



This Project is funded by the European Union under the 7th Framework Programme

Deliverable D9.1

Consortium & Management Team

Responsible institution: Centre for Migration and Intercultural Studies -
University of Antwerp (UA)

Authors:

Project manager (PM):

Lore Van Praag

Project coordinator (PC):

Christiane Timmerman

Financial manager:

Marianne Samson

The **Consortium** is comprised of 10 academic institutes from different European countries:

1. Belgium, University of Antwerp, Centre for Migration and Intercultural Studies (coordinator) (UA)
2. United Kingdom, Middlesex University, Social Policy Research Centre (MU)
3. Sweden, Stockholm University (SU)
4. Portugal, University of Porto, Center for Research in Education (UPORTO)
5. Netherlands, Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR)
6. Poland, University of Warsaw, Faculty of Education (UW)
7. Spain, Autonomous University of Barcelona (UAB)
8. Hungary, Central European University, Center for Policy Studies (CPS)
9. Austria, Wien University of Economics and Business, Education Science Group (WU)
10. United Kingdom, University of Sheffield (USFD)

The **Management Team (MT)** consists of the core partners of the project, who are also Work package leaders:

UA: General Coordinator, expert in Qualitative Research (WP1, WP4, WP7, WP8, WP9)

MU: Expert in Quantitative Research (WP3)

UW: Expert in data triangulation and implementation and development of conceptual models in education systems (WP5)

UPORTO: Expert in the training of young researchers and provision of services to the community (WP2)

EUR: Expert in policy development (WP6)

Partner 1, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Lore Van Praag/ Christiane Timmerman/ Marianne Samson

Partner 2, Middlesex University, United Kingdom

Louise Ryan

Partner 4, University of Porto, Portugal

Helena C. Araújo / Eunice Macedo

Partner 5, Erasmus University Rotterdam, The Netherlands

Maurice Crul

Partner 6, University of Warsaw, Poland

Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

The MT guarantees, because of its composition, an interdisciplinary management of the project. The MT will assist the Coordinator in making strategic decisions, in particular situations concerning the scientific content of the project, its implementation and dissemination strategies. This team will also overlook the reporting to the EU and the responsibilities of each participant to contribute to reports and other deliverables. More in particular, the MT will assist the Coordinator in:

- the preparation and supervision of the project activities and the timeline
- the supervision of the quality of the research methodology
- the supervision of the quality and content of the research reports
- the follow up of the communication with the Commission
- the supervision of the reports to the Commission
- agreeing to procedures and policies for dissemination of knowledge from the project
- making projects how to act in case of a defaulting partner

The **Consortium Team (CT)** consists of all the researchers from all partner institutions (Team leaders, Senior researchers, PhD researchers, etc.), who meet at least once a year during the lifespan of the project. The Consortium Team meetings are crucial anchor points of the project because they allow all researchers and partners involved to meet face-to-face discussing the further development of the project.

Consortium team meetings

CT I (Antwerp, March 2013): Kick – off meeting

CT II (Porto, January 2014): Discussion of definition ESL, selection of focus regions and focus schools, theory development, mapping of ESL policies, planning of quantitative empirical cycle, planning of dissemination activities

CT III (London, March 2015): Discussion of quantitative instrument A1, qualitative instruments, planning of dissemination activities

CT IV (Antwerp, February 2016): Discussion of quantitative instruments B & A2, of qualitative instruments, the progress of the empirical fieldwork and identification of target group, planning of dissemination activities

CT V (Warsaw, March 2017): Discussion of completed fieldwork and quantitative and qualitative analyses and triangulation, development toolkit and policy briefs, dissemination activities

CT VI (Copenhagen, August 2017): ECER

Content - Overview Meetings

- 1. Kick off - 1st Consortium/Scientific Meeting – Antwerp, Belgium, 12-13 March 2013**
 - **1a. Management Committee/team Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 13 March 2013**
 - 2. Scientific and Policy Meeting – Brussels, Belgium, 7 June 2013**
 - 3. 2nd Consortium Meeting, Porto, Portugal, 28-29 January 2014**
 - **3a. Management Committee/team Meeting, Porto, Portugal, 29 January 2014**
 - 4. Scientific and Policy Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 29-30 September 2014**
 - 5. 3th Consortium/Scientific Meeting, London, United Kingdom, 21-22 April 2015**
 - **5a. Management Committee/Team Meeting, London, United Kingdom, 22 April 2015**
 - 6. Scientific and Policy Meeting, Budapest, