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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AfL</td>
<td>assessment for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>British Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>black minority ethnic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COI</td>
<td>Country of Origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPD</td>
<td>continuing professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRC</td>
<td>Convention on the Rights of the Child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CtC</td>
<td>Child-to-Child Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCSF</td>
<td>Department for Children Schools and Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIE</td>
<td>Department for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfE</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DfES</td>
<td>Department for Education and Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAL</td>
<td>English as an Additional Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECM</td>
<td>Every Child Matters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMAS</td>
<td>Ethnic Minority Achievement Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESOL</td>
<td>English for Speakers of Other Languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE</td>
<td>General Certificate of Secondary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSET</td>
<td>in-service training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITT</td>
<td>Initial Teacher Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS3</td>
<td>Key Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KS4</td>
<td>Key Stage 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Local Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>looked after children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALDIC</td>
<td>National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS</td>
<td>National Health Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofsted</td>
<td>The Office for Standards in Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEP</td>
<td>Personal Education Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSHE</td>
<td>Personal, Social and Health Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>post-traumatic stress disorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QCA</td>
<td>Qualifications and Curriculum Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCO</td>
<td>refugee community organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RRSA</td>
<td>Rights Respecting Schools Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAL</td>
<td>Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEN</td>
<td>special educational needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA</td>
<td>teaching assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UASC</td>
<td>unaccompanied asylum-seeker children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UKBA</td>
<td>United Kingdom Border Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Executive summary

Pilot project overview

Child-to-Child is an international network promoting children’s participation in health and development. The Child-to-Child Six-Step Approach uses a series of activities to enable children to think about key issues, make decisions, develop life-skills and take action to improve their health and well-being. In 2011, the Child-to-Child Trust (CtC) initiated a pilot project with marginalised children in the UK, building on its international expertise: 'A participatory action-based approach to empower and integrate marginalised pupils'. In preparation for the pilot, a detailed literature review was conducted to highlight the situation of refugee and asylum-seeking children in the UK, and successful approaches for supporting their integration and achievement.

The pilot project took place in Bishopsford Arts College in South London and involved a series of weekly child-to-child activities for refugee and asylum-seeking children. Some of the 22 children involved during the lifetime of the pilot were from mainstream classes, others were from the Bishopsford LINK (a facility for supporting English language development prior to entering mainstream classes). The pilot sought to improve language and communication skills among the pupils and facilitate their enhanced engagement in the wider school community. It also aimed to build capacity among school staff to facilitate participatory activities with children and understand the needs of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils; provide evidence of the benefits of such an approach in the UK context; and prepare the groundwork for scaling up the approach to more schools.

The weekly child-to-child activities were facilitated by a CtC consultant, two staff members from the LINK and four mainstream teaching assistants. In-service training was provided at the start of the pilot, to introduce the six-step approach to school staff and identify which personnel would become facilitators. Nineteen one-and-a-half-hour sessions were run on Thursdays. Each ‘step’ took several sessions, with steps 1 and 2 taking the majority of time (13 sessions between them).

Specific challenges to the management of the pilot included: the necessity of changing the timing of sessions so pupils did not miss some of their lunch break; inconsistent punctuality by facilitators; gaps in internal communication within the school; lack of confidence with participatory techniques among facilitators; changes in the pupil group over the 19 weeks; and a negative Ofsted inspection with subsequent major upheaval for the school.

Monitoring and evaluation of the pilot project

The CtC pilot was evaluated by two external consultants who worked closely with the CtC consultant throughout the pilot. The evaluation aimed to learn more about the issues affecting refugee and asylum-seeking pupils within the British school system; and to evaluate whether the CtC pilot was effective at promoting the integration of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils. A range of stakeholders was consulted to
provide information for the evaluation, including: participating pupils, the school’s vice-principal, the English as an Additional Language (EAL) co-ordinator, teaching assistants and LINK staff, and the CtC consultant. Data was also collected from baseline and tracking information provided by the LINK teacher, INSET and session attendance records for staff and pupils, and extensive research of current policy and practice guidance. The evaluators used a range of approaches, including observation of sessions, interviews and focus group discussions.

While generally a smooth process, the evaluators faced a few challenges. For instance, end-of-session evaluation activities often did not happen due to lack of time; facilitators did not keep regular, detailed reflective diaries as requested and pupils’ language skills limited opportunities for written feedback; and the school’s record keeping was not always accurate or made readily available to the evaluators.

**Project outcomes**

By having the evaluators involved from the start of the pilot, a vast amount of data was collected, which could be analysed in relation to the desired outcomes for the project. These outcomes are summarised below, while more details of the process for achieving these outcomes is offered in Section 6 of this report.

*Outcome 1: improved language, communication and life skills among pupils*

The pilot sought to enhance pupils’ listening, speaking and language skills. It made considerable progress with this, from a starting point where some pupils could not communicate with each other to a point where they were able to present work and hold discussions during the sessions, and speak and engage more in their regular classes and around the school.

The pilot also sought to enhance pupils’ life-skills (confidence, interpersonal communication, problem-solving and decision-making), and achieved this to a high degree by helping pupils develop improved communication, team-working and empathy skills. The process enabled them to negotiate and make decisions together, and become more independent learners who asked questions of each other rather than always relying on the facilitators.

*Outcome 2: enhanced engagement with the wider school and community*

One aim of the pilot was to have a positive impact on the pupils’ engagement with school and community life more generally. The evaluation was able to gather limited ad hoc data that suggests this was beginning to happen. However, for various logistical reasons, the pilot (and evaluation process) was unable to ‘reach out’ beyond the specific sessions to the extent originally anticipated. Therefore, the picture of wider impact is less detailed and clear than the evidence available for the other expected outcomes. This remains an area that future projects can focus on in more detail.

*Outcome 3: enhance staff capacity around participation and understanding of*
The pilot sought to boost staff skills and confidence with facilitating children’s participation, and enhance their understanding of the needs of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils. To some extent this was achieved, with facilitators showing stronger understanding of and commitment to child-centred and child-led approaches, and ability to facilitate such activities. However, the pilot did not achieve a situation in which the staff owned and took full responsibility for the process. This was perhaps due to a lack of initial and on-going training; lack of time or opportunity to practise techniques beyond the pilot in regular classes; and external pressures and demotivation brought about by the failed Ofsted inspection. Nevertheless, the pilot did improve staff awareness of the experiences of refugees and asylum seekers, and understanding of their needs. This learning was acknowledged and appreciated by the staff.

**Outcome 4: generate evidence about the effectiveness of the Child-to-Child six-step approach in a UK context**

The use of evaluators, and varied evaluation tools, from the start of the pilot enabled every element of the pilot to be documented and analysed, in a way that a final, retrospective evaluation could not have achieved. Considering this was only a short pilot, a large quantity of information and learning has been gathered providing evidence of the validity of the child-to-child approach in similar contexts.

**Outcome 5: enable sustainability of activities and scaling up to more schools**

The evaluation found a strong likelihood that the participating school staff would continue to use the skills and activities learned and facilitation confidence gained in some way through their day-to-day work, and perhaps also share this with colleagues. The subsequent impact of the extensive changes brought about by the failed Ofsted inspection, however, were not recorded and may have affected sustainability.

More broadly, the success of the pilot illustrated that CtC’s six-step approach can be adapted to the UK context. It is hoped that funding can be secured to fully develop facilitator training materials that can be used to develop this pilot into a larger project and extended to more schools, using many of the sessions that proved to be a success during this pilot phase.

**Conclusions and recommendations**

This report provides evidence of the benefits of using CtC’s participatory action-based approach with refugee and asylum-seeking young people in the UK, and highlights areas of further potential not fully realised in the initial pilot. The pilot was carried out within a school facing extraordinary pressures, and yet still ran smoothly and achieved success in all of its desired outcomes, most particularly in relation to the impact on the pupils themselves. To a large extent this success was due to the preparation work, support given to school staff, and flexibility of the CtC consultant.

The six-step approach enabled children with initially very limited English skills to...
engage in, progress through and reach commendable levels of achievement in communication, collaboration and problem-solving. It supported school staff to embrace new ways of working and overcome their reticence around child participation and child-led activities. The comprehensive initial research and monitoring and evaluation process generated an extensive body of information, and there is a solid basis of methodology and tools for future scaling up.

Some areas of the pilot were not explored fully, such as the engagement of participating pupils in the wider school community, but this offers a focus of attention for future work. Other areas of the pilot – such as facilitator confidence and willingness to own and lead the process – could have been enhanced with more extensive training and support throughout the process. Again, this presents a very achievable improvement to the approach that can be implemented in future projects.

This report offers detailed recommendations designed to support CtC in realising the potential of the project and scaling it up to more schools and youth groups. A summary of key recommendations is provided below. Please see Section 7.2 for full details.

1) Planning and organisation: There is a need for high-level buy-in for such projects within the school; flexible planning to support staff participation; and possibly the allocation of the project to an existing mainstream department in the school to enhance ownership and management within the school.

2) Facilitator attendance: Staff need to be given permission and sufficient time and support to carry out all tasks needed for their facilitator role, for the duration of the project; and their managers need to be kept fully informed about the sessions and their impact on pupils and staff development.

3) Student attendance: This can be enhanced through using existing groups or clubs as the basis for sessions; with school partners facilitating more informed commitment to the process; ensuring social and leisure time is not affected; consulting and listening to children and young people regarding arrangements for the sessions; seeking greater support from parents and other school staff; and ensuring facilitators give greater attention to gender equality throughout the process. There could also be planned induction and exit support for those children who have to join or leave midway through the process.

4) Facilitator training: Staff who will act as facilitators need to be allocated sufficient time for initial and on-going training, under flexible conditions. This needs to involve effective briefings at the start, to enable informed participation in the process; greater use of reflective practice and sharing between staff (and between schools working in similar initiatives); the development of flexible expectations for staff, depending on their own and their school’s current situation; and greater linking of the professional development opportunities from the project with existing staff continuing professional development mechanisms.
5) **The learning environment:** The selection of a suitable, flexible, comfortable and safe space for the activities is important. Varied locations may be useful throughout the project, and pupils should be consulted about their preferences.

6) **Process: the six-steps:** Support should be given to schools to continue, complete or repeat activities after CtC’s involvement ends; and CtC should help identify further curriculum and activity opportunities for pupils to continue with further cycles.

7) **Pupil attention and behaviour:** Facilitators should be given advice and ‘tools’ with which to manage pupil behaviour effectively and appropriately. They may also benefit from support from mainstream, pastoral staff in the school; and from the provision of more formal translation and team building opportunities to pupils at the start of the process.

8) **Acknowledging pupil outcomes:** Pupils’ achievements in the project could be celebrated by the school, and certificates used to inform existing achievement records. Pupils and staff could also draw up guidance points/rules for others who do the project in future.

10) **Monitoring and evaluation:** As with this pilot, sufficient time should be allocated in each session for evaluation activities, with evaluation always commencing at the start of the project. There should also be effective ongoing maintenance of records and a strong focus on engaging the wider school in the project as well as on evaluating pupils’ interactions with the wider school community.
2. Introduction

2.1. Child-to-Child

Child-to-Child is an international network which has been promoting children’s participation in health and development for over 30 years. The Child-to-Child Trust (CtC)\(^1\) was established in 1987. Its child-centred, active learning approach “enable[s] and empower[es] children and young people worldwide to reach their full potential and achieve their rights by promoting the holistic health, well-being and development of themselves, their families and their communities”.\(^2\)

The Child-to-Child Step Approach uses a series of linked activities (‘steps’) to enable children to think about key issues, make decisions, develop life-skills and take action to improve their health and well-being.

- Step 1: children identify the problems they face
- Step 2: they find out how these problems are affecting them and/or their communities
- Step 3: they plan actions they can take individually or collectively
- Step 4: they take action
- Steps 5 and 6: they evaluate the actions taken and plan further actions.

The number of steps and what one addresses can be adjusted to different contexts and needs. (See Appendix 1 for a full version of the approach.)

2.2. Basis for the pilot project

In 2011, CtC sought to build on the knowledge and expertise gained through using the steps approach overseas by adapting it for use in the UK. This would initially be done with marginalised children. CtC secured funding from the Paul Hamlyn Foundation,\(^3\) and between January and July 2012 delivered a pilot project: ‘A participatory action-based approach to empower and integrate marginalised pupils’ (hereafter known as ‘the pilot’). The pilot “intended to engender change in the lives of the children and the wider communities of which they are a part”.\(^4\)

2.3. Aims and objectives of the pilot project

The pilot sought to engage refugee and asylum-seeker pupils in a series of weekly child-to-child activities facilitated by teachers and/or support staff within their school. These teachers/staff would receive training from CtC.

The child-to-child activities would be based on the six-step action learning cycle. Activities would take place inside and outside the classroom. Participating children would identify issues of concern to them and develop plans for action to bring about

---

\(^1\) For more information visit http://www.child-to-child.org
\(^2\) http://www.child-to-child.org, last accessed 03/09/12.
\(^3\) For more information visit http://www.phf.org.uk
positive changes to their lives, within and beyond school. Changes were anticipated in children’s life-skills, basic learning skills, language skills and numeracy skills.

Much of the activity was anticipated to take place outside the classroom, allowing language skills to be applied in a wider range of situations and circumstances, and fostering a sense of responsibility for one’s own learning. It was also anticipated that activities would require interaction with other pupils and/or community members, leading to participants becoming more confident, more integrated into the school and wider community, with stronger relationships and sense of belonging. Overall the activities were expected to raise educational achievement, reduce marginalisation, and promote integration and social cohesion.

Expected outcomes:

• **15 refugee/asylum-seeking students will have enhanced listening and speaking skills; enhanced learning skills; and enhanced life-skills** (confidence, interpersonal communication, problem-solving and decision-making).

• **15 refugee/asylum-seeking students will be more engaged with the wider school community**. They will engage more with non-EAL students, play a more active role in formal and informal school activities, and participate more effectively in other lessons, demonstrating increased autonomy as learners.

• **3 of the 11 school staff attending INSET sessions will have the ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful children’s participatory activities**, with only limited support, and have a deeper understanding of the specific support needs of refugee and asylum-seeking young people.

• **A body of evidence will be generated regarding the effectiveness of the child-to-child approach for promoting the integration of young refugees and asylum-seekers in the UK**, and providing new and deeper understandings about the needs of refugee and asylum-seeker pupils. Outputs from the research will include a monitoring and evaluation framework and participatory data collection tools, baseline data.

• **The Trust will be in a position to implement Phase 2 of the project**: facilitator training materials will have been piloted and adapted to the UK context; delivery processes for child-to-child activities will have been tested and refined.

The long-term plan, following a successful pilot, is to scale up the work to 20 more schools; train more facilitators; and establish communities of practice through which child-to-child facilitators can share lessons learned. During the scale up, links with organisations such as EMAS (Ethnic Minority Achievement Service) will also feed into best practice for those supporting EAL pupils.
3. Research summary

3.1. Research methodology

At the start of the pilot a literature review was completed which provided information about the issues affecting refugee and asylum-seeking pupils within the school system in England. This, together with information about what is effective in promoting the successful integration and achievement of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils informs our conclusions. The full literature review, with references, can be found in Appendix 2. There follows a brief summary of the main points.

3.2. Background information

A refugee has fled his or her country because of a well-founded fear of persecution. There are over 15 million refugees in the world. The majority are women and children. The experiences of persecution and flight are diverse, but the refugee experience is unquestionably about loss, including the loss of home, family members and friends.

Nearly 18,000 refugees applied in the UK for asylum in 2010. Recent estimates suggest approximately 6.5 per cent of all school children in Greater London are asylum-seekers, refugees or other groups of forced migrants. One inner London Local Authority (LA) reports up to 21 per cent of their school population are first generation refugees. Refugee children and young people in UK schools are either UASC (unaccompanied asylum-seeker children), who are the responsibility of the local authority in whose geographical area they seek help, or refugee children in families, who are living with one or both parents or with adult relatives who are caring for them as guardians. Asylum-seeking and refugee children are a very mobile population within the UK.

3.3. The policy context

The UK has an obligation under international law to admit and protect refugees. However, the dominant national policy trend has been to tighten control and reduce the numbers of applicants for asylum. Recent surveys show that attitudes towards asylum-seekers have been increasingly hostile. Whilst recognising how community cohesion and integration are important issues for communities, current government

---

5 As defined by the UN Convention relating to the Status of Refugees.
policy suggests that integration happens locally and only exceptionally by national
government. It places fresh emphasis on the importance of shared aspirations, a
sense of responsibility, social mobility and active participation at local levels, whilst at
the same time encouraging robust responses to extremism and exclusion. National
funding is primarily directed at supporting the English language tuition of successful
adult asylum-seeker applicants. Statutory school-age children are entitled to
schooling irrespective of immigration status, where schools are expected to support
their curriculum access. The UK Border Agency (UKBA) has a legal duty to
safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The children’s service authority in the
area where a young person presents as an unaccompanied asylum-seeker child will
need to decide on the age of the individual, to establish if it has a duty to assist or
look after them.

3.4. Refugee integration and the barriers young refugees experience

Rather than being used to describe the desired end goal of integration policy,
research leans to the view that integration is not a single process but a series of
processes related both to more functional aspects such as material assistance, to
more emotional aspects such as belonging, and to their entitlements that support
access and recognise equal rights. Previous government policy that emphasised
access, participation and contribution is still influential in informing public service
delivery. Education is seen as a significant means to this end.

The dominant political and media discourse accuses multiculturalism, with its
accommodation of difference, as being a divisive influence on communities,
exacerbating segregation. This is influencing funding streams available for promoting
integration, despite the lack of research evidence that the presence of diverse
cultures stokes community tensions. Several academics, however, argue that
multiculturalism is an important facilitator for integration. At a bare minimum it allows
the establishment of common identities, common citizenship and dialogue across
different communities. A more inclusive interpretation of multiculturalism, supporting
a freer and open accommodation of new migrant communities, places emphasis on
the contribution migrants and refugees can make to the realisation of a fairer and
more equal society. The importance of this and of empowerment is confirmed by
important research on what refugees themselves say. Young refugees describe
integration as a gradual and two-way process that involves being released from
anxiety, fear and uncertainty; being able to achieve something in life through their
own efforts; and being empowered and able to participate in normal activities and
decisions that affect them.

---

11 Creating the Conditions for Integration: DCLG 21st February 2012
12 See Modood, T (2007) ‘Multiculturalism’. Also see the writings of Will Kymlicka, Bhikhu Parekh and Charles
Taylor
http://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/tcs/research_docs/Making%20a%20new%20life%20in%20New
ewham.pdf
Research suggests refugees often experience a range of barriers to integration and to achieving in school. These may include the asylum process and fear of removal, lack of familiarity with their new environment, poverty and lack of play or study space at home, lack of opportunities for socialising with local people, bullying and racism, frequent moves, arriving late in the curriculum and having to catch up and also coping with a different education, low teacher expectations and little specialist support available for the acquisition of English.

3.5. Promoting refugee children’s well-being

It is important to recognise that most refugees will be resilient and will have many positive coping strategies when dealing with any difficulties they encounter. Any distress they express can be part of a normative and adaptive communication. However, refugee children and young peoples’ experiences will have an impact on their emotional well-being in different ways. These can include being affected by their parents being pre-occupied and emotionally unavailable.

The mental health of refugee children, as with any young person, must be considered within a wider context. For refugees that includes consideration of their pre- and trans-migration experiences and those current circumstances, such as asylum and poverty, that affect them. Positive interventions that promote refugee children’s well-being will be multi-faceted, target the stressors in their lives, be culturally aware, and cognisant of the losses they may have experienced in their lives.

Research shows that a starting point for planning interventions must be children and young people’s own ability and capacity to deal with their experiences. Professionals need to understand people’s own perceptions, build on their strengths and resources and develop programmes that support social integration rather than segregation. Throughout, children need to be recognised as active agents in their own development through participation.

Such an approach not only considers the adaptation of the child to their new school environment, but also the school’s and the teachers’ inclusiveness. A critical characteristic of schools most likely to have positive effects on children and young people’s well-being is a willingness to make changes for their benefit. A measure of

---


18 Tolfree, D. (1996) Restoring Playfulness – Different Approaches to Assisting Children who are Psychologically Affected by War or Displacement, Radda Barnen (Swedish Save the Children)
the success of educational intervention needs, therefore, is to focus not only on for example a child’s individual behaviour, progress, peer relations and health, but also on changes to school policy and practice.

### 3.6. The role of the school

Schools play a key role in promoting both the well-being of refugee children and young people, and positive integration outcomes. This includes:

- Providing a sense of security, opportunities for friendship and positive aspiration linked to academic success
- Opportunities for therapeutic interventions through play and other creative activities
- A resource for communities to develop networks and participation
- Help with their immediate needs.

However, there is a need for schools to provide improved, more targeted and consistent approaches and practice to effectively support the integration and achievement of refugees.

Schools that develop coordinated holistic provision for young refugees through a whole-school response are seen to be most effective. Young refugees themselves have identified the importance of social support and child-centred responses that value their cultural heritage. Schools with an ethos of inclusion are more likely to do this effectively.

The Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC, 1989), the Children Act (1989 and 2004), the Education Act (1996), the revised National Curriculum (2000), the Education and Inspections Act (2006) and the Equality Act (2010) are important policy instruments that provide schools with guidance in this respect. Important statutory guidance on promoting the achievement of looked after children emphasises that a LA should take account of the child’s views, and interventions should reflect the importance of a personalised approach to learning. The new school inspection framework means Ofsted inspectors will closely scrutinise what schools are doing to reduce or remove attainment gaps and foster good relations between different groups.

---


There is a growing body of evidence about what constitutes effective practice across schools. Key points from research and guidance include the importance of schools perceiving themselves as including refugee pupils in their identity, knowledge of prior learning including the language, culture and background of new arrivals, effective support for English language acquisition, a relevant curriculum, awareness about the experiences of refugees across the school community and special support for UASC and other children and young people with particular needs. Teachers need to develop a range of practices, including encouraging pupils to be more independent, adapting teaching and learning to meet the needs of individuals or groups of pupils, and developing peer- and self-assessment so that pupils can take charge of their own learning.

Schools are responsible for preparing all pupils for life in Britain’s multiracial society. The new Ofsted inspection framework for schools includes close scrutiny of how well the school promotes all pupils’ spiritual, moral, social and cultural development by providing positive experiences such as developing awareness of, and respect towards, diversity, and promoting understanding the range of different cultures within school and further afield.

3.7. Refugee pupil participation

Despite participation being a vital resource to support integration, there is limited evidence to date that demonstrates the benefits of refugee pupil participation for promoting integration into UK schools. Where the contribution participation can make to school improvement is recognised, schools have developed structures and activities that boost the influence of all pupils on decision-making. Research has identified some effective approaches, which include a range of strategies and approaches that develop skills of participation, and that the views of pupils are actively sought as a matter of course, including about ways of improving the teaching and learning that goes on in the classroom.

Some charities and youth programmes have worked directly with young people or through schools to promote refugee participation. These projects have developed participation through a range of activities, for example to tackle prejudice or improve welcome. Some have focused particularly on the needs of UASC. Schools have found that developing the curriculum to raise awareness helps tackle prejudice against refugees. Partnerships with NGOs have enabled schools to deploy young people’s participation to raise awareness to greater effect. There are real education benefits for all pupils from learning about refugees. Learning about refugees also links closely with National Curriculum Programmes of Study and schools’ duty to

---

22 See ‘school practice: key elements of effective practice’ in full literature review in Appendix 2
23 Ofsted Framework and Evaluation Schedule (from September 2012)
http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/framework-for-school-inspection-september-2012-0 (last accessed August 2012)
24 For example see DfES (2003) Building a Culture of Participation: Research report
25 See Refugees into Schools’ feedback from schools http://www.employabilityforum.co.uk/refugees-into-schools/
promote community cohesion. Other partnership work between schools and NGOs to support refugee integration includes lunch and after-school clubs, study support, and advocacy and advice for families.

3.8. Developing the role of teaching assistants

Research shows how the role of teaching assistants (TAs) has developed from that of supporting the teacher to a more distinct pedagogical role.\(^\text{26}\) However there are real concerns about current classroom practice and the effectiveness of TAs. There is a lack of training, and poor management and deployment of TAs so that pupils are directed away from tasks that can help them make more significant progress. Research however also suggests ways this can be remedied through supporting TA professional development, such as providing strategies that foster active pupil participation in learning.\(^\text{27}\) These would include ways to facilitate learner independence and encouraging pupils to think for themselves. TAs would also make a greater impact with the provision of more joint planning and feedback time between teachers and TAs; the sharing of teachers’ plans with TAs; and TA feedback contributing to further planning and the establishment of explicit roles and tasks.

---


4. Pilot activities and key challenges

4.1. Location

The pilot took place in Bishopsford Arts College, Morden, London Borough of Merton, South London.\(^{28}\) It was led by staff members from Bishopsford LINK (hereafter known as the ‘LINK’). The LINK occupied a classroom in the school. Staffed by a teacher and a youth worker it supported up to 20 refugee and asylum-seeking pupils at a time (Key Stage 4 (KS4) – 14 to 16-year-olds) to improve their language skills prior to entering mainstream classes.\(^{29}\)

The school provided space for the CtC pilot sessions. For the first session an unfurnished, very large drama room was used. This proved a difficult space to facilitate in, with some children becoming very active and excited, so a classroom was used for Sessions 2 to 4. This was too small and was replaced with the larger LINK room for Session 5 onwards.

4.2. Participating pupils

The pilot comprised pupils from the LINK as well as KS3 (11-14 year old) and KS4 pupils from mainstream classes who were new arrivals to the UK. Most of the participating pupils were from black or other minority ethnic backgrounds (BME), were EAL learners, and had arrived in the UK in the last five years.\(^{30}\)

In total, 22 pupils participated during the life of the pilot (February to July 2012). Initially 14 pupils were selected. Some subsequently left the pilot group (either because they moved from the LINK to mainstream classes, or because they were mainstream pupils who chose to drop out of the pilot and return to regular lessons). Other pupils from the LINK or mainstream classes were identified to take their place.

There were three girls involved initially. One left after two weeks, but the LINK staff recruited two more girls who started in Session 6, and two who started in Session 9. For the final 11 sessions of the pilot there were usually six girls and 10 boys present.

Throughout the report the 22 pupils who took part in the pilot are known as P1 to P22.

4.3. Facilitators and facilitator training

In January 2012, 11 staff members\(^{31}\) attended an initial in-service training (INSET) session facilitated by the CtC consultant and one of the pilot evaluators (see section 5 for details of the evaluation process). This session sought to outline the pilot project

\(^{28}\) For more information visit http://www.harrismorden.org.uk/

\(^{29}\) Due to cuts in local council funding, the LINK was closed in July 2012.

\(^{30}\) Information provided by the vice-principal, school contact for the pilot.

\(^{31}\) Participants were: the LINK youth worker, the EAL specialist teacher and co-ordinator, the internal exclusion manager, five TAs, one TA specialising in EAL, and two other staff members who attended for a very short time.
and generate interest in becoming involved. It provided participants with information about CtC, the pilot project, and the child-to-child approach, especially the six steps; and offered an opportunity to think about the benefits of this approach.

The evaluation team member also used the INSET as an opportunity to find out participants’ awareness of the needs of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils and participatory approaches, and how confident they were with facilitating meaningful participatory activities.

Several participants indicated that they would like to facilitate the pilot and develop new skills. To help ensure the pilot outcomes were achieved, the vice-principal agreed that, in addition to the LINK youth worker, two or three of the INSET participants would be made available to act as facilitators during the Thursday sessions. She also agreed that the same facilitators would further develop participatory activities during after-school clubs each Tuesday. The school and the CtC consultant discussed which participants to invite to become pilot facilitators.

Four TAs and the LINK youth worker were organised to start the pilot. The TAs did not attend the first session with pupils, having been told by their manager to follow the timetable during the Ofsted inspection. They had also asked the vice-principal to withdraw because they did not feel confident in their abilities to work on the pilot. They subsequently did participate, although there were some changes of personnel during the pilot. One TA attended only for Session 2, and was replaced from Session 4 by another TA, who also attended only a few sessions and then went on extended sick leave from Session 12 onwards. Most sessions were therefore attended by 3 TAs and the LINK youth worker. From Session 11 onwards the LINK teacher became a facilitator.

The facilitators received further brief trainings from the CtC consultant after some of the pilot sessions. This training focused on active learning and learner-centred activities; asking open and closed questions; and teacher language (words to use when talking to pupils whose first language is not English).

As part of the pilot project, the CtC consultant conducted an extra staff INSET session entitled Supporting Learners with Literacy Needs for all Bishopsford school staff mid-way through the pilot.

Throughout the report the four participating TAs are referred to as TA1, TA2, TA3 and TA4.

32 Unfortunately this did not take place.
4.4. The sessions

Timing

There were 19 weekly sessions, starting on 2 February 2012 and finishing on 5 July 2012. The CtC consultant organised and delivered 18 of these, with help from the LINK staff and TA facilitators. The one-and-a-half-hour sessions were run on Thursday afternoons. The vice-principal informed school staff (teachers, TA managers, etc) about the pilot to ensure that pupils and TAs were released from timetabled lessons/activities on these afternoons.

For 40 minutes after each session the facilitators and the CIC consultant met to reflect on the activities and plan the following week’s session and facilitation roles. A few very short facilitation trainings were also done in these periods.

Approach

An adapted six-step action learning cycle was used, with the steps being spread across 19 sessions, as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: Delivery of the six steps during the pilot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 to 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8 to 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>14 to 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 to 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Icebreaking activities started each session, usually led by the LINK youth worker. These activities were fun, and often very lively, yet highlighted key pilot objectives, such as pupil collaboration, listening and speaking skills and use of English. (See Appendix 3 for details of the activities used).

Step 1 activities

Step 1 activities spanned seven sessions and involved verbal, written, movement, drawing and drama tasks designed to enable pupils to:

• get to know each other
• establish rules
• discuss health and safety issues
• learn new words
• reflect on issues of personal concern
• choose a topic for work in Steps 2-6.

The table in Appendix 4 provides more details about each activity.

33 Due to the lack of time available for the pilot, Step 6 was not completed.
Step 2 activities
This step started in Session 8 with an activity matching cartoon faces to words such as sad, happy, embarrassed, worried or laughing. The task illustrated how bullied people, and the bully, could feel when bullying occurs. Pupils then did some Internet research and found film clips about bullying which they presented and discussed.

In Sessions 9-12 pupils developed questionnaires for collecting information from various people about their thoughts and experiences of bullying. They first made a list of questions, and then discussed how they could find out the answers, looking at where they needed to go, who to speak to, how to divide the tasks among them, etc. They typed and printed questionnaires for four target groups: teenagers, teachers, the community police officer and family members. Using a mock survey about preferred crisp flavours they tested the questionnaire approach and ways of displaying data in charts, etc. Then in Session 13 pupils worked in three groups: one interviewed the teenagers (in the sixth form block), one interviewed some teachers, and one went to speak to the community police officer (who was not available so additional teacher questionnaires were completed instead). Pupils took the family questionnaires home and completed them with their parents, aunts, uncles, siblings, or guardians.

Step 3 activities
In Sessions 14 and 15 pupils collated the statistics from their questionnaires and made bar charts, pie charts, pictograms and posters (containing quotes) to display their results. They presented their findings and held a question and answer session.

They then discussed what action they wanted to take. In a whole-group discussion, led by pupils, the following two suggestions were developed:
• Create a drama about the effects of bullying which they can show to other pupils.
• Design and produce posters for display around the school, park, bus stops, streets, or in the newspaper, to educate people about the harm bullying does.

Step 4 activities
In Sessions 16 and 17 the pupils decided to create a play about a bullying incident, and then role play a ‘bully court’, where the bullies and bullied people would ‘appear’ before judges to speak about what happened. This would be filmed by other pupils and shown in assembly/citizenship classes and could be used as the basis for a lesson on bullying. Audiences watching the film could vote for the appropriate punishment for the bullies. (See Appendix 5 for more details of the play.)

A group of pupils also produced a poster to highlight the problems associated with bullying using information gathered during the survey.

Step 5 activities
During Session 19, pupils reflected on the film and discussed how they felt about it, what they could do differently in future, and what audiences they would like it to be shown to. They also reflected on the whole pilot and what they thought they had
enjoyed the most.

**Step 6 activities**
Due to the short duration of the pilot, there was no time for the pupils to decide if more action was necessary, and then to plan and deliver these additional activities.

Appendix 6 provides more details about activities for each step.

### 4.5. Key challenges

**Timings**
There was some difficulty arranging suitable timings and durations for the pilot activities, with adjustments needing to be made after the pilot had started. For instance, when it became clear that some pupils were arriving late, pupils requested shorter sessions (1.5 instead of 2 hours) rather than missing part of their lunch break with friends. This change happened from Session 6. Some sessions also ended early because several boys had been chosen to play for the school cricket team.

**Punctuality**
TAs also did not always arrive promptly, leaving the CtC consultant unable to discuss ideas with them before the pupils were present (although TAs were emailed session plans in advance). This issue was recorded in the debriefing following Session 10; the planning sheet states “Communication among the facilitation team could be better. Everyone will try to arrive 10-15 minutes early for the session”. On a number of occasions the TAs were unable to stay for the debriefings after the sessions.

**Pupil attendance**
At the start of the pilot 14 pupils were present, 11 boys and three girls. This grew to 16 at the end, with six girls and ten boys. Attendance varied however. Sometimes pupils were absent for personal reasons, such as ill health or attending meetings with social workers or carers about their immigration status. This is normal in a school. However, on other occasions KS3 pupils (for example P8, P9 and P10) chose to be absent and attended their mainstream lessons instead. These three finally removed themselves completely from the pilot and did not return. This may have been due to the pressure of work, fear that they were missing something, or because they did not enjoy being with older KS4 pupils. Attendance also fluctuated when LINK pupils left the LINK to join mainstream classes. For example, P11, P12 and P20 left the LINK and integrated fully into mainstream classes, leaving a gap in the pilot’s numbers which was only filled when new arrivals joined the LINK or new pupils, (e.g., the P15 and P16), were drafted in from the mainstream school.

**Internal communications**
There were some problems with TAs not being released to attend the pilot sessions, and not being confident enough to challenge their managers about this, despite the vice-principal’s instructions. TAs also noted a lack of information from school management in preparation for the INSET, leaving them unclear about the nature of
the pilot and thus less able to accurately discuss things like their hopes and fears regarding participating in the pilot.

**Planning**

The CtC consultant did a lot of preparation and planning to maximise the participation of the school and to support the initial engagement of both staff and pupils. The effectiveness of this planning, at times, was affected by organisational problems within the school, but CtC made the school aware that it was willing to respond to any challenges in a flexible and collaborative way.

**Selection of pupils**

The selected pupils were all EAL learners and refugees or asylum-seekers. Some participants at the INSET felt this potentially missed an opportunity to promote integration and friendships with English-speaking pupils, and that language acquisition opportunities might be lost.

**Facilitator confidence and training**

It can be challenging to build capacity around children’s participation and active learning among staff who are new to this type of methodology. Not all facilitators felt as confident with leading and planning sessions as had been originally expected. From the start of the pilot, follow-up training to support on-going growth in facilitators’ skills and confidence was identified as necessary. Unfortunately it was not possible to allocate time for the staff to attend further training. Limited training was done at the end of some sessions, but often the debriefing and forward planning took up all the available time. Facilitators mentioned that they would have liked additional training on a number of occasions throughout the pilot, as they felt that this would have enabled them to increase their effectiveness during the pilot.

**External pressures**

In addition to the challenge of organising the pilot activities (arranging staff/pupil availability, timetabling, etc), the vice-principal and staff were dealing with the pressure of an Ofsted inspection which coincided with the start of the pilot. They faced further scrutiny by Her Majesty’s Inspectorate, leading to the school being placed in special measures and then its governance being changed.
5. Monitoring and evaluation of the pilot

5.1. Evaluation aims and objectives

The CtC pilot was evaluated by two external consultants who worked closely with the CtC consultant between January and July 2012.

The evaluation aims were:
• to learn more about the issues affecting refugee and asylum-seeking pupils within the British school system
• to evaluate whether the CtC pilot is effective at promoting the integration of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils.

The specific evaluation objectives were:
• to generate new and deeper understandings about the needs of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils, including, for example, the differences and commonalities of experience of refugees and asylum-seekers
• to inform the development, refinement and effective implementation of the new CtC module
• to determine whether and how the CtC approach can be adapted to promote a greater level of integration between refugee and asylum-seeking pupils and the wider (school) community(ies) of which they are a part
• to track the outcomes for participating refugee and asylum-seeking pupils, their support staff and the wider school communities within which the pilot takes place
• to make recommendations regarding the feasibility of expanding the pilot in future.

5.2. Evaluation participants and activities

Information for the evaluation was gathered from a range of sources, including:
• twenty-two young refugees/asylum-seekers from a number of countries
• the vice-principal of Bishopsford Arts College
• the EAL co-ordinator
• seven TAs nominated by the school for the initial INSET
• four TAs (including one EAL TA), the LINK youth worker and later LINK teacher who became pilot facilitators
• the CtC consultant
• relevant baseline and tracking information provided by the LINK teacher
• attendance at the INSET
• attendance at the pilot sessions
• extensive research of current policy and practice guidance.

Consulting staff

Key staff members were consulted through group activities integral to the initial INSET, follow-up focus group discussions (in June), and individual interviews. The
vice-principal, who was responsible for the pilot, was interviewed by telephone in April and July. An evaluator also periodically spoke to her in school during the pilot.

Facilitators were given the opportunity to write reflective diaries capturing their thoughts about the pilot, what was happening, results that were emerging, etc. After each session, facilitators were given 30 minutes with the CtC consultant to evaluate the activities – what went well, what didn’t go so well and what could be changed (see Appendix 7 for details of these activities).

Consulting pupils

Pupils were consulted through group and individual consultation activities. There was a focus group discussion in June. In addition, many of the sessions concluded with short participatory evaluation activities (see Appendix 7 for details of these activities).

Observations

During the pilot sessions the evaluators observed and recorded changes in pupils’ learning and language skills, such as active listening and speaking (including trying out new vocabulary), independent learning, information gathering and handling, and independent writing. They also looked at communication and life skills such as interpersonal communication, assertiveness, negotiation, leadership and facilitation skills, empathising, increased motivation and confidence, and analysing and problem-solving.

The evaluators examined changes in facilitators’ ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful participatory activities using active learning techniques; pupil-centred approaches and non-directive facilitator roles; promoting young people’s agency, responsibility and resilience; and supporting English language acquisition through facilitation of participatory activities. They also observed how the facilitators showed knowledge of refugee and asylum-seeker pupils’ needs such as by listening to pupils and showing an interest in, and awareness of, their cultural experiences and backgrounds; encouraging the deployment of first languages where appropriate (e.g., to help understanding); and enabling pupils to share their perspectives about the barriers they face.

5.3. Challenges

In general the monitoring and evaluation process went smoothly. The challenges identified in section 4.5, relating to the need for adjusting timing/duration of sessions, inevitably impacted on the time available for monitoring and evaluation too.

Other timing issues affected evaluation activities. For instance, the end-of-session evaluation activity was sometimes cancelled because the sessions over-ran or pupils left early due to school or personal commitments.

Facilitators were asked to complete one reflective diary entry each month. However, there was not consistent completion of these diaries. The four TAs, at different times,
completed a number of entries, but the LINK youth worker did not make any diary entries.

There were also some challenges with the use of pupil diaries. These were done in the form of a question sheet containing four short questions, but even these could not be completed every week due to time constraints and pupils’ poor understanding of written English (requiring a lot of help from facilitators to complete the ‘diaries’). At the end of the last session there was also no time for the pupils to complete a final question sheet.

Other data was not always available for the evaluators, and record-keeping during the pilot was sometimes inaccurate, making the evaluation task more challenging. For instance, the pupil attendance list taken by the facilitators for each session did not match the list that the evaluator made when present. Also, despite various requests being made, certain baseline information about pupils was not supplied to the evaluators.

Overall, there was not enough time allocated to the consultants for the monitoring and evaluation process during some of the weekly sessions.
6. Key outcomes

This section is organised according to the five expected outcomes for the project, listed in section 2.3.

6.1. Building skills among refugee and asylum-seeking pupils

| Expected outcome: 15 refugee/asylum-seeking students will have enhanced listening and speaking skills; enhanced learning skills; and enhanced life-skills (confidence, interpersonal communication, problem-solving and decision-making) |

At the start of the pilot the LINK teacher noted that some of the recently arrived older boys, from Afghanistan, Albania and Somalia, were not independent learners. The girls also were not openly engaging with others in the learning process. In general the pupils had very limited English skills and were not used to the styles of teaching and learning used in the school/LINK.

6.1.1. Active listening/speaking and improved written English

Active listening
At the start of the pilot it was observed that pupils listened quietly to each other in small first-language groups, but as the pilot progressed they actively listened more in larger groups with English being spoken – though they were still getting used to doing so. For instance, TA1 noted in her reflective diary in March that the pupils “are learning to listen to each other and to ask questions, but they do find it difficult”.

By mixing the small groups into mixed-language groups in Session 6, the facilitators further encouraged pupils to listen carefully to each other in English as they could not rely on getting a translation. One test of listening was the ‘knots’ energiser (see Appendix 3), which revealed that the girls’ group listened better to each other’s instructions and quickly untangled themselves, while the boys’ group did not listen and remained tangled.

Active speaking
Early in the pilot many of the pupils spoke in their first languages, with one or two pupils acting as interpreters. A few who were more confident used English during the large group discussions. These (all boys) were pupils who had been in the UK for a few years, and who were younger children studying in the mainstream school. However, it only took three weeks before other pupils (those who were shy and/or
had poor English skills) started to speak during large group discussions. The TAs noted their surprise that the girls could speak English, and that they had started to speak to TAs at other times in school and to read out in class in the mainstream school – a significant change.

By Session 4, more confident pupils were observed initiating questions for the group, for example: “Can I ask a question?”, “Can I say…?” and “Can I join in?” and insisting that their peers used English. Later during the questionnaire activities, a pupil who hadn’t spoken in class for two years was observed to be questioning older pupils. By the end of the pilot, pupils who had previously relied on friends for translation were chatting in English.

**Written English**

Pupils were doing written tasks throughout the pilot. The evaluator observed that it was often pupils who had been in the country for a few years, or who had spoken English in their home country, who did most writing. However, others started to write as they gained confidence and were assisted and encouraged by their peers. Pupil diaries completed in Sessions 3 and 4 were very sparse (often single word comments), but by Session 15 many were writing much longer comments. Several, like P1, stated that they enjoyed the sessions “because I am learning English”. This change may, of course, not be solely attributable to the pilot as opposed to their other lessons.

**Was the outcome achieved?**

The pilot sought to enhance pupils’ listening, speaking and language skills. The pupils improved in these skill areas considerably during the period of the pilot, from a starting point where many did not know enough English to communicate with each other and most communication was initially channelled through the facilitators. During their focus group discussion in June, many pupils said that they had learned and improved their English. The girls stated that they were now speaking more in class, not just in their usual Urdu-speaking friendship groups, but also in mixed groups, which was confirmed by the TAs. One TA felt that the pupils would have understood the pilot better if their English had been better. Conversely we could argue that the pilot was successful precisely because it enabled pupils with very limited English to engage with activities and make considerable achievements.

### 6.1.2. Enhanced life skills

**Interpersonal communication**

During the early sessions, the evaluator observed more confident pupils acting as interpreters for their peers. This continued throughout the pilot, but reduced noticeably as pupils became more confident with English. The first independent exchange between pupils (i.e. not responding to a facilitator’s prompt) was observed in Session 3, during the feedback about the health posters:

P11 asked if he could ask P3 “why aren’t you safe at home” and P3 replied. P11 then discussed with P4 about coming to school and how safe they felt.
Following this exchange, others gained the confidence to speak out and the TAs reflected at the end of the day that the girls (P13 and P14) "contributed well and seem much more confident".

By Session 5, several pupils were openly asking such questions during the whole group debate. TA1 reflected that, by Session 4, the pupils were trying to take it in turns to talk rather than all speaking at once, in both the small-group and larger-group activities. The evaluator observed that pupils discussed for longer and challenged each other more as the pilot progressed, although some still struggled to engage at this level.

**Group-work/collaboration**

The evaluator noticed that, initially, pupils worked well together during the ice-breaker/energiser activities at the start of each session, but then reverted to their first language groups to clarify subsequent tasks. There was also some disruptive behaviour and pupils not sticking to their tasks. As their confidence and language skills grew, however, they became more focused and collaborative. TAs noted that this confidence and collaboration improved after the pupils had been put into groups of mixed home language, gender and age. The evaluator observed pupils increasingly making joint decisions, negotiating and reaching consensus.

**Assertiveness and confidence**

During the June focus group, TAs mentioned the significant growth in pupil confidence. This confidence was highlighted when pupils felt able to perform dramas and discuss their personal stories of bullying and racism. The girls in particular were noticed by the TAs for their escalating confidence levels (including communicating with the boys), which seemed to be boosted as more girls joined the pilot.

P2 was a KS4 new arrival. He began the pilot very withdrawn, complained of regular headaches and removed himself from activities. However, during Session 15 he was actively taking the lead when presenting his group’s bullying survey findings. He asked other presenters to speak up when they spoke quietly, and also asked questions in English to presenters such as: “What does lonely mean?”

**Facilitation skills**

Throughout the pilot the evaluator witnessed various pupils taking on facilitation roles, such as organising the groups, helping peers to understand the tasks, motivating a discussion when others were reluctant to speak, inviting peers to ask questions about their work, or asking them to be quiet and listen. As the pupils’ confidence grew, more began to take on facilitation roles.

During Session 15 small groups presented their survey findings. Occasionally pupils asked for quiet, without prompting from staff members. P14 (girl) said “Excuse me!” to the group when she was presenting, and then continued to ask questions such as: “How do you feel when you are bullied?” P18 (girl) clapped her hands to refocus the audience when she was presenting. P2
(boy) was ad-libbing whilst presenting, asking questions such as “What does sad mean? Crying” and “Who are the bad people? Bullies!”

**Negotiation skills**
Pupils often had to negotiate what they wanted to do in their groups, choose which topic they would research, which roles they would play in their dramas or what questions they would ask for their surveys. As a whole group they also negotiated a set of rules for the pilot, which were then printed and used as reminder cards throughout the sessions. This rules approach was noted in the pupils’ focus group as having been particularly helpful. The whole group also negotiated a solution as to where their bullying film should and should not be shown.

P14 argued “it was good but I don’t want to show it to other people [because] the children who watch it will laugh because the acting was bad!”

**Empathy and understanding**
By Session 5 facilitators had noted that pupils were beginning to empathise with, understand and support each other better. The pupils increasingly listened with respect when others were talking or presenting.

**Motivation**
CtC’s six-step approach motivates young people through topic choice and action. Overall, the pupils engaged with all the activities. They were motivated and produced many different types of work. At their focus group discussion in June, the pupils stressed that they had been happy participating in the pilot:

- “I feel it’s good”
- “it is good because I can learn something and some English”
- “I like this group, the bullying group, because I enjoy the learning because this is very good. I am happy to do it”
- “because we are learning together.”

The pupils’ diary scores (completed in Sessions 3, 4 and 15) showed that they were very happy with the pilot sessions, ticking ‘Yes’ 100 per cent, 91 per cent and 92 per cent respectively.

At the end of the pilot the pupils sat in a circle and threw a ball to one another, answering the question: The best thing about the bullying pilot was:

- “everything is good”
- “the games”
- “making the video/film”
- “writing and drawing”
- “joking”
- “talking about bullying”
- “getting together, getting along and talking about bullying together”
• “doing the drama”
• “working together and respecting each other.”

*Was the outcome achieved?*

The pilot sought to enhance pupils’ life-skills (confidence, interpersonal communication, problem-solving and decision-making). There is clear evidence that this was achieved. Over the period of the pilot, pupils developed improved communication and team-working skills, and demonstrated empathy and support for each other. They made decisions together, often negotiating to take account of diverse opinions and solve problems (such as what to do with the film screening). They developed into more independent learners, able to ask each other for support rather than always relying on the facilitators, and to facilitate and organise each other.

6.2. Supporting engagement with the school community

| Expected outcome: 15 refugee/asylum-seeking students will be more engaged with the wider school community. They will engage more with non-EAL students, play a more active role in formal and informal school activities, and participate more effectively in other lessons, demonstrating increased autonomy as learners. |

At the start of the pilot the LINK teacher had noted that the KS4 pupils were motivated and most engaged well with others in the group. The Afghan boys “engaged well with fellow Pashtu speakers”. Some pupils stated in their pupil diaries that they asked others for help. The LINK teacher also recorded that the girls were generally shy and only engaged with other Muslim girls, speaking Urdu together. One pupil showed very little engagement with either pupils or staff members at the start of the pilot. As we have seen above, the pilot was instrumental in significantly improving pupils’ communication and interactions within the group. However, the pilot also sought to enable participating pupils to engage more with other children and adults in the wider school and community.

The facilitators and evaluators noticed increased confidence among pupils, around the school and in class. The pupils began to speak English more confidently to their class-mates in lessons, interacted more with their peers from other backgrounds during the pilot group-work sessions, and were more relaxed and talkative around school, in the corridors and on the stairs. In their focus group discussion the pupils noted that they had friends from different nationalities.

P7 and P17 said that they now had a mix of friends, “not just Afghan boys or Eritrean girls”.

In addition, five of the KS4 Afghan boys, who had recently joined the school and been more ‘isolated’ in the LINK, developed the confidence to attend the cricket trials and were selected to play for the school team.

Unfortunately, due to the impact of the Ofsted inspection, there was little opportunity
for the evaluators to collect evidence of pupils’ engagement in the wider school community, and no realistic opportunity to involve or consult mainstream teachers. Further, the delayed start to the pilot meant much of the activity took place in the run-up to external examinations.

Was the outcome achieved?
The pilot sought to have a positive impact on the pupils’ engagement with school and community life more generally. The evaluation was able to gather limited ad hoc data that suggests this was beginning to happen. However, for various logistical reasons, the pilot (and evaluation process) was unable to ‘reach out’ beyond the specific sessions to the extent originally anticipated. Therefore, the picture of wider impact is less detailed and clear than the evidence available for the other expected outcomes. This remains an area that future projects can focus on in more detail.

6.3. Building staff capacity to facilitate children’s participation

| Expected outcome: 3 of the 11 school staff attending INSET sessions will have the ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful children’s participatory activities, with only limited support, and have a deeper understanding of the specific support needs of refugee and asylum-seeking young people. |

6.3.1. Understanding and confidence around participation and the child-to-child approach

Initial situation
During the INSET participants were shown photos from other projects and asked to identify the characteristics of the approaches depicted (e.g. photos from Vietnam showed pupils taking the lead in a lesson). They mostly did this with confidence. Participants were also asked to brainstorm what they understood by participation and discuss the benefits for pupils. Again they mostly provided strong answers, and indicated that participation can, for instance, help develop conceptual thinking, and a sense of shared experiences. They did, however, feel that pupils probably need to be taught how to participate as it is a new concept for them, and not just those who have come from other countries. Participants were asked to score themselves on their confidence with participatory approaches with children, and all scored between 2 and 5 (where 1 was not confident and 5 was very confident).

Most INSET participants indicated a lack of awareness of children’s right to a voice in decisions affecting them (as enshrined in the CRC). Some expressed concern about giving children more voice as they felt children already have a lot of control and voice opinions that are not necessarily desirable or helpful (such as racist or sexist views). These viewpoints from participants indicated that they may not have much existing understanding of, or commitment to, child-to-child principles. However, in a task during the INSET most participants correctly matched real-life examples of children’s activities with steps in the six-step approach, and some offered good ideas for activities that would suit certain steps.

When asked to reflect on the problems pupils might face (which could become a
topic for the pilot), and what pupils could do about them, some participants focused more on strategies the pupils could learn to help them deal with the problems, rather than on activities that pupils themselves could develop to improve the situation. There was acknowledgement that the latter would require staff to take a step back, which they often are not used to doing; and also facilitators expressed some concern about how to teach pupils to work collaboratively to achieve these sorts of ‘self-help’ outcomes. However, in feedback at the end of the INSET, participants felt they better understood the pilot’s purpose and possible benefits; and could see how a process of children solving problems would work and benefit the pupils and the community.

Facilitators’ practical skill and confidence
Initially, the facilitators found it difficult to stand back and let the pupils take responsibility for their own learning. For instance, during early sessions, the LINK youth worker tended to lead, quickly intervene, and repeat pupils’ questions or answers; while TAs used the same approaches as in mainstream lessons and tended to want to do a task for the pupils if they were struggling. Following advice from the CtC consultant, and observing her modelling participatory approaches, facilitators began to allow the pupils to work things out together, although this remained an issue throughout the pilot, with TAs feeling that sometimes they needed to offer at least initial help to get a task started.

In discussion with the evaluator, TAs indicated that they understood the benefit of ‘stepping back’ and allowing active learning, and their actions in later sessions suggested that they were indeed less ‘intrusive’ in group work, etc. They also reported some changes to the way they worked in regular classes, in particular in relation to the use of open or closed questions, and getting pupils to help each other. However, overall they felt they had little time to encourage other participatory and active learning in class (due to pressure to get a certain amount of work completed), and also felt they needed to be seen as actively working. The evaluators were unable to observe TAs in the mainstream classes, so could not provide an alternative perspective on this wider impact of the pilot.

Throughout the pilot the facilitators worked well with pupils in small groups. They were motivating, explaining and encouraging pupils to contribute, with some notable successes, such as supporting a previously very quiet, withdrawn pupil to speak out and join in.

They also moved from directly helping pupils with spelling, reading and writing (as they would in class) to thinking more about how they could support pupils’ English language acquisition through participatory activities. For instance, they used rule cards to promote the use of English rather than pupils translating for each other, asked pupils what words meant, and explained how to do effective presentations. They also increasingly encouraged pupils to ask each other rather than always asking the facilitators.

Facilitators made notable progress and changes in their ways of working with pupils, but by the end of the pilot were still not fully confident in participatory working, and
often reverted to a more teacher-centred approach. In general, the facilitators had been given limited time to learn about active learning and participatory methodologies at the start of the pilot, and to reflect on and share experiences with others as a way of building confidence. This may partly explain their on-going struggle with ‘stepping back’, especially if this was not expected of them for the rest of their working week.

**Leading the facilitation**

Subsequently, throughout the pilot, the facilitators showed some willingness to lead certain activities and plan sessions. However, the bulk of this responsibility still fell on the CtC consultant, even though the LINK youth worker and LINK teacher already had many of the necessary skills. Along with the TAs, they seemed reluctant to take ownership and control of the pilot. By midway through the pilot the facilitators were running smaller, peripheral tasks but not leading entire sessions. The CtC consultant noted in late April that “The TAs made it clear they don’t want to [lead] and ‘it’s not their job’”. Because the LINK youth worker also did not want to take responsibility for the pilot, from Session 11 onwards the LINK teacher also took on some of the facilitation tasks. The LINK youth worker and LINK teacher ably led Session 15 due to the CtC consultant’s absence, but still were not willing to plan for the next session. TA3, however, was observed to take on increasing responsibility, despite admitting she was not used to leading in her usual TA role.

One reason for the general unwillingness to take a lead in facilitating full participatory sessions, instead of just specific activities, could be the limited time for training and familiarisation with the approach provided at the start of (and throughout) the project. The upheaval caused by a failed Ofsted inspection, the departure of the head teacher and conversion of the school to an Academy also left staff morale low. The LINK staff were feeling vulnerable (due to impending closure of the LINK, as funding had been withdrawn) and TAs were concerned for their jobs and involved in union meetings after the sessions. This all had an inevitable impact on facilitators’ motivation and energy.

**Was the outcome achieved?**

The pilot sought to give staff the “ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful children’s participatory activities, with only limited support”. To some extent this was achieved. The staff who acted as facilitators developed a stronger understanding of and commitment to child-centred and child-led approaches and the validity of listening more to children’s voices. They were able to facilitate activities with skill and confidence.

However, by the end of the pilot the staff were not yet owning the process and taking responsibility for leading the facilitation and planning. This was likely due to various factors, including a lack of initial and on-going training and reflection/sharing opportunities; lack of time or opportunity to practice techniques beyond the pilot in regular classes; and external pressures and demotivation brought about by the failed Ofsted inspection and ensuing staff/management changes in the school.
6.3.2. General knowledge about refugees and asylum-seekers, and understanding of the problems they face

A multiple-choice quiz during the INSET sought to find out how much participants knew about refugees in the UK and globally. Most found the questions challenging and achieved low accuracy scores. They were also asked to rate their confidence in their knowledge of refugees. None felt very confident, and low confidence scores generally matched the low knowledge accuracy scores.

Discussions during the INSET raised a number of issues relating to problems faced by young refugees and asylum-seekers. For instance, there was concern that pupils in the LINK got more support than other early users of English who were not in the LINK. The difficult experiences that many pupils have been through, and the myths that persist around refugees were noted, along with the problem of new arrivals having limited knowledge of what life is like for others in the school community. The problem of Qat substance abuse within the Somali community was raised, along with the issue of Afghan boys not understanding women’s rights.

INSET participants were asked to list problems facing refugee and asylum-seeking pupils, and then rank how common and frequent they thought they were. They also completed a confidence chart indicating how confident they were in their knowledge of these problems. Confidence levels were again mixed, though generally slightly higher than the levels of confidence in general knowledge about refugees.

During the June focus group discussion, the TAs reflected on their previous awareness of refugee and asylum-seekers’ needs and experiences, and acknowledged that they had not known much about these young people at the start of the pilot. Through the pilot, however, they felt they had discovered much more about the difficulties that new arrivals face when they first come to the school. These included language barriers, the shock of different classroom cultures, and a lack of literacy even in their mother tongue. The TAs also recalled information they had learned about pupils’ earlier lives (such as the arduous or dangerous journeys they had made to get to the UK, or the violent deaths of relatives), and about pupils’ experiences of bullying in their new school/community. Based on this new learning, one TA was even contemplating a career change to focus on working with refugee and asylum-seeking young people.

Was the outcome achieved?
The pilot sought to give staff “a deeper understanding of the specific support needs of refugee and asylum-seeking young people”. On the whole this was achieved, and the learning was acknowledged and appreciated by the facilitators. The current evaluation did not have the scope to look further into this issue to determine if the understanding of support needs translated into more effective actions beyond the pilot sessions.
6.4. Generating evidence for the effectiveness of child-to-child approaches with refugee and asylum-seeking pupils in the UK

Expected outcome: A body of evidence will be generated regarding the effectiveness of the child-to-child approach for promoting the integration of young refugees and asylum-seekers in the UK, and providing new and deeper understandings about the needs of refugee and asylum-seeker pupils. Outputs from the research will include a monitoring and evaluation framework and participatory data collection tools and baseline data.

The pilot was developed with monitoring and evaluation built in from the start. This is something still rarely done, yet is vital for building up evidence of the processes and impact of any project. Relying on a single, short final evaluation activity is insufficient. The consultant evaluators played a central role in the pilot even before its formal start date, helping to develop activities that the CtC consultant and facilitators could use to monitor progress towards the expected outcomes on a weekly basis.

Initially, baseline information of pupil profiles was requested from the LINK teacher. This was added to whenever new pupils joined the group (see Appendix 8). The evaluation tools used (e.g. reflective diaries, participatory activities with the pupils, focus groups, interviews, a short film, etc), and the evaluators’ regular observation of sessions, enabled every element of the pilot to be documented and analysed, in a way that a final, retrospective evaluation could not have achieved. In some ways, too much evidence was generated, making the task of preparing a final, succinct report very challenging!

Was the outcome achieved?
The evaluation framework provided a number of ways to collect information from a variety of sources. However, it must be noted that the existing monitoring and evaluation tools will need to be revisited, adapted and in some cases simplified for use on future projects.

6.5. Sustainability and scaling up

Expected outcome: The Trust will be in a position to implement Phase 2 of the project: facilitator training materials will have been piloted and adapted to the UK context; delivery processes for child-to-child activities will have been tested and refined; a Master Trainer training package and marketing strategy will be in place and eight partner schools secured.

Sustainability and scaling up are important issues for this pilot. The vice-principal reflected on the sustainability of the pilot work already carried out in the school. She noted that the ‘bottom-led’ approach (i.e., staff shaping and delivering the activities) was a reason for its success and crucial for ensuring that the work and its impact could be maintained in future, through increasingly confident TAs working throughout the school. The vice-principal was also hopeful that TAs would share their experiences, to expand the impact of the pilot on classrooms, and perhaps contribute...
to the school’s newly qualified teacher training programme and/or train other TAs in the newly acquired skills. She also envisaged that the short film documenting some of the pilot, and pupils’/facilitators’ views, could be used with staff to highlight and challenge racism in the school, and show what the pilot achieved. However, the vice-principal lost her post following the conversion of the school to an academy, leaving these future plans in limbo.

The success of the pilot has illustrated that CtC’s six-step approach can be adapted to the UK context. It is hoped that funding can be secured to fully develop facilitator training materials that can be used to develop this pilot into a larger project and extended to more schools, using many of the sessions that proved to be a success during this pilot phase.
7. Conclusions and recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

‘I’d like to reiterate the positive impact the project has had on our young people, and their growing confidence, as well as the staff’. Vice-Principal, Bishopsford Arts College.

This report provides evidence of the benefits of using CtC’s participatory action-based approach with refugee and asylum-seeking young people in the UK, and highlights areas of further potential not fully realised in the initial pilot.

Data was collected through varied and flexible monitoring and evaluation tools, some developed in advance, others created during the pilot. There were certain limitations to the evaluation; the process was restricted to observation of sessions and discussions with participating pupils and staff as observation and discussions in the wider school community were not logistically possible. As a result the evaluation has not captured extensive evidence of the pilot’s potential to have an impact on pupils and staff across the school and within the community – this remains an area for closer monitoring during future similar projects.

The pilot sought to achieve five main outcomes: enhanced skills among the pupils; their improved engagement with the wider school community; improving staff confidence and ability to use participatory approaches; building a body of evidence about the effectiveness of the child-to-child approach in this context; and preparing the ground for scaling up the work to more schools.

The pilot has recorded success towards all of these outcomes. To a large extent this was due to the preparation work, support given to school staff and flexibility of the CtC consultant. The six-step approach enabled children with initially very limited English skills to engage in, progress through and reach commendable levels of achievement in communication, collaboration and problem-solving. It supported school staff to embrace new ways of working and overcome their reticence around child participation and child-led activities, to the extent that the staff could begin transferring these skills to the regular classroom. The comprehensive initial research and monitoring and evaluation process generated an extensive body of information, and there is a solid basis of methodology and tools for future scaling up.

The participants were a group of very vulnerable pupils, many of whom felt disempowered by their experiences of persecution, difficult journeys and exile. Joining a new school in a new country, where they did not understand the education system or approaches to learning was even more unsettling and challenging. The fact that the pilot enabled these pupils to identify problems, make collaborative decisions about solutions, and then take direct action to bring about change, is evidence of the benefits and future potential of the six-step approach in these
The pilot was not without challenges, as one would expect in any school development work. Bishopsford, however, faced extraordinary external pressures at the time of the pilot. While this was in some ways detrimental to the full achievement of all desired outcomes, it offered CtC an opportunity to learn many useful lessons around ‘working in a crisis situation’ that should enhance their capacity to handle similar projects in challenging circumstances.

Many of the key challenges identified in this report were organisational. This was acknowledged by the school. The TAs did not always have the confidence to manage the organisational problems they faced, in part because the pilot asked them to work beyond what was usually required of them. Building facilitator capacity in a project like this is vital, and all parties involved acknowledged that there was insufficient time dedicated to both initial and on-going training and professional development. Nevertheless, the facilitators developed a commitment to the approach, learned and implemented skills around active learning and child participation, and grew more aware of the needs of refugee and asylum-seeking pupils. One can anticipate even more positive results in future projects with a stronger focus on training and support for facilitators.

The success of this pilot indicates that there is potential, using CtC’s six-step approach, to plan further partnerships with schools and other education providers, including youth groups. The literature review further confirms this: CtC’s inclusive, rights-based approach to empowering and integrating young people responds well to refugees’ own views on the importance of equality, participation and the exercise of choice when considering key aspects of integration. Research into the psycho-social needs of refugees not only shows the importance of supporting refugees’ resilience, so they feel safe and enabled to rebuild social and community networks, but also the importance of schools and classrooms changing and adapting to include refugee children. The literature further identifies how schools play a key role in supporting refugee integration and promoting well-being.

By tailoring its work to the needs of each school and community context, CtC could deliver recognisable partnership benefits to schools, including:

- demonstrating effective ways of identifying barriers faced by refugees and of meeting their needs
- raising awareness across the school community and tackling prejudice
- supporting the acquisition of English (even in schools which lack EAL provision) and other key skills that support integration and achievement
- helping schools meet their statutory duties and satisfy Ofsted’s close scrutiny regarding pupils’ spiritual, moral, social and cultural development. This means fostering good relations through promoting the skills and attitudes that enable all pupils to participate fully and positively in modern Britain and understand and appreciate the range of different cultures within school and further afield as an essential element of their preparation for life
- developing teacher and TA continuing professional development (CPD) through
promoting high quality teaching which facilitates pupils to analyse and solve problems (individually or collaboratively), and which enables staff to integrate culturally inclusive teaching and learning activities into the curriculum so that they genuinely become part of a school’s ethos.

The following recommendations are designed to support CtC in realising the potential of the project and scaling it up to a significant number of schools and youth groups. The recommendations build on the many of the pilot’s strengths and address the challenges experienced.

7.2 Recommendations

1) Planning and organisation

a) High level commitment: Before starting a project, agreement is needed at the highest level (and among all staff and managers who will be involved) that there is commitment to the project’s aims and objectives and to regular attendance of chosen facilitators at sessions. In addition, a contract could be drawn up between CtC and the school.

b) Flexible planning: The project plan needs to acknowledge and prepare for inevitable absences when staff are required for other, more pressing, duties.

c) Mainstream ownership: The project’s aims are cross-curricular. However, the project may benefit from a mainstream department taking greater ownership of the delivery of the work (perhaps PSHE/Citizenship if it exists), tailoring the project to promote the participation and meet the needs of all pupils in the group, including the integration needs of refugees and asylum-seekers. Such a move may make the logistics more manageable. Ownership of the process by an established department should also help to promote teacher and TA involvement, and may ensure that whole-school events, such as Ofsted inspections or staff changes, cause less disruption to the project.

2) Facilitator attendance

a) Agreed leave to attend: From the start, the school needs to agree that staff facilitating the project will be given appropriate time away from their core duties to attend the sessions. This needs to be formally timetabled so that there is no ambiguity.

b) Sufficient time: There needs to be agreement from the start that staff will be allowed enough time to attend a briefing before each session (for preparation) and a debriefing and future planning meeting after each session.

c) Duration of attendance: Staff participating as project facilitators need to be available, as far as the school is aware, for the duration of the project. Their attendance should be encouraged and monitored by their managers.

d) Feedback to managers: Managers need to be regularly briefed about the positive impact the sessions are having on the pupils and on the professional development of their staff.
3) **Pupil attendance**

   a) **Use of existing mechanisms:** Groups may already be functioning (for example as a mainstream class or an after-school club). These will be less vulnerable to large fluctuations in numbers and members, and encouragement of attendance can be done through the groups’ existing channels.

   b) **Support joiners and leavers:** Turbulence in pupil attendance is often inevitable in programmes targeting mobile pupils. CtC could plan for this by offering additional induction and exit support for pupils joining or leaving midway through the programme.

   c) **Informed commitment:** Young people need to commit to attending the project on a regular basis. Facilitators need to ensure at the start of the project that the young people know what is involved and can make a commitment based on informed choice. Interpretation may be required for this.

   d) **Protect social time:** The project should be run at the same time as school lessons, if the project is run during school-time, to avoid pupils having to miss valuable social opportunities with peers outside the project.

   e) **Consult pupils:** If the project will be run outside normal lesson times, pupils should be consulted at the start of the project regarding their preferred timing and duration for sessions (e.g., whether they prefer to give up lunch breaks to have a longer session; or want to maintain the lunch break but perhaps work more intensively during a shorter session).

   f) **Listen to concerns:** As demonstrated in the pilot, there should be opportunities throughout the project for children to raise concerns about the timing/duration of activities. This should be replicated in future activities.

   g) **Contact with parents:** Time needs to be invested in communicating with parents and carers. The school should approach families, providing information that reassures parents and carers about the educational value of the project, its safety and appropriateness. It is important to ensure that young people have parental backing and are not under pressure from parents to leave the project in favour of attending their usual lessons.

   h) **Staff buy-in:** All teachers/support staff in the school need to be aware of and encouraged to support the project so that they do not put pupils under pressure for missing a class.

   i) **Gender equality:** It is essential to ensure that gender equality is understood by facilitators. The support and training they receive should be designed to help facilitators appreciate the gender-related barriers experienced by pupils and understand how to tackle them. Facilitators should be encouraged and supported to be gender-sensitive in all their work. For example, when choosing an issue they want to investigate both boys and girls must be facilitated to have a say, as happened in the pilot. There may need to be some mixed and some segregated activities planned in future projects to ensure that all voices are heard. If girls or boys are under-represented, they still need to be able to influence choices and decisions made by the group. Perhaps gender issues can be explicitly addressed by the group early on.
4) Facilitator training

a) **Allocated training time:** The school was unable, in this instance, to provide sufficient time for formal and focused training sessions at the start of the project. When this is the case, there needs to be time set aside for short workshops throughout the lifetime of the project, to tackle issues that arise in certain sessions or to support the development of new skills.

b) **Initial briefings:** All participants attending the initial training session should be accurately briefed about the project, its intended outcomes and how they may be participating. CtC could prepare a handout to help schools in this regard.

c) **Early identification of potential facilitators:** Before the initial training session, staff available to be project facilitators could be identified by the school. While they may not be able to decide on their participation before the introductory session, their participation at this session can be strongly encouraged. This would allow more targeted initial briefings and communication.

d) **Flexible training arrangements:** If adequate time for the initial training session cannot be timetabled in one go, facilitators need to be provided with additional training sessions at the start and throughout the project.

e) **Reflective practice:** Facilitators need to be given ample time to reflect (this was not possible in the pilot). Time needs to be set aside for maintaining reflective diaries, and this needs to be supported and encouraged by leadership teams. Facilitators need time to reflect together (to share thoughts and learning with each other) and to disseminate learning to their peers.

f) **Inter-school sharing:** In scaled-up work involving multiple schools, there should be opportunities for sharing of experiences between schools (e.g., through clusters), to enhance training and motivation. Teacher/staff networks can provide further guidance and support. CtC is already seeking funding to develop a London hub of CtC facilitators in schools and other settings, which is a commendable move.

g) **Flexible expectations:** CtC may need to build in options that respond to a wide range of school staff qualifications and experience, whether they be teachers or TAs. Their ability to take ownership of sessions will also be determined by the expectations of their role by school management. This goes hand-in-hand with allocating time and resources for CPD and ensuring this aligns with existing teacher/TA/other support staff development work.

h) **Mainstreaming the skills:** Schools should be encouraged to link the staff development offered by the project to their existing accreditation of staff development. They should also link the work of the project with the promotion of similar teaching approaches across the curriculum. Future school partners should be encouraged to see the project as benefiting mainstream teacher CPD. This would help to encourage participants to engage fully with all aspects of the project.

5) The learning environment

a) **Choosing a suitable room:** Selection of the most appropriate learning space needs to be given careful consideration at the start. It needs to be large
enough to be comfortable and offer a flexible space for diverse activities; yet not so large as to create facilitation challenges.

b) **Safe space:** In particular for the initial meeting, when young people and facilitators do not know each other, the meeting space needs to feel safe and calm.

c) **Consult pupils:** Participating young people need to be given a say in the choice of working space, within the limits of what is available and considering accessibility and gender sensitivity (places girls like and places boys like).

d) **Varied locations:** In some situations, a mixture of locations may help young people to stay focused.

**6) Process: the six-steps**

a) **Activities after CtC’s involvement:** In many settings it may be difficult to allocate enough time for all six steps to be completed during CtC’s involvement. CtC therefore needs to ensure these settings are able to continue the steps themselves, and begin a second cycle based on reflections from Step 5.

b) **Identify opportunities:** CtC can assist the school/youth group in identifying, with the facilitators, further curriculum and activity opportunities for pupils to continue with further cycles, if their evaluations show that this is necessary.

**7) Pupil attention and behaviour**

a) **Managing behaviour:** As pupils and facilitators settle into a project that uses approaches they are unfamiliar with, behaviour may inevitably be disruptive at times. A ‘bank’ of activities for managing behaviour needs to be built and used from the first session, including activities that encourage pupils to take responsibility for their behaviour. Activities that were shown to be effective in the pilot need to be deployed in future projects; that is activities that are paced, fun, and stimulate different learning styles to help to motivate and focus pupils, and reduce disruptive behaviour.

b) **Involve mainstream staff:** The involvement of mainstream staff, especially pastoral managers, should raise the status of the project in the eyes of the pupils and help to reinforce codes of behaviour. Such involvement may not extend beyond staff showing interest in the pupils’ project, but could also involve occasional visits from a Head of Year or equivalent.

c) **Ensure understanding:** It may be useful to offer interpretation support when explaining the project and codes of conduct to the pupils, so that they are aware of behaviour and other expectations.

d) **Extra team building efforts:** When working with a group of young people (and facilitators) who do not know each other, specific ‘bonding’ activities should be run early on to help team-building in a fun, safe environment.

**9) Acknowledging pupil outcomes**

a) **Celebrate achievement:** Pupils’ achievements on the project could be celebrated by the school, for example at an assembly. Their certificates could inform existing achievement records.
b) **Help successors:** An exit task for staff and pupils would be to draw up guidance points/rules for the next cohort of pupils and facilitators.

10) **Monitoring and evaluation:**

   a) **Learn from pilot experience:** It will be important to ensure that future projects deploy evaluation methods and resources that were most effective during the pilot.

   b) **Allow time for evaluation:** Each session should have time allocated at the end for completion of an evaluation activity. Session activities need to be structured with this in mind.

   c) **Evaluate from the start:** As with the pilot, the evaluation team and systems for monitoring and data collection (including baseline information) should be put in place from the beginning of future, larger projects.

   d) **Maintaining records:** There must be an agreement that staff will maintain registers, collect relevant baseline information, and make this available to evaluators within an agreed time limit. Evaluators must be clear about their compliance with confidentiality requirements and data protection legislation.

   e) **Look at the wider school:** Mainstream class teachers need to be encouraged to provide feedback on pupils, sharing their expectations and observations. Time and resources need to be set aside for monitoring and evaluation of pupils’ wider school engagement and appropriate monitoring and evaluation tools developed. The project should ensure that there is senior leadership team approval and support for this.
Appendices

Appendix 1: The six-step approach

A six-step CtC cycle and examples of activities young people might do at each step are described below. The issues facing young refugees and asylum-seekers addressed in the pilot, and how activities will have the desired impacts are also outlined.

**Step 1 – Choose a topic and understand it well**

The purpose of this step is to provide young people with the opportunity to identify what they think are key issues of concern in their lives. Pupils will then discuss and agree which issue of concern to work on collectively as a group and in so doing will develop speaking and listening skills and life-skills e.g. improved co-operation, team work, decision-making and communication. Members of the group will explore their understanding of the issue by, for example, drawing and writing about what the issue means for them and formulating questions that they will answer during Step 2.

**Step 2 – Find out more**

This step helps young people understand why their issue of concern is problematic for them. Finding out more about the chosen topic increases understanding and knowledge of the issue of concern and improves research skills. They might research using the internet, a library, engaging with a guest speaker and/or conducting surveys and interviews outside the classroom. They develop language skills in a ‘real-world’ context and increase their confidence as they design and conduct research in the school or wider community.

**Step 3 – Discuss findings and plan action**

This step provides an opportunity for participants to share information learned and improves ability to interpret and present numerical data in bar charts, pie charts and graphs. Presentation, speaking and listening skills develop. Using the information gathered, young people plan action they want to take to address the issue of concern. This improves ability to discuss and come to agreement. Team work, creative thinking and language skills are strengthened.

**Step 4 – Take action**

Young people feel empowered as they take action outside the classroom to make positive changes to the school and/or community. They are required to communicate in ‘real world’ contexts. Pupils participating in previous pilots in the UK have taken action in the following ways:

---

34 Taken from pilot brief.
• creating a DVD and play to show to other pupils on how to protect yourself from becoming a victim, and what to do if you are a victim of street crime;
• designing anti-racism posters and leaflets and being interviewed and photographed for an article on racism in the local paper;
• creating a rap, designing posters and leaflets to raise awareness about lonely elderly people in the area and arranging visits to a residential home.

**Step 5 – Reflect and evaluate**

This step provides young people with an opportunity to reflect on what they did and evaluate what they were able to achieve. They can say what they liked and voice what they may feel could have been done differently developing language, learning and critical thinking skills.

**Step 6 – Take further action**

This step provides an opportunity to decide whether or not more action is necessary, plan and act accordingly consolidating the life-skills developed earlier in the cycle and creating more confident, autonomous learners. It provides further opportunities to communicate in ‘real world’ contexts and make positive changes to the school and/or community.
Appendix 2: Research

1.1 Refugees in the world

A refugee has fled his or her country because of a well-founded fear of persecution\(^{35}\). An asylum-seeker is a person who has crossed an international border and is seeking safety or protection (recognition as refugee) in another country. In 2010, there were estimated to be 15.4 million refugees around the world, of whom approximately 80 per cent were women and children.\(^{36}\) The vast majority of the world’s refugees are living in developing countries, often in camps. Africa and Asia between them host more than three-quarters of the world’s refugees\(^{37}\). Europe hosts just 14 per cent.\(^{38}\)

An asylum-seeker is someone who declares themselves to be a refugee but whose claim has not yet been determined. During 2010, a world-total of 845,800 individual applications for asylum or refugee status were submitted in 166 countries, with only 350,000 lodged in the 44 most industrialised countries of the world.\(^{39}\) The highest numbers of new asylum applications in 2010 were made by Zimbabweans, with 149,400 new claims. Large numbers of asylum-seekers also originated from Somalia, DR Congo, Afghanistan and Colombia.\(^{40}\)

The experiences of young refugees\(^{41}\) are diverse. According to Home Office and Department of Health\(^{42}\) and National Health Service (NHS)\(^{43}\) guidance, and information from the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR),\(^{44}\) those who come from the same country or even the same town or community can have quite different experiences of persecution.

- Some refugees have endured years of repression whilst others may have fled a sudden onslaught of political violence. Some may have experienced serious food shortages or drought as a result of warfare.


\(^{37}\) US Committee for Refugees and Immigrants. World Refugee Survey 2009 [http://www.uscirrefugees.org/2010Website/5_Resources/5_5_Refugee_Warehousing/5_5_4_Archived_World_Refugee_Surveys/5_5_4_7_World_Refugee_Survey_2009/5_5_4_7_1_Statistics/RefugeesandAsylumseek.pdf](http://www.uscirrefugees.org/2010Website/5_Resources/5_5_Refugee_Warehousing/5_5_4_Archived_World_Refugee_Surveys/5_5_4_7_World_Refugee_Survey_2009/5_5_4_7_1_Statistics/RefugeesandAsylumseek.pdf) (last accessed August 2012)

\(^{38}\) COMPAS Migration Observatory, Migration to the UK: Asylum. [http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk](http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk) (last seen August 2012)


\(^{41}\) This report will in general use the term ‘refugee’ to mean anyone coming to the UK in search of asylum, whether they or their household have had a positive decision (refugee status, Humanitarian Protection, Discretionary Leave), or are still awaiting a decision (asylum-seeker).


\(^{43}\) Burnett, A. (2002) Meeting the health needs of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK: An information and resource pack for health workers NHS.

\(^{44}\) UNHCR [www.unhcr.org/home.html](http://www.unhcr.org/home.html) (last accessed August 2012)
• Refugees may also have had very different opportunities to access health care, education or employment. Many refugees come from poor countries where the primary health care systems are overburdened or have broken down.
• Refugees can be persecuted for their beliefs or because they belong to a particular racial or social group. The nature of their experiences means that some refugees have been exposed to violence, some detained and perhaps tortured.
• Refugee girls and young women are especially vulnerable. They may have been subjected to sexual violence including rape.
• Fleeing persecution can lead to many losses, including the loss of home, family members and friends. Journeys to safety can also be hazardous. Children and young people can be trafficked, that is, coerced into travelling to other countries.

1.2 Refugees in the United Kingdom (UK)

It is difficult to estimate the numbers of refugees as the Home Office does not keep such data. Different local authorities who serve refugees as part of the local population and provide services such as housing, healthcare and welfare benefits keep a record of the refugees that are recipients of their services.

Asylum applications in the UK in 2010 totalled 17,790. Asylum applications were at their lowest in 2010, since a peak in 2002 of 84,130. A total of 5,190 (3,480 refugee status, 1,710 other forms of protection) were granted leave to remain in 2010.

In 2010, the most common nationalities of applicants in the UK were Iran, Afghanistan, Zimbabwe, Pakistan and China. Other nationalities include Nigeria, Eritrea, Somalia and Sudan. The UK is home to less than two per cent of the world’s refugees. It received 0.37 applications per 1,000 residents, below the average figure for the European Union (EU) which was 0.54 applications per 1,000 residents.

1.2.1 Refugee children in the UK

Refugee children and young people fall into two main groups:

• Those who are unaccompanied asylum-seeking children (UASC), who are the responsibility of the local authority in whose geographical area they seek help.
• Refugee children in families, who are living with one or both parents or with adult relatives who are caring for them as guardians.

Children in families are the responsibility of the Home Office for housing and financial support while waiting for an asylum decision.

---

45 See UNHCR information on refugee women: www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home?page=PROTECT&id=3b83a48d4 (last accessed August 2012)
471997-2010 Figures from Parliamentary Question 54493, 10 May 2011
48 COMPAS Migration Observatory, Migration to the UK: Asylum http://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk (last accessed August 2012)
The largest group of unaccompanied refugee children arriving in the UK are Afghan. A Country of Origin (COI) circular has information about political violence in Afghanistan, including child kidnapping. Reports by human rights organisations indicate that the number of displaced Afghan children and young people rises after surges in violence between Taliban and NATO forces in Afghanistan. Death threats from the Taliban and pressure to undertake suicide bombing missions are among the reasons for fleeing given by the Afghan children. According to Human Rights Watch, civilian deaths from insurgent attacks were largely the result of insurgents’ failure to respect the laws of war.

**Statistical information**

The Home Office does not distinguish between adult and child dependents of asylum applicants in its asylum statistics. There is no published data on the numbers of accompanied children (children in families) who apply for asylum as a dependent of a principal asylum applicant.

The UK Border Agency (UKBA) publishes statistics on the number of UASC arriving in the UK. In 2009, as in previous years, the UK registered the highest number of applications from UASC in Europe, with close to 3,000 UASC claims. The available information indicates that 7,900 unaccompanied and separated children were recognised as refugees or granted a complementary form of protection in 2009. This figure is higher than in 2008.

Local Authorities (LAs) collect information on refugee and asylum-seeking children in schools in their area in order to estimate numbers. Likewise, social services collect data on unaccompanied minors who have received positive decisions.

Schools do not collect data on the legal status of pupils but they would collect related data on ethnicity, first language, date of entry into school, and previous school.

Almost all LAs in the UK have resident refugee populations, small or large. Approximately 36 per cent of England's asylum-seekers reside in London. As of December 2010, there were 3,400 supported asylum seekers in Greater London. Secondary migration to Greater London of asylum-seekers who are dispersed but then receive leave to remain is occurring. This is not new as there has always been considerable secondary migration of refugee groups to the capital, with push and pull factors including existing community, family and friends, work and safety.

In 2003, the Refugee Council’s Education Steering Group’s survey estimated that the LAs with the largest population of refugee children were the London boroughs of Newham and Haringey, and the City of Manchester. Other LAs with more than 2,000 refugee children in 2003 were:


50 http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/policyandlaw/guidance/coi/ (last seen August 2012)
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schools were Barnet, Brent, Camden, Ealing, Enfield, Hackney, Hounslow, Islington, Lewisham, Redbridge, Waltham Forest, Westminster, Glasgow and Birmingham.\(^{55}\)

Since the Refugee Council’s Education Steering Group estimate of the number of refugee children in England in 2003, there has been no extensive cross-country survey made by any public body. More recent estimates suggest at least 60,000,\(^{56}\) with 6.5 per cent of all school children in Greater London estimated to be asylum-seekers, refugees or other groups of forced migrants.\(^{57}\) One LA in inner London reports up to 21 per cent of their school population are first generation refugees.\(^{58}\)

The largest groups of asylum-seeking and refugee children in schools across the UK are Somalis and Somali minority groups, comprising about 21 per cent of all asylum-seeking and refugee children in the UK. Sri Lankan Tamils are the next largest group and other large populations include Afghans, Turkish Kurds, Iranians and Congolese.\(^{59}\)

Asylum-seeking and refugee children are a very mobile population within the UK, owing to the temporary nature of housing allocated to asylum-seekers, and the fact that most refugees, once granted status, are then placed on a LA waiting list for housing and have moved to areas where such housing has become available.\(^{60}\)

### 1.3 National policy context

The UK is a signatory to the 1951 United Nations (UN) Convention on the Status of Refugees.\(^{61}\) The UK has an obligation under international law to admit and protect refugees.

The dominant policy trend regarding UK treatment of asylum-seekers, represented by the seven major pieces of immigration and asylum legislation enacted in the last twelve years in the UK,\(^{62}\) is to tighten control and reduce the numbers of applicants for asylum.

The Immigration and Asylum Act 1999\(^ {63}\) removed existing rights to housing and all types of benefits. Asylum-seekers who needed accommodation, unless they had particular medical needs only treatable in London, were dispersed outside London and the south-east of England, often to areas where they had no family or community ties. In July 2002, all asylum-seekers lost the right to work. The Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc) Act (2004) set the policy context for Home Office strategy to remove the right of indefinite leave to remain from successful applicants for asylum, to set higher targets for removals, to put in

---

\(^{55}\) Ibid.


\(^{60}\) The Convention can be found on the UNHCR website http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10.html (last seen August 2012)

\(^{61}\) http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1999/33/contents
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place stronger border controls and electronic checks, and to find ways to return UASC. The current government continues to implement key elements of this strategy.

It can be argued that the policy context in the UK is partly informed by the hardening of attitudes towards immigrants, including asylum-seekers. It can be argued that tolerance of immigration amongst young people in Britain is well below the international average and that of countries in Europe and North America; the UK public has the largest majority saying immigration is “more of a problem” than an opportunity.

The Coalition Government’s first statement on its approach to cohesion and integration in England has been recently published. It recognises how community cohesion and integration are important issues for communities learning to live together in an increasingly complex and diverse society. The Government approach suggests that integration happens locally and only exceptionally by national government and places fresh emphasis on the importance of shared aspirations, a sense of responsibility, social mobility and active participation at local levels whilst at the same time encouraging robust responses to extremism and exclusion. The approach challenges six government departments to put integration at the heart of their mainstream programmes. However, little mention is made of the austere times when local funding, especially for voluntary organisations, is under pressure and local grassroots activity is being curtailed. Whilst the Government places this fresh focus on integrating local communities in its mainstream work, it can be argued that success to date has been achieved largely through specially funded programmes. There are further policy areas for ‘Gateway refugees’ and those that relate to migrant communities, such as community cohesion and equalities. The Department for Communities and Local Government leads on community cohesion while the Government Equality Office (located in the Home Office) leads on discrimination. The UKBA within the Home Office is responsible for refugee integration and for settlement and Citizenship policy. The UKBA focus for successful applications for asylum (including those who arrive through the Gateway Programme), is on English language tuition, family reunion advice, and limited settlement support information from a ‘case owner’ about benefits, finding housing and work. There is no targeted introductory language and orientation programme for new arrivals to the UK, but school-age children are entitled to schooling irrespective of immigration status where schools are expected to support their curriculum access. Older refugees can attend classes in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). Migrants and refugees applying for citizenship need to demonstrate that they meet Knowledge of Life and Language criteria by taking either the Life in the UK Test or an ESOL course using citizenship materials. The Life in the UK test certificate is equivalent to level B1 of the Common European Framework.

---

64 See section 2.5, paragraph 6 below
66 Survey: governments receive low marks from public for handling of immigration
67 Creating the Conditions for Integration: DCLG 21st February 2012
68 The Gateway Protection Programme is a partnership protection programme operated by UKBA in partnership with the UNHCR and offers 750 refugees a year a route to settling in the UK:
   www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/asylum/gateway (last accessed August 2012)
69 UKBA http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/asylum/outcomes/successfulapplications/integration/ (last accessed August 2012)
70 The Education Act 1996
71 The Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant has been traditionally ring-fenced to provide English as an additional language support and other programmes to promote minority ethnic achievement. The grant is no longer ring-fenced.
of Reference, demonstrating an understanding of everyday English. Alternatively, the ESOL option can be taken by those whose language ability is below this level. These requirements have led to increased demand for ESOL and citizenship classes\textsuperscript{72}, but budget challenges may be restricting provision.

\textbf{1.3.1 Unaccompanied refugee and asylum-seeking children}

\textit{Promoting the welfare of children}

The UKBA has a legal duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. Those responsible for running the immigration system must share the same responsibilities as agencies which are subject to Section 11 of the Children Act 2004, for ensuring the safety and welfare of children\textsuperscript{73}.

\textit{Age assessment}

An asylum applicant arriving in the UK, either without documentation which establishes their age or with documentation that the Immigration Service regards as suspect, and who is also claiming to be a minor (under the age of 18), will have their age ‘assessed’. This is to establish whether they should be subjected to the adult or child asylum determination procedures, and who has responsibility for their accommodation and support while their asylum application is processed\textsuperscript{74}. This latter issue is of concern to the local children’s service authority. The children’s service authority in the area where the young person presents as an asylum-seeker will need to decide on the age of the individual, to establish if it has a duty to assist or look after them under Part III of the Children Act 1989\textsuperscript{75}.

