

## Summary notes on the student-exchange week 12-16 November 2018

### Monday 12<sup>th</sup> of November

The morning was started with a welcome and energizer organized by two students from the HvA who went to the exchange week last year in Copenhagen. The energizer was focused on getting to know each other, the Danish students (13) and the Dutch students (20).

After the energizer the same two students held a presentation on the Dutch day care system.

We also had two presentations from the Danish students about the Danish child care system and the Danish educational system.

After a short break the students went into a discussion about the differences and similarities in the system.

We presented the Erasmus+ project and described the goal, the outputs and the reason why the students are meeting here together. After that we dove into Output 1. We discussed plenary how they would give a definition of social inclusion. People mentioned:

- Being accepted into a group
- Special needs being able to be guided in a regular setting
- It's a hype
- Passend onderwijs in NL, SN is regular educational settings.
- It is a way of saving money.

A short introduction on the review article was given and after that students were split into small groups again to discuss the article based on reflection questions. Even though the students had the assignment to read the review prior to the first day of the Exchange week, not one student had read it. It was therefore quite difficult for them to answer the reflection questions but it was a good starting point for them to get acquainted with the concept of social inclusion.

After exploring the literature review, students were asked to stay in their groups and were handed the cases from output 2. Every group was assigned a different case and handed reflection questions. Students discussed cases from Denmark, the Netherlands and from Slovenia. The cases were quite long and students had a hard time reading the cases on the spot. It would have been more valuable to read them prior to the lesson, in their free time. However, it seemed as though students also had a hard time doing any kind of 'homework'. Another idea might be to shorten the cases for these exchange weeks, so students don't have to read the extended versions. That way they can read a short case and discuss the questions. Another point is that the cases are best practices and therefore already contain the solutions. Of course it's possible for students to explore what other solutions and approaches are possible, but another option would be to leave out the 'solution' or approach the cases describe, and let the students together discuss the options. Students also mentioned this, that it would be more challenging for them if the solutions were left out (or could be read at a later moment).

### **Tuesday 13<sup>th</sup> of November**

In the morning Ankie van der Kerckhove gave a presentation on the Competence system. After that the students were split into small groups for a discussion based on reflection questions concerning the opinions of students regarding the different competence profiles.

Unfortunately some students had extreme difficulty with the English language and understood very little and were hesitant to actively participate in smaller group discussions.

In the afternoon the Slovenian colleagues gave a presentation on the Slovenian ECEC system and presented the Hans Christian Anderson day care institute. They also showed their new film of the day care and students were inspired to see best practices in Slovenia. After that students were prepared for their field visits on Wednesday. They were given an observation guide (see Appendix) and were asked to look at the different criteria in this guide and select a few to specifically focus on while visiting the different schools and daycare institutions. The assignment was to then reflect on this the following day.

**Wednesday 14<sup>th</sup> of November:** Field visits to five different locations, IKC's, day care centers, pre-schools, and primary schools in different socio-economic areas.

### **Thursday 15<sup>th</sup> of November**

In the morning we had a reflection on the field visits. The students went into their field visit-groups and discussed the institutions and the approaches and challenges to social inclusion. All the groups had one or more members of the group present their reflections and observations.

After the break Serv Vinders and Yvette Vervoort presented on the policy paper.

Challenges were discussed by Serv and Yvette in an international perspective. What is Denmark good at, what is the NL good at, what is Slovenia good at, and Ghent. Money as a prerequisite for good social inclusion is discussed, but another important aspect is parental involvement. And observations from the projects have made clear Ghent is a real expert in this area, but policy has also invested their money into this. Also good leadership is a prerequisite for effective social inclusion. Policy is of course so dependent on elections and how finances are distributed. In Slovenia, Ljubljana, policy is more stable, less elections and policy is made by experts. That's a great advantage. Also the problems with politics is discussed. What is missing in NL is, everything is really going well, when it comes to lists. All the ratings are good. Kids in NL are happy, the PISA scores are good, why change it. Everyone is more or less happy. Policy will only change if it is more seen as a real problem in society, politicians need to see it's necessary.

In the afternoon a part of output 3 was presented to the students. We displayed two films, one from Copenhagen and one from Ljubljana. We handed reflection questions to the students prior to each film and discussed these with the students after each film. Students really valued the films as they helped the students form images of best practices in regards to social inclusion, enhancing their understanding from a cross cultural perspective.

### **Friday 16<sup>th</sup> of November**

On the Friday students were asked to form groups and reflect on what they had learnt during the exchange week, the differences on ECEC in the different participating countries, but also in particular to reflect on what they had learnt in regards to Social Inclusion. Students from the Pedagogical Program visited the exchange-week students and they gave small group presentations. It was very

valuable to see what they had learnt and to hear them present it to other students from the education Program at the HVA.

After the reflections students were informed about Output 4 and to give input on the development of the framework for the Social Inclusion Module, for using the different outputs as study material. Professor dr. Ruben Fukkink then joined the group to give a short closing presentation on Social Inclusion and Urban Education, working with lots of photo-images and asking students in what way they were able to recognize social inclusion.

### **Evaluation of the week by students and project members:**

Students were very excited about the different presentations, in particular those of Serv and Yvette about policy approaches in different countries and Ruben's presentation on social inclusion in the urban context, using many images in which students were asked to observe and recognize elements of social inclusion.

The students look back very positively on the field visits.

For future exchanges the following tips have been collected by the students as well as developed by the team:

- Getting to know each other - at the start, more activities focusing on exchanges and icebreakers.
- Field trips at the start might be more valuable than in the middle of the week.
- Use more images in presentations (images enhance the understanding of the concept of social inclusion).
- Present more theory using images and dilemma's. Theory becomes valuable once it's connected to real live examples and problems.
- Cases: The cases need to be rewritten and comprised. In their current form many cases also present the answers or solutions. For students it's more interesting to be presented cases not just as best practices but also as problems still seeking solutions.
- Competences: cross comparison; a model with different levels, practicing with applying the levels. Practicing not just the individual level but also the institutional level.

Evaluation post-exchange week. Odette continued to work with the Dutch group, participating in the minor 'the young child', and noticed how after the exchange week, students discussed topics of social inclusion without it being explicitly addressed by the teacher or the curriculum. It became clear that students have begun to integrate the concept of social inclusion into their pedagogical thinking and acting.