



OECD Reviews of Migrant Education

NORWAY

**Miho Taguma, Claire Shewbridge, Jana Huttova
and Nancy Hoffman**

June 2009



OECD Reviews of Migrant Education

NORWAY

Miho Taguma, Claire Shewbridge, Jana Huttova and Nancy Hoffman

June 2009



ORGANISATION FOR ECONOMIC CO-OPERATION AND DEVELOPMENT

The OECD is a unique forum where the governments of 30 democracies work together to address the economic, social and environmental challenges of globalisation. The OECD is also at the forefront of efforts to understand and to help governments respond to new developments and concerns, such as corporate governance, the information economy and the challenges of an ageing population. The Organisation provides a setting where governments can compare policy experiences, seek answers to common problems, identify good practice and work to co-ordinate domestic and international policies.

The OECD member countries are: Australia, Austria, Belgium, Canada, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, the Slovak Republic, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom and the United States. The Commission of the European Communities takes part in the work of the OECD.

This work is published on the responsibility of the Secretary-General of the OECD. The opinions expressed and the arguments employed herein do not necessarily reflect the official views of the Organisation or of the governments of its member countries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	7
CHAPTER 1: KEY CHALLENGES	11
OECD Review of Migrant Education.....	12
Summary of the position of immigrants in Norway	13
Recent immigration trends	13
Language.....	13
Immigrant population.....	13
Statistical evidence and identification of priorities.....	15
Possible priority target groups	15
Early childhood education and care (ECEC)	16
Primary education	16
Lower secondary education.....	16
Upper secondary education	18
Issues on policy design and implementation	19
Whole-of-government approach to at-risk issues.....	19
“Equity in Education” – inclusive education and adapted education.....	20
Universal versus targeted measures	20
Policy lags – implementation and impact	23
NOTES.....	24
REFERENCES.....	25
CHAPTER 2: POLICY ORIENTATIONS	27
Introduction.....	28
Early childhood education and care.....	29
Strengths.....	29
Challenges.....	31
Policy options.....	31
Schools and communities	35
Strengths.....	35
Challenges.....	38
Policy options.....	41
System management	49
Strengths.....	49
Challenges.....	51
Policy options.....	53
NOTES.....	56
REFERENCES.....	57

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE.....	63
ANNEX B: POLICY REVIEW OF NORWAY	67
ANNEX C: LANGUAGE SUPPORT POLICIES	73

Figures

Figure 1.1. Immigrant groups in Norway	14
Figure 1.2. An overview of education outcomes in Norway, by immigrant status	15
Figure 1.3. Reading performance at age 15	17
Figure 1.4. Proportion of first and second-generation immigrant students in education	18
Figure 1.5. Indicators of success for students in upper secondary education	19
Figure 1.6. Socio-economic gradients for PISA 2006 reading performance	23
Figure 1.7. Government steering tools to coordinate policy implementation.....	24
Figure 2.1. Difference in reading performance between immigrant and native students	28
Figure 2.2. Institutional accountability indicators for Norway.....	52

Tables

Table 1.1. Concentration of immigrants in major cities	14
Table 1.2. Participation rates in kindergarten	16
Table 1.3. Student performance in PISA 2006 and language spoken at home	17
Table 1.4. Examples of current projects that benefit students with immigrant backgrounds ..	22
Table 2.1. Home resources for disadvantaged students at age 15 and reading performance...	40

Boxes

Box 1.1. OECD Review of Migrant Education	12
Box 2.1. Family Learning Models	30
Box 2.2. Policy recommendations: Kindergartens	34
Box 2.3. Selected characteristics of good practice in the whole-school approach	43
Box 2.4. Policy recommendations: Schools and communities	48
Box 2.5. Policy recommendations: Managing regional variations	55

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This policy review of migrant education in Norway would not have been possible without the support of the national authority and the stakeholders involved. The OECD Secretariat would like to thank the national co-ordinator, Synne Nordmark Børstad, for her work in providing information and advice and organising the visits. We would also like to thank all those who gave their time during our visits to inform the review team of their views, experiences and knowledge and responded to our many questions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Between 8 and 10% of students in Norwegian schools have an immigrant background representing many countries, cultures and languages.

Strong economic performance has attracted immigrants to Norway in recent years. Most migrants come to Norway for humanitarian or family reunification reasons; but increasingly they come to seek work and many have lower socio-economic background than their native peers. The integration of their children has led to a larger proportion of more heterogeneous students in Norwegian schools. In 2006, 8-10% of students in Norwegian kindergartens, primary, and secondary schools were of immigrant background, although many were born in Norway. There are more than 120 languages spoken in Oslo schools.

Immigrant students who were not born in Norway – especially those who are older and arrive at a later stage of their education – face tougher challenges than other students in achieving good education outcomes.

Compared to their native peers, immigrant students have relatively weaker education outcomes on average at all levels of education. At age three, participation rates in early childhood education and care are much lower for immigrant students, although they are comparable at age five. However, the toughest challenges appear to be for first-generation immigrant students (those who were not born in Norway and whose parents were not born in Norway). Nearing the end of lower secondary education their performance is significantly lower than their native peers. Fewer first-generation immigrant students choose to follow upper secondary education and those who do are significantly more likely to drop out or complete without qualification. In vocational programmes in 2006, only 47% of first-generation immigrant students had either gained a qualification or were still enrolled in a programme after five years compared to 66% of their native peers.

Norway has already developed measures to respond to some of the key challenges in educating migrants, but needs to build capacity to successfully implement these measures.

Norway has undertaken numerous measures to improve migrant education. Universal measures include raising the quality of basic schooling, intervening at younger ages to improve basic reading skills, enhancing school leader capacity, and implementing new assessment tools and curriculum. Targeted measures include counsellors, language support, curriculum development, and diagnostic tests in different languages. However, to achieve real improvements in education outcomes for immigrant students, more effort may be needed to address the implementation and impact lags of chosen policies. In particular, priority should be given to improving the capacity of teachers and school leaders to be more responsive to linguistic and cultural diversity.

Access to quality early childhood education and care should be prioritised for all students, but is especially important for immigrant students under age three.

Universal and affordable access to quality early childhood education and care for all children is a political priority for Norway backed by financial commitment. However, access and participation is restricted for immigrant children, especially under age three. A lack of kindergarten places, the cash benefit scheme and prohibitive participation fees seem to be the major barriers to immigrant children's participation. As of 2009, access is guaranteed by law. It should be monitored and economic barriers should be removed. With respect to quality, Norway puts a strong focus on language development in the early years, but this needs to be reinforced at home. Working closely with parents is of critical importance at this early stage.

Schools need to be more responsive to linguistic and cultural diversity – improving the capacity of teachers and school leaders is the top priority.

Schools are challenged by the growing heterogeneity of the student population and increased demands to meet the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse students. The government has recognised the need to further enhance the multicultural perspective in teaching practice and school management. However, teachers are not yet well prepared to adapt their teaching to the specific needs of immigrant students or to implement the new language curricula. School leaders are not yet trained to organise effective induction programmes for immigrant students new to their schools or to manage the successful implementation of the new language curricula. The priority is to improve the capacity of teachers and school leaders with a whole-school approach. All teachers – not only language teachers – need to be able to carry out formative assessment in classrooms, teach second language learners, and work more closely with families and communities. School leaders should be given more opportunities for professional development to promote an inclusive and multicultural school environment.

Language support needs to be mainstreamed into the curriculum, teacher education and research.

Norway has put in place various language support measures, including: the right to adapted language teaching; extra financial resources for schools with high proportions of immigrant students in need of special language support; Norwegian and mother-language curricula; free language courses to adult immigrants with a residence permit, etc. Given that proficiency in the language of instruction has a significant effect on raising the education outcomes of immigrant students, more efforts can be made. The priorities may include implementing the Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula; training all teachers to be able to teach second language learners; integrating language and subject learning; and advancing research on effective language support. Formally recognising students' prior knowledge and skills as part of the curriculum is being recognised as a practical means to value the resources that immigrant students bring with them. Validating students' language competencies in their mother language may be an effective option, especially for immigrant students who arrive in Norway at a later stage of their schooling.

More VET-specific support such as technical language acquisition and career guidance should be provided.

Norway's 2+2 model of Vocational Education and Training (VET) is regarded as an effective means to prevent student disengagement and support a successful transition from school to work. Although the offer of apprenticeships in companies has increased over recent years, research suggests that discrimination can be an impediment to finding an apprenticeship. Immigrant students, especially males of non-Western origin, have a difficult time finding an apprenticeship place and must outperform their native and Western immigrant peers. Policy to encourage diversity in apprenticeships and the workplace could be pursued with a whole-of-government approach. Better grades and good school attendance records improve students' chances of obtaining an apprenticeship. Immigrant students in VET would benefit from tailored language support to master technical terms and from career guidance and mentoring to help them make appropriate choices for apprenticeships through mentors' networks.

Managing regional variations is another key challenge in migrant education.

With Norway's highly decentralised system, managing variations among municipalities, counties and schools is a key challenge for the central government. The challenge cuts across various targeted measures such as language support, induction programmes, second-chance programmes, and activities outside school hours. Some initial steps have been taken towards building a robust accountability system, such as setting national education standards, setting up supervising and self-reporting systems for municipalities and counties, and putting in place an annual policy analysis by the Directorate. Further efforts are needed to consolidate the accountability system by setting clear targets, especially towards achieving improvements in outcomes for immigrant students.

With the most recent education reform, *Knowledge Promotion*, more responsibility has been delegated to the local level. In reality, teachers, schools and municipalities have not been well equipped to implement the reform. If professional development is not sufficiently available or flexible, it is of critical importance that teachers be trained through peer-learning opportunities and networking. Municipality and country leaders should be encouraged to share good practice of accommodating immigrant students.

Monitoring and evaluation practices should be improved.

Norway participates in international testing (OECD's PISA and IEA's TIMSS and PIRLS) and introduced national testing in 2007. There is a growing awareness of different purposes and practices of assessment as well as monitoring of learning outcomes of students. The importance of formative assessment has been emphasised at all levels, *i.e.* students need feedback from their teachers and schools need feedback from municipalities and counties. School teachers and leaders should be trained to use the available information and tools in order to better monitor school practices and student education outcomes.

In Oslo certain districts have a high concentration of immigrants and educators fear that – especially in non-Western districts – native-born Norwegians and well-off immigrant families may move away. To alleviate potential negative effects of concentration on schooling outcomes, education policy should monitor school capacity to accommodate newly arrived immigrant students and inform other policies such as housing and immigrant dispersion. Evaluation of different practices at schools with mixed student populations may help identify effective school interventions.

CHAPTER 1: KEY CHALLENGES

By international standards, Norway has an inclusive education system with comparatively little difference in performance among schools. This equitable system is challenged by the growing heterogeneity of the student population and increased demands on schools to meet the needs of academically and culturally diverse students. Norway's immigrant population reached nearly 11% in 2009 and at least 8% of all students in primary and secondary education have an immigrant background.

Compared to their native peers, immigrant students, on average, have weaker education outcomes at all levels of education, but these are most pronounced for first-generation immigrant students and at the upper secondary level of education. This suggests the need for policies targeting those immigrant students who arrive in Norway at an older age.

As in many OECD countries, many but not all of these differences in performance are accounted for by immigrant students' comparatively less advantaged socio-economic background. However, emerging socio-economic differences among schools suggests there is need to support students from the least socio-economically advantaged backgrounds.

Norway has undertaken numerous universal and targeted measures that can benefit migrant education. However, to achieve real improvements in education outcomes for immigrant students, more effort may be needed to address the implementation and impact lags of chosen policies.

OECD Review of Migrant Education

This review is one of a series of policy reviews of migrant education in OECD countries (see Box 1.1) and follows the policy evaluation framework established for the OECD Review of Migrant Education. However, policy challenges and priority issues for immigrant students vary from country to country. To this end, each country was invited to tailor the focus of the policy review in consultation with the OECD Secretariat in order to ensure that the immediate output of the review will meet the specific needs of the country. This policy review of Norway presents selected policy options designed to respond to high priority issues and supported by evidence and research or other country practices. (See Annex A for the Terms of Reference and Annex B for the visit programmes).

Box 1.1. OECD Review of Migrant Education

The OECD launched the Review of Migrant Education in January 2008. The scope of the project includes pre-school, primary school, and secondary school. The overarching question of the review is *what policies will promote successful education outcomes for first- and second-generation immigrant students?*¹

“Education outcomes” are defined as follows:

- **Access** – Whether immigrant students have the same access to quality education as their native peers; and if not, what policies may facilitate or hinder their access.
- **Participation** – Whether immigrant students may drop out more easily or leave school earlier than their native peers; and if so, what policies may influence immigrant students’ completion of schooling.
- **Performance** – Whether immigrant students perform as well as their native peers; and if not, what policies may effectively raise immigrant students’ performance at school, especially for those from low socio-economic background?

The project consists of two strands of activities: analytical work and country policy reviews.

- **Analytical work** draws on evidence from all OECD countries. It includes an international questionnaire on migrant policies, reviews previous OECD work and academic literature regarding migrant education, and explores statistical data from PISA and other sources.
- **Country policy reviews** aim to provide country-specific policy recommendations. Reviews are being conducted in Austria, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden. Each participating country has prepared a Country Background Report based on common OECD guidelines.

The results of both the analytical work and country policy reviews will feed into the final report of the OECD Review of Migrant Education.

¹ First-generation immigrant students were born outside the country of assessment and their parents were also born in a different country. Second-generation immigrant students were born in the country of assessment but their parents were born in a different country, *i.e.* they have followed all their pre-school/schooling in the country of assessment.

This Review should be read in conjunction with the Country Background Report prepared by the Norwegian authorities (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 2008).

Summary of the position of immigrants in Norway

Recent immigration trends

The Norwegian economy has flourished over recent years. There has been substantial real income growth, low inflation and very low unemployment (OECD, 2008a). Such strong performance has driven demand and there has been a significant increase in labour immigration over recent years (OECD, 2008b). Some changes are now anticipated as a result of the economic crisis.

Language

Norway accommodates linguistic diversity. There are three official languages: Bokmal Norwegian, Nynorsk Norwegian and Sami (an official language in eight municipalities). Around 86% of students in primary and lower secondary schools receive instruction in Bokmal and around 14% in Nynorsk, which is the main language of instruction in two counties. Finnmark is the only county where a significant proportion of students receive instruction in Sami (8%). Children start to learn English in the first grade of primary school. The growing immigrant population in Norway means that there are more than 120 minority languages represented among Oslo school pupils.


Immigrant population

Norway has been part of the open Nordic labour market since the mid-1950s. In the 1950s and 1960s, Norway had few immigrants and had no official policy aiming at incorporating migrants into mainstream society. From the end of the 1960s until 1975, Norway recruited immigrant workers, especially from Pakistan, Morocco and Turkey, to make up for workforce shortages.

From the mid-1970s, Norway started to restrict the immigration of low-skilled workers from non-Nordic countries. Immigrants to Norway have therefore mainly been refugees and asylum seekers allowed to stay for humanitarian reasons and persons immigrating for the purposes of family reunion. However, Norway has seen a substantial increase in labour migration since 2004 within the framework of the Economic Area Agreement (EEA), under which free movement of persons applies on certain conditions.¹

At the beginning of 2009, Norway had 508 199 immigrants forming 10.6% of Norway's population, including 85 604 born in Norway to immigrant parents. The largest immigrant groups are shown in Figure 1.1.

Figure 1.1. Immigrant groups in Norway



Source: Statistics Norway, 2009.

Oslo has by far the largest immigrant population in Norway, with the largest groups coming from Pakistan, Somalia, Sweden, Poland and Sri Lanka (Table 1.1). Besides Oslo, the cities with the largest immigrant populations are Bergen and Stavanger.

Table 1.1. Concentration of immigrants in major cities

	Oslo		Bergen		Stavanger	
Number of immigrants	152 149		26 489		18 434	
Total population	575 475		252 051		121 610	
Share of immigrant population in the total population, %	26		10		15	
Major immigrant groups by country of origin (as % of all immigrants)	Pakistan	14	Poland	10	Poland	9
	Somalia	7	Iraq	6	United Kingdom	7
	Sweden	6	Vietnam	5	Turkey	6
	Poland	6	Chile	5	Somalia	4
	Sri Lanka	5	Sri Lanka	4	Germany	4


Source: Statistics Norway, 2009.

Statistical evidence and identification of priorities

Possible priority target groups

There are marked differences in outcomes among native and immigrant students at all levels of education (Figure 1.2). However, the largest gaps are seen between native and first-generation immigrant students. On average, first-generation immigrant students arrive in Norway around age ten or eleven (Norwegian Ministry for Education and Research, 2008). This seems to be an additional challenge to first-generation immigrant students: their outcomes are particularly weak at the upper secondary level, notably in vocational programmes, but are already pronounced at the primary and lower secondary levels. These results suggest that policy makers should prioritise support measures for immigrant students who were not born in Norway and in particular those who entered the Norwegian education system at a later age. That said, the comparatively lower performance of second-generation immigrant students at the primary and upper secondary levels shows the importance of offering adequate support to all immigrant children. Figure 1.2 also shows that from an early age there are differences in equity, with much lower participation rates for immigrant children (both first- and second-generation) aged three or younger in early childhood education and care (ECEC). At age five, participation in ECEC is far more equitable.

Figure 1.2. An overview of education outcomes in Norway, by immigrant status
2006



Note: For participation in ECEC, '10' represents 100% participation rate (the participation rate for linguistic minority children is used for both first- and second-generation immigrant students). For reading in primary school, '10' represents the national average of the top performing country. For reading in lower secondary school, '10' represents the national average of the top performing country. For upper secondary success in vocational and general programmes, '10' represents 100% success rate for the 2001 cohort after five years.

Source: Participation in ECEC, Statistics Norway.2008; reading in primary school, IEA's PIRLS 2006; reading in lower secondary school, PISA 2006; success in vocational and general programmes, Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training.

Early childhood education and care (ECEC)

Although overall participation rates have increased in recent years, immigrant children are still under-represented in early childhood education and care especially for the youngest groups (Table 1.2).

Table 1.2. Participation rates in kindergarten

Per cent

Age (year)	All children	Linguistic minority children
1	59	25
2	79	43
3	92	72
4	95	86
5	96	90
1-5	84	63

Source: Statistics Norway (2007/08).

Primary education

There are significant performance gaps in reading ability between immigrant and native students and these are particularly pronounced for students who were not born in Norway – this is the largest performance disadvantage among OECD countries (IEA, 2007). National tests in the fifth year of primary education in 2007 also showed higher proportions of lower performing first-generation immigrant students compared to their native and second-generation peers (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2008).


Lower secondary education

Significant performance differences between native and immigrant students are evident in the 2007 national tests in the first year of lower secondary education, with an over-representation of underperforming first-generation immigrant students. In large part this is attributable to the lower levels of education of these students' parents (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2008). Non-Western immigrant students who were born in Norway, or who arrived before school started, achieved on average, approximately the same Grade Points in the Year 10 test as other students with comparable parental education and economic resources at home (Statistics Norway, 2004).

First-generation immigrants also show extremely wide performance variation in PISA 2006 with only one quarter scoring at or above the OECD average in reading performance and a significant performance gap with native students (Figure 1.3). Furthermore, 22% of first-generation immigrant students perform below Level 1 of the reading assessment in PISA 2006, indicating that these students cannot complete the simplest tasks in the international assessment.

Figure 1.3. Reading performance at age 15

Distribution of reading performance in PISA 2006



Source: OECD PISA 2006 database.

In PISA, Norway shows relatively little performance variation among schools, but large performance differences within schools. However, the average economic, social and cultural status of schools attended by immigrant students is significantly lower compared to other schools (OECD, 2007).

In Norway, 4.7% of students reported speaking a language other than Norwegian at home and these students scored significantly below the OECD average, although much of this was explained by their less advantaged socio-economic and cultural status (Table 1.3).²

Table 1.3. Student performance in PISA 2006 and language spoken at home

	Norwegian or Sami	Different language
Reading	491	429
Mathematics	495	448
Science	492	442


Source: OECD, 2007c.

Upper secondary education

The percentage of first-generation immigrant students increases as the education level increases: only about 30% of the immigrant students enrolled in public upper secondary school were born in Norway (Figure 1.4). Such students are more likely to need higher levels of support to gain proficiency in the Norwegian language. Only 88% of first-generation immigrant students enter upper secondary education (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 2008). Once there, they are less likely to complete, with two-thirds of them dropping out of upper secondary education. However, those that complete general upper secondary education show a higher rate of transition to higher education than native students (Figure 1.5).

Dropout rates are higher in upper secondary vocational programmes and particularly high for first-generation immigrant students: 45% of first-generation immigrant students who entered upper secondary vocational programmes in 2001 had dropped out five years later, compared to 28% of native students and 30% of second-generation immigrant students (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2008).


Figure 1.4. Proportion of first and second-generation immigrant students in education



Source: Statistics Norway.

Figure 1.5. Indicators of success for students in upper secondary education

2006/07



Source: Statistics Norway.

Issues on policy design and implementation

Whole-of-government approach to at-risk issues

“Norway intends to be the most inclusive society in the world,” stated Prime Minister Jens Stoltenberg. The strong political will to promote and achieve social inclusion is exemplified by two strategic plans to combat poverty and enhance inclusion. The *Action Plan against Poverty* includes NOK 13.6M for direct or indirect investment in the education of immigrant children and NOK 67.6M for other measures for children and young people. The *Action Plan for Integration and Social Inclusion of the Immigrant Population and Goals for Social Inclusion* includes NOK 66M for education and language for children and young people.

Although Norway has adopted a whole-of-government approach to social inclusion, some challenges remain. The *Action Plan for Integration* specifies goals for eight different ministries. The Norwegian Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion (AID) holds the main responsibility for co-ordinating work among the different ministries while the Directorate of Integration and Diversity (IMDi) plays the key role of advising municipalities, other public authorities as well as NGOs and the private sector. Despite these formal arrangements, the OECD review team has found that co-operation rather fragmented.

Norway has one of the lowest levels of child poverty in the world, and relevant immigrant groups are embedded as targets into anti-poverty child measures. Nonetheless, there are still a substantial number of children living in poverty and statistics show that the most vulnerable groups include immigrant children with non-Western ethnic minority backgrounds.

“Equity in Education” – inclusive education and adapted education

The Directorate for Education and Training maintains that “Equity in Education is a national goal and the overriding principle that applies to all areas of education”. The latest reform, *Knowledge Promotion*, aims to help students to develop basic skills. It seeks to improve learning outcomes by changing the contents, organisation and structure of education programmes in the compulsory and upper secondary education and training and offering differentiated learning that supports both individual adaptation and inclusion. “*Inclusive education* means that the system must adapt to each individual and group... *Adapted education* focuses on the individual while bearing in mind the consequences for the common community”. Immigrant children are captured as part of target groups of public policy in Norway although putting inclusive and adapted education in place for immigrant students may pose specific challenges.

Universal versus targeted measures

To alleviate child poverty, for instance, most successful countries, including Norway, have combined a universal approach with measures targeting the most vulnerable such as by targeting deprived areas (European Commission, 2008).

Norway places a high value on universal policy measures with some targeted initiatives, while some other countries put more emphasis on targeted interventions on grounds of efficiency. In this context, the key challenge for Norway is how to design universal measures that are sufficiently effective that few targeted measures would be necessary.

This comes back to the actual practices of adapted education or individualised learning in Norway, in other words, the way in which ordinary classroom education is adapted to the needs of individual students. If adapted education is practised at all schools, this should benefit every student at risk and with different learning needs, including immigrant students. However, this will require time, strong commitment and understanding, plus different strategies to reshape the teaching workforce, curriculum or the education system (OECD, 2006).

But there is a risk of children falling through an implementation gap between policy and actual practice: targeted measures can provide a safety net to catch those students.

Focus and tools to support universal or targeted measures

There are currently numerous initiatives – including both universal and targeted interventions – which should improve migrant education. The priority areas of universal measures include raising the quality of basic schooling and intervening at younger ages to improve basic reading skills, enhancing school leader capacity, and implementing new assessment tools and curriculum. Those of targeted measures include language, curriculum, concentration, diagnostic tests in different languages and counsellors. Table 1.3 presents some examples of current initiatives, but is by no means an exhaustive list. Rather, it gives a snapshot of how relevant initiatives both straddle different levels of education and fall under the responsibility of different ministries.

Adapted education should be an effective tool to implement larger universal policies as recognised in the recent *White Paper on Early Intervention for Lifelong Learning*, which focuses on equal opportunities and early intervention, and *White Paper on Quality in Education*, which focuses on improving the general quality in school. However, the *White Paper on Teacher Education* identifies the importance of improving school leader and teacher capacity to effectively adapt education to meet increasingly diverse student needs.


The *White Paper on Language Build Bridges* sets out targeted measures to improve language proficiency with some universal approaches included. *Equal Education in Practice!* is specifically targeted at immigrant students. It sets out concrete, goal-oriented measures and planned timelines to raise the learning outcomes of immigrant children and students in kindergartens and schools. In addition, the *Committee for Equal Education for Linguistic Minorities* was established in October 2008 to study the education offered to immigrant children, youth and adults.

Table 1.4. Examples of current projects that benefit students with immigrant backgrounds

Project	Objectives	Budgets NOK million	Responsible Ministry
Language assessment (SPRAK 4).	To survey the language skills of four-year-olds at health clinics	10	Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion
Language promotion (Sprakloftet)	To follow up children identified with low language skills in SPRAK 4.	5	Ministry of Education and Research
Free core time in day-care centres	To provide free early childhood education and care for all 4 and 5 year-olds in areas with high proportions of minority language children.	27	Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion
Targeted concentration	To provide additional resources to schools with more than 25% minority language students	6	Ministry of Education and Research
Norwegian language instruction for asylum-seekers	To provide up to 250 hours of instruction for asylum seekers in regular reception centres.	43	Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion
Development of diagnostic tests in different languages	To assess student's development accounting for Norwegian language skills and cognitive development.		Ministry of Education and Research
Co-operation with Sweden to share ICT tools for mother-language tuition	To capitalise on existing knowledge and tools for providing effective mother-language tuition.		Ministry of Education and Research
Programme for basic competence in working life	To prevent adults being rejected from working life due to low basic skills.	10	Ministry of Education and Research
New subject curricula for education in Norwegian and the native language for linguistic minorities	(introduced in 2007-2008)		Ministry of Education and Research
Positive role models	To stimulate children to pursue an education. Students from the three largest university college regions shall serve as mentors to children in primary and lower secondary school.	3	Ministry of Children and Equality
Strengthening measures for children and young people in large urban communities.	To provide holiday and leisure activities to children and families in poverty and labour market measures for young people with basic or incomplete education	10	Ministry of Children and Equality

Identifying target groups

Data on the socio-economic background of immigrant and native students can help to identify which groups among immigrant students would need targeted interventions. On average, immigrant students come from less advantaged socio-economic and cultural backgrounds (Figure 1.6). This is particularly pronounced among the least advantaged students – one quarter of immigrant students come from lower socio-economic and cultural backgrounds than 5% of the most disadvantaged native students.

Figure 1.6. Socio-economic gradients for PISA 2006 reading performance

Note: Each dot represents a student plotted for his or her reading performance and socio-economic and cultural status.

Source: OECD PISA 2006 database.

In principle, universal measures might overcome the disadvantages associated with poor home background, but the analysis suggests that even after home background is taken into account students with immigrant backgrounds perform less well. So while universal measures to raise the quality of education would benefit all students in Norway, there may still be some need for targeted measures for immigrant students – particularly those from the least socio-economically advantaged backgrounds. At age 15, such students are nearing the transition to either work or upper secondary education. Adequate language support and additional educational support and guidance for those newly arrived in Norway would be crucial to ensuring a successful transition.

Policy lags – implementation and impact


Another general issue is policy lags. The recognition lag is the time before a government recognises a policy problem. The decision lag is the time involved in coming to a decision about how to address a problem. The implementation lag is the time taken to turn a decision into an implemented policy initiative. The impact lag is the time lag between policy being implemented and it having the desired impact.

The Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research has already recognised the challenges to migrant education policies and taken decisions to address them. It has a systemic approach to migrant education outcomes, examining data and conducting analysis and it has effectively used legislation to address identified challenges in migrant education. These are reflected in the many well thought-out policy papers and measures on migrant education. However, to achieve real improvements in

outcomes for immigrant students, more effort may be needed to address the implementation and impact lags of chosen policies. Challenges include setting priorities, scaling-up successful initiatives, streamlining the implementation process, ensuring coherence across policies and setting realistic timelines for implementation.

While the appropriate government agencies have pursued relevant initiatives, there is room to raise awareness of the rights and responsibilities of other agents, including immigrant children and their families and developing a stronger approach to co-ordination among stakeholders. This involves orchestrating efforts between: a) information and communication, b) monitoring, c) capacity building, and d) sharing resources, placing the primary intended beneficiaries (students) in the centre (Figure 1.7).

Figure 1.7. Government steering tools to coordinate policy implementation



NOTES

¹ The EEA includes the EU-25 plus Iceland, Liechtenstein, and Norway.

² Students with an immigrant background speaking a language other than Norwegian or Sami at home scored 60 points lower than other students in PISA 2006 science, but this performance gap was reduced to 24 points once their socio-economic and cultural status had been accounted for (Table 4.3c, [OECD, 2007b]).