The age assessment made by a local children’s service authority to establish if it has a duty under Part III of the Children Act 1989 must be lawfully conducted. The requirements of a lawful age assessment by a local authority are summarised in the ‘Merton information note’.\textsuperscript{76} Age assessments that do not meet these requirements may be open to legal challenge. It should be noted in particular that it is not lawful for a LA to simply adopt a decision on age made by the Home Office, but must decide on the matter themselves.\textsuperscript{77}

\textsuperscript{72} Changes to ESOL Funding House of Commons briefing paper. 2011 www.parliament.uk/briefing-papers/SN05946.pdf (last seen August 2012)
\textsuperscript{73} http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/policyandlaw/legislation/bci-act1/ (last accessed August 2012)
\textsuperscript{74} Coram Children’s Legal Centre http://www.childrenslegalcentre.com/index.php?page=faqs_age_assessment (last seen August 2012)
\textsuperscript{75} Section 17 of the Act requires the children’s service authority to “safeguard and promote the welfare of children within their area who are in need” and, where they are found to be a child in need (by the department), Section 20 requires it to “provide accommodation for them as a result of (a) there being no person who has responsibility for him; (b) his being lost or having been abandoned; or (c) the person who has been caring for him being prevented (whether or not permanently, and for whatever reason) from providing him with suitable accommodation”.
\textsuperscript{76} The UKBA bases age assessments on the applicant’s physical appearance and/or general demeanour and any available documentation. “It is Border and Immigration Agency policy to accept a local authority (in England and Wales ‘Merton compliant’ age assessment as evidence of age where we are satisfied that such an assessment has been carried out. The Merton judgment was handed down by Burnt J in the High Court on 14 July 2003, and gives ‘guidance as to the requirements of a lawful assessment by a local authority of the age of a young asylum-seeker claiming to be under the age of 18 years’. All local authorities are required, following the Merton judgment, to ensure that their assessments are full and comprehensive, that the process for assessing age is clear, transparent and fair. A ‘Merton Compliant’ assessment can normally include a face-to-face meeting; general background of the applicant, and adhere to standards of fairness”. For further details, see Coram Children’s Legal Centre website http://www.childrenslegalcentre.com/index.php?page=faqs_age_assessment (last seen August 2012)
\textsuperscript{77} Ibid
1.3.2 The European Union policy context

European Union policy supports activities largely focused on sharing good practice and an Integration Fund for initiatives at state and local level. The 2008 EU Green Paper reflected EU concerns about the access of international migrants to early years provision across the EU, early leaving times and achievement gaps. The resulting consultation has led to a focus on EU co-operation monitoring achievement gaps, developing a comparative study on measures for newly arrived migrant children and establishing an expert network on the education of children from migrant backgrounds.

1.4 Refugee integration

1.4.1 What is meant by refugee integration?

Refugee integration can be interpreted in a variety of ways. Whilst some may see it as describing the assimilation of refugees into a ‘British way of life’, developing shared values and a common identity, others instead may see it as a two-way process of mutual adaptation. In academic analysis it is often used to explain the process that migrants are engaged in from the day they arrive, regardless of policy intervention, whereas in policy debates it can be the term used to describe the desired end goal of integration policy.

Research leans to the view that integration is not a single process but a series of processes. It relates for example to participation, social interaction and cultural practices.

“The sense of identity and belonging of migrants, and of those with whom they interact, may also change over time. The rate at which these processes take place depends on the migrant and on the opportunities open to them in the localities where they live.”

Government policy has been influential, especially the previous government’s Integration Matters strategy, which was partially informed by research into how to measure integration. The integration of refugees was seen to take place when they were empowered to access the public services to which they are entitled, achieve their full potential as members of British society and contribute fully to the community. The participation of refugees in the life of communities was seen as a key factor, as were the different social relationships and networks that promote integration and the key knowledge and circumstances that help people to be active, engaged and secure within communities. Education was seen as a significant ‘marker of integration’ and also a powerful means to this end.

There has over the last few years been persistent and, at times, intense debate on immigration in the dominant media and political discourse. This has linked issues of community cohesion, citizenship and extremism to the immigration ‘debate’, reinforcing the
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link between integration and assimilation. ‘Integration’ has become the flagship of those opposed to multiculturalism, which values the contribution made by diverse cultural traditions. Feelings that multiculturalism reinforced segregation between communities and separate identities came to influence policy on community cohesion. This attack on multiculturalism conducted through the dominant political and media discourse prompted an intervention by the Prime Minister in 2011.

“Under the doctrine of state multiculturalism, we have encouraged different cultures to live separate lives, apart from each other and the mainstream….. We have even tolerated these segregated communities behaving in ways that run counter to our values. …”

This concern about separateness can be seen to link to concerns about the development of cultural ghettos and parallel communities. In this regard integration is seen as something that can contribute to community cohesion through supporting positive relationships between migrants and host communities.

“Community cohesion is what must happen in all communities to enable different groups of people to get on well together. A key contributor to community cohesion is integration which is what must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another” Department for Communities and Local Government

However, recent research could find no evidence that levels of trust and co-operation are highest in ethnically homogenous neighbourhoods, nor of people living in deprived areas being most suspicious of those that do or do not look like them. It suggests poverty, not race, makes people uneasy and distrusting of each other. Furthermore, there is little evidence of multiculturalism fostering segregated neighbourhoods. Prominent social geographers’ recent research suggests that segregation is either stable or in decline.

Indeed academics have written that there is no contradiction between multiculturalism and integration, where multicultural is seen as “the political accommodation of difference” and integration is seen as “integrating new identities into the overarching, collective identity of being British”. This view underlines the importance of establishing common identities, common citizenship and of dialogue across different communities. It proposes that the existence and recognition of different identities in a shared political space within a framework of human rights is essential to living in a just and fair multicultural society.

---


89 Modood, T (2007) ‘Multiculturalism’. Tariq Modood is Director of the Centre for the Study of Ethnicity and Citizenship at the University of Bristol.

90 Also see the writings of Will Kymlicka, Bhikhu Parekh and Charles Taylor.
Commentators further emphasise the contribution migrants and refugees can make to the realisation of a fairer and more equal society with an approach that sees each culture as valuable but incomplete; so needing to engage in dialogue with other cultures, to benefit from what they possess; cultural diversity therefore enriches our society. Kundnani would go further and promote the idea that our society can only gain by learning and benefiting from the experience of refugees’ and other migrants’ struggles against persecution and for a better life. The message underpinning his book proposes we build participation around new narratives of solidarity through finding ways to talk about citizenship and belonging that link to a more refined sense of global citizenship, recognising people’s struggles and contribution. By harnessing the energy of migrant communities through their participation we can all realise greater equality.

1.4.2 What refugees say

Recognising that there has been less attention to how refugees and other migrants themselves feel about integration, the Refugee Council, with the University of Birmingham, conducted an extensive survey of refugees’ experiences and views. Their report organised refugees’ own conceptions of, and aspirations for, integration into three main themes:

- functional aspects of integration, relating particularly to employment, education, English language acquisition and housing
- subjective and emotional aspects of belonging and the importance of social networks, social spaces and contact with settled communities
- equality and aspirations for equal citizenship.

Social networks were seen to provide access to ‘know-how’ and to material resources that meet immediate functional needs, emotional resources that provide a sense of belonging and social connection or enhance coping strategies or self-confidence, and capacity-building resources that enable people to define and meet longer-term goals.

The Refugee Council research distinguishes between ‘bonded’ ties that are generated by networks comprising people with shared ethnic or cultural identities (important for generating close relationships, coping mechanisms and resources to help members ‘get by’), and ‘bridged’ ties generated by those networks that comprise members with different identities, but perhaps shared interests, (seen as being based on connections that promote wider social and community cohesion and can enable members to ‘get ahead’).

Lack of choice, material resources, immigration status and what it symbolised in relation to feeling excluded, and lack of employment were seen as key barriers to social networks.

“I don’t choose anything, anything. Everything is chosen for me here, everything is chosen by the government, where to live, when to go, what to do, everything… I want to help this country, make this country my country and help all the society here, give everything that I can to the people, to the society here. Give me a job, I will do anything, anything, and I won’t

ask for no money from anyone then, no benefit, no house, nothing, I will only help everyone, help this country, all the time.”

The Metropolitan Research Trust’s consultation with refugees showed that many defined their integration in terms of their employment success, their social interactions and their personal happiness. In addition to immigration status, interviewees felt that tolerance, secure housing, English language proficiency, social networks and the long-term support of a professional helped them to integrate. Importantly, many interviewed also felt that integration did not take place solely on an individual level; there were also important familial and inter-generational aspects of integration.

1.4.3 What refugee children and young people say

A literature search suggests that there has been limited research on the views that refugee young people have explicitly about integration. One important Children Society consultation report explains settlement in a new country as a process involving both getting basic needs met, such as language, education, security and stable accommodation and also the building of social networks and developing goals for the future. The young refugees consulted describe settlement as starting the day they arrived in the place of exile and continuing up to the time they feel safe and happy at school, at home and in everyday life. It involves being released from anxiety, fear and uncertainty; being able to achieve something in life through your own efforts; being empowered and able to participate in normal activities and decisions that affect you. It is seen as a gradual process of adapting to a new and welcoming environment; and as a two-way process. The young refugees interviewed believed that the way they are treated when they arrive has a long-term impact on future settlement and that integration follows on naturally from settlement.

“Any evaluation of integration must be concerned with the aim that refugees should become active members of the host society. Integration is a multi-faceted process – encompassing legal, social, cultural and economic aspects. Significantly, there is a subjective element to integration, hence refugees’ perceptions of their integration is central.”

More recent research published by the Children’s Society, but this time planned and carried out by the young refugees themselves, looked at three issues they thought most important: how they felt about London, education and bullying. Other consultations with newly arrived refugees and asylum-seekers identify similar issues as of most relevance to their early settlement and integration, as well as racism, accessing school and social networks, living in sub-standard temporary accommodation, dealing with an arduous and punitive asylum process, and combating isolation.

---
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1.5 Barriers to integration

Lack of familiarity with their new environment, of practical information, of knowledge of rights and responsibilities, and of opportunities to meet local people and socialise with them are among some of the barriers identified by new migrant communities – including refugees and stakeholders – involved in delivering services to them, particularly early on in their settlement in the UK. Others include having to manage urgent survival needs, public hostility and ignorance, and lack of English.\(^{100}\)

UKBA Research Report 36\(^{101}\) found that some groups of refugees are more likely to experience multiple barriers to integration in the UK. For example those from Eritrea and Somalia are likely to have low English language ability and no qualifications on arrival in the UK. Older refugees are more likely to have a low level of English language ability and to experience poorer health than younger refugees. Almost two-thirds of refugees who lived with children had at least one child under the age of five in their care.

Integration clearly does not depend only on individual refugees’ efforts to integrate, but also on the opportunities offered them by the host society.\(^{102}\) Research shows that refugee communities are among the poorest people in the UK\(^{103}\). Most asylum-seekers in the UK are living in poverty and experience poor health and hunger. Asylum-seekers are not allowed to work and are forced to rely on state support, this can be just above £5 a day to live on.\(^{104}\) A new study of Black African settlement in the UK\(^{105}\) found that Somali and Congolese refugee communities were the most socio-economically deprived communities within the ‘Black African’ group. This experience of poverty is confirmed by what refugees themselves say about integration.\(^{106}\) Lack of material resources and lack of employment are seen as key barriers.

Socio-economic barriers to integration are recognised as a major block to integration by charities that support asylum-seekers and other new migrant communities. A 2008 Children’s Society study of the living conditions of asylum-seekers in the UK found that children were living in dirty, unsafe and overcrowded conditions, some large families were housed in one or two rooms and their accommodation was often without heating or electricity. Their self-advocacy was deeply compromised by isolation and the constant fear that they may be

\^102\ van Liempt, I (2011) From Dutch dispersal to ethnic enclaves in the UK: The relationship between segregation and integration examined through the eyes of Somalis. Urban Studies
\^103\ Children’s Society (2011) I Don’t Feel Human: Experiences of destitution amongst young refugees and migrants http://www.childrenssociety.org.uk/sites/default/files/tcs/research_docs/thechildrenssociety_idontfeelhuman_final.pdf (last accessed August 2012)
\^104\ UKBA, cash support for a single asylum-seeker aged 18 and over.
\^105\ Aspinall P., Milton L. (2010) Black Africans in Britain: Integration of segregation? University of Kent
\^106\ The Refugee Council (2007) Refugee Experiences of Integration, The Refugee Council and Birmingham University.

returned to unsafe countries. A more recent 2011 Children's Society study says it has seen a ‘noticeable rise’ in the numbers of child migrants seeking its help. The report suggests more children are suffering homelessness and hunger as a result of restrictions on the benefits they can claim.

Because their migration to the UK is forced, refugees and their families can be more vulnerable to social exclusion, prejudice and discrimination than other new international migrants. This can be compounded by the national policy of dispersal where many of these children and young people arrive in communities unused to cultural diversity.

Information about attitudes to asylum-seekers and refugees is limited. Social attitudes surveyed over the last few years consistently provide data that suggests sometimes high levels of hostility towards asylum-seekers, including among existing minority ethnic communities. A recent survey by the British Red Cross found that attitudes to asylum-seekers in Britain are being skewed both by gross over-estimation of the numbers of refugees reaching the UK and prejudice towards immigrants among young people. Of particular concern was the negative image of asylum-seekers among the 18-24 age group, where nearly two-thirds chose the word ‘uneducated’ and 33 per cent used ‘hostile’ when asked to describe refugees.

Research also suggests that a complex set of factors influence attitudes towards refugees and asylum-seekers. These included labour market position and income, educational background, ethnicity, contact with minority ethnic groups, knowledge of asylum and immigration issues and the context of the dominant political and media discourse. Whereas Independent Asylum Commission research showed people strongly believing that offering ‘sanctuary’ to the persecuted was a good thing, attitudes became more hostile when using the word ‘asylum’.

1.5.1 Refugee children and young people

Refugee children and young people are a very diverse group. Their age and developmental history may influence health and education outcomes and how they manage the experience of being a refugee. They may be especially vulnerable in times of persecution, war and conflict because of their dependency on others and their inability to understand fully many of the situations they are forced to confront.
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Home Office and Department of Health\textsuperscript{116} guidance recognises that on arrival in the UK, refugee children, especially those who are unaccompanied, can face many difficulties, including:

- getting used to a new culture and language, and not understanding systems in the UK
- emotional problems, such as loneliness or depression
- social isolation
- not speaking, reading or writing English
- managing family separation and personal bereavements
- dealing with discrimination and racism
- accessing services
- the pressures of the asylum system, fearing being removed from the country and having their age disputed.

University of Cambridge research\textsuperscript{117} also identifies that refugee children’s behaviours as a result of their experiences can be misinterpreted. The research highlights that refugee children can have feelings of guilt as a result of having to leave family members behind, and that they are having to cope with a new culture, changes in family relationships, frequent school moves due to the asylum process or being in temporary accommodation, and vulnerability to more frequent health problems.

SHARED Futures’ focus group consultations with refugee children and their parents/carers, identified a number of additional problems and barriers to integration. These included loss of identity, barriers to educational attainment, uncertainty about the future, stress in families and particular problems facing unaccompanied and separated children.\textsuperscript{118}

Although most refugee children and young people are very resilient, research has found that lone asylum-seeking children were more likely to have experienced high levels of war trauma, combat and torture than those who arrived in the country with adult carers.\textsuperscript{119} The study revealed that UASC are at much greater risk of mental health problems than their accompanied peers.

**Barriers to learning**

Refugee pupils come from a wide variety of backgrounds, with many different experiences. Refugee pupils may have literacy skills in other languages, and may already have attended school in the UK and other countries. Some may never have attended school previously or may have gaps in their learning. They may be managing difficult transitions at home as well as at school.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{116} Ibid
\textsuperscript{118} SHARED Futures (2007) *Consulting Refugee and Asylum-seeker Focus Groups and Host Young People for the Shared Futures Project: Supporting the integration of refugee children and young people in school and the wider community*. See: www.sharedfutures.org.uk
\textsuperscript{119} Hodes M. et al. (2008) ‘Risk and resilience for psychological distress amongst unaccompanied asylum-seeking adolescents’. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*
\textsuperscript{120} Home Office and Department for Education (DfE) guidance on refugee integration into schools 2007 http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090805000644/http://www.nrif.org.uk/
Extensive consultations by SHARED Futures\textsuperscript{121} with refugee children, their parents/carers, and the host community identified a number of problems and barriers to making progress in school. These included:

- coping with the differences between the education system in the UK and the system they had been used to in their home countries (including differences in the school curriculum, culture and organisation)
- the challenge of learning in an environment in which some pupils have low aspirations
- the fact that some teachers do not set good examples to pupils
- low expectations
- bullying and racism
- language and communication problems.

The young people also identified a lack of discipline in school, the poor behaviour of some pupils, and noise levels in the classroom as presenting barriers to progress. Catherine Burcham’s research into how male adolescent refugees experienced their transfer and adaptation to a secondary school in the UK\textsuperscript{122} identified the same issues, together with feeling unsafe and feeling that not getting the settling-in they needed presented a major difficulty for them. Being bullied was also part of most of the young people’s experiences, especially during the early stages of their transfer. One participant to the research experienced the bullying “triggering post traumatic stress disorder” (PTSD).

The Refugee Council’s extensive consultation with refugee children, families and providers\textsuperscript{123} found barriers to inclusion included lack of financial resources to support children’s participation in school trips and out-of-hours activities. Families also had difficulties providing school uniforms and other school-related materials. The research further suggested that experiences ‘of trauma and flight’ can have a profound impact on the behaviour of refugee children and relationships with teachers and other children.

UNICEF’s 2010 report\textsuperscript{124} surveying the experiences of UASC’s and professionals in three boroughs in the UK, found particular barriers included: problems understanding the education system and different syllabus; entering the education system in KS4 when their peers are busy in the middle of General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) courses; being taught by teachers who were not skilled in supporting English language acquisition; and dealing with complex feelings of belonging and aspiration when still unsure as to whether their asylum application would be successful.

\textsuperscript{121} SHARED Futures (2007) Consulting Refugee and Asylum-seeker Focus Groups and Host Young People for the Shared Futures Project: Supporting the integration of refugee children and young people in school and the wider community. See: www.sharedfutures.org.uk


1.6 Promoting refugee children’s well-being

1.6.1 The psycho-social needs of refugees

Whilst stressing that refugees have very diverse backgrounds and are unique individuals with different experiences of persecution, flight and exile, the refugee experience is, as Ron Baker has written,\(^{125}\) essentially one that involves loss.

“Loss of what is obvious, tangible and external such as possessions, a home, work, role, status, life style, a language, loved members of the family or other close relationships; and loss that is less obvious, ‘internal’ and ‘subjective’ such as loss of trust in the self and others, loss of self esteem, self respect and personal identity”.

Ron Baker constructed a simple diagram, which he called a ‘relationship web’, which is helpful in understanding the position of a refugee. A person is normally held in position in his or her culture by a ‘web’ of relationships and connections to other people and social structures. These provide status, affirmation and a sense of connection and belonging. In the process of being forcibly uprooted and becoming a refugee, a person is “usually dramatically stripped of this web representing a massive threat and challenge to the individual’s coping and adaptive capacities”.

Department of Health guidance from 2009,\(^{126}\) drawing on a range of research, emphasised that it is important to remember that, despite having what may have been traumatic experiences, most refugees are not suffering from mental illnesses. Many refugees will be resilient and will have many positive coping strategies. However their traumatic experiences can, for some, have a significant impact on their mental well-being in a variety of ways. Assessment must however take proper account of cultural differences. What may seem odd to someone in this country may in other cultures be recognised as a normal reaction to distressing experiences.

PTSD is a term used to describe a psychological and physical condition that can be caused by extremely frightening or distressing events. It consists of a number of symptoms relating to the re-experiencing of aspects of the original distressing event, for example in nightmares, intrusive memories or flashbacks. When these symptoms affect the person to such a degree that they are no longer able to function in their day-to-day life, and if they persist, a person may be diagnosed as having PTSD.\(^{127}\)

Summerfield\(^{128}\) describes how the impact of war and conflict on mental health is an area of contention for academics and specialist mental health professionals. There are different understandings and conceptualisations of the social, personal, and health-related consequences of warfare. In the ‘west’, psychological explanations are frequently used in relation to people’s problems and experiences. Summerfield argues that for refugees this

---


\(^{127}\) Ibid.

means that rather than their distress being seen in western terms as PTSD, it is important that their distress is recognised as being a normative and adaptive communication.

1.6.2 Children and young people

Most refugee children and young people are very resilient despite these experiences. However, the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health’s guidance recognises that children may be affected by their parents’ psychological state. Refugee parents, pre-occupied with the traumas they have suffered and many difficulties they face, may not be as emotionally available to their children as they might wish. The British Medical Association (BMA) identified that, due to socio-economic pressures, certain groups of children and adolescents are at greater risk of suffering mental health problems, including refugee children. Indeed the mental health of refugee children, as with any young person, must be considered within a wider context. It is important to take account of issues that impact upon mental health such as housing, education, safety, economic well-being and family situations. To respond adequately, professionals must appreciate the range of problems faced by refugee families and the particular disadvantages experienced by unaccompanied minors.

Richman (1998) points out that it is often assumed refugee children are traumatised by their experiences and in need of specialist treatment, but that in practice few are, or do. She stresses the need to realise that symptoms of PTSD related to past experiences offer only a partial view of suffering arising from organised violence.

“Other aspects such as loss, bereavement and separation, and current stressors related to asylum, poverty, housing and obstacles to integration, are equally important.”

Richard Hamilton and Dennis Moore outline a range of theoretical perspectives, proposing a framework that can acknowledge the very diverse backgrounds and experiences of children, and the divergence of contributing factors and potential effects. They draw on Urie Bronfenbrenner’s contributions to the field of developmental psychology and his ecological, socio-cultural view of child development because of the significance of contextual events on refugee children.

Bronfenbrenner’s ecological theory emphasises the importance of contexts in human development. According to Bronfenbrenner, development occurs in contexts; his model separates aspects of the child’s environment according to the immediacy with which they impact of the developing child. Bronfenbrenner visualised these interacting systems nested one inside the other. The key implications are that development is a process of mutual accommodation, characterised by reciprocity. A person is not only influenced by his or her environment but also influences that environment; and the environment of interest is not a

---
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131 The British Medical Association (BMA) Child and adolescent mental health – a guide for healthcare professionals www.bma.org.uk/ap.nsf/content/Childadolescentmentalhealth (last accessed August 2012)
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single, immediate setting but incorporates several settings and the interconnections between them.

Hamilton and Moore argue that ecological approaches allow us to consider the impact of personal and environmental factors on the development of refugee children. They propose a development model that can be used to describe and track changes that children go through over a period of time. The model attempts to make a distinction between pre-migration, trans-migration and post-migration factors.

- **pre-migration factors** include experiences of refugees that occurred prior to leaving the home country
- **trans-migration factors** include those experiences that occurred in the transition from home to host country
- **post-migration factors** include those experiences that occur on arrival in the host country.

