G. (2005). Government, knowledge and the business of policy making; the potential and limits of evidence-based policy, *Evidence & Policy,* 1(2), 215-226*.*

Mulkerrins, D. (2007). The transformational potential of the Home School Community Liaison Scheme. In P. Downes and A. L. Gilligan (Eds), *Beyond educational disadvantage*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration pp:133-143

Munro, E (2011). *The Munro review of child protection: the final report*, Cm 8062, London: DfE.

NESS (2011). *The impact of Sure Start Local Programmes on five year olds and their families*, London: DfE.

Needham C. (2010). *Commissioning for personalisation: from the fringes to the mainstream* London: The Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy http://www.cipfa.org.uk/pmpa/publications/download/Commissioning_for_personalization_-from_the_fringes_to_the_mainstream.pdf (downloaded January 2013)

NFER (2010). An international perspective on integrated children's services. London: CfTB Education Trust. http://www.cfbt.com/evidenceforeducation/pdf/2646_childrens_services_web.pdf (downloaded January 2013)

Pekrun, R., Goetz, T., Frenzel, A., Barchfeld, P. & Perry, R. (2011). Measuring emotions in students' learning and performance: the achievement emotions questionnaire (AEC), *Contemprary Educational Psychology,* 36, 36-48.

Reinke, W.M., Splett, J.D., Robeson, E.N. & Offutt, C.A. (2009). Combining school and family interventions for the prevention and early intervention of disruptive behavior problems in children: A public health perspective. *Psychology in the Schools,* Vol. 46(1), 33-43.

Réseau des écoles de la deuxième chance en France, Paris: Fondation des Écoles de la Deuxième Chance http://www.fondatione2c.org/upload/editor/0801_Etude_1192526656461.pdf (downloaded January 2013)

Room, G. (1995). Poverty and social Exclusion: the new European agenda for policy and research, in G. Room (ed.) *Beyond the threshold: the measurement and analysis of social exclusion.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Rutter, M (2007). Sure Start Local Programmes: an outsider's perspective, in J. Belsky, J. Barnes & E. Melhuish (eds.). *The national evaluation of Sure Start: does area-based early intervention work?*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Schensul, J.J., Robison, J., Reyes, C., Radda, K., Gaztambide, S. & Disch, W. (2006). Building interdisciplinary/intersectoral research partnerships for community-based mental health research with older minority adults*. American Journal of community Psychology,* 38, 79-93

Schmachtel, S. (in progress) Exploring local governance in a German 'educational landscape' project: a case study of the strategy-building process in a local planning partnership on the neighbourhood level. PhD study at the Department of Psychology, University of Copenhagen.

Social Protection Committee (2011). *The social dimension of the Europe 2020 strategy.* Brussels: EC.

Small, M. L. (2009). *Unanticipated gains: origins of network inequality in everyday life.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Spring, N. (2007). Tracing the language of educational disadvantage. In P. Downes & A.L. Gilligan (Eds.), Beyond educational disadvantage. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration, pp. 3-9.

Statham, J. & Smith, M. (2010).*Issues in earlier intervention: identifying and supporting children with additional needs*, DCSF RR 205, HMSO: DCSF.

United National Economic and Social Council 3 March 2006. Commission on Human Rights, Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health, Paul Hunt.

Van Veen. D. (2011). *Behaviour and education support teams in Dutch schools,* Seminar 12-14 January 2011, Universidad de Alicante.

Vassing, C. (2011). Developing educational consultative practice in schools framed within a cultural-historical theory of child development in H. Daniels & M. Hedegaard (eds.). *Vygotsky and special educational needs.* London: Continuum pp. 109-127.

White, C., Warrener, M., Reeves, A. & La Valle, I. (2008). *Family intervention projects: An evaluation of the design, set-up and early outcomes*, Research Report DCSF-RW047, London: DCSF.

World Health Organization (2003).*Caring for children and adolescents with mental health disorders: setting WHO directions*. Geneva, Switzerland:WHO.

US Department of Health and Human Services. (2001). *Mental health: culture, race, and ethnicity—a supplement to mental health: a report of the surgeon general.* Rockville, MD: US Department of Health and Human Services.

Zeedyk, M.S., Weritty, I. & Riach, C. (2008). One year on: perceptions of the lasting benefits of a parenting support programme, *Children and Society,* 22, 99-111.

Appendix A. The Hardiker Continuum of Interventions

■ **First Level: (UNIVERSAL) Targets vulnerable groups and communities through programmes such as Sure Start.**

■ **Second Level: (EARLY RISKS) Addresses early stress and families in temporary crisis or difficulties through short term, task-centred interventions and resources.**

■ **Third Level: (SERIOUS RISK) Addresses serious stresses: risks of significant harm, family breakdown and entry into the Looked After Systems. Difficulties may be severe/acute or well-established.**

■ **Fourth Level: (REHABILITATION) Addresses a diverse group of issues; social breakdown; Looked after Children; abused children.**

The continuum of "tiers" given above provides broad guidance to children's services on the levels of intervention undertaken with children across the UK. Schooling and health, as universal services open to everyone, work at Tier One. Tier Two interventions are preventative programmes targeted at specific individuals or groups and may be provided in or close to schools, usually by other specialists working at different degrees of collaboration with school staff. Services working at Tier Three are concerned with preventing children from coming to significant harm. The role of schools here is primarily one of identifying risk and notifying specialist services. Tier Four is also the domain of specialist services. Importantly, the intention is that children who require Tier Three or Four support will eventually move down the levels of need. Schools therefore have a crucial role to play in the rehabilitation of these children.

For the purposes of this report the focus of schools' activities with other services is at Tiers One and Two. However, the boundary between Tiers Two and Three are often unclear. Social workers in the UK talk of Tier "Two plus" as efforts are made to keep the level of support at targeted prevention of increased risk and to avoid moving to a Tier Three response. Consequently schools may find themselves supporting extremely vulnerable children and can become important links in the system of support assembled around a child.

Hardiker, P. Exton, K. and Barker, M. (1991) The Social Policy Contexts of Prevention in Child Care, *British Journal of Social Work,* 21. 341-359.

Appendix B. The Main Interventions Examined

Intervention	Country	Focus	Primary mode of collaboration* (these cooperation modes are briefly explained in section 1.2)
Bildungsoffensive Elbinseln	Germany	Pre-school to post-school plus community	Network and multi-sectoral
Children's Centres	England	Pre-school	Teams plus networks of services
Children's Fund	England	School age (5-13), families and communities	Networks of services
Community Schools(also known as extended schools)	Belgium	School age	Networks of services
Early Learning Parent Partnerships	England	Pre-school and families	Individuals who may call on other services
Extended Schools (also known as full-service schools)	England, Ireland and Netherlands	School age	Networks of services
Familiscope	Ireland	School age and families	Multi-professional team offering discrete services
Health literacy	Spain	School age, families and community	Network of services
LSB (Behaviour and Education Support Teams)	Netherlands	School age	Teams plus networks of schools
One Square Kilometre of Education	Germany, Berlin	Pre-school, school-age and community	Co-ordinated network of services
On-Track	England	School age and community	Co-ordinated network of services
Parenting support	England, Finland, Lithuania, Malta, Spain	Pre-school, school age and families	Various
Le Réseau des Écoles de la Deuxième Chance	France	Transition from school and post-school	Local networks within national network
Social Workers in School	England and Sweden	School age	Individuals working with other services/actors
Sure Start	England	Pre-school, families and communities	Teams, networks of services, multi-professional
Team around the Child	England	School age and community	Teams and networks of services