REFERENCES

- European Commission (2008), *Child poverty and well-being in the EU: current status and way forward*, European Commission, Brussels.
- IEA (2007), *PIRLS 2006 International Report – IEA’s Progress in International Reading Literacy Study in Primary Schools in 40 Countries*, International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement, Boston College, Boston.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (2008), *Education Mirror 2007*, Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, Oslo.
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research (2008), *OECD Thematic Review on Migrant Education - Country Background Report for Norway*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/44/42485380.pdf>
- OECD (2008a), *OECD Economic Surveys: Norway*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2008b), *OECD Immigration Outlook*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006 – Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World, Volume 1*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007b), *PISA 2006 – Volume 2: Data/Données*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2006), *Schooling for Tomorrow: Personalised Education*, OECD, Paris.
- Statistics Norway (2009), *SSB: Immigration and immigrants – tables and charts*. Available at: <http://www.ssb.no>
- Statistics Norway (2004), *Marks across lower secondary schools in Norway – what can be explained by the composition of pupils and school resources?*, Statistics Norway, Oslo

CHAPTER 2: POLICY ORIENTATIONS

Being an immigrant student can have a significant effect on academic performance. In Norway, as in the majority of OECD countries with available data, socio-economic status and lack of language proficiency in the host country are two major barriers to raising the academic performance of immigrant students at age 15. Policies need to tackle these barriers as a priority in combination with other factors that may affect education outcomes of immigrant students.


The Ministry of Education and Research has identified target areas of intervention and is undertaking a wide range of policies covering all levels of education. Nevertheless, there is scope to improve access to quality early childhood education and care for all, especially immigrant children under age three. There is also a need to encourage primary and secondary schools to be more responsive to the growing linguistic and cultural diversity of students. Enhancing the capacities of teachers and school leaders is a priority. Also, further efforts can be made to embed migrant education in school practices by mainstreaming language support into curriculum, teacher education and research; providing more support for vocational education and training, such as technical language acquisition and career guidance; and compensating for the gaps in learning environments at home such as through extended school hours, homework assistance, providing mentors with immigrant backgrounds and supporting migrant parents.

With the reforms planned or underway, Norway can look forward to better managing regional variations by promoting knowledge sharing and strengthening accountability of schools. To improve the school system, Norway can also make further efforts to monitor progress and use formative evaluation at all levels – classroom, school and system.

Introduction

Being an immigrant student can have a significant effect on academic performance. There are significant differences in reading performance at age 15 between immigrant and native students in all but four OECD countries with available data (Figure 2.1). In Norway, immigrant students' socio-economic background accounts for nearly half the performance difference in reading. The evidence indicates that socio-economic background and lack of language proficiency in the host country are two major barriers to raising the academic performance of immigrant students: in Norway and the majority of OECD countries, there is no longer a significant difference in reading performance between immigrant and native students at age 15 once the students' socio-economic background and language spoken at home have been accounted for.

Figure 2.1. Difference in reading performance between immigrant and native students



Note: Statistically significant differences are marked in a darker tone.

Source: OECD, PISA 2006 database.

This chapter reviews policy orientations in three areas. First, for early childhood education and care (ECEC), especially for children aged three and under. Second, for school and communities, including teachers and school leaders, language learning, vocational education, and educational support outside core school hours. Third, for system management, including two cross-cutting

elements, the variation among counties and municipalities and monitoring and evaluation. Strengths, challenges and policy orientations are examined in each of these areas.

Early childhood education and care

Strengths

Political will and financial commitment

Norway has a strong political will and financial commitment towards universal and affordable access. The importance of early childhood education and care is set out in the government's White Paper of the Ministry of Education and Research, Report No. 16 (2006-2007) to the Storting, *Early Intervention for Lifelong Learning*. The political will is accompanied by financial commitment. Funding has increased from NOK 4 billion in 2000, 11.9 billion in 2005, and 18 billion in 2007. Over the last five years, the overall proportion of children aged one to five attending kindergarten (*Barnehage*) has gradually increased. It reached 87% in 2008.

As of 2009, the government guarantees a place in quality pre-schools for all children whose parents wish to use pre-school services. Significant additional funds will need to be allocated in the near future to guarantee this individual legal right. This may require re-prioritising funding among different levels of education both at the national and local levels. The Municipality of Trondheim, for example, has over the past two years, used central funds to build new pre-schools offering over 1 000 additional places.

The government has also pledged to keep pre-schools affordable. It sets the framework so that parental fees are capped at a monthly maximum. In 2008, that monthly fee was NOK 2 330, which covers between 22 and 30% of costs. The rest of the money is provided by the government and municipalities. The government has also launched a pilot project, "free core time in day-care centres", for all four- and five-year olds in areas with a high proportion of immigrant children. The project focuses on collaboration with parents and competency building of staff.

Language development in the early years

Norway puts a strong focus on language development in early years. The White Paper *Early Intervention for Lifelong Learning* clearly sets out goals emphasising the importance of providing language stimulation at an early stage of life. This measure will be especially beneficial for immigrant children, who have fewer opportunities at home to learn Norwegian from their parents. In addition, the revised *Framework Plan for the Content and Tasks of Kindergartens* will require kindergartens to actively support children in using their mother language and, at the same time, to promote their Norwegian language skills.

The strategic plan *Equal Education in Practice!* also sets out a clear goal to improve language skills among pre-school immigrant children and emphasises the importance of developing all-round language development for this age. The priority areas include: language assessment and follow up (*e.g.* SPRAK 4 and Sprakløftete), language stimulation for those not having access to kindergarten places (*e.g.* Ambulatory Educationalists Pilot Project) and bilingual education at kindergarten (*e.g.* family learning models [see Box 2.1]).

Box 2.1. Family Learning Models

The National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO), in collaboration with the Norwegian Directorate for Education, is carrying out a model development project with various bilingual education models. Examples of models include:

Open kindergartens with Library: Better School Start for Children and Families

This model aims to: i) stimulate children's language learning; ii) prepare both children and parents on school start; iii) increase parents' participation in language stimulation and homework; iv) recruit children to regular kindergartens; v) try out and develop family-learning principles; and vi) encourage families to read books and use libraries.

The kindergarten teachers are working with children of age four and five and their parents. The parents are welcome to stay with the children any time during the day and to participate in learning activities every other week such as talking, going for walks, making books, and playing games. Other institutions like the health centre also visit the kindergartens. Once a week, children and parents of the participating kindergartens meet at a local library and read, tell fairy tales, play games, and make books. The parents learn how to read and are encouraged to borrow books at the library. The parents are encouraged to read both in their mother language and Norwegian which aims to stimulate language development.

Family Learning including Norwegian Education for Pre-school Children and Their Mothers

This model aims to: i) offer Norwegian language stimulation to four- to five year-old immigrant children who do not attend kindergarten; and ii) involve their mothers by discussing education and society-related topics such as the Norwegian school system, Norwegian traditions, health care services, family nutrition, and other support services.

A municipality has offered this service for several years and results in language tests prove it to be effective in developing participants' language skills. Positive effects have been reported for the mothers. With the services, they aspire to be a good parent in the Norwegian environment and to help their children. They feel encouraged by making friends and building networks with other mothers, which is something they may not have the possibility to do otherwise.

Collaboration between Kindergarten, School and Library: Reading Friends

This model aims to: i) develop both children's mother language and Norwegian, ii) strengthen the multicultural perspective in school and kindergarten, iii) develop good co-operation between education institutions and children's homes, and iv) increase the use of the local library among family members.

Children aged ten prepare themselves to tell stories in their mother language. They practice reading books at school and read for their families at home. After practicing, they visit two kindergartens, where they sit with kindergarten children sharing the same mother language and read the stories to them. Their parents can borrow the same books after the reading sessions.

Source: Reporting during the OECD Policy Review Visit to Norway, February 2009.

Challenges

Delivering universal access to quality early childhood education and care in all municipalities is a key challenge. A shortage of kindergarten places is one reason for low participation rates in some regions. To stimulate more creative and local solutions, the national government plans to provide more autonomy over funding to municipalities by shifting from ear-marked funding to block grants. However, some key stakeholders are concerned that the legal framework may not be respected and the shift of funding may lead to lower spending on ECEC, particularly by some municipalities faced with other priorities. It is important that all municipality leaders comply with the right to a kindergarten place for all children and manage the shift of funding mode effectively.

Access should come with quality. International literature reviews report that effective ECEC programmes need to be “long term, intensive and implemented by people who are well qualified and motivated” (Heckmann, 2008). Capitalising on its internationally comparatively strong ECEC provision, Norway could improve qualifications for kindergarten staff.

Another challenge is the under-representation of immigrant children in ECEC. A number of factors may come into play, including government regulations, affordability of ECEC, and cultural norms regarding the age when children should start pre-schooling, etc. (Otero and McOoshan, 2005; Eurydice, 2009). However, in Norway, the financial situation of families is one main reason why some immigrant children do not attend kindergarten. Two major factors have been identified.

First, a cash benefit is paid to parents who stay at home with children under three years of age without using a Norwegian kindergarten. This scheme is particularly attractive to parents with low education and weak participation in the workforce and provides an incentive for them not to put their child into Kindergarten (*Barnehage*). The take-up rate of this benefit is much higher for non-Western immigrant parents – in Oslo, in 2004, 84% of non-Western immigrant parents received cash benefits compared with only 33% of the majority population.

Second, parental costs are high. Although primary and secondary education in Norway is free, pre-school is not. Kindergartens (*Barnehage*) are generously subsidised and capped and most municipalities offer so-called free places for children from poor family backgrounds. Yet the overall parental fees may still be prohibitively high for the most economically disadvantaged families.

Policy options

Strengthening accountability of municipalities

The first policy option is to strengthen the institutional environment. To be effective, the government’s commitment to guaranteeing pre-school places needs an institutional environment where municipalities become accountable for access to, and quality of, early childhood education and care for all regardless of background.

Legislation is a powerful policy tool, however, pitfalls exist. Compliance at the local level is a general issue with the approach often concerning access or anti-discrimination (Bhandal and Hopkins, 2007). The central government assumes the major responsibility through legislation but municipalities and providers may not be aware of the legislation or fulfil their obligations and claim-holders (families) may not be aware of, or able to exercise, their entitlements. It is of critical importance that the government ensures accountability and promotes responsibilities at all relevant levels.

To achieve this, systems need to be established for monitoring both access and quality in ECEC. The key indicators should be consistent with the goals set in the *Action Plan for Integration and Social Inclusion of the Immigrant Population and Goals for Social Inclusion*. Examples include: the number of children with kindergarten places (with a breakdown of age, gender and language spoken at home); the number of teachers (with a breakdown of age, gender, qualification, and language spoken at home); and the average teacher-child ratio at the kindergarten (*Barnehage*).

In the Netherlands, a special system has been established to monitor the results (including access and quality) of ECEC policy. In 2006, 2008 and 2010, municipalities are requested to provide information such as definition of children at risk and data such as participation rates, programmes, staff training, etc. to the *Landelijke Monitor Voor-en Vroegschoolse Educatie* (National Monitor for Early Childhood Education).

Capacity also needs to be strengthened in municipalities and in the kindergartens (*Barnehage*). Municipalities play a critically important role in Norway. The national government could use the monitoring systems to identify municipalities who would need additional support. The association of municipalities (KS) could also take a stronger role in building the capacity of municipalities.

Reducing economic barriers

The second policy option is to tackle the economic barriers that discourage low-income families in general from participating in ECEC and fall disproportionately on immigrant families. The government has been making efforts to ensure affordable access by lowering the cap, but it still remains relatively high for disadvantaged families, especially immigrant families, who are mostly refugees and unlikely to have completed primary and lower secondary education. This suggests there is scope to reduce the cap further for disadvantaged families.

However, reducing the cap for all parents would have a high budget cost and deliver additional assistance to families whose children are already participating. Targeted measures may be more effective and efficient to ensure affordable access. The national government would need to develop a set of criteria to identify who should be entitled to free access or subsidised fees. These criteria could include father's income, mother's education level, results of language assessment at age four, etc.

There would also be scope for expanding the provision of free ECEC in line with Measure 1 of *Equal Education in Practice!* To this end, the government, NAFO and municipalities should also work together to plan more effective provision of the "free core time in day-care centres".

The cash benefit scheme operates as another economic barrier, as it involves a loss of income if the child attends kindergarten (*Barnehage*). However, the conditions of entitlement for this benefit should be adjusted with care, since its outright removal would have negative financial consequences for families with weak earnings prospects. This would, in turn, have an adverse impact on the child's home environment. Nonetheless, the negative incentives for participation in ECEC need to be addressed.

Working more closely with parents

The third policy option would be to put more emphasis on working more closely with immigrant parents, through a range of initiatives. Municipalities could offer more adult learning programmes in kindergartens and schools. There are effective examples of ECEC accompanied by parent education in the same local site so that mothers can save time, can network with other mothers of immigrant background and are not afraid to leave their children because they are in the same building. In Austria, the city of Vienna offers mothers German courses at the kindergarten or school where they drop off their children. Although no data is collected to report the impact on student performance, an evaluation exercise reports positive opinions among school managers, teachers and parents and positive effects on school climate and school-parent communication (Wroblewski and Herzog-Punzenberger, 2009).

Municipalities could also work more closely with kindergartens and schools to provide diverse adult learning programmes. Parenting skills courses may be of critical importance for this age because the quality of learning environment at home depends on them. In addition, international research shows that parental involvement is one of the key determinants of quality ECEC programmes (Barnett, 1995; Reynolds, 2004; Heckmann, 2008). Parenting skills for their child, literacy, language courses and formal primary/secondary education for themselves may also be a priority.¹

The government could also encourage municipalities to provide “home visiting” pre-schooling for children ages three and under. Lack of trust in the quality of ECEC and different cultural norms (at what age children should start pre-schooling) may hinder immigrant participation. Home-visiting programmes are often found to be effective in serving isolated families, meeting the specific needs of the individual families, raising cognitive abilities of the child (Lombard, 1994; Alder, 1995; Burgon, 1997; Gomby, 2005). In Australia, Chile, Germany, Israel, Mexico, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Turkey and the United States, the Home Instruction Programme for Pre-school Youngsters (HIPPY) has been put in place. This could be done by extending the “ambulatory educationalists project” run by the City of Oslo to children aged three and under, drawing on the experience for children aged four to five (Measure 3 of the strategic plan). The model could be piloted in Oslo and then disseminated to relevant municipalities, where a considerable gap in enrolments is observed between immigrant and native children.

Box 2.2. Policy recommendations: Kindergartens

- Create an institutional environment where municipalities become accountable for access to and quality of early childhood education and care for all regardless of background.
 - Set up monitoring systems for access and quality in ECEC.
 - Provide capacity building opportunities to municipalities
- Reduce economic barriers that discourage immigrant parents from participating in ECEC
 - Provide free access or set a lower cap for disadvantaged families
 - Adjust the “cash benefit” scheme to remove the current disincentive to participate in ECEC
- Develop programs that work more closely with immigrant parents and communities
 - Develop more and diverse adult learning programmes provided at the kindergarten or school
 - Develop home-based education programmes especially for children aged three and under

Schools and communities

Strengths

Political support for raising teacher competencies and qualifications

During the course of the OECD policy review, the government adopted a new *White Paper on Teacher Education* “The Teacher – the role and the education” (Report to the Storting No. 11 [2008-2009]). In the White Paper the government recognises the important role that teachers play in improving student learning and identifies four main areas of action: enhancing quality of teacher education, increasing recruitment to the teaching profession and teacher education, providing support to newly qualified teachers, and providing more relevant research for initial and in-service teacher training.