### 1.6.3 Positive interventions

These theoretical perspectives have clear implications for our planning of practice responses to:

- mental health related to grief, loss and trauma
- migration and displacement and post-migration stressors. These include the physical change of location, the need to acquire a different language and issues of culture and minority status
- the need to promote the resilience of children to help them overcome adversity to achieve good ‘developmental outcomes’. Such a focus helps identify factors that support healthy adaptation, supporting the development of useful, often school-based, interventions
- the vulnerability of refugee children to finding themselves ‘at the margins’ in a school system dependent on classification and labelling. Such labelling can also adversely affect refugee children’s adaptation.

However there is a paucity of material specifically on school-based interventions to promote the well-being of refugee children.

Baker’s ‘relationship web’ is, however, a model of some value because it shows us the extent of the loss occurring from a fracturing of relationship networks. It can suggest some of the interventions and strategies that can be adopted to support refugees. Baker himself argues that “help will be or ought to be directed toward rebuilding (the) relationship web in a variety of ways”. He emphasises that raising awareness of what it means to be a refugee is a vital first step in understanding the needs of children. Attention needs to be given towards the totality of each child’s experience rather than focusing exclusively on the psychological aspects of health and well-being. A range of strategies and interventions need to be deployed to promote recovery and well-being.

---

Richman\textsuperscript{139} explains that the barriers, or ‘risk factors’, interrelate with the ‘positive factors’, or ‘protective’ factors in children’s lives, which may shield children from distress. These can include supportive parents or other carers who are coping well with their situation, belief systems that can guide and support, social supports within and beyond family, a sense of structure and meaning, positive self-esteem, and an educational environment that provides structure, access to ‘normal’ childhood experiences and positive experiences.

"Children and families are affected by events from the past, current stresses and positive aspects in their lives. Support therefore needs to be multifaceted, to promote positive factors that can outweigh negative ones, building on children’s strengths, giving them hope for the future."\textsuperscript{140}

Tolfree (1996) explains the importance of recognising that the starting point for planning interventions must be people’s own ability and capacity to deal with their experiences.\textsuperscript{141} This emphasis on resilience does not mean that children who are resilient do not experience symptoms of distress, but children need to be seen as active survivors, rather than as passive victims. Children may have considerable inner resources for coping; a significant proportion of children exposed to stress remain resilient. We need to understand people’s own perceptions, develop programmes that support social integration rather than segregation, build on children and families’ strengths and resources, prioritise family support, and provide protection, security, a daily structure, play and recreation, together with opportunities for children to piece together their difficult experiences. Throughout, children need to be recognised as active agents in their own development through participation.

Such an approach not only considers the adaptation of the child to their new school environment, but also the schools’ and teachers’ inclusiveness. Hamilton and Moore\textsuperscript{142} emphasise that adaptation is a mutual process. "Not only will the child be required to adapt but schools, teachers and existing pupils will also need to adapt to the child." A critical characteristic of schools most likely to have positive effects on children is a willingness to make changes for their benefit. A measure of the success of educational intervention needs, therefore, to focus not only on for example a child’s individual behaviour, progress, peer relations and health, but also on changes to school policy and practice.

1.7 The role of the school

There is a great deal of evidence to support the key role that schools play in promoting both the well-being of refugee children and young people, and positive integration outcomes.\textsuperscript{143} Going to school can help restore normal daily routines and provide a sense of security, friendship and academic success.\textsuperscript{144} School can help refugee children make sense of their

\begin{small}
\textsuperscript{139} Richman N. (1998) \textit{In the Midst of the Whirlwind}, Trentham Books. Staffordshire
\textsuperscript{140} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{141} Tolfree, D. (1996) \textit{Restoring Playfulness – Different Approaches to Assisting Children who are Psychologically Affected by War or Displacement}, Radda Barnen (Swedish Save the Children)
\textsuperscript{143} SHARED Futures (2007) The Integration of Refugee Children: A review of research and current practice - Supporting the integration of refugee children and young people in school and the wider community. See: www.sharedfutures.org.uk (last accessed August 2012)
\end{small}
past experiences and provide a bridge to building a new life.\textsuperscript{145} At the heart of the local community, schools can actively reach out to include all sections of the local population, and facilitate communication and social connections between them. For refugee families, schools are also places where they can obtain important information and advice about local services and ways to obtain further support. By accessing school, refugee children and families can therefore receive help with their immediate needs and start the process of integration.\textsuperscript{146}

LAs and schools with considerable experience of working with young refugees and their families have continued to develop and refine their practice, while many other LAs and schools without such experience have also admitted young refugees, especially since the Government introduced a policy of dispersing asylum-seeking families and individuals to a variety of locations in the UK.\textsuperscript{147}

Ofsted noted that many schools enrolling new arrivals responded positively to providing for the education and welfare of refugee pupils and their families.\textsuperscript{148}

However, more recent research suggests that professional practice is often inconsistent across LAs and schools both in terms of quality and scope.\textsuperscript{149} Arnot and Pinson (2005) identified six broad models of local authority provision:

- the holistic model: in which the emphasis is on the whole child and on meeting a range of needs that arise from their individual circumstances
- the EAL pupil model: in which the emphasis is on provision of EAL teaching and support
- the minority ethnic pupil: in which the emphasis is on raising attainment within the National Curriculum
- the new arrivals model: in which the emphasis is on induction of pupils into the school and early EAL teaching
- the race equality model: in which the emphasis is on eliminating racial harassment and discrimination and fostering hospitality to diversity
- the vulnerable children model: in which the emphasis is on gaining and maintaining access to education.

This classification accounts for the varying perceptions different LAs may have of young refugees and their needs and the priority they give to these needs. Schools are likely to adopt similar responses to their LA advisors, although whichever model they use it is likely to include some EAL provision.

“A consequence of this is that young refugees are subsumed within more general groups defined by language background or ethnicity. Consequently their particular circumstances and needs as refugees may not be identified or catered for. While any ranking of priorities

\textsuperscript{147} See section 1.3, paragraph 3 above
A ‘holistic’ approach to developing provision for young refugees necessarily starts from the experiences of young refugees themselves; it is a child-centred approach that locates provision in the collective practice of all the agencies that are involved in a young person’s life. In practical terms this illustrates, for example, that a whole-school response to young refugees is vital and cannot be the responsibility of just one designated individual or team. In turn, this cannot remain entirely the responsibility of the school but must be shared by various teams within local authority children’s services and other service providers such as health and housing.

“Nevertheless, the school is the crucially important key provider, in that it is uniquely placed to be the hub for all the activities carried out by individuals and agencies. Whether or not the school assumes this role is dependent on the extent to which it has an ethos of inclusion.”

1.7.1 What young people say

A consultation of more than 700 young asylum-seekers from 27 schools was undertaken by Save the Children and Glasgow City Council. More than 75 per cent ranked school as the best thing about living in Glasgow. Children and young people said that going to school helped them to feel normal, make friends and learn English. They also said it was easier to make friends at school than in the community where they live.

Young refugees have identified key elements of practice that supported them to settle into school:

- the whole family being made welcome and having friendships and people to trust
- good induction with rules and routines explained, along with how things are different to where they came from and how people are protected and free to practice their own religion
- caring, supportive and friendly teachers who are confident and interested in teaching children and young people from diverse backgrounds
- being included in all activities, including extended school activities, and being supported to befriend children from the host community
- opportunities to do activities with refugee and non-refugee peers – both in and out of school
- being encouraged to contribute and take responsibility from early on


Ibid.


• schools that provided interpretation and outreach such as home-school support
• being in a school that values and celebrates their cultures.

1.8 School practice

1.8.1 Policy context

The Convention on the Rights of the Child
There is a range of international instruments to ensure the protection of refugee children. One of the most comprehensive is the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) adopted by the UN General Assembly on 20 November 1989, and ratified by the UK on 16 December 1991.

Key principles are enshrined in the first three articles of the Convention: all rights in the Convention apply to all children without any discrimination of any kind, and the best interests of the child must be a primary consideration in all actions concerning children. The right of all children to an opinion and to have that opinion taken into account, in any matter or procedure affecting the child, is enshrined in Article 12.

Although the Convention relates to the protection of and support for the development of all children, certain articles are of particular significance to refugees. This includes the right of refugee children to appropriate protection and humanitarian assistance, to be reunited with parents, and to benefit from social security; and the right to a standard of living adequate for proper development, to enjoy his/her own culture, practice his/her own religion and use his/her own language, and to receive appropriate support for physical and psychological reintegration into society.

A rights-based approach
The CRC’s major innovation is that it gives rights to children. We are used to thinking of children as having needs that should be met, rather than as having legal rights. A rights-based approach supports a sense of obligation, duty and responsibility, rather than goodwill, charity and benevolence. Children can be seen as having strengths and support can be offered to enable the child to move from dependency to empowerment. Whereas needs can be put in order of priority, rights are non-negotiable, non-hierarchical and interdependent.

Further statutory guidance
The Equality Act (2010) places a duty on all public bodies, including schools, academies and colleges, to show due regard to the need to advance equality of opportunity, eliminate discrimination and foster good relations between those with protected characteristics and those without. Protected characteristics, as defined by the Act, include race and ethnicity, gender, disability and sexual orientation. The Act also lays down standards to ensure that criteria for admissions are equally open to children and young people from all communities. The Act explains that “having due regard to the need to foster good relations” involves, in particular, bearing in mind “the need to tackle prejudice and promote understanding”. This clearly has implications for the curriculum and the organisation of schools, and for the 2007 duty of schools to promote community cohesion.

The revised School Admissions Code of Practice (2011) requires admissions authorities to ensure that access to suitable education is secured quickly for children who have no school

155 http://www.unicef.org/crc/ (last accessed August 2012)
place. However, there is a growing body of evidence to suggest that there are complexities arising from the widening range of types of school governance. It is argued that, as they are their own admissions authority, and due to the pressures to raise attainment, some schools are not facilitating equal access, especially where more vulnerable groups are concerned.\textsuperscript{156} Also the academies expansion policy currently represents investment of public resources away from areas of deprivation.\textsuperscript{157}

The Education Act (1996) establishes a legal duty on LAs to provide education to all children of compulsory school age resident within their area, irrespective of the child’s immigration status and appropriate to age, ability and aptitudes, and any special educational needs.

The National Curriculum\textsuperscript{158} sets out a clear, full and statutory entitlement to learning for all pupils, including those pupils who arrive in school at non-standard times. Teachers must plan for the diverse needs of all pupils, including refugees and asylum-seekers. Schools have a responsibility to provide a broad and balanced curriculum for all pupils.

The last government’s strategy for children was set out in the Children Act (2004) and the ‘Every Child Matters’ (ECM) framework\textsuperscript{159}, which marked a change in the way local and national government, and other organisations, worked with children and families. The Children Act (2004) introduced the duty of regard for the welfare of children to almost all state agencies. It also set out a statutory framework for local co-operation to protect children. According to the ECM framework, all organisations with responsibility for services to children ensure that in providing these services they safeguard and promote the welfare of children.

The duty on governing bodies of maintained schools to promote the well-being of pupils in school\textsuperscript{160} came into force in 2007. Section 10 of the 2004 Children Act set out a statutory framework for co-operation arrangements to be made by LAs, with a view to improving the well-being of children in their area. Section 1(1) of the Childcare Act 2006 places a duty on English LAs to improve the well-being of, and reduce inequalities between, young children in the authority’s area.

The education of unaccompanied and separated minors

If a child falls within the criteria set out in section 20 of the Children Act (1989)\textsuperscript{161} and needs to be accommodated, he or she will become ‘looked after’ by the LA. The Education Act (2005) makes provision for the prioritisation of the admissions of looked after children (LAC).

Sections 48 to 52 of the Education and Inspections Act (2006) widen LA powers so that they can direct the admission of LAC to the most suitable school to meet their needs. As part of their statutory duties, the LA must formulate a care plan and hold regular reviews of the child’s placement. The first review must take place within four weeks of the date upon which the child begins to be looked after.\textsuperscript{162}

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{156} Anti-academies Alliance www.antiacademies.org.uk (last accessed August 2012)
  \item \textsuperscript{157} By encouraging schools judged as ‘outstanding’ to become academies, schools disproportionately representing wealthier areas of the UK are receiving greater direct investment.
  \item \textsuperscript{158} https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/QCA-99-457.pdf (last accessed August 2012)
  \item \textsuperscript{159} https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/DfES/1081/2004 (last accessed August 2012)
  \item \textsuperscript{160} Inserted by the Education and Inspections Act (2006) into section 21, after subsection 4, of the Education Act (2002).
  \item \textsuperscript{161} http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/41/section/20 (last accessed 2012)
  \item \textsuperscript{162} Regulation 5 and Schedule 2 of the Review of Children’s Cases Regulations (1991) spell out the issues to be considered in a review. These include the child’s educational needs, progress and development.
\end{itemize}

Statutory Guidance describes what LAs need to do to demonstrate they are actively fulfilling their legal responsibilities to implement this duty.

“Where a placement has been made in an emergency, or where education provision breaks down, the responsible authority, through the child’s social worker and accountable team manager, should ensure that a suitable new education placement is secured within 20 school days. In all other cases suitable education should be arranged before a child is placed.”

Key points relate to promoting the educational achievement of LAC. The duty extends to young people preparing to leave care. Measures of success in discharging the duty include strategic planning and day-to-day processes throughout the LA to demonstrate robust procedures and a culture of proactive commitment to securing the highest educational outcomes for LAC.

Discharging the duty on a day-to-day basis means that a LA should take account of the child’s views, identify educational needs, ensure that all LAC of compulsory school age have an effective and high quality Personal Education Plan (PEP), and ensure that there is a robust assessment of the child’s learning styles. The PEP should reflect the importance of a personalised approach to learning. A high quality PEP should be an achievement record and identify developmental and educational needs. It should set short-term targets, including progress monitoring against each of the areas identified against development and educational needs. It should also set long-term plans and educational targets and aspirations. Information should be shared effectively through inter-agency and inter-authority co-operation.

New Ofsted inspection framework for schools
Recent changes to the inspection framework mean that the limiting judgement on equalities has been removed, and Ofsted no longer report on a school’s compliance with the Equality Act or the duty to promote community cohesion. However, Ofsted inspectors’ scrutiny continues to link strongly to advancing equality of refugee and asylum-seeking children in four principal ways, by considering:

• the extent and nature of gaps in attainment and participation between pupils belonging to protected groups and other pupils, and what schools are doing to reduce or remove such gaps
• the extent to which there are good relations between different groups, as reflected in, for example, low levels of prejudice-related bullying and incidents
• the extent to which pupils from certain backgrounds are disproportionately affected by fixed-term and permanent exclusions

165 In the 2009 inspection framework, schools that did not comply could not be given an overall judgement above ‘satisfactory’.
166 In the 2009 inspection framework, schools that did not comply could not be given an overall judgement above ‘satisfactory’.
1.8.2 Key elements of effective practice

There is a growing body of evidence about what constitutes effective practice across schools, colleges and LAs. This is practice that, as in all successful strategies, is central to the ethos of the education setting, its basic systems and approaches, and is made relevant to all staff. Support for refugee children is not something pursued as an after-thought or by a few committed people working in isolation. A range of guidance published under the previous government, though not always primarily concerned with the integration of refugees, has both captured and influenced the development of practice in schools.

Guidance related to the integration and achievement of refugee pupils, much of it informed by evaluation evidence or case studies of effective practice, includes:

- The Education of Asylum-seeker Pupils (Ofsted 2003)
- Managing Pupil Mobility: Guidance (Department for Education and Skills (DfES), 2003)
- Aiming High: Guidance on Supporting the Education of Asylum-Seeking and Refugee Children (DfES 2004)
- Home Office and Department for Education (DfE) Guidance on Refugee Integration into Schools
- Aiming High: Supporting Effective Use of the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (DfES, 2004)
- Ethnicity and Education: The Evidence on Minority Ethnic Pupils (DfES, 2005)
- Effective Leadership in Multi-Ethnic Schools (National College for School Leadership, 2005)
- Excellence and Enjoyment: Learning and Teaching for Bilingual Children in the Primary Years (DfES Primary National Strategy, 2006)
- Excellence and Enjoyment: Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning (DfES Primary National Strategy, 2005)
- The Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) 2004 guidance, ‘Pathways to Learning for New Arrivals’
- National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (NALDIC) and Teacher Training Agency ITT SEAL website.
- Narrowing the Gap in Outcomes for Vulnerable Groups (Department for Children Schools and Families DCSF/nfer/LGA 2007/8): A review of the research evidence
- Raising the Attainment of Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Somali and Turkish Heritage Pupils (DfES National Strategies 2007)

Key points from this guidance include the importance of:

- a strong ethos of leadership on social justice and race equality. Schools which manage to establish good processes and practices most effectively are often those which perceive themselves as including refugee pupils in their identity
- clear policies on racism and bullying
- an ethos of welcome and belonging; a friendly school
- effective admission and induction systems, and the strategic deployment of specialist staff to ensure high quality assessment and planning for inclusion across the curriculum
- peer support, including buddy schemes for new arrivals
• good links to other services; addressing wider needs
• parental involvement; regular parents meetings, enlisting volunteers, family learning opportunities
• high status for Ethnic Minority Achievement staff
• awareness of language, culture and background of new arrivals
• effective support for English language acquisition
• quick access to play, leisure, sports and after school activities
• a curriculum relevant to a culturally diverse pupil community and valuing home languages
• developing awareness and empathy through the curriculum about refugees and human rights, and celebrating cultural diversity, including through Refugee Week
• recruiting staff of refugee heritage
• working with other agencies to develop advocacy, social space for families and family support
• particular support for UASC.

The change of government in 2010 led to the archiving of national good practice guidelines and their removal from the website of the Department for Education (DfE). The good practice guidelines are no longer being promoted. However a significant amount of guidance and resources have been put together by LA Ethnic Minority Achievement staff across the UK, much of which is still available.168

Teaching EAL beginners

The influential 2007 Primary and Secondary National Strategies ‘New Arrivals Excellence Programme (NAEP) Guidance’ for teaching beginners of English newly arrived from overseas169 promotes key principles, including:

• Every child in our schools has an entitlement to fulfil their potential through access to the National Curriculum. This is best achieved within a whole-school context where pupils are educated with their peers.
• Children and young people learn best when they feel secure and valued. Schools need to ensure that there is a process to support the integration of new arrivals.
• Schools should focus on the positive contributions made by new arrivals…
• Provision for pupils should be based on a meaningful assessment of their prior knowledge and experience as well as their language proficiency.” 170

Assessment

NAEP identifies that a key challenge for teachers is to collect data gathered through assessment of the learning of new arrivals so that it can be used formatively and feed back into classroom planning. Initial assessment needs to establish the previous academic achievement and English language levels of each new arrival; inform the setting of suitable
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learning challenges; provide a framework for tracking progress; and help establish what further support is needed. Identifying and activating prior learning is a key focus of guidance on assessment for all pupils.\textsuperscript{171}

“Assessment is about recognising evidence of learning so teachers can help individuals progress. This approach to assessment will help schools to design a curriculum around the needs, capabilities and aspirations of their learners, and use assessment to strengthen learning.”\textsuperscript{172}

The new Ofsted evaluation framework and accompanying guidance\textsuperscript{173} emphasises that inspectors will be more rigorous in their scrutiny of assessment for learning strategies in the classroom. Assessment for learning (AfL) has been defined as: “the process of seeking and interpreting evidence for use by learners and their teachers to decide where the learners are in their learning, where they need to go and how best to get there.”\textsuperscript{174}

There are two main purposes of assessment. Assessment of learning summarises where learners have reached at a given point in time, in terms of attainment and achievement. Assessment for learning informs the next steps to teaching and learning. AfL involves\textsuperscript{175} using assessment in the classroom to raise pupils’ achievement. It therefore closely links to participation methodologies because it is based on the idea that pupils will improve most if they understand the aim of their learning, where they are in relation to this aim, and how they can achieve the aim or close the gap in their knowledge\textsuperscript{176}.

To use AfL effectively, schools need an ethos that promotes trusting relationships, encourages and builds self-esteem, and believes that all pupils can improve. Teachers need to develop a range of practices, some of which are particularly relevant to developing pupil participation, for example, knowing their pupils better, sharing learning intentions with pupils, encouraging pupils to take responsibility for their learning, adapting teaching and learning to meet the needs of individuals or groups of pupils, and developing peer- and self-assessment so that pupils can take charge of their own learning.\textsuperscript{177}

Developing a culturally inclusive curriculum

The curriculum, resources used and the climate for learning all play a vital role in the extent to which pupils from a refugee background feel included and accepted in school. Schools are responsible for preparing all pupils for life in Britain’s multiracial, multicultural society. An inclusive curriculum can help all learners learn about and understand other cultures.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{171} Ibid
  \item \textsuperscript{172} Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (2008) A Fresh Approach to Assessment. QCA briefing to teachers, headteachers, senior managers, local authorities, governors, DFCS
  \item \textsuperscript{173} Ofsted Framework and Evaluation Schedule (January 2012); Guidance for school inspectors http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/conducting-school-inspections-guidance-for-inspectors-of-schools-january-2012
  \item \textsuperscript{174} Assessment Reform Group (2002) Assessment for Learning: 10 principles.
\end{itemize}
The Equality Act (2010) places a duty on schools to show due regard to three needs, including the need to promote equality of opportunity. Having due regard to the need to advancing equality of opportunity involves, in particular:

- removing or minimising disadvantages suffered by people which are connected to a particular characteristic they have
- taking steps to meet the particular needs of people who have a particular characteristic
- encouraging people who have a particular characteristic to participate fully in any activities.\(^{178}\)

The new Ofsted inspection framework for schools\(^ {179}\) includes close scrutiny of how well the school promotes all pupils’ spiritual, moral, social and cultural development by providing positive experiences through planned and coherent opportunities in the curriculum and through interactions with teachers, other adults and the local community as shown by pupils:

- developing awareness of, and respect towards, diversity in relation to, for example, gender, race, religion and belief, culture, sexual orientation, and disability
- developing the skills and attitudes to enable them to participate fully and positively in a democratic, modern Britain
- understanding and appreciating the range of different cultures within school and further afield as an essential element of their preparation for life.

The views of pupils, parents, carers and the wider community are an important part of a school’s consideration of how culturally inclusive it is. A key challenge for schools is managing to integrate culturally inclusive teaching and learning activities into the curriculum so that they genuinely become part of a school’s ethos.\(^ {180}\)

1.8.3 Developing the role of teaching assistants

TAs are most often deployed by schools to support pupils with special educational needs (SEN). TAs are also used to support newly arrived refugee pupils from overseas, even though most do not have SEN. This deployment has been alongside the expansion of the TA workforce in schools generally,\(^ {181}\) and also a response to the demise of centrally funded EAL specialist teams who provided peripatetic support to EAL learners in schools, including bilingual language assistants.

High quality TA support, especially if enhanced through any bilingual skills a TA may have,\(^ {182}\) can make a contribution to the progress of newly arrived refugee and asylum-
seeking pupils. However, recent extensive research on the impact of TAs on pupils' learning and behaviour gives rise to concern. Although the focus of the research is on the deployment of TAs to support low attaining pupils or those with SEN, the findings are relevant to any consideration of the effectiveness of asylum-seeker and refugee pupil support strategies. The study recognises how the role of TAs has developed from that of supporting the teacher to a more distinct pedagogical role supporting and interacting with pupils. However, the findings give cause for real concern about current classroom practice and how TAs are deployed. The findings include that:

- “TAs lack training, which at best can be patchy due to problems for schools finding time to release TAs for training
- Teachers lack training in how to organise and manage TAs effectively
- TAs frequently experience problems finding time for planning or feedback with teachers
- TAs have at best an indirect effect on pupil standards, providing alternative or replacement support rather than additional support because where TAs are deployed, the attention of the teacher given to those pupils and their needs decreases
- There is no identifiable causal link between TA support and improvement in attainment
- As pupils get older they are more likely to feel a stigma attached to receiving TA support
- Where there was a positive impact on pupils’ positive approaches to learning, it was often where there were high levels of TA support resulting in a much greater pupil attention to learning. However high levels of TA support often meant withdrawal from the classroom, particularly from non-core subjects, to work on basic numeracy and literacy skills. In these settings ‘tasks that attend to pupils’ stronger functions, or are designed to build confidence by practising basic skills, can occur at the expense of tasks that can help pupils make more significant progress’

In the study, schools sometimes recognised how it took great skill to balance support with the need for pupils to develop independent learning skills. Positive approaches to learning were undermined by pupils becoming too dependent on TA support. Unfortunately, teachers recognised this less than TAs themselves, and many were uncertain about how to plan work that fostered independence.

Effective teaching literature emphasises the importance of cognitive engagement, sufficient time and success. TAs roles in providing explanation of concepts, links to prior knowledge, clearly stated learning objectives and questioning that leads to learning are key contributors to cognitive engagement. Prompting pupils, responding supportively and providing feedback can enhance success. Blatchford P. et al. (2012) found that teachers, usually to the whole class, engaged more in explanation of concepts, feedback about learning, introduction to objectives and links to prior knowledge. TAs on the other hand, usually to individuals or small groups, engaged more than teachers in prompts and types of questions. Furthermore, TAs were found to frequently provide the answer when prompting, and that they almost exclusively asked closed questions. “Teachers generally ‘open up’. Whereas TAs ‘close down’ talk with pupils”.

are uniquely able to build on forms of knowledge and cultural experience brought from pupils’ homes, so activating their prior knowledge and enhancing their access to the curriculum.


Ibid. (Chapter 5.3.1)


The research’s conversational analysis suggests key areas for TA professional development, including strategies that foster active pupil participation in learning, such as ways to facilitate learner independence and encouraging pupils to think for themselves. The recommendations are therefore of interest, and include: more joint planning and feedback time between teachers and TAs; the sharing of teachers’ plans with TAs; and TA feedback contributing to further planning and the establishment of explicit roles and tasks, with TAs not routinely only supporting lower attaining pupils or those with SEN.

Other literature about effective teaching confirms the importance of developing independence. Hattie’s (2009) influential research emphasised teachers encouraging pupils to think through and solve problems, either by themselves or as a group, as an important aspect of the quality teaching that made teachers most effective.187

There is little research that addresses pedagogic practices in EAL teaching.188 Literature about the effective teaching of EAL learners who are not making satisfactory progress does confirm the importance of these strategies.189 Setting up an achieving context for these pupils is dependent on the way teachers think about the pupils and on how each pupil appears to each teacher. A dynamic structured learning environment would include the pupil feeling valued as an individual with a home language, life experience and intellect; and effective interactions between the teacher and each pupil that promote learning through supporting positive identities and interventions that boost participation and independence. Where pupils have additional needs, then teachers should develop reflective strategies to open up possible responses. Dr Susan Hart (1996)190 recommends teachers ask what more they need to know, what assumptions they are making, how they feel about the child and how the child herself sees the situation.

---

188 Andrews R. (2009) Review of Research in EAL Institute of Education. Also see NALDIC website research links: www.naldic.org.uk/research-and-information/eal-research-topics
189 LCAS (1999) Enabling Progress in Multilingual Classrooms. LB Enfield
1.8.4 Promoting refugee pupils’ emotional well-being

Home Office and DfE guidance\(^{191}\) emphasises that schools can play a key role in helping refugee children to adapt to the changes they have experienced. Teachers can use their freedom to adapt and shape the curriculum to meet pupils’ emotional needs and overcome some of the barriers these may present for pupils’ learning. Many teachers have found that the curriculum provides opportunities to include refugee pupils’ experiences and explore positive ways of handling problems. Lesson activities can help pupils express their feelings in a safe environment. Opportunities for refugee pupils to articulate and assimilate their experiences can be provided through a range of curriculum subjects, including English and the Expressive Arts. Curriculum subjects such as Personal, Social and Health Education (PSHE), and Drama, can help refugee pupils acquire the skills they need, both socially and emotionally.

School partnerships with charities, refugee community organisations (RCOs) and youth projects.

Home Office and DfE guidance\(^{192}\) has a range of case studies showing how local and national charities and RCOs work on specific projects with schools to support the integration of refugee children and families.

The SHARED Futures resource pack and DVD\(^{193}\) shows collected examples of good practice across the UK that support and promote integration. It includes the work of Salusbury WORLD,\(^{194}\) the charity that developed the resource, with information about its work to provide extended day activities and support for the families of refugee children.

The Shpresa Programme is a grass-roots Albanian-speaking refugee community group that works with local schools to promote an understanding of Albanian culture and traditions through traditional dancing, songs, poetry and story telling. They organise performances in schools as part of Refugee Week, Black History Month, End of the Year activities, and Language Week. The Shpresa Programme aims to build confidence and appreciation among Albanian-speaking children of the culture they come from. This aims to help them successfully integrate into their host community, as well as introduce the culture to local communities to increase understanding and co-operation.\(^{195}\) Shpresa also organises sessions with parents, at which they explain school practices and policies, expectations towards the pupils, the curriculum, and any other issue that may be of concern to this refugee community.

The Children’s Society Leading Edge project\(^{196}\) improved access to education for young refugees aged 11-18. By working in partnership with local schools and young people it provided study support services, designed to improve achievement, integration and inclusion. Leading Edge services included homework club provision, peer welcome and induction.


\(^{192}\) ibid.


\(^{194}\) www.salusburyworld.org.uk

\(^{195}\) See www.shpresaprogramme.com; also see www.youtube.com/watch?v=BfjbrFyEkGI&feature=related (last accessed August 2012).


schemes, group awareness-raising events, conflict resolution training, extra-curricular and holiday activities, and consultancy services.

1.8.5 Developing the curriculum to raise awareness about refugees

Guidance outlines the benefits of raising awareness about refugees and human rights through the curriculum.\(^{197}\) Promoting awareness and tackling press myths means that anti-refugee racism can be more effectively dealt with, making schools safer for refugees. It can also provide opportunities for them to share their experiences if they wish to. Although research suggests that many young people hold negative views about asylum-seekers,\(^{198}\) a British Red Cross survey\(^{199}\) found that 86 per cent of the 1,124 young people surveyed who responded neutrally or negatively to the statement ‘I know about the issues faced about migrants’, changed to a positive response after awareness-raising activities.

There are also real benefits for all pupils from engaging them in critical analysis and linking with global citizenship issues at local, national and international levels. Learning about refugees links closely with National Curriculum Programmes of Study across many subject areas\(^{200}\). For example, in English, History, Religious Education, PSHE and Citizenship Education. It also links strongly to the duty to promote community cohesion: helping children to understand others, value diversity, share values, and develop awareness of human rights and skills of participation and responsible action.\(^{201}\)

Learning about refugees connects strongly to teaching about rights and responsibilities. UNICEF’s 2010 evaluation of the Rights Respecting Schools Award (RRSA) in the UK found that the values based on the CRC and ‘guide to life’ provided by the RRSA had a significant and positive influence on the school ethos, relationships, inclusivity, understanding of the wider world and the well-being of the school community, according to the adults and young people in the evaluation schools.\(^{202}\)

Several charities have supported the development of materials and programmes to embed awareness-raising in the curriculum.\(^{203}\) For example, Refugees into Schools was a recent project run by the Employability Forum which supports refugee volunteers to visit schools across all boroughs in London. Feedback from participating schools suggests a significant impact on pupils’ knowledge and attitudes.\(^{204}\)

Some school partnerships with charities have developed young people’s participation to raise awareness. Positive Press\(^{205}\) was one of a number of projects within Save the Children’s England programme, working with refugee and trafficked children. Young people at Lampton School, Hounslow, London, worked with Positive Press to raise awareness about issues of racism, asylum and immigration. The young people wanted the Positive Press project to

---

199 Positive Images Newsletter May 2011 British Red Cross
204 See Refugees into Schools' feedback from schools http://www.employabilityforum.co.uk/refugees-into-schools/
205 Save the Children (2008) Positive Press: working with the media to challenge racism and discrimination
encourage young people to respect and value others and to show how the media affects people’s attitudes. The young people conducted a range of activities, including developing questionnaires to support interviews of friends, family and the public. They also gathered important information about their local communities, their own histories of migration, refugees and the media. The young people then worked with professional film-makers to produce a DVD. They worked on every aspect and also wrote the music. The film was launched by Save the Children in July 2008.

1.9 Promoting refugee pupil participation

1.9.1 What the guidance says

Pupil participation is a vital resource for supporting integration into schools. By promoting pupil participation and the active involvement of refugee pupils, schools will benefit from the skills and talents of all their pupils. Pupils in schools can be trained to offer friendship and support to new arrivals. Curriculum activities can be developed to support friendship building through collaboration and support for positive identities. Even if new to English, refugee new arrivals can undertake responsibilities in school that help them contribute and belong. Developing skills of participation is an essential element in the Citizenship and PSHE curriculum and can ensure the views of refugees are heard and their experiences are taken into account.

However, whilst there is evidence of the effectiveness and impact of peer support for refugees through buddying and mentoring, there is less evidence to demonstrate the benefits of refugee pupil participation for promoting integration into UK schools.

One way of creating a positive school culture and demonstrating respect for pupils is to provide them with opportunities to contribute their views and to participate in the change process that is part of whole-school improvement. Some of the key characteristics of effective approaches are:

- There is an awareness of what constitutes pupil participation and the benefits it can bring.
- School self-evaluation is informed by the collection of pupils’ views on their learning and other school experiences.
- Ethnic Minority Achievement practitioners have a key role in supporting refugee pupils to develop skills of participation and be involved in participation initiatives.
- There are a range of strategies and approaches that develop skills of participation.


- There are strategies for actively seeking the views of pupils and gaining an insight into their perceptions and experiences.
- There is an effective school council in place. All groups of pupils are represented.
- There are peer support initiatives that enable children and young people to be assisted in various ways by other pupils.
- Pupils are consulted about ways of improving the teaching and learning that goes on in the classroom.
- There are opportunities across the curriculum for pupils to develop skills of participation and learn about their rights and responsibilities.
- There are opportunities for pupils to be involved in the process of recruiting and selecting staff.

Some charities and youth programmes have worked directly with young people or through schools to promote refugee participation. For example:

- Brighter Futures was a self-advocacy project for young asylum-seekers and refugees in England, supported by Save the Children’s England Programme. The project has now closed. There were three groups across the country. Each group focused on its own advocacy campaign, based on key issues identified by members in their area.
- Projects that promote the participation of young refugees have found that, through celebrating diversity and learning about the experiences of refugees, schools can ensure refugee children are welcomed. Schools can also provide opportunities for all young people and local communities to examine critically their own attitudes, understand the global context of their local lives, and develop important skills for life. Greenish and Lewisham’s Young People’s Theatre (GLYPT) VOICES Project involved young people developing an East of England Regional Assembly (EERA) project, ‘Moving Here’. Through this they delivered a theatre and video project for primary schoolchildren to “…improve young people’s perceptions and knowledge in relation to refugee integration and to counter negative images and racist attitudes”.
- New Londoners (2006-2008) and Project Dost worked together to help young separated refugees settle and integrate into the UK. Through the project, 15 New Londoners were mentored by 15 emerging and established London photographers to create personalised photo stories about their views and experiences of London.
- Refugee Youth are a community of young people from around the world, and a network of youth groups working together across London. As a collective of young adults they learn from each other’s experiences as migrants and take action to better their lives and the lives of others like them.
- London Somali Youth Forum is a youth-led organisation that has been established to meet the needs of young Somali people in their respective boroughs in London. Their main objective is to support, empower and inspire young Somalis in London and neighbouring areas through the provision of advice, counselling, mentoring, training, development and community representation, and all other activities that contribute to the above.


www.glypt.co.uk/projects_previous.html

http://www.thetrinitycentre.org/dost/index.html

http://www.photovoice.org/projects/uk/new-londoners

http://www.refugeeyouth.org/

http://www.lsyf.org.uk/ (last accessed August 2012)
1.9.2 The effectiveness of participatory approaches for observing the impact of integration methodologies

The impact of integration activities with refugee children and young people should not be assessed only through quantitative observations, such as using tick lists. Quantitative observations may tell the observer the number and scale of changes that occur, like ‘who was it done by’ and ‘how many times’, but he/she will be unable to gather information around questions such as ‘why something happened’ or ‘how it happened’. Evaluation of the impact of integration work can be enhanced using qualitative approaches, which reinforce and support the data collected through quantitative means. Qualitative and quantitative research often go hand-in-hand, helping us to build a complete picture of both scale and reasons.

However, the two approaches cannot replace each other. We cannot use only qualitative research if we want an end result that presents statistics; and we cannot use only quantitative research if we want to understand accurately the reasons behind a set of figures.

Using participatory, qualitative approaches to collect information and gather stakeholders’ opinions is a good way to assist the measurement of inclusion-focused initiatives. Qualitative but non-participatory observations, for example by outsiders watching and interviewing, collects some information, but researchers will likely miss many things that are not on their (the outsider’s) personal ‘radar’, however closely they try to observe the activities taking place. Thus, to discover what the participants of an initiative are thinking, and how and why they are affected, requires a qualitative and participatory observation approach to gather information from a wider range of perspectives.

Qualitative participatory research focuses on gathering in-depth understandings about a situation and about the experiences, beliefs, ideas and priorities of the stakeholders in this situation. It is concerned with investigating questions of why and how, not just with looking at what happened, and when and where this occurred. Qualitative participatory research also looks at the relationships between stakeholders and the links between aspects of life, with the participants themselves being directly involved in the research process and information and evidence gathering.

Informal, ad hoc qualitative investigation is being done all the time within projects, for instance, whenever staff and stakeholders talk to each other about what is happening, the problems they face and how things are progressing. This is likely to be quite a subjective process, involving personal opinions and one-off pieces of information. However, "when qualitative research is done systematically, the findings are as reliable and objective as those produced by quantitative methods"[215] Therefore, a larger-scale piece of qualitative investigation, using a structured methodology and pre-planned data gathering tools, and implemented by an experienced researcher, can generate valuable and trustworthy data.

The nature of qualitative research also means that it can be done with small samples of participants.

Inevitably, qualitative research does not generate statistics. The process does not help us to find out, for instance, how many children are unhappy at school. It does, however, help us gain an insight into why children are unhappy at school. Therefore, while quantitative research would give us a sense of the scale of the problem, qualitative research provides us with the essential information we need (seen from the perspective of all key stakeholders) to make appropriate decisions about how to solve the problem.

Appendix 3: Details of ice-breaker activities used with pupils

At the beginning of each session pupils, often joined by the facilitators, took part in an activity which referred to the pilot’s objectives, such as pupil collaboration, listening and speaking skills and use of English. These activities were usually led by the LINK youth worker.

**Ball games**

a) *Catch:* This ball game was used to help people get to know each other and learn names. Initially it was played with the LINK youth worker standing in the centre of a circle, and pupils and facilitators standing on the outside. He threw the ball to those in the circle, who had to catch it, say their name, and then return it. Catch was used in other sessions to refresh people’s memory of people’s names, but also to allow pupils to practise their English, for instance by asking questions when they threw the ball to others such as: “What is your name?”

b) *Leg basketball:* This was a fun motivation activity. People stood in a circle with their legs open and tried to throw a football through the legs of others. If the ball went through a person’s legs, he/she dropped out and the circle got smaller.

**Lining up alphabetically**

This ice-breaker tested the pupils’ English language, interpersonal, speaking and listening, and collaboration skills. It also introduced pupils to one another. They lined up in alphabetical order, asking each another their names in English and then ordering themselves from A to Z.

**Post-it name game**

This is another game that helped participant to get to know one another’s names. A facilitator placed the names of pupils, written on post-its, on the wrong people’s backs. Moving around in silence, the pupils worked collaboratively. They removed the incorrect post-its and gave pupils post-its displaying the correct names.

**On the river bank**

This activity was designed to test pupils’ listening skills. Everyone lined up along the edge of the rope; one side was the river bank, and the other side was in the river. Participants stayed in the game if they could move to the correct place when either ‘on the river bank’ or ‘in the river’ was called out. If they did not listen carefully and moved when ‘on the river’ or ‘in the river bank’ were called out, then they were eliminated from the game.

**The sun shines on…**

Everyone sat in a circle with one person standing in the centre. He/she had to think of something that was true to them and some of the others in the circle, e.g. wearing black shoes. He/she then had to say: “The sun shines on someone who wears black
shoes”. Everyone wearing black shoes stood up and tried to swap places while the person in the centre had to try to sit in a vacated chair. Whoever did not find a seat in the circle, stood in the centre and began a new round of ‘the sun shines on someone who…’ This energiser encouraged participants to listen carefully and to speak out when they are in the middle of the circle. It also helped them to learn, understand and remember new words.

‘Knots’ game
This activity tested co-operation, listening and speaking skills. Everyone held hands in a line, and then moved under one another’s arms until they are all tangled up. Then, by communicating with each other, the group tried to unravel the ‘knot’ it has produced, without letting go of one another’s hands.

Relay race
Every person’s name was written on a post-it and stuck on the board. The participants were put into groups and lined up one behind the other at the far end of the room. One team member at a time ran to the board to collect their name. When they returned to the team the next group member set off. The group that collected all their names first was the winner.

‘Haka’
In Session 6, as a consequence of the pupils’ lack of concentration during previous weeks, the facilitators decided to design an activity that could be used “when concentration seems to be flagging”. Three groups of pupils designed a short performance, a ‘Haka’ – named after the New Zealand rugby team’s ‘Haka’, performed at the start of matches. Their ‘Hakas’ had to involve movement, sound and a formation. Whenever ‘Haka’ was shouted by facilitators – when they observed the pupils were off task, losing concentration or displaying disruptive behaviour – the groups assembled and performed their ‘Hakas’. The group that finished first gained a point. Pupils were also able to shout ‘Haka’ if they felt they were being disrupted by others. This energiser refocused the pupils.

Yagul
Two groups stood at either end of the room. One group held a flag (a tie). One member of the other team had to walk up and collect the flag without laughing. If they managed this with a straight face then they could collect the flag and take it back to their group. However, the group holding the flag could keep it if they managed to make the pupil laugh. If the flag was ‘captured’, then the other group tried to retake it in the same way.

Spot the leader
Everyone sat or stood in a circle. One or two people went outside the room. The rest of the group nominated a ‘leader’ and had to copy whatever the leader did, e.g., tapping his/her head or hopping. The leader could change the movement they were doing. The people outside the room come back in and had to guess who the ‘leader’ was. If they were correct, someone else went outside and the game continued, with a new leader being chosen.
**Number game**
Participants stood in a circle. Taking it in turns around the circle, they counted from one upwards. Anyone saying a number that was a multiple of three clapped their hands instead of saying the number. Anyone saying a number that was a multiple of four turned around once instead of saying the number. Anyone whose number was a multiple of three and four, (e.g., 12), clapped and turned around. Those pupils who made mistakes dropped out.

**Elephant, giraffe, toaster**
People stood in a circle. Someone demonstrated the different positions for ‘Elephant’, ‘Giraffe’ and ‘Toaster’. Each ‘position’ needed three people, (e.g., one person as the giraffe’s head, two others representing its ears). One person stood in the middle of the circle. She/he pointed to someone in the circle and said either ‘Elephant’, ‘Giraffe’ or ‘Toaster’. That person, and the two people either side of him/her, immediately acted out the word. If anyone hesitated or got their action wrong, they replaced the person in the centre of the circle and the activity was repeated.
### Appendix 4: Details of activities carried out in Step 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Sessi</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of English</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>To assist in getting to know each other, pairs of pupils asked each another basic questions (such as &quot;where are you from&quot;), and wrote down the answers. They exchanged answer sheets with other pairs who read out the information to the whole group. Pupils then guessed who was being described.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matching pictures with statements</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>In small groups pupils matched health statements with pictures, and wrote out the statements below the pictures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key words/ phrases/feelings</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>TAs took it in turns to note on flipchart any new words that arose for the pupils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brainstorming and in-depth group discussion</td>
<td>On-going</td>
<td>These covered things like ‘rules everyone should follow in the sessions’, and health and safety issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drawing pictures and creating posters</td>
<td>Several sessions</td>
<td>For example in Session 3 pupils created and presented posters about different health issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>‘Freeze frame’ role-play and drama</td>
<td>1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Used for investigating how included the pupils felt at school. Pupils were given photos of different activities in other schools (e.g., break time, class activities). Each group prepared a role play based on the photo, the final scene being a freeze frame of the photo. Other groups guessed what the play was about, and everyone discussed whether this was like their school. A second drama activity asked pupils in 3 groups to create silent drama about places where they felt unsafe. The audience guessed where the scenes were taking place and what was happening. The three groups created a drama about bullying (their chosen topic to focus on throughout the pilot).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Agree/disagree activities

4

5

Pupils stood on a line, one end of the line represented ‘agree’ and the other end represented ‘disagree’. When a statement was read out pupils moved to a position on the line that represented how they felt about the statement. The statements mostly focused on safety (which had been raised by pupils as an issue in Session 3, and the line was adapted so that one end represented ‘very safe’, the other ‘very unsafe’). An adapted version of the activity used a ‘safe’/’unsafe’ line on a white board, and pupils stuck their names onto the line, depending on how safe they felt, and discussed their reasons.