The government has recognised the need to further enhance the multicultural perspective in teaching practice. The national strategy plan *Equal Education in Practice!* (2007-2009) focuses on creating multicultural, inclusive and equal teaching. Norway has already introduced multicultural education and cultural diversity as a mandatory part of all four-year teacher-training programmes. Most universities and university colleges in Norway also provide optional, in-service, supplementary training programmes (ranging from short, one-to-five day training courses to a full Master’s degree) in multicultural understanding and multicultural pedagogy.

Strong support for Norwegian language at school – political, legal, financial and technical support

The overall goal of language support in Norway is to enable students to master the Norwegian language as soon as possible so that they can join mainstream classes. Students attending primary, lower secondary and upper secondary schools who have a mother language other than Norwegian or Sami are entitled to special Norwegian instruction and if necessary, mother-language instruction. The statutory right to adapted language teaching is intended to serve all immigrant students, but should be especially beneficial for newly arrived immigrant students who are older and joining the Norwegian system at a more advanced level of education. Schools can apply for extra financial resources according to the number of immigrant students in need of special language support.

The organisation, content and length of the introductory programmes offered to newly arrived students may vary among municipalities and schools, depending on the capacity of municipalities and schools, the academic background of immigrant students, etc. For instance, some schools in Oslo prepare so-called reception classes for about ten months after which students join mainstream classes. However, in other parts of Norway students may stay in introductory programmes longer with the timing of the transition depending on the students’ level of proficiency in the Norwegian language. Results from a survey in 2005 showed that an estimated 80% of students needing language support were included in mainstream classes, but offered separate classes in special language teaching (OECD, 2006).

Norway currently takes a systemic approach to language support through curricula. Not all countries have explicit curricula or a curriculum framework for second language support (OECD, 2006; See Annex C). The new curriculum *Knowledge Promotion* introduced two new components for primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education and training (*Basic Norwegian for Language Minorities* and *Mother Tongue for Language Minorities*). The new curricula focus on enhancing

students' proficiency in Norwegian by adapting teaching to the required level of Norwegian. The curriculum of *Basic Norwegian for Language Minorities* has changed from *Norwegian as a Second Language*. Although no evaluation has been made yet on the effectiveness of the curriculum change, it may be an effective intervention to change the low status of the subject if students were given a grade as in other subjects. In Sweden, the issue of the low status and associated risks such as exclusion of students taking the subject and quality of teaching are being reported (Parszyk, 1999; Gruber, 2004; Swedish National Agency for Education, 2008).

The curricula are accompanied by implementation tools, *i.e.* a portfolio-assessment tool and teachers' guidebooks. The curricula are seen as transitional programmes to allow students to master a satisfactory level of Norwegian, at which time they can participate in regular lessons.

Unfortunately, there is no solid research to indicate which types of language support programmes are effective. Available meta-analysis research on bilingual education points to conflicting conclusions (Nusche, 2009). When positive effects of mother-language teaching on learning outcomes are reported, these are conditional on other important factors such as the duration of learning (Ramirez, Yuen and Ramey, 1991; Thomas and Collier, 2002; Bakken, 2003; Swedish National Agency for Education, 2008).

Legal support for Norwegian language and basic education programmes for adults

Adult immigrants with a residence permit have the right and/or an obligation to attend free Norwegian language courses. Adults without primary and lower secondary education also have the right to such education. In 2007/08, 4128 adults participated in regular primary or lower secondary education programmes, of which 70% spoke a minority language. Around 95% of participants in primary education programmes for adults were immigrants. About 23 000 immigrants took part in Norwegian language courses. Municipalities are responsible for disseminating information of Norwegian language courses available for adult immigrants and adults' rights to primary and secondary education. Oslo is one municipality which has an active programme to target immigrant parents, for example by use of information posters in public transportation networks.

Support for mother language and bilingual education

As indicated above, research findings are often inconclusive about the effects of bilingual education, mother language teaching and study guidance in the mother language on the education outcomes of immigrant students. However, some research shows broader effects – not necessarily on education outcomes – of mother-language teaching such as raising motivation, building self-confidence; facilitating communication between school and their family (Driessen, 2005; Brind *et al.*, 2008).

Although no direct link can be proven between mother-language teaching and education outcomes, these effects on motivation and self-confidence may have positive effects on students' performance. Both PISA 2006 and national research show that in Norway, immigrant students are highly motivated and PISA 2006 showed that higher levels of motivation and engagement in science-related activities were all positively associated with science performance (OECD, 2007).

When it comes to actual arrangements of mother-language teaching, however, schools often face practical challenges such as managing different size and composition of immigrant students, arranging qualified teachers for different languages and different levels, and finding funding to ensure equal access. To tackle logistical and cost-related challenges, the government has initiated collaboration with the Swedish government using the existing web-based mother-language teaching aids.² To ensure a supply of qualified teachers, a common framework was developed for a three-year bachelor's degree program for mother-language teachers, bilingual teachers and bilingual assistants in 2005. This program is offered at nine university colleges.

High quality vocational education and training with strong use of apprenticeships

Many of the strongest Norwegian students in the vocational education and training (VET) system participate in two-year apprenticeships that lead to jobs. These apprenticeships are highly regarded, and do not carry a stigma as in some other countries. Indeed, the programme with two years of school followed by two years of apprenticeship (2+2) upper secondary VET programme has many best practice features such as commitment from social partners, financial resources, and consistent signals from policy makers about its importance as an induction into working life. The number of apprenticeship places offered in companies and the number of applicants being awarded an apprenticeship has been increasing over recent years (OECD, 2008).

Municipality and school initiatives to offer leisure, cultural and learning support activities

Students in Norway have access to many different activities organised outside school hours, for example, sports clubs, musical activities and the performing arts and various voluntary organisations. This allows students to participate in activities that their parents may not easily be able to offer. Since 1 January 1999, all municipalities have been legally obliged to provide Day Care Facilities for School Children (SFO) before and after school for children in the first four years of primary school (and for the first seven years for children with special education needs). SFO facilities aim to provide cultural and leisure activities for children, but there is no educational focus.

There are moves to offer all students more opportunity to learn by extending the school day. During the period 2007-08 the school day was extended in eleven municipalities according to measure 4.1.1 in the White Paper No.31 on Quality in Education. The aim of extending the school day was to give more opportunity for students to master basic skills in the *Knowledge Promotion* curricula and to support students with homework as well as providing meals and physical activities.

In addition, there are many examples of compensatory educational activities offered by local authorities, such as homework assistance, mentoring programmes and in some cases extended opening hours for schools. The Municipality of Oslo funds schools with high proportions of migrant students to offer extended or community services, for example, Rommen primary school is open from 7 a.m. until 11 p.m. all year round. The school offers its services as public library, cultural hall, sports facilities and family learning activities.

The *Equal Education in Practice!* strategy includes measures for schools to collaborate with public libraries to stimulate reading among immigrant students. There are also examples of schools offering lessons to parents, including Norwegian language lessons for parents with no or weak Norwegian language skills.

Growing awareness of parents and immigrant communities as resources

Several immigrant communities organise native-language instruction courses on weekends or after school hours, including cultural activities for children and young adults. Again, the provision of such courses varies significantly by municipality, and importantly, by immigrant community. The most organised native-language instruction is offered in Polish (embassy and clubs), Tamil (cultural and resource centres) and Arabic (mosques), but there are many examples of activities run by parents.

The Organisation for Parents to Improve Co-operation between Minority Parents and Schools (MIR) is also growing in representation with offices opening all around Norway. Evaluation of this organisation showed that parents gained self-confidence and greater understanding of themselves as a resource for their child's learning.

Challenges

Adapting teaching to individual needs of all students

International assessments indicate limited progress in raising the educational achievement of all children over recent years. This suggests that teachers could do more to meet the individual needs of all children, not only immigrant children. The OECD review team was impressed by the professional commitment of the teachers in the schools it visited, but stakeholders reported that there were not enough resources to ensure teachers receive the necessary support and training. The context is also fast changing in many schools with growing and changing groups of students with immigrant backgrounds.

Teachers play a critical role in adapting curricula and pedagogy but often teachers in schools with limited or no previous experience in integrating immigrant students have most likely received very limited special training, if any. They are therefore ill-prepared to address the needs of an increasingly diverse population.

As an immediate intervention, the government decided to increase the numbers of teachers with immigrant backgrounds. This saw the recruitment of many student teachers with immigrant backgrounds but either without a formal teachers' qualification or with a foreign teachers' qualification, but they are given opportunities (through a scholarship scheme) to obtain the Norwegian formal qualification. The scheme is recognised as an effective intervention; it is also important, however, that such teachers should not become a substitute for goal that all teachers be able to adapt their teaching to immigrant students.

Lack of leadership capacity of school leaders in multicultural schools

School leaders (head teachers and managers) in multicultural schools have limited access to the support and resources they need. Training opportunities, materials and funding for extra resources are mostly *ad-hoc* and dependent on the size of school budgets and/or the amount of support provided by the municipalities or counties. School leaders play a key role in promoting the participation of teachers in training where necessary. NAFO reports that there is still a severe impact lag in the implementation of the curricula in multicultural education.

Many school leaders, particularly in upper secondary schools, lack experience with minority language education and do not have sufficient capacity to implement the new curricula in Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue. Until now, training of, and support to, school leaders on how to support second-language teaching and learning has been rare and non-systemic. A recent evaluation report by Rambøll management (2009) showed that only a fraction of school leaders report feeling competent to lead the implementation of the new Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula. School leaders, particularly those from upper secondary schools, report that a lack of resources and insufficient support from school owners are barriers to the implementation process.

Lack of systemic language support for newly arrived students in upper secondary education

Although the right to special language teaching is now introduced in upper secondary education it is not fully practised. The reasons may be, first, that students and their parents are not aware of the right and, second, schools and teachers are also not aware of the right or do not have the capacity to offer such teaching.

There are no national guidelines on how to organise the teaching for newly arrived students in primary, lower secondary and upper secondary education. As mentioned earlier, the organisation of the introductory programmes for newly arrived students vary to a great extent and there is no research to support any one particular programme. However, interventions need to address specific learning needs of the students, considering the duration of stay, previous educational and psychological experiences, socio-economic backgrounds, and so on. There should also be a systematic way to ensure minimum standards of educational support for this target group. In Sweden, the National Agency for Education has found that newly arrived immigrant students often stay too long in so-called 'preparation classes' while they only get tuition in the Swedish language and, therefore, they tend to fall behind in other subjects. The Agency plans to publish general recommendations or guidelines to municipalities and schools on how to best support newly arrived immigrant students (Swedish Ministry of Education and Research, 2008).

High dropout rates in VET programmes and lack of places for immigrant students in VET apprenticeships

Dropout rates are higher for students in vocational programmes than in general programmes. The likelihood of completing upper secondary education (general or vocational) without qualification is higher for non-Western immigrant students even when accounting for family characteristics and students' performance in compulsory education, aspirations and time spent on school work (Markussen *et al.*, 2008). Overall, students with lower performance in compulsory education go into vocational programmes, but based on performance in compulsory education non-Western immigrant students are more likely to choose to follow a general programme. This suggests a comparatively weaker intake among immigrant students to vocational programmes and after five years of study dropout rates are very high: 43% for female immigrant students and 56% for male immigrant students. The strongest predictor of these dropout rates is previous performance in compulsory education (Lødding, 2009).

Despite increased offers of apprenticeships over recent years, 12% of those who applied for an apprenticeship in 2008 did not obtain one (CEDEFOP, 2006). Recent research has shown that employers screen potential apprentices according to grades and absenteeism in school; students without significant behaviour and learning problems at school can find apprenticeship without difficulties in most sectors (Høst, 2008). Apprenticeships go disproportionately to higher achieving

native-born Norwegian students. Although grades and school attendance records have a marked effect on the probability of obtaining an apprenticeship, there are ethnic differences that are not due to such human capital factors (Helland and Støren, 2006). Furthermore, good grades were more important for the minority than for majority applicants. All in all, the results suggested that the ethnic minority applicants of non-Western origin have to outperform their majority peers in order to have the same chance of obtaining an apprenticeship.

The negative results for apprenticeship seekers with a non-Western background applied mainly to male immigrant students, in particular those who applied for apprenticeship in Oslo (Støren *et al.*, 2007). The results indicate that discriminatory practices exist and represent an impediment to completing their education for some of the immigrant students attending vocational courses (Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research, 2008). There is also evidence that outright discrimination exists in the allocation of apprenticeships, particularly for male students. Some research findings also point in the direction of discrimination against male non-Western immigrant students (Engebriksen and Fuglehaug, 2007).

Variation of support measures to complement family resources among municipalities and schools

National and international test results indicate that students' family backgrounds are strongly associated with their outcomes (OECD, 2007; Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2007). PISA 2006 data also indicates that immigrant students who are at a social, economic and cultural disadvantage also have access to fewer educational resources at home (Table 5.1). In particular, it would seem important to provide these students (nearing the end of their lower secondary education) with access to schools and/or libraries for reference materials, computing facilities and quiet places to study.

Table 2.1. Home resources for disadvantaged students at age 15 and reading performance

Per cent, PISA 2006

	Immigrant students		Native students	
	Bottom 25% of students in reading performance	Top 25% of students in reading performance	Bottom 25% of students in reading performance	Top 25% of students in reading performance
Textbooks for school work	39	61	72	86
Link to internet	44	96	86	91
Classical literature	n/a	33	19	41
Desk to study at	54	99	93	97
Room of own	53	79	97	99
Quiet place to study	40	86	75	91
Computer for school work	40	97	89	97

Note: For both immigrant students and native students, results are presented for the 25% least advantaged students as measured by the PISA index of economic, social and cultural status.

Beyond access to facilities offering study resources to students, there is a need for additional support measures in lower and upper secondary schools where immigrant students who have arrived in Norway at an older age may have particular need of language support, career guidance and even maybe psychological support. Offering adequate psychological and emotional support services to students coming from diverse family backgrounds and, in the case of some refugees, previous traumatic experiences may be especially important.

However, the offer of different support activities varies significantly among municipalities and these are not necessarily linked to schools, nor, indeed, of an educational nature. The extended school day is offered by only eleven municipalities and not all schools whose student population could benefit from extended or community support have the necessary resources to offer these services. Representatives of parents' organisations reported during the OECD review visit that migrant children often do not participate in municipal leisure and cultural activities due to prohibitive costs and sometimes simply a lack of awareness by parents that such activities exist. For younger children, there is the option of day care services (SFO), but the fees may deter lower income families. Regardless, such services only offer social and recreational activities and in no way – other than through language use in social interaction – offer compensatory educational support. Representatives of parents' organisations reported that SFO services are often perceived to be costly and of low quality and that they need services offering extra educational support.

Policy options

Training teachers for cultural diversity

The government's focus on teacher education creates an important window of opportunity to develop a new teacher education framework that explicitly addresses the needs of immigrant students within mainstream teaching. There is evidence of improved achievement in schools with diverse student populations where teachers have had more pre-service or in-service professional training in cultural diversity, teaching second language learners, and teaching students with special needs (Wenglinsky 2002; White *et al.*, 2006).

The government should review existing policies on teacher education, including both initial teacher education and in-service training to ensure that they consistently and explicitly address the needs of immigrant students. Teacher education policy for upper secondary schools should also be aligned with the White paper on Teacher Education.³

In particular, the government could demonstrate its commitment by adding explicit emphasis on immigrant issues to the current goal in the White Paper on Teacher Education to enhance teachers' competence and skills in guiding learning processes when teaching a diverse and complex student body. All subject teachers should be prepared to use appropriate teaching strategies to identify students 'at risk' and carry out formative assessment.

Specific attention should be given to second language acquisition. Analysis of good practice in 'successful' countries participating in PISA has identified teacher training in second language acquisition as one of the key elements of good language support practice (Christensen and Stanat, 2007). Both pre-service and in-service providers should prepare language teachers as well as subject teachers and classroom teachers in second language acquisition.

All teachers regardless of their backgrounds need to be trained to identify and respond to the learning needs of immigrant students and their cultures, particularly those arriving at an older age and refugees. Studies on culturally responsive pedagogy show that students would benefit if teachers learnt how to use and build upon immigrant students' previous experiences and knowledge (*e.g.* Delpit, 1995; Gay, 2000; Goodwin, 1997); if teachers become more inclusive in their teaching by better understanding of the different social and educational experiences of immigrant students, particularly the newly arrived ones (Sadowski, 2008); and if teachers can work with families and communities.

In Finland, the Ministry of Education has recognised the need to enhance the competence and skills of teachers to be better prepared for the needs of immigrant students. In 2001, the government reinforced initial training in minority languages and cultures, also signalling the importance of the issue for continuous in-service teacher education and training (Eurydice, 2004).

Improving the school environment for immigrants

The school itself is a critical environment for achieving better learning outcomes for immigrant students and needs to provide a positive and supportive experience. School leaders and managers play a critical role in creating multicultural and inclusive schools (Pont *et al.*, 2008). This role was highlighted as a precondition for improving the educational achievement of Black Caribbean students in an evaluation of the United Kingdom's *Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant* (Tikly *et al.*, 2006).

Norway has already introduced several initiatives to enhance the capacity of school leaders. A new regulation provides the opportunity to all new school leaders to complete a course in educational leadership on a voluntary basis. In Oslo, the municipality has developed a Masters course for school leaders, and a number of head teachers, managers and teachers reported to the OECD team that they had participated in the programme and considered it highly valuable.

A priority now is to ensure that opportunities are available for the professional development of school leaders in all schools, particularly schools with immigrant students, so that they become true leaders valuing the cultural, ethnic and linguistic diversity of all students. Training courses and materials also need to be developed to enhance competences of school leaders in adapted language instruction, second language education and multicultural education. School leaders also need training in how to implement the Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula and incorporate them into the overall school curricula.

Another measure would be to promote a whole-school approach to migrant education. Evidence suggests that schools of good general quality also effectively integrate immigrant students and offer them good educational opportunities. A review of the international literature on the whole-school approach shows five major components that are necessary to build inclusive and culturally responsive schools: school management, teachers, curriculum and instruction, parents and community, and student development and support services (Johnson, 2003). Another literature review of policies aimed at the education of minority, migrant and marginalised children in Europe identified various characteristics of good practice in a whole-school approach (Box 2.3).

Box 2.3. Selected characteristics of good practice in the whole-school approach

1. Schools where there is a culture for critical reflection.
2. Schools where inclusion and diversity are reflected in the curriculum and school organisation.
3. Strong school leadership with a vision and commitment to addressing inequality and to mainstreaming initiatives to raise achievement.
4. Induction strategies for 'newly arrived' immigrant students - including children of asylum seeker or refugee families.
5. High quality training so that staff can tackle the needs of immigrant students with confidence.
6. The meaningful involvement of parents and community.
7. High expectations from teachers and all school staff of their students, and the availability of mentoring programmes.
8. Utilising 'restorative' and 'preventative' approaches to behaviour management that seek to mediate the root causes of conflict rather than simply punishing students.

Source: Brind *et al.*, 2008.

The Office for Standards in Education in the United Kingdom published two reports on schools that are especially successful in integrating immigrant students and raising their educational achievement. The reports cite the following characteristics: good management of the school, good co-operation among staff, high expectations of teachers towards students, coupled with readiness to give support, good quality teaching, good school equipment and high involvement of parents (Ofsted, 2002a; Ofsted 2002b). These results are reinforced by examples of twelve outstanding secondary schools in England (Ofsted, 2009).

Teachers and school leaders need additional training and support in working effectively with immigrant families and communities. They should include parents and ethnic community leaders in the process of developing school curricula and in extracurricular activities. Parents, community members and ethnic community associations may offer activities such as after-school mentoring programmes, mother-language courses, supplementary classes (remedial or homework help) in mother language, etc.

Improving language support and adapted education

There are great variations and deficiencies in the implementation of the two new curricula as well as the provision of adapted language instruction in upper secondary school. Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula are not mandatory and many municipalities decided not to use them. There are also barriers to the successful implementation of the Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula (Rambøll Management, 2009). Many municipalities have limited information on, and understanding of, the new curricula and a large proportion of school owners reported that they lack competences, resources, and support to lead the implementation. Language support for immigrant students in upper secondary schools was limited, especially for the newly arrived students with least proficiency in the Norwegian language. In some schools, students were not offered classes of basic

Norwegian and teachers were not aware of students' needs for adapted language instruction or, indeed, prepared to offer this.

The government should now focus priority attention on developing measures to remove the barriers identified and put implementation of Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula in upper secondary education.

First, in collaboration with the KS the government could help raise awareness of the two new language curricula and build the capacity of municipalities by undertaking a stock-taking exercise to gather evidence of existing resources and explore possibilities for sharing them in the most efficient way alongside securing students' right to language specific measures.

Second, the government should swiftly disseminate the portfolio-assessment tool and teachers' guidebooks through face-to-face training. Although these tools and resource guidebooks are often made available on the web, in practice, teachers often only become aware of support available to them through face-to-face, discussion-oriented workshops to introduce such materials.

Third, the government in collaboration with KS could help municipalities, counties and schools to share resources and experiences on mother-language teaching. While Oslo focuses almost exclusively on the development of Norwegian language competency, Trondheim considers the linguistic diversity of the student population as a resource and systematically supports the development of the mother language. The government could further assist the collaboration with Sweden in implementing mother-language teaching and greater use of ICT in mother-language provision.

Fourth, the age restriction on the provision of adapted language teaching should be removed. The government should strengthen language support for adult immigrants. Under the current law, the right to adapted language teaching does not apply to those who are above 25 years of age. This may hinder the majority of the adult immigrants who take part in primary secondary and upper secondary education from benefiting from adapted language teaching.

Fifth, if induction programmes are prepared separately from the regular classes, successful implementation will also require additional investment in measures to ensure that subject and classroom teachers provide continued language support in regular classrooms, to support children after they complete their induction programme. Responsibility for language acquisition and development of academic fluency is often divided between teachers for Norwegian, mother-language and subject teachers, as is often reported in other countries (Loewenburg and Wass, 1997; Karsten, 2006). Subject teachers have not been trained to teach second-language learners and may be unwilling or unable to adapt their teaching strategies to the linguistic needs of their students; they need to be equipped with adapted teaching strategies.

Sixth, there is also scope for municipalities, schools and teachers to integrate more explicitly the Basic Norwegian and the Mother Tongue curricula into the overall school curriculum. To this end, the Ministry should ensure that national centres under the Directorate explicitly highlight the development of academic language competency in new guides for specific subject curricula, articulating special needs of second-language learners. The government can also help by supporting the development of a compendium of best practice of implementation of integrated curricular and teaching materials in a collaborative way with schools and teachers. The Directorate for Education and Training should identify key criteria of good practice of inclusive curricula that reflect the learning, linguistic and

cultural needs of all students. Successful schools could be asked to reflect on their practice based on the identified criteria.

Seventh, evidence on effective language support is scarce, especially on mother-language teaching. Research universities in co-operation with target schools should be given incentives to evaluate mother-language teaching experiences, recognising that regions typically face different challenges reflecting different immigrant communities. Evaluation of initiatives elsewhere may also shed useful insights. For example, a bilingual Swedish-Arabic education programme started in Malmö, where half the students speak Arabic as their first language, is currently being evaluated for impact on language development in both languages and acquisition of knowledge.

Finally, the government could encourage municipalities to validate the competencies of immigrant students, especially late arrivals, in their mother language. Evaluation of local initiatives such as offering mother languages as second foreign languages in Trondheim could help to spread good practice. In Ireland, competencies in official European Union mother languages can be validated through non-curricular languages examinations⁴ in the Leaving Certificate. This will help avoid costly additional classes and allow students to use the class time to spend on learning the language of instruction or subjects in which they fall behind.

Strengthen support to immigrant students in VET programmes

As in general programmes, the organization and planning of classes, pedagogy, language guidance to students, and the contact with the students' families may affect immigrant students' success in VET programmes (Pedersen, 2006). VET-specific support in these areas would be helpful. For instance, learning the language of instruction for technical purposes – in comparison to learning for conversational or academic purposes – may require different sets of knowledge (Jakobsen *et al.*, 1995). In addition to general language support, VET-specific language support may help immigrant students to follow the classes more easily and prevent weak students from dropping out.

Students also need to receive adequate support and guidance within vocational programmes. *Knowledge Promotion* rightly highlights career guidance during the transition between lower and upper secondary schools. Better exchange of information and collaboration between lower and upper secondary schools is of critical importance and should be an aim in and of itself (Lødding, 2009). Furthermore, effective career guidance and mentoring programmes should continue to be provided in upper secondary vocational education to strengthen the chances of successful completion and finding apprenticeship places for immigrant students. Mentoring – both general and provided by mentors of immigrant background – is often found to be an effective approach in providing academic and career guidance (OECD, 2004; European Commission, 2008; Brind *et al.*, 2008). Research identifies that students who find apprenticeships often benefit from their fathers' established networks/labour market contacts and knowledge of the expected profiles and codes of conduct of the firms (Lødding, 2009). Through mentoring, such contacts and knowledge should be facilitated.

The issue of discrimination and lack of apprenticeship places for immigrant students can be found in parallel to the lack of work places for immigrants in general. Tackling the issue will require policies to adjust labour market institutions and practices (OECD, 2007b; OECD, 2008). It therefore goes beyond the scope of this study. What education policy could do is to coordinate with labour market policy, promote dialogue with social partners, and encourage diversity in the apprenticeship and workplace.

Compensating for learning environments at home

Many immigrant students, especially lower-performing ones at a disadvantage in their home environment, may benefit from an intervention to compensate the lack of family resources (Figure 2.1). The government could play a stronger role through measures designed to compensate for the gaps in home resources (Table 2.1). This could be achieved through three different channels.

The first channel is by supporting and promoting school efforts to provide access to learning resources outside of core school time for students, parents and communities. Students could benefit significantly from free access to the school library, both for the use of educational reference materials and a quiet place to study. Similarly, schools could offer access to computing rooms for students for their schoolwork. Schools could also provide access to library and computing facilities for students' parents who could use these to study and/or research on employment opportunities.

Schools could also provide meeting places for tuition/homework support groups organised by volunteers in the local communities. In particular, the Directorate should promote those homework support groups that were evaluated to have good results as part of the strategic plan *Equal Education in Practice!* The United Kingdom's Full Service Extended Schools provide one model that showed a range of positive results, especially for students facing difficulties (Brind *et al.*, 2008).

The staggered implementation of community schools can gradually build momentum for schools to offer such facilities, for example, in the Netherlands' Programme of Extended or Community Schools. In 2007, 1000 of the 7000 primary schools were Extended Schools and 350 of the 1200 lower secondary schools were Extended Schools. In Amsterdam, virtually all primary schools in districts with high proportions of non-Western ethnic minorities offer extended schools (Onderzoek en statistiek, 2007). The Dutch Inspectorate for Primary Education judged 83% of primary schools in these districts to be of 'sufficient quality', compared with 78% in other districts of Amsterdam (Inspectie, 2008).

A second channel would be for municipalities to work with existing adult education providers to support offers of education and training to students' parents in residential areas where there are large proportions of newly arrived immigrants. Training could be focused on developing Norwegian language skills, but organised around different relevant topics for migrant parents, for example 'how to support your child's learning', 'looking for work'. For example, in the United Kingdom, Uxbridge College in London works in partnership with the Somali Women's Group ICT Training Project in Hillingdon to provide training at a local community centre. Tutors from the College go to the community centre located near a housing estate with a high proportion of refugees. This allows the Somali women to receive specialised training in a comfortable environment (OECD, 2006b).

A third channel would be to engage immigrant communities in mentoring and counselling students. To build on measures in the *Equal Education in Practice!* strategic plan to improve information about upper secondary school education and career choice for immigrant children and their parents, the government should encourage schools to use parent or community liaison officers and school assistants from immigrant backgrounds as counsellors. This is important in lower secondary education to promote a successful transition into upper secondary education as well as in upper secondary to ensure a successful completion at that level. Priority in counselling services should be given to newly arrived immigrant students whose families are unfamiliar with the choices available in the Norwegian school system.

Successful immigrant students, notably those who have made the transition from upper secondary to university-level education, can be valuable role models and mentors for younger immigrant students. There are mentoring projects established in Belgium, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the United Kingdom. In Denmark, the *We Need All Youngsters* campaign uses immigrant role models to inform immigrant students about learning the Danish language and general aspects of the Danish education system. Half the students included in the evaluation reported that role models had played an important role in inspiring them to enrol in or complete a youth education programme (LPX Consulting, 2008).