Choosing a topic

6 & 7

In small groups pupils wrote their main concerns on flipchart paper, indicating how common and serious these concerns were, and how much the pupils could do about these issues. They ranked the concerns, and scores from all groups were collated. ‘Bullying and racism’ was the highest ranking topic and thus chosen as the topic for Steps 2-6.
Appendix 5: Pupils’ play about bullying

The cast and others directing and filming included:

Bullies – P4, P5, P6, P21
Victims of bullying – P7, P14
Dinner man – P1
Head-teacher – P3
Judges/Jury – P2, P13, P15, P17
Camera operators – P5, P18
Directors – P3, P11.

• Act 1 – The bullying incident
Some pupils are from a different country, not speaking much English. In the school canteen the bullies push each other into these pupils – the victims of bullying – who have just bought their lunches from the dinner man. Drinks and food are spilled and the victims of bullying fall over. The bullies point and laugh. One of the victims gets up and kicks one of the bullies. They start fighting. At this moment the headteacher comes in, stops the pupils fighting, remonstrates with them, telling them that they will be punished and marches them out of the school canteen.

• Act 2 – The bully court
Everyone is in the court except the judges. They enter and the court rises. The head judge (P2) welcomes everyone and calls the first witness – the dinner man (P1). P2 then interviews the victims of bullying (P7 and P14), the headteacher (P3) and the bullies (P4, P5, P6 and P21). The head judge says that he and the associate judges will leave the court to discuss the case and give their verdict. Someone calls out “all rise” and the judges leave.

• Act 3 – The verdict: given by the audience
The footage shot during the drama was downloaded and cut by the CtC consultant. It was shown to the pupils during Session 19 to collect their feedback and to ask them where they would like it to be shown, and to whom.
Appendix 6: Descriptive detail of other project activities carried out by participants during steps 2-5

**Faces showing emotions**

During Session 8 cartoon faces with different expressions were used as props to illustrate how bullied people, and the bully, could feel when bullying occurs. In groups, pupils matched the expressions to words of emotions such as sad, happy, embarrassed, worried or laughing.

**Research**

Throughout Step 2 pupils carried out research about their chosen topic: bullying and racism. During Session 8 they did some initial research using the Internet and found a number of film clips about bullying which they then presented to the group. A discussion followed.

During Sessions 9 to 12 the pupils created a series of questionnaires to be used to collect information from a variety of sources: pupils, teachers, family members, and the community police officer (stationed at the school), about their thoughts and experiences of bullying. Firstly they discussed and decided on a number of important questions to ask about bullying, such as:

- What is bullying?
- Have you ever been bullied?
- Why does it happen?
- Where did it happen?
- Who was there?
- How often does it happen?
- How does it make you feel?
- Is it a problem in this school?
- How can we solve this problem?
- Who can help you sort out this problem?
- Is there real help from teachers to solve this?

In Sessions 10 and 11 the pupils discussed how they would find out answers to these questions. For example:

- How will we collect the information? (e.g., through surveys or questionnaires)
- Who do we need to speak to? (e.g., pupils, teachers, family members, or the community police officer)
- Where do we need to go? (e.g., which parts of the school or outside school)
- Which pupils/groups will collect what information? (e.g., assigning group tasks.)
These questions were discussed in small groups and ideas inserted into a whole-group table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What do we want to find out? (Our questions.)</th>
<th>How will we collect the information?</th>
<th>Who do we need to speak to?</th>
<th>Where do we need to go?</th>
<th>Who will collect the information?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.g., What is bullying?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During Session 12 the pupils typed up and formatted their questions into questionnaires for four audiences:

- teenagers – older pupils in the school, e.g., sixth form pupils
- teachers
- the community police officer
- family members.

They typed up and printed these for use the following week (Session 13).

The group carried out a trial run using a variety of crisp flavours. The pupils tasted the crisps and decided their favourite and least favourite flavours and then tallied the scores to discover the group’s favourite crisp.

During Session 13 the pupils divided into three groups. One group interviewed the teenagers (in the sixth form block), one group interviewed some teachers, and one group went to speak to the community police officer. They worked in pairs, one person asking questions while the other filled out the questionnaires. Sometimes they swapped roles. Unfortunately the community police officer was unavailable so this group completed additional teacher questionnaires.

For homework the pupils took the family questionnaires home and completed them with their parents, aunts, uncles, siblings, or guardians.

**Sharing information**

Following the crisp flavour rehearsal, the pupils had displayed their findings in bar charts, pie charts and pictograms. In Session 14, they referred to these when thinking about how to display the information they had collected on bullying. They consulted their questionnaires – which recorded the thoughts of teenagers, teachers and family members – tallied the information, and produced similar bar charts, pie charts, pictograms and posters (containing quotes) to display their results. These were completed during Session 15. Pupils then presented their findings to the whole group and held a question and answer session.
Action planning

Following the presentation of findings in Session 15, pupils discussed what action they wanted to take, guided by the presentations of their findings. In a whole-group discussion, led by pupils – P7 asking questions while P17 captured the ideas on a flipchart – the group provided the following two suggestions:

- Create a drama about the effects of bullying which they can show to other pupils. The LINK teacher and LINK youth worker improvised a short piece during which the teacher bullied the youth worker, pushing him and stealing his phone. Some of the pupils ad-libbed and intervened; P7 called the police, and P2 and P6 acted as police officers, coming in to detain the teacher.

- Design and produce posters that can be displayed around the school, park, bus stops, streets, or in the newspaper, to educate people about the harm bullying does.
Appendix 7: Monitoring and evaluation tools

Below are a number of tools used by the evaluators and the CtC consultant to collect evidence to evaluate the pilot.

1. INSET materials

The quiz and confidence chart are two documents used by the evaluator during the INSET with facilitators at the beginning of the pilot.

QUIZ

NAME .................................................................

Please circle answers you think are correct

1. Approximately how many refugees are there in the world?
   a) 49 million    b) 13.5 million    c) 4.7 million    d) 1.1 million

2. About two thirds of the world’s refugees live in which two regions?
   a) Europe       b) Africa        c) North America   d) Middle East

3. The number of applications for asylum in Britain in 2010 was approximately:
   a) 125,000      b) 26,000        c) 86,000         d) 2,000

4. What approximate % of the world’s refugees live in Europe?
   a) 23%          b) 4%           c) 16%           d) 64%

5. In a recent opinion poll, people on average thought that the UK hosted what percentage of the world’s asylum-seekers?
   a) 10%          b) 24%         c) 5%           d) 35%

6. Who is a refugee?
   a) A person who has crossed an international border and is seeking safety or protection in another country
   b) Someone who has entered a country without permission before being allowed
to stay

c) Someone who has had to leave his or her country and who is genuinely afraid to return there for fear of being persecuted.

7. Asylum-seekers in the UK are entitled to which of the following?

a) Housing benefit and other means-tested benefits

b) Schooling, if of statutory school age

c) A one-off provision of a free mobile handset and £20 pay-as-you-go voucher

d) Council accommodation if accompanied by children

e) Free travel to their Home Office interviews.
PARTICIPANT CONFIDENCE CHART

Name of participant: ......................................................

Please circle the number to show how confident you felt doing each activity.

1 = Not confident
5 = Very confident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY 1:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you in your knowledge about refugees in the UK and the World?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything you want to add?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY 2:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you that you know what barriers your refugee pupils experience and are most concerned about?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything you want to add?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY 3:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How confident are you of your knowledge and deployment of participatory approaches in your teaching/work?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything you want to add?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Facilitator observation form

This form was completed by the evaluator each week while observing the facilitation of the sessions.

Facilitator Observation/Success Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful participatory activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Active learning techniques</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Pupil-centred approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Promotes young people’s agency, responsibility and resilience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Collaborative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Knowledge of, and commitment to, benefits of participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Non-directive facilitator roles undertaken (see Feedback Forms)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Supporting English language acquisition through facilitation of participatory activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Deeper knowledge of refugee and asylum-seeker pupils’ needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Culturally inclusive teaching resources/aids and approaches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Shows interest in other cultural experiences and backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Celebrates diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D Culturally competent (including. self-awareness of how presents to other cultures)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Awareness of refugee experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F Involves pupils’ prior learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G Encourages deployment of first languages where appropriate (e.g., to help tackle cognitive challenge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H Enables pupils to share barriers they face</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Tackles stereotyping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J Listens to pupils</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBSERVATION GRID**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Facilitator</th>
<th>Ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful participatory activities</th>
<th>Deeper knowledge of refugee and asylum-seeker pupils’ needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TA1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAT4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINK youth worker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Evaluation activities used with pupils

One-word answers
Facilitators and pupils were asked a question or questions and wrote their one-word answers on post-it notes. These were stuck onto a flipchart as they left the classroom. For example:

- Which of the activities did you enjoy most during the session?
- What one word describes how you felt about today’s session?
- What did you find most difficult today?

Bulls-eye target
A large target with three areas was used. The bulls-eye area denoted ‘lots’; the inner circle represented ‘some’; and the outer circle represented ‘little’. The target was also divided into three sectors, each corresponding to a different question:

- Did you understand what you had to do?
- Did you have fun?
- Did you work together well?

Pupils and facilitators were given three circular stickers. Each sticker was placed in each of the three sectors, depending on whether their answer to each question was ‘lots’, ‘some’ or ‘little’.

Smiley faces
Three large smiley faces were drawn down the left hand side of a flipchart. One was happy, one was neutral and one was unhappy. Pupils made a cross using a red pen against the face that showed how they felt before the session, and then used a green pen to indicate how they felt after the session.

End of pilot group circle game
At the end of the pilot the pupils sat in a circle and threw a ball from one to another. Each person answered the following question when they caught the ball: ‘The best thing about the bullying pilot was…’

Pupil diaries (see Sections 4 and 5 below)
At the end of Session 3, 4 and 15 a short question sheet was given to the pupils to complete. There were four questions which asked them to tick whether they enjoyed or did not enjoy:

- Thursday afternoon with CtC
- lessons and activities in school this week
- working and playing with other pupils this week
- Science, English, Maths, break-times and lunch-times.

If they wished, pupils could also add additional comments.
The question sheet was not given out each week because there was usually little time left at the end of each session to complete the questions, and because many pupils’ understanding of written English was very poor and so they had to have a lot of support from the facilitators.
4. Pupil diary

This diary was designed for pupils to complete at the end of each session, where appropriate.

Pupil diary

Name: ............................................. Date

1. Did you enjoy Thursday afternoon with Child to Child this week?
   Please √ one box.
   Yes €  Not Sure €  No €
   Why? What did you enjoy most and least?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Did you enjoy any lessons and activities during the week in school?
   Please √ one box.
   Yes €  Not Sure €  No €
   What lessons or activities did you most enjoy? Why?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Did you enjoy working/playing with other pupils this week?
   Please √ one box.
   Yes €  Not Sure €  No €
   Who did you work or play with?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
   Why did you work or play with them?
   ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

4. Please tell us more about your week in the school.
**WHAT DID YOU ENJOY?** Please √ one box.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LESSON OR ACTIVITY</th>
<th>LIKE</th>
<th>NOT SURE</th>
<th>DISLIKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MATHS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGLISH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breaks and lunch-times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. **Is there anything else you would like to write about your week in school?**

*Information collected by EENET will be used lawfully in accordance with the 1998 Data Protection Act. While it is unlikely, EENET may be required to disclose user data by a court order or to comply with other legal requirements. We will use all reasonable endeavours to notify an individual or organisation before we do so, unless we are legally restricted from doing so. EENET shall not sell, rent, distribute or otherwise make user data commercially available to any third party without prior consent, except as described above.*
5. Pupil exit diary

This diary was designed for pupils to complete at the end of the pilot during the last session.

Pupil diaries

Name: .............................................

6. Did you enjoy Thursday afternoon performing the play?

Please √ one box.

Yes €  Not Sure €  No €

Why? What did you enjoy most and least?

………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

7. What are two important things you have learned TODAY when you were performing the play?

•  ...........................................................................................................................
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

•  ...........................................................................................................................
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………
………………………………………………………………………………………………

Pupil exit diary
8. Are there any things that you now do better in school since you began doing the bullying project?

• ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………
  ………………………………………………………………………………………………………

9. Have you made any new friends in the school since the project started? What do you do with them?

……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
……………………………………………………………………………………………………
6. Pupil observation form

Relevant parts of this form were completed by the evaluator each week while observing the pupils’ activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Enhanced learning and language skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Enhanced communication and life skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Engagement with wider school community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## OBSERVATION GRID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of pupil</th>
<th>Enhanced learning and language skills</th>
<th>Enhanced communication and life skills</th>
<th>Engagement with wider school community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Post-session evaluation form

Relevant parts of this form were to be completed after each session.

Post-session (3.30pm – 4pm) Facilitator Session Monitoring Form

Facilitators complete one form together

Session: ________________________________ Session date: ___________
Facilitators present: __________________________ No of pupils present:

What worked well in today's session?
(Consider the session itself - activities and materials as well as the planning)

What did not work so well in today's session?
(Consider the session itself - activities and materials as well as the planning)

Action
What tasks did pupils carry out? (e.g. made a poster, wrote a letter, telephoned, decided what questions to ask)
(Note: this is NOT just the C-to-C take action step)
Facilitator roles
Guiding young people requires adults to adopt different roles at different times. The model below is to help you reflect on the appropriateness of the roles you adopt in sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilitator role</th>
<th>Non-directive</th>
<th>Directive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Reflect and feedback on what is happening in the group.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Ask questions to find out what pupils want to do. Encourage inclusion. Provide resources to take action.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activator</td>
<td>Challenge ideas and encourage pupils to develop their ideas further. E.g., may play devil's advocate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Suggest ways in which events can move forward.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adviser</td>
<td>Tell pupils what is happening. Provide other information. May include facilitator's own views.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Tell pupils what to do and how to do it. E.g. ensure structure, discipline and safety.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doer</td>
<td>Take action on behalf of children.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List the key activities in the session and the facilitator role adopted

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Role(s) adopted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Personal development
What did the pupils learn? How did they develop? How well did they get on and participate? What did they get out of the session?

Any other comments
8. Facilitator reflective diary

Facilitators were asked to complete a reflective diary each month.

_All information given will be treated as confidential. Though the information will be drawn on in our evaluation reporting, no facilitators will at any time be named in any reports, briefings or submissions. The main focus of our evaluation of your work is to ascertain both your ability and confidence to facilitate meaningful participatory activities and your understanding of the specific support needs of the young people._

**Facilitator diaries**

**Date**

Name: ..............................................

1. How did you feel about your role as facilitator this month?
   
   Please √ one box. Happy €  Not Sure €  Unhappy €

   Why?
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

2. Have you learned anything about the personal strengths the young refugees’ have? Give an example of what you have learned (e.g., anything that any particular young person did this week that showed particular strength of confidence, resilience, leadership, self esteem, inter-personal skills)
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………

3. Have you noticed anything particular about what the young people have learned this month? Give an example (e.g., was there anything that the young people did this month that showed particular learning e.g., information-gathering, problem-solving, use of English, listening or other communication, persuasion, use of IT, taking responsibility?)
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
   …………………………………………………………………………………………………
4. Were there any individuals who found it too difficult to manage certain activities without support, or felt overwhelmed, this week? Why? Please explain.

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

5. Have you learned about any particular needs the young people have, or barriers they face, because they are refugees and/or new to UK schooling?

…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………

Please use the space below for anything else you would like to share with us about this month's activities...

Information collected by EENET will be used lawfully in accordance with the 1998 Data Protection Act. While it is unlikely, EENET may be required to disclose user data by a court order or to comply with other legal requirements. We will use all reasonable endeavours to notify an individual or organisation before we do so, unless we are legally restricted from doing so. EENET shall not sell, rent, distribute or otherwise make user data commercially available to any third party without prior consent, except as described above.
9. TA focus group prompt/starter questions

These are a sample of questions used at the TA focus group discussion.

- What do you enjoy about the project?

- What have you gained from the project?

- How different is the way you work on Thursday afternoons to the way you work in class the rest of the week?

- What approaches have you learned to use and you are confident with using which you feel are successful in assisting pupils’ participation and collaboration? (also use confidence chart)

- Have any skills or approaches you have learned from the project affected your practice in the classroom and around the school?

- If it hasn’t, why not?

- What in your view are the main difficulties for new arrivals when they first arrive in class/school?

- Do you think that the pupils who have worked on the project have engaged more in the classroom/around the school? (Examples of friendships with others/non-EAL/new arrivals, etc, working in class with who, English competency, independent learning, etc)

- Remind them about the INSET. Was your judgement of your awareness accurate now that you reflect on the training? (e.g., do you have a deeper knowledge of asylum-seeking or refugee pupils’ needs?)

- Would you like to change it?

- Where is your awareness now?

- And thinking back to the confidence measures. Where is your confidence now?

- Is there anything else you’d like to tell me? Positive anecdotes, management, etc
10. Pupil focus group prompt/starter questions

These are a sample of questions drawn on for use at the pupil focus group discussion.

- How do you feel during these Thursday afternoon activities?
- What do you like about Thursday afternoon activities?
- What don’t you like about Thursday afternoon activities?
- What have you learned this week during Thursday afternoon activities?
- How do you feel in school?
- What do you like about school?
- Please tell us more about your lessons in the school reasons for liking or disliking?]
- Who are your friends in school? Are they here with you on Thursday afternoon activities?
- Tell me about them
- Do you feel welcome in school as a whole?
- Do you feel safe in school?
- Do you ever feel alone in school? Tell me about it
- Are you ever bullied at school? If so, how do you deal with it?
- What do you like doing in school?
- Is there anything you’d like to do in school that you don’t do? For example, study, play, etc. If so why can’t you do it/what stops you doing it?
- What do you want to do when you leave school in Year 11?
- Do you take any positions of responsibility?
- What don’t you like about school?
- What gets in the way of your learning at school? Also what things outside school get in the way of your learning (friends, having no space to do homework, asylum application process, worrying about family/back home …etc)
- Are you punctual? Do you get to school and your classes on time?
- Do you think your teachers understand about your experiences before you came here? All of the teachers? Do you think they know you are a refugee?
- Do you have any good friends in school? Are any from the UK or are they from overseas like you?
- Is there anything else you’d like to tell me?
Appendix 8: Baseline information

The baseline information of pupil profiles was collected from the LINK teacher during the first few weeks of the pilot and whenever new pupils joined the group. Information was received from 17 of the 22 pupils who took part in the pilot.

Country of origin
Pupils attending the pilot were either new arrivals to the UK or had come to the country a number of years ago. They were from various different countries:

- Afghanistan
- Albania
- Bulgaria
- Denmark/Norway/Sri Lanka
- Ghana
- India
- Pakistan
- Somalia
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan/Italy

Migration history
Some pupils had flown directly to the UK from their homeland, others had spent many years travelling here, spending time in-between living in other countries. For example, P16’s parents fled Sri Lanka and went to Norway where she was born. She then stayed in Denmark before coming to the UK. She is trilingual, speaking Danish, Tamil and English. P4 left Afghanistan alone as a young boy. He travelled overland through Greece where he stayed for four years. He speaks Greek and Pashtu. P19 fled Somalia and spent three years in Dubai before coming to the UK.

Several pupils had traumatic experiences when travelling, often without family members, to the UK. Several of the older Afghan boys, including P4, had spent many months travelling overland to the UK. P1 and P2 spent five months while P3 spent four months. P5 had travelled around in Afghanistan for a year before journeying for six months overland through Iran and Europe to the UK. P11 had travelled alone overland from Albania. At the start of the pilot he was “isolated; the only Albanian in the school and unable to make contact with the local community”.

Place of residence
Of the 17 pupils with baseline information eight were looked after by the local authority, having no close family to stay with, while nine were either living with parents or close relatives or, in one instance, in foster care.

Gender
Fifteen boys and seven girls took part in the pilot, a ratio of 2.15 to 1. Initially three

girls began the pilot, one of whom (P8) dropped out after two weeks. She decided to go back to her mainstream classes. During Sessions 3, 4 and 5, often 11 boys attended and two girls (P13 and P14), a ratio of 5.5 to 1. This created some unease and unwillingness on the part of the girls to be separated during activities. In Sessions 6 and 9 two more girls joined on each occasion, resulting in six girls being present each week from Session 9 onwards (except when absent due to illness). At the end of the pilot six girls and ten boys were usually present each week, a ratio of 1.67 to 1, a better gender balance.

Pupil age range
Pupils were selected from KS4: Years 11 and 10, and KS3: Years 9 and 8. They were aged between 13 to 16 years old.

Language

First language
The pupils spoke a variety of first languages including:

- Albanian
- Danish
- Dari
- Greek
- Italian
- Pashtu
- Somali
- Tamil
- Tigrean
- Twi
- Urdu.

A number of pupils spoke several languages. P4, an Afghan 16-year-old boy, recently arrived in the UK, had stayed in Greece for four years. He spoke Greek and Pashtu.

Most pupils could speak, read and write in their first, and sometimes second, languages. The exception was a few of the recently arrived older Afghan boys who could only speak Pashtu.

English
The pupils’ ability to speak, read and write English varied greatly. The older KS4 Afghan, Albanian and Somali boys had very low English attainment levels (measured for speaking and listening, reading, and writing) – National Curriculum Level (NCL)1 and NCL2. They spoke, read and wrote very little English at the beginning of the pilot. The younger KS3 boys and girls had been in the UK for a few years and had achieved higher English Levels – NCLs 4 and 5. The KS3 boys spoke out a lot at the start of the pilot. An exception was the two younger KS3 girls (P13 and P14) whose English Levels were measured at NCL2. Initially, they did not speak in the group activities. Two boys, P9 and P10 had been taught in an English-medium school in their home country before coming to the UK.
Baseline Student Profile Information Request Form

Our storage and use of data at all times meets the requirements of the Data Protection Act and also our confidentiality agreements with Child-to-Child Trust and the school. All information given will be treated as strictly confidential. No students will at any time be named in any reports, briefings or submissions.

Student outcomes we are evaluating:
- Engagement with wider school community, including non-EAL students
- Involvement in school activities
- Autonomy as learners
- Language skills, learning skills, life skills

Documentation/liaison that could assist gathering the information we need:
- LINK student profile records, including last assessment
- Any tracking data held by LINK (including of progress in mainstream if relevant)
- Student timetables
- Pastoral manager/form tutor/LINK teacher
- One or two parents/carers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Name (or code):</th>
<th>Year Group:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Looked After?</td>
<td>Yes: € No: €</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of origin:</th>
<th>DOB:</th>
<th>Gender: M: € F: €</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First language:</th>
<th>Spoken:</th>
<th>Read:</th>
<th>Written:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Previous education, where and number of years if known:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of arrival in UK:</th>
<th>Date of arrival in school:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Any relevant information on migration history (e.g., length of interruptions to schooling, countries travelled, current and past stresses impacting on learning, etc)?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English Level:</th>
<th>Maths Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Further comment on learning skills (including independent learning skills):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge and use of ICT (computer / internet, etc.):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
How does the student engage with his / her peers, including non-EAL learners