Box 2.4. Policy recommendations: Schools and communities

- Train teachers for cultural diversity. Design teacher education and in-service training programmes so that all teachers – not only language teachers – will be able to individualise students' learning by:
 - Carrying out formative assessment in classroom
 - Teaching second language learners
 - Incorporating immigrant students' different cultures, knowledge, and previous experiences into teaching
 - Working with families and communities
- Improve the school environment for immigrants
 - Enhance school leaders' capacity to lead in a culturally diverse setting
 - Provide guidelines to promote a whole-school approach in respect of migrant education
- Improve language support and adapted education
 - Focus on the implementation of the Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue curricula
 - Make teacher training of subject and classroom teachers in second-language acquisition a priority, especially for secondary school teachers. This will help provide continued language support in regular classrooms to ensure a smooth transition from induction programmes.
 - Encourage integrating language learning and subject learning by explicitly integrating the Basic Norwegian and the Mother Tongue curricula into the overall school curriculum
 - Advance research on effective language support
 - Encourage municipalities and schools to validate the language competencies of immigrant students in secondary education (in the short term) and broaden the foreign language learning options in the curriculum (in the mid-term)
- Strengthen support to immigrant students in VET programmes
 - Strengthen VET-specific support for language, the organisation and planning of classes, pedagogy, guidance to students, and contact with students' families
 - Provide more guidance and mentoring in vocational programmes
 - Coordinate with labour market policy, promote dialogue with social partners, and encourage diversity in the apprenticeship and workplace.
- Develop programmes that compensate for learning environments at home
 - Provide access to educational resources and learning opportunities outside of core school time for students, parents and communities
 - Encourage municipalities to offer flexible adult learning opportunities
 - Engage immigrant communities to mentor and counsel students

System management

Strengths

Strong commitment to local control

Norway enjoys a high degree of decentralisation and in the most recent education reform (*Knowledge Promotion*) the central government delegated more responsibility to the local level. Norway's 430 municipalities and 19 counties receive block grants for education and social expenditure from the government and have autonomy in deciding how to allocate these funds while at the same time they have the obligations to provide services that are specified by the law.

There is an established channel for consultation between the national government and local authorities. The Norwegian Association of Local and Regional Authorities (KS)⁵ is an umbrella organisation that represents the interests of the municipalities, county authorities and public enterprises under municipal or county ownership in negotiations on administrative and political issues with the national parliament. There are four consultative meetings per year between the national government and local authorities to discuss among other issues financing and efficiency measures.

Emerging system of accountability

The White Paper on Quality in Education and the Education Mirror 2006 describe the steps being taken to build a more robust accountability system. The Ministry of Education and Research set guidelines for the education system, including proposing any amendments to the Education Act and setting the curricula framework and education standards. The Directorate for Education and Training has a supervisory role. The county governors (*fylkesmann*) are the national government's main representatives supervising local authorities and they review the legality of decisions made by municipal councils (Local Government Act, article 59). County governors can review and overrule decisions made by municipalities to ensure that schools adhere to the Education Act.

In addition, municipalities and county authorities are required to complete electronic reports on input and output indicators in the Municipality-State-reporting information system KOSTRA. Information is used to benchmark local authorities and is published on the internet in March. This system is well respected with over 93% of municipalities and county authorities having reported their accounts as of 16 March 2009.⁶ The Directorate for Education and Training publishes annually a key analytical report – *The Education Mirror*.

Participation in international testing and growing use of evaluation and assessment within the country

Norway participates in international assessments, including OECD's Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) and the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement's Progress in International Reading Literacy Study (PIRLS) and Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Parliament decided in 2003 to establish a national quality assessment system (NKVS). There were pilot national tests in 2004 and 2005 and the first national tests in mathematics, Norwegian and English in both years five and eight were held in autumn 2007. The ministry is now considering using sampling to gain broader knowledge about student skills and learning without the cost or burden of additional tests for all students.

The Ministry of Education and Research attaches great importance to diagnosing potential learning problems or additional learning requirements at an early stage through the regular monitoring of students' progress by teachers and schools. To this end, it will introduce a system of formative assessment or "charting tools" with obligatory tests of reading skills in years one to three in primary education (a staggered implementation to be completed by autumn 2010). There are plans to introduce formative assessment in upper secondary education also: compulsory tests in mathematics and reading at level one will be introduced in autumn 2009 and autumn 2010, respectively. These "charting tools" are for teachers and schools only and results will not be reported to national authorities.

The importance of making use of these results to improve learning outcomes for students and schools is emphasised by the legal obligation of schools and school owners to follow up results from local and national assessments (Education Act Section 13-10). Research has shown that one indicator of potential dropout from schooling is high rates of truancy. In Norway, schools are legally obliged to register students' absence each term (White Paper No.31 on Quality in Education: 4.1.6). Such data collection can be useful in early intervention at different levels of the education system. The Ministry of Education and Research proposes to record lower-secondary school absences on the school leaving certificate (White Paper No.31 on Quality in Education: 4.1.6).

Great importance is also attached to the views of students on, among other things, whether or not they get feedback from their teachers. As such, there is a legal obligation for schools and school owners to carry out a Pupil Survey each spring in years seven and ten of primary and lower secondary education and in the first year of upper secondary education (Education Act, Section 2-3 and Private Schools Act, Section 2-3). The Pupil Survey also provides useful data on students' learning environments, including reports of bullying.

There is also recognition of the need to nurture the emerging assessment culture. For example, 78 educational institutions throughout Norway (primary, lower and upper secondary schools, plus adult education centres) are participating in the *Better assessment practice* project (*Bedre vurderingspraxis*). The project runs from November 2007 to August 2009 and aims to establish clearer regulations on assessment and to promote a more relevant assessment of students' work done in different subject areas.

Growing practice of evaluating pilot projects and documenting the results

From 2008-2011 the private consultancy group Rambøll Management is conducting an evaluation of the implementation of the *Basic Norwegian for Language Minorities Subject Curriculum* and the *Mother Tongue for Language Minorities Subject Curriculum*. The Central Bureau of Statistics has developed a system to monitor both the implementation and impact of schemes regulated by the Introduction Act for newly arrived immigrants to Norway. The Ministry of Education and Research will evaluate a pilot project undertaken in four counties to develop models to support newly arrived immigrant students with weak educational preparation.

Challenges

Variations in the provision of targeted support measures among municipalities

The provision of targeted measures to improve the education outcomes of immigrant students varies greatly among municipalities and levels of education. While Oslo (and several other larger municipalities) has the resources to hire and retain education professionals and leaders to run their schools, smaller municipalities must rely on officials who carry out a wide variety of duties. In addition, many school owners and schools lack the capacity to implement key targeted measures such as induction programmes that inform newly arrived immigrants about society in general, education systems and learning opportunities in Norway, etc., systematic language support and catch up, and remedial or second chance programmes for young adults.

Lack of co-operation between different levels of education, especially between lower and upper secondary education

During the OECD policy visit, stakeholders identified a communication gap between lower and upper secondary schools. This gap may be a symptom of the larger problem that different levels of government do not work closely enough together since municipalities are responsible for lower secondary schools and counties for upper secondary schools and apprenticeships. In contrast, Oslo is both a county and a municipality, making co-ordination an easier task.


Lack of supportive tools for schools

The White Paper on Quality in Education notes that since the *Knowledge Promotion* strategy was put in place it has become evident that many schools do not have the capacity to implement the reforms and that “experiences with the curricula indicate that the national education authorities should provide more direct support. More guidance should be given to the individual teacher, school and municipality....” This statement was confirmed during the OECD policy visit: *Knowledge Promotion* provides little specification about how schools are to organise, operate, and assess progress to attain the desired improvement in learning outcomes; in addition, there is no plan in place for a continuous professional development system.

Lack of clear targets

The White Paper also points out that a weak accountability system may constrain the government’s ability to improve outcomes. Most significant is the absence of focused targets for improvement. This diagnosis is confirmed by the *OECD Economic Survey* of 2008, which noted that “measures to meet the targets seem insufficient, and some of the targets themselves lack focus” (Figure 2.2).

Figure 2.2. Institutional accountability indicators for Norway



Source: Gonand *et al.*, 2007.

Under-use of the results of evaluation to improve teaching and learning

Results from the Pupil Survey in 2007 reveal that while the use of assessment and feedback is becoming established in Norwegian schools, not all students benefit and feedback varies among schools and also within schools among different subject teachers. Only half the students reported that teachers told them what they had to do to improve in most or all subjects, 18% of students reported that they had been assessed in none or only a very few of their subjects and 12% of students in lower and upper secondary education reported that they had not had a performance review or student interview that year (Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, 2008). Almost half of students in primary, lower and upper secondary education reported that reviews were useful generally or to a great extent and 42% reported that continuous feedback led to improvements in many subjects or in all or most subjects.

At the same time, Parents' Associations are concerned that there are many cases where teachers do not give honest feedback to parents on their child's progress. There was a general perception that qualitative feedback such as "good" or "happy at school" was inadequate and that parents would respond better to supporting their child if the feedback were more concrete and based on an objective test result.

Emerging concentration issue in Oslo

Overall, immigrants make up 25% of the population in Oslo, but these are not evenly distributed throughout the city. In particular the districts of Søndre Nordstrand and Alna have high concentrations of non-Western immigrants (41% and 38% respectively). While, in general, immigrant students in Oslo have above average test results, educators fear that the emergence of non-Western districts where children attend schools with large percentages of immigrant students are in danger of “tipping”, that is, becoming so heavily immigrant that native-born Norwegians and well-off immigrant families will move away from these districts. Residential segregation coupled with school segregation can result in isolation of immigrants from mainstream society.

There is some evidence to indicate that residential patterns are impacting schooling outcomes. Analysis of PISA 2006 results reveals that at age 15 there is a pronounced difference in the socio-economic and cultural composition of schools attended by immigrant students in Norway (OECD, 2007c). Analysis of national data identified a particular challenge in completing upper secondary education for non-Western immigrant students living in Oslo (Støren *et al.*, 2007). Research from Sweden has investigated the effect of ethnic heterogeneity in school from the perspective of democratic learning and concluded that it does not seem to have a universal positive or negative effect. Research in the United States has consistently shown that residential patterns are the driving factor in school segregation and that consequently “race neutral” school assignment policies do not result in school desegregation, indicating the need for stronger policy interventions (Reardon, *et al.*, 2006).

Policy options

Promote knowledge mobilisation among municipalities, counties, and schools

If the Directorate is going to demand more accountability from officials at the local level, those responsible for schools will need on-going support. Norway needs to create a professional “community of practice” on the issue for immigrant students among relevant officials so that they are not only aware of the rules and regulations they must enforce, but also have access to key new ideas and best practices to stimulate change and improvement in schooling.

The government can take the lead in promoting knowledge mobilisation among municipalities, counties and schools and strengthen the accountability system. This would require devoting resources to identifying key stakeholders, bringing together existing small networks into one network for meetings, creating virtual learning communities to discuss critique and internalise the most important obligations, and developing strategies for implementing the curriculum report, especially on Basic Norwegian and Mother Tongue Teaching for leading and administering schools. This exercise could also identify how research and evidence can be used more effectively to guide practice and how to adapt experiences and lessons from other countries to Norway. Increased pressure to be accountable for results should encourage officials to participate in the support activities provided.

A key channel for this is to support teachers through “peer learning” opportunities and networks that would both identify and spread good practices and build intellectual connections among teachers across different levels of education and across different subject matters. The Finnish Ministry of Education has set up teacher networks to help in matters related to immigrant education. Sweden has given incentives to schools to become “idea schools” working in co-operation with the Swedish National Agency for School Improvement and the Regional Development Centres (RUC). This initiative is designed to start networks, disseminate knowledge, and inspire vocational upper secondary schools that have not come as far in their own quality work. In the United States, the International Resource Center has a Network for Public Schools which is a non-profit organisation dedicated to the

development and support of the network of International High Schools that serve late-entry immigrant English Language Learners.

At another level, the government could help build capacity in municipalities by providing leadership and management training and by promoting knowledge-sharing among municipalities. Municipalities may also benefit from peer-learning, sharing experience and expertise on accommodating immigrant students and tackling some common challenges, such as the provision of mother-language support and setting targets to improve education outcomes. In Sweden, the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SALAR) aims to promote local self-government and democracy. It carries out a benchmarking exercise among municipalities based on school results. The results are shared publicly. Municipalities are to analyse the results to set the vision for themselves and, in parallel, let the schools set the vision and goals themselves. Municipalities then talk with schools, through a so-called “quality dialogue”, where the purpose is not to evaluate schools but to help them improve themselves.

Consider setting achievement targets for improvement outcomes for immigrants

Developing systems for strengthening accountability in general in schools is beyond the scope of this report. Nevertheless, any such system would need to include well-designed measures for assessing progress towards achieving improvements in outcomes for immigrant students, using a value-added approach, as well as criterion-referenced norms. As a start, the national government could specify desired achievement levels for immigrant at the national level and encourage municipalities to set their own achievement targets.

With the contextual information collected in administrative registers and results of national tests, Norway has a rich information base to inform school improvement. In particular there is contextual information on whether or not the student was born outside of Norway, the country/region of origin and the age at which immigrants arrived in Norway. Drawing on such information, preliminary value-added models have been developed in Norway with the aim of presenting a fairer picture of school performance by taking account of the variety of factors outside the control of school that can affect student performance (Haegeland, 2006). Such measures could not only provide additional information on school performance but also help identify schools producing the best learning results for particular student groups, including immigrant students.

Encourage municipalities to work with school leaders and teachers to use evidence of what works in a formative way at the system, school and classroom levels

There is scope for school owners to work with school leaders and teacher to use evidence of what works at the system, school and classroom levels more effectively. The Directorate has developed charting tools and introduced new compulsory tests. Teachers will need training in the use of the charting tools. The Counties should ensure that the introduction of compulsory tests in mathematics and reading at the upper secondary level is accompanied by adequate guidelines and training on how to effectively use the results of these tests to improve students’ future learning. In particular, teachers will need to pay attention to the interpretation of results for children for whom Norwegian is a second language. It will be essential to work with school owners, leaders and teachers to evaluate the effectiveness of these tools for second language learners and to refine the tools.

Teachers also need to be able to use diagnostic tools to judge whether students have regular second language development or specific learning disabilities. School owners should promote the use

of new diagnostic tests which are being developed to assess the language and language-related ability of immigrant children in both their mother language as well as in Norwegian (by the special support services). NAFO and Bredtvet centre have produced new assessment materials testing language competency in various mother languages and these assessment tools will be made available for testing students in primary and lower secondary education. Further, tests of basic reading skills in many different languages are already available for teachers to use. These were developed by NAFO to be used by bilingual teachers alone or in co-operation with relevant monolingual Norwegian teachers.

Alleviate negative effects of concentration

The Ministry of Education and Research should evaluate the capacity of schools in different municipalities and districts to provide the necessary educational support to newly arrived immigrant students. The results of such evaluation can provide useful information to ministries responsible for housing and dispersion policies for immigrants.

The government should evaluate different educational approaches used in schools with mixed student populations. For example, in the Netherlands, the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture launched two years ago the “Knowledge Centre on Mixed Schools”. The Centre acts as a clearing house for existing research on mixed schools and disseminates this via a website and newsletter. Successful examples of inner-city schools with a representative mix of both native and immigrant students are those that promote school quality, enjoy strong support from the school leader and teachers and open doors to the community, including hosting information meetings and other public relations activities.

Box 2.5. Policy recommendations: System management

- Promote knowledge mobilisation among municipalities, counties and schools
 - Support teachers' peer-learning opportunities and networks
 - Provide leadership and management training to municipality and county leaders
- Consider setting achievement targets for improving outcomes for immigrants
- Encourage municipalities to work with school leaders and teachers to use evidence of what works in a formative way at the system, school and classroom levels
 - Support teachers and school leaders to effectively use the available information and tools (*i.e.* charting tools, the results of national tests, language diagnostic tools, etc.)
 - Use the existing contextual information with care to inform school improvement
- Alleviate negative effects of concentration
 - Monitor school capacity in different districts to provide the necessary educational support to newly arrived immigrant students
 - Evaluate different educational practices of schools with mixed student populations and identify good practices

NOTES

-
- 1 Examples of programmes designed to accommodate the diverse needs of immigrant parents include: Family involvement training programmes (*e.g.* Austria, Ireland, Israel, Germany, Sweden, the Netherlands, Norway, the United States, etc.); language learning for workplace (*e.g.* Australia, Canada, Ireland, Sweden, the United States, etc.); learning about the education system and rights and responsibilities in the society in general, learning how to use the public library, etc. (*e.g.* Ireland, Norway, Sweden, etc.); adult language courses including how to read books for children, etc. (*e.g.* Sweden, etc.); mixed courses where parents and children can participate together such as learning the language of the host country and mathematics together with children, etc. (*e.g.* Sweden).
- 2 <http://modersmal.skolutveckling.se>
- 3 Norway has taken a number of initiatives and actions related to teacher education. However, these initiatives are mostly segmented by levels of education. Initial teacher education and in-service training are addressed by separate white papers and strategic plans. For example, the new *White paper on Teacher education* focuses primarily on initial teacher education and recruitment to primary and lower secondary schools. Pre-school teacher education will be addressed separately in the new policy on Quality and Content of Kindergartens planned for 2009. Upper secondary teacher education does not seem to be a focus of any of these measures. Further and continuing education, while briefly mentioned in the *White paper on Teacher Education*, has been primarily supported by previous policies, such as “Competence for Development – Strategy for Competence Development in Primary and Lower Secondary Education 2005 -2008” and the *White Paper on Quality in School* (Report to the Storting No.31).
- 4 These are Bulgarian, Czech, Danish, Dutch, Estonian, Finnish, Hungarian, Latvian, Lithuanian, Modern Greek, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Slovakian and Swedish.
- 5 <http://www.ks.no>
- 6 http://www.ssb.no/english/subjects/00/00/20/kostra_en/

REFERENCES

- Alder, C. (1995), "Research on the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters", Paper presented at the *Second Research Seminar of HIPPY International*, 29-31 May 1995, Jerusalem, Israel.
- Bakken, A. (2003), *Minoritetsspråklig ungdom i skolen. Reproduksjon av ulikheter i sosial mobilitet, NOVA Rapport*, 15/03
- Barnett, S.W. (1995), "Long-term Effects of Early Childhood Programs on Cognitive and School Outcomes", *The Future of Children*, Vol.5, No.3, pp.25-50.
- Bhandal, L. and L. Hopkins (2007), *Fighting Racism and Promoting Equal Opportunities in the Field of Education*, European Network Against Racism, Brussels.
- Brind, T., C. Harper and K. Moore (2008), *Education for Migrant, Minority and Marginalized Children in Europe*, A report commissioned by the Open Society Institute's Education Support Program, Open Society Institute, Budapest.
- Burgon, J. (1997) "Appendix F: The HIPPY Programme in Family Service Centres". *Final Report Family Service Centres Evaluation*, Department of Social Welfare, Wellington.
- CEDEFOP (2006), *Norway: Overview of the Vocational Education and Training System in 2006*, ReferNet, Norway.
- Christensen, G. and P. Stanat, (2007), *Language Policies and Practices for Helping Immigrants and Second-Generation Students Succeed*, The Transatlantic Task Force on Immigration and Integration, Migration Policy Institute, Washington, D.C. Available at: <http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/ChristensenEducation091907.pdf>
- Delpit, L. (1995), *Other People's Children*, New Press, New York.
- Driessen, G. (2005), "From Cure to Curse: The Rise and Fall of Bilingual Education Programs in the Netherlands", in Arbeitsstelle Interkulturelle Konflikte und gesellschaftliche Integration (ed.), *The Effectiveness of Bilingual School Programs for Immigrant Children*, Wissenschaftszentrum Berlin für Sozialforschung, pp. 77-107.
- Engebretsen, A. and Ø. Fuglerud (2007). *Ungdom i flyktningfamilier*, Report 3/07, NOVA, Oslo, (English Summary, pp. 95–96). Available at: www.nova.no/asset/2558/1/2558_1.pdf
- European Commission (2008), *Child Poverty and Well-Being in the EU: Current Status and Way Forward*, European Commission, Brussels.

- Eurydice (2009), *Tackling Social and Cultural Inequalities Through Early Childhood Education and Care in Europe*, Brussels.
- Eurydice (The Information Network on Education in Europe) (2004), *Integrating Immigrant Children into Schools in Europe*. Finland, National Description - 2003/04. Available at: <http://www.mszs.si/eurydice/pub/eurydice/migranti/Finland.pdf>
- Gay, G. (2000), *Culturally Responsive Teaching*, Teachers College Press, New York.
- Gomby, D. (2005), “Home Visitation in 2005: Outcomes for Children and Parents”, *Invest in Kids Working Paper No. 7*, Committee for Economic Development, Invest in Kids Working Group, Washington, D.C. Available at www.ced.org/docs/report/report_ivk_gomby_2005.pdf
- Gonand, F., I. Joumard and R. Price (2007), “Public Spending Efficiency: Institutional Indicators in Primary and Secondary Education”, *OECD Economics Department Working Papers*, No. 543, OECD, Paris.
- Goodwin, A.L. (ed.) (1997), *Assessment for Equity and Inclusion: Embracing All Our Children*, Routledge, New York.
- Haegeland, T. (2006), *School Performance Indicators in Norway: A Background Report for the OECD Project on the Development of Value-added Models in Education Systems*.
- Heckmann, F. (2008), *Education and the Integration of Migrants*, NESSE Analytical Report 1 for EU Commission DG Education and Culture, EFMS, Bamberg.
- Helland, H. and L.A. Støren (2006), “Vocational Education and the Allocation of Apprenticeships: Equal Chances for Applicants Regardless of Immigrant Background?”, *European Sociological Review*, Vol. 22/3, Institute of Education, University of Muenster, Germany, pp. 339–351.
- Høst, H., J.P. Gitlesen and S. Michelsen, (2008), “How the number of apprenticeships are influenced by policy and economic cycles”, in Høst, H., *Continuity and change in Norwegian Vocational Education and Training (VET)*, Vol. 2008/29, NIFUSTEP, Oslo.
- Inspectie van het onderwijs (2008), Regionale analyse. Een analyse van het Amsterdamse basisonderwijs, Inspectie van het onderwijs, Utrecht.
- Karsten, S. (2006), Policies for disadvantaged children under scrutiny: the Dutch policy compared with policies in France, England, Flanders and the USA, *Comparative Education*, Vol. 42/2, Routledge, pp. 261-282.
- Lødding, B. (2009). *Sluttere, slitere og sertifiserte. Bortvalg, gjennomføring og kompetanseoppnåelse blant minoritetsspråklige ungdommer i videregående opplæring. (Quitters, Strugglers and Completers. Opting Out and Qualification Among Young People with Language Minority Background in Norwegian Upper Secondary School)*, Vol. 2009/13, NIFUSTEP, Oslo.
- Loewenberg, S. (2006) The Health of Europe’s Most Marginalised Populations, *The Lancet*, Vol. 268, No. 9553, Elsevier, p. 2114.

- Lombard, A.D. (1994), *Success Begins at Home: The Past, Present and Future of the Home Instruction Program for Preschool Youngsters (2nd edition)*, Dushkin Publishing Group, Guilford, CN.
- LPX Consulting (2008), Evaluation of *Brug for alle unge* (We Need All Youngsters), LPX Consulting, Copenhagen. English summary available at: http://www.brugforalleunge.dk/fileadmin/bruger_upload/Billeder/Publikationer/English_Summary_evaluation_BFAU_final-version.pdf
- Markussen, E., M.W. Frøseth, B. Lødding and N. Sandberg, (2008), *Bortvalg og kompetanse (Early leaving, non-completion or completion)* Vol. 2008/13, NIFU STEP, Oslo.
- Markussen, E. and N. Sandberg, (2005), *Stayere, sluttere og returnerte (Stayers, quitters and returners)*, Vol. 2005/6, NIFUSTEP, Oslo.
- Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training (2008), *Education Mirror 2007*, Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training, Oslo.
- Norwegian Ministry of Education and Research (2008), *OECD Review of Migrant Education – Country Background Report for Norway*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/44/42485380.pdf>
- Nusche, D. (2009), “What Works in Migrant Education? A Review of Evidence and Policy Options”, *OECD Education Department Working Papers*, No. 22, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2008), *Jobs for Immigrants, Volume 2: Labour Market Integration in Belgium, France, the Netherlands and Portugal*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007a), *PISA 2006 – Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World, Volume 1: Analysis*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007b), *Jobs for Immigrants, Volume 1: Labour Market Integration in Australia, Denmark, Germany and Sweden*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2007c), *PISA 2006 – Science Competencies for Tomorrow’s World, Volume 2: Data/Données*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2006a), *Where Immigrant Students Succeed: A Comparative Review of Performance and Engagement in Pisa 2003*. OECD, Paris.
Also available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/2/38/36664934.pdf>
- OECD (2006b), *From Immigration to Integration: Local Solutions to a Global Challenge*, OECD, Paris.
- OECD (2004), *Career Guidance and Public Policy: Bridging the Gap*, OECD, Paris.

- Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) (2002a), *Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils: Three Successful Primary Schools*, Ofsted, HMI 447, London.
Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/135.pdf/>
- Ofsted (2002b), *Achievement of Black Caribbean Pupils: Good Practice in Secondary Schools*, Ofsted, HMI 448, London.
Available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/assets/63.pdf/>
- Ofsted (2009), *Twelve Outstanding Secondary Schools – Excelling Against the Odds*, Ofsted, HMI 080240, London.
- Onderzoek en statistiek (2007), *Segregatie in het basisonderwijs in Amsterdam*, Gemeente Amsterdam, Onderzoek en statistiek, Amsterdam.
- Otero, M.S. and A. McCoshan (2005), "Study on access to education and training", *Final Report for the European Commission*, ECOTEC Research and Consulting Limited, Birmingham.
- Pedersen, M. S. (2006), *Hold fast (Hold on)*, Roskilde University Centre. Available at: http://pub.uvm.dk/2006/holdfast/hold_fast_low.pdf
- Pont, B., D. Nusche and H. Moorman (2008), *Improving School Leadership – Volume 1: Policy and Practice*, OECD, Paris.
- Rambøll Management (2009), *Evaluering av implementering av læreplaner i grunnleggende norsk og morsmål for språklige minoriteter*, Utdanningsdirektoratet, Oslo.
- Ramirez, J., S. Yuen, and E. Ramey (1991), *Final Report: Longitudinal Study of Structured English Immersion Strategy, Early Exit and Late-Exit Transitional Bilingual Education Programs for Language Minority Children*. US Department of Education Contract No. 300-87-0156, Squirre International, San Mateo, CA.
- Reynolds, A.J., S.R. Ou and J.W. Topitzes (2004). *Paths of Effects of Early Childhood Intervention on Educational Attainment and Delinquency: A Confirmatory Analysis of the Chicago Child-Parent Centers*, Vol. 75/5, Child Development, Wiley-Blackwell, pp. 1299-1328.
- Reardon, S.F., J.T. Yun and M. Kurlaender (2006), "Implications of Income-Based School Assignment Policies for Racial School Segregation", *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, Vol. 28/1, Sage, pp. 49-75.
- Sadowski, M. (ed.) (2008), *Teaching Immigrant and Second-Language Students. Strategies for Success*, Harvard Education Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Shepherd Johnson, L. (2003), "The Diversity Imperative: building a culturally responsive school ethos", *Intercultural Education*, Vol. 14, Routledge, pp. 17–30.

- Støren, L.A., H. Helland and J. B. Grøgaard (2007) *Og hvem stod igjen...?* Report 14/07, Oslo: NIFU STEP. (English title: *And who was left behind...? Throughput of students in upper secondary education for classes embarking upper secondary education in 1999, 2000 and 2001*. English Summary, pp. 24–38, see http://www.nifustep.no/norsk/publikasjoner/og_hvem_stod_igjen.)
- Swedish Ministry of Education and Research (2008), *OECD Review of Migrant Education – Country Background Report for Sweden* Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/42/42485410.pdf>
- Swedish National Agency for Education (2008), *With another mother tongue – students in compulsory school and the organisation of teaching and learning*, Swedish National Agency for Education , Stockholm.
- Thomas, W. and V. Collier, (2002), *Summary of Findings across All Research Sites. A National Study of School Effectiveness for Language Minority Students' Long-term Achievement*, Final Report: Project 1.1., Center for Research on Education, Diversity and Excellence, University of California, Santa Cruz, CA.
- Tikly, L. et al. (2006), *Evaluation of Aiming High: African Caribbean Achievement Project*, Department for Education and Skills, London. Available at: http://www.standards.dfes.gov.uk/ethnicminorities/resources/ACAPevalrsrch_reportoct06.pdf
- Wenglinsky, H. (2002), How schools matter: The link between teacher classroom practices and student academic performance. *Education Policy Analysis Archives* 10(12) (February 13).
- White, K., K. Lewis, and F. Fletcher-Campbell (2006), “Raising the Achievement of Bilingual Learners in Primary Schools: Evaluation of the Pilot/Programme”, DfES Research report No.758, Department for Education and Skills, United Kingdom. Available at: www.dfes.gov.uk/research/data/uploadfiles/RR758.pdf
- Wroblewski, A. and B. Herzog-Punzenberger (2009), *OECD Review of Migrant Education – Country Background Report for Austria*. Available at: <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/26/42485003.pdf>

ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

National policy context

Budget: The red-green coalition government will continue to develop the Norwegian welfare state, through investment in kindergartens, education and research. Amongst other things, the government proposes spending a total of around NOK 2 billion on improving the quality of our schools in 2009. Priority will be given to measures for quality development and quality assurance such as enhancing the status and competencies of teachers, making the teaching profession more attractive and improve quality and standards in schools.

The Knowledge Promotion is the latest reform in the ten-year compulsory school and in upper secondary education and training. It introduces certain changes in substance, structure and organization from the first grade in the ten-year compulsory school to the last grade in upper secondary education and training. The overall objective of Knowledge Promotion is to help pupils and apprentices to develop fundamental skills that will enable them to participate actively in our society of knowledge. The Norwegian school system is inclusive; a school for all. Everyone is to be given the same opportunities to develop their abilities. The Knowledge Promotion, with its special emphasis on learning and learning outcomes, is meant to help ensure that all pupils receive adapted education.

The following are the most important changes in the Norwegian school system that stem from the *Knowledge Promotion* strategy: Basic skills are to be strengthened, reading and writing skills are emphasised from the first grade, new subject curricula have been developed in all subjects, clearly indicating what pupils and apprentices are expected to learn, new distributions of teaching hours per subject, new structure of available choices within education programs, freedom at the local level with respect to work methods, teaching materials and the organization of classroom instruction.

- Report No. 16 (2006-2007) to the Storting, the Norwegian Government's *White Paper on Early Intervention for Lifelong Learning*, focuses on equal opportunities and early intervention.
- Report No.31 (2007-2008) to the Storting, The Norwegian Government's *White Paper on Quality in Education*, focuses on universal measures to improve the general quality in school.
- Report No.23 (2007-2008) to the Storting, the Norwegian Government's *White Paper: Language Build Bridges* include both universal and targeted measures to improve language proficiency.

Equal Education in Practice! Strategy for increased learning and greater participation for language minorities in kindergartens and schools is a strategy targeted at pupils and apprentices from linguistic minorities. The Strategic Plan is to provide a many-faceted picture and implement goal-oriented measures that can improve the situation for linguistic minorities who do not participate and for those who do not achieve the desired learning outcomes.

There are introduced new curricula; The curriculum *Basic Norwegian for Language Minorities* and *Curriculum for Mother Tongue Teaching for Language Minorities* were introduced autumn 2007. This is described in the strategy *Equal Education in Practice!* The government is working to strengthen the rights for linguistic minorities in the Education Act, in order to secure equal learning opportunities (see background report on Norway). The Committee for equal education for linguistic minorities in kindergarten, school and higher education was set down in October 2008. The committee will study the quality of the education given to linguistic minorities, how the teaching is organised and if the legal and economic aspects secure equal learning opportunities for linguistic minority pupils and apprentices.

Purpose of the review

Country specific priority questions need to be in line with the overarching policy question of the Review on Migrant Education: *what policies will promote successful education outcomes for first and second generation migrants?* To make the country review visits as focused and relevant as possible, the focus of the review will be:

1. To identify policies that will help prevent immigrant students from dropping out from school and/ or re-integrate immigrant students who have dropped out back into education or work.
2. To highlight areas of policy that will effectively help low-performing immigrant students to raise their learning outcomes.
3. To assess the benefits and opportunities of early intervention.
4. To review comprehensive or universal measures from which immigrant students may benefit besides targeted interventions for immigrant students.

Scope

The level of education will include: pre-primary, primary and secondary education with a specific focus on upper-secondary with respect to the drop-out issues.

Overall questions to be addressed:

- How do educational factors relate to immigrant students' completion rates and better performance?
- What are the major challenges in improving completion rates and raising student performance? Do current reform(s), comprehensive and universal measure(s), and targeted intervention(s) address the challenges sufficiently – what is working/not working?
- Are there international insights in overcoming the challenges from which your country might draw? If so, what appear to be the principal benefits and advantages of these approaches to your country? And what are the most feasible strategies to overcome the challenges in a manner that respects the culture, values and traditions of your education system? Which are the most important challenges requiring urgent attention?

- To implement such strategies, what initiatives might be pursued by the state, municipalities, schools and other key stakeholders in your country?

Specific questions to be addressed

- What are the effective induction programmes for newly arrived immigrant students (especially for those who arrive at an older age, those who arrive as asylum seekers without parents, etc.)?
- What policies can effectively raise language proficiency of immigrant students and their parents (immersion, bilingual education or mother-language education at school or language support programmes outside school)? What are the effective teacher education programmes and in-service training to enhance teachers' capacity in implementing the language support policies?
- What policies and practices, besides language support, can ensure good learning environments at school and school responsiveness to cultural diversity to better meet the needs of immigrant students (*e.g.* quality school leaders, academic and career guidance provision, assistance with home work, non-educational activities, support for good learning environment at home, etc)?
- What are the effective preventive interventions for potential early school leaving immigrant students and the effective outreach strategies to provide second chance to those who have dropped out from school?
- What are the effective measures to widen participation in early childhood care and education?

ANNEX B: POLICY REVIEW OF NORWAY

The *fact-finding visit* seeks to establish the facts, identify issues and formulate preliminary policy conclusions. Based on the findings of the visit, the Secretariat prepares a discussion paper that sets the scene for policy review visit. It summarises general strengths and challenges; identifies relevant features of the national context and priority areas for improving policy and practice; and suggests research-based policy options to address the challenges. This visit to Norway took place on 3-7 November 2008.

The *policy review visit* aims to narrow down the policy focus for the country. During the visit, the review team meets with various stakeholders to assess the *feasibility, timeliness, cost-effectiveness, robustness, sustainability* and *facility of implementation* of the preliminary options proposed. As a result, the extensive list of policy suggestions becomes focused and prioritised. The visit also aims to foster open policy dialogue among key stakeholders on migrant education. This visit to Norway took place on 16-19 February 2009.

Programme for OECD Fact-finding Mission, 3-7 November, 2008

Monday, 3 November

Oslo

Ministry of Education and Research (KD)	Kari Brustad, Kjersti Flåthen, Tove Slinde Mogstad, Elisabeth Harlem Eide and Synne Børstad
Directorate of Education and Training (Udir)	Laila Fossum, Vibeke Thue, Matilda Burman, Gro Kamfjord and Tone Abrahamsen

Tuesday, 4 November

Oslo

Meeting with various Ministries and Directorates	
Ministry of Education and Research (KD)	Kari Brustad, Jens Rydland and Synne Børstad
Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion (AID)	Anne Lilltvedt
Integration and Diversity Directorate (IMDI)	Jamila Bubikova Moan
Directorate of Education and Training (Udir)	Laila Fossum and Vibeke Thue
Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development (KRD)	Håkon Andreas Evju
Ministry of Children and Equality (BLD)	Anne-Lise Grette

Norwegian Institute for Adult Learning, Ministry of Education and Research (VOX)	Tove Dina Røynestad and Hilde Havgar
Meeting with Social Partners	
The Norwegian Confederation of Trade Unions	Per Syversen (invited but not present)
Confederation of Norwegian Enterprise	Helge Halvorsen (invited but not present)
Union of Education Norway	Agneta Bolinder
School Student Union of Norway	Håvard Vederhus (invited but not present – another representative attended)
Meeting at Oslo University College	
Teacher training at Oslo University College	Unni Hagen Knut Patrick Hanevik Per Arne Olsen
Meeting with Researchers	
NOVA	Anders Bakken
NIFU STEP	Liv Støren and Berit Lødding
Rambøll Management	Grete Aspelund
University of Oslo	Jon Lauglo and Astrid Roe
Norwegian Center for Child Behavioural Development	Terje Ogden
Directorate for Education and Training	Grethe Hovland
Oslo University College	Brit Steinsvik, Finn Aarsæther and Marit Storeng

Wednesday, 5 November*Oslo*

Visit upper secondary school in Oslo	Synne Børstad, KD
Meeting at National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO)	Jens Rydland, KD and Vibeke Thue, Udir
Meeting with other institutions	
Norway's Contact Committee for Immigrants and the Authorities (KIM)	Hilde Roald
Parents' Organisation for Improving the Co-operation between Minority Parents and School (MIR)	
General Parent Union (FUG)	Randi Jørgensen
Norwegian Organisation for Asylum Seekers (OMUD)	Morten Tjessem (invited but not present – another representative attended)

Ombudsman for Children	Camilla Kaied
The Equality and Anti-Discrimination Ombud	Taran Knudstad (invited but not present – another representative attended)

Thursday, 6 November*Trondheim*

Trondheim Municipality	
Welcome	May Johnsen
Education for Minority Students in Trondheim	Toril Haugseth
Ministry of Education and Research (KD)	Jens Rydland
School visits	
Åsheim Lower Secondary School Co-operation with Tiller Upper Secondary School - Project home work (SINTEF)	Inger Hilstad
Tiller Upper Secondary School	Toril Hofstad
Ringen Kindergarten	Terje Nilsen

Friday, 7 November*Oslo*

Rommen Primary School Tokerud Lower Secondary School	John Langmoen, Headmaster, Rommen Primary School Synne Børstad, KD
Education for minority students in Oslo	Mette Gaarder
Meeting with Ministry of Education and Research	

Programme for OECD policy visit, 16-19 February, 2009**Monday, 16 February***Oslo*

Meeting with the Ministry of Education and Research and the Directorate for Education and Training	
Meeting with school owners /leaders	
Interest Organisation for the Municipalities and Regions (KS)	
Oslo Municipality	Bjarne Hansen
Rommen Primary School, Oslo	John Langmoen, Headmaster Elin Jacobsen and Bushra Naheed
Trondheim Municipality	Hasan Ajnadzic, Education Advisor Mai Johnsen, School Administrator
Huseby School, Trondheim	Merete Ødegård, Advisor on reception classes
Larvik Municipality	Jan Erik Johannessen
Hedmark County	Hedmark Fylkeskommune (represented)
Hamar Katedralskole, Hedmark County	Rita Henriksen
Teachers union	Agneta Bolinder, Elisabet Dahle and Sonia Monfort Roedelé
Committee on Equal Education	Sissel Østberg, Head of Committee

Tuesday, 17 February*Oslo*

Seminar on migrant education	
Committee on Equal Education	
Head of Committee	Sissel Østberg
Municipality of Trondheim	Hasan Ajnadzic
NOVA	Anders Bakken
Researcher, Sweden	Aina Bigestans
County of Hordaland	Petter de Presno Borthen
County of Rogaland	Sølvi Ona Gjøl, County Governor
Municipality of Oslo	Helge Jagmann
Head of kindergarten in Sør-Varanger	Bodil Labahå
Parents' Organisation for Improving the Co-operation between Minority Parents and School (MIR)	Bashar Al Raho
Norwegian Directorate for Children, Youth	Pernille Pettersen Smith

and Family Affairs	
Teachers' Union	Agneta Bolinder
Labour Union	Nina Tangnæs Grønvold
Norway's Contact Committee for Immigrants and the Authorities (KIM)	Rita Kumar
Interest Organisation for the Municipalities and Regions (KS)	Arne Rekdal Olsen
Student Union	Håvar Vederhus, Head
Secretariat on Equal Education	Matias Nissen-Meyer Giæver Kathrine Alvern Grete Gåra Liltved Anne Erdis Mare Løvaas Elisabeth Vibeke Thue Synne N. Børstad
Additional researchers	
NIFU Step	Berit Lødding, and Liv Anne Støren
Hedmark University College	Tor Ola Engen
University of Oslo	Vibeke Grøver Aukrust and Bente Hagtvedt
FAFO	Marianne Dæhlen
SØF	Torberg Falch
Ministry of Education and Research	Jens Rydland
Meeting with various ministries and directorates	
Ministry of Education and Research (KD) Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion (AID) Integration and Diversity Directorate (IMDI) Directorate of Education and Training (Udir) Ministry of Local Government and Regional Development (KRD) Ministry of Children and Equality (BLD)	

Wednesday, 18 November*Oslo*

Meeting with National Centre for Multicultural Education (NAFO)	
Meeting with Rambøll Management	Marianne Højdahl Grete Aspelund

Thursday, 19 November*Oslo*

Meeting with the State Secretary	Lisbet Rugtvedt Lubna Jaffery Fjell , political advisor at the Ministry of Labour and Social Inclusion
----------------------------------	--

ANNEX C: LANGUAGE SUPPORT POLICIES

Table C1. Existence of an explicit curriculum for the most common language support programmes

2003

Country	Sub-national entity	Primary education		Lower secondary education	
		Immersion with systemic language support	Immersion with a preparatory phase of language support	Immersion with systemic language support	Immersion with a preparatory phase of language support
Australia	New South Wales	Yes	a	Yes	Yes
	Queensland	No	No	No	No
	Victoria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Austria	Vienna	Depends on the school	a	Depends on the school	a
	Vorarlberg	Depends on the school	a	Depends on the school	a
Belgium	French Community	a	No	a	No
Canada	British Columbia	No	a	a	Yes
	Ontario	No	a	Yes	a
Denmark		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Finland		No	No	No	No
Germany		Yes, in some länder	No	No	No
Luxembourg		No	No	No	Yes
Netherlands		Yes	a	No	No
Norway		Yes	m	Yes	m
Spain		a	a	No	a
Sweden ¹		Yes	No	Yes	No
Switzerland	Canton Berne	No	No	No	No
	Canton Geneva	No	a	No	No
	Canton Zurich	No	No	No	No
United Kingdom	England	No	a	No	a

1. A curriculum exists for the school subject *Swedish as a second language* which may be implemented in different types of programmes

Immersion with systematic language support: Students with limited proficiency in the language of instruction are taught in a regular classroom. In addition, they receive specified periods of instruction aimed at the development of language skills in the second language, with primary focus on grammar, vocabulary, and communication rather than academic content areas. Academic content is addressed through mainstream instruction.

Immersion with a preparatory phase of language support: Most students in the programme have limited proficiency in the second language. They initially receive some instruction through their native language, but there is a gradual shift toward instruction in the second language only. The goal of the programme is to make the transition to mainstream classrooms as rapidly as possible.

Source: OECD, 2006a

OECD Reviews of Migrant Education

NORWAY

Net migration to the OECD has tripled since 1960. There has been extensive research on the successful integration of migrants into labour markets, but very little research at the international level focusing on the education outcomes of their children and the effectiveness of education policy interventions. In many OECD countries, immigrant students tend to have more restricted access to quality education, leave school earlier, and have lower academic achievements than their native peers. Therefore, improving the education of immigrant students is often high on policy agendas.

The OECD Review of Migrant Education was launched to help policy makers to design and implement migrant education policy successfully in their countries. It will provide solid facts about access, participation and student performance of immigrant students in comparison with their native peers and identify a set of policy options based on evidence of what works and examples of experience from many countries.

By international standards, Norway has an inclusive education system. However, immigrant students, on average, have weaker education outcomes than their native peers at all levels of education, and particularly for first-generation immigrant students and at the upper secondary level. Norway is undertaking a wide range of universal and targeted measures to improve the situation of immigrant students. Nevertheless, there is scope to:

- Improve access to quality early childhood education and care for all, especially immigrant children under age three.
- Enhance capacities of teachers and school leaders at primary and secondary schools to be more responsive to the growing linguistic and cultural diversity of students.
- Mainstream language support into curriculum, teacher education and research.
- Provide more support in vocational education programmes such as technical language acquisition and career guidance.
- Compensate for the gaps in learning environments at home through extended school hours, homework assistance, providing mentors from immigrant backgrounds and supporting migrant parents.
- Better manage regional variations by strengthening accountability of schools and promoting knowledge sharing among municipalities and schools.
- Monitor progress and use formative evaluation at all levels – classroom, school and system.

OECD is conducting policy reviews of migrant education in Austria, Denmark, Ireland, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden. This report is one in the series of country policy reviews and provides country-specific diagnosis and policy recommendations. The overall findings of the OECD Review of Migrant Education will be published in 2010 as a concise, action-oriented handbook for policy makers.

Background information and documents are available at www.oecd.org/edu/migration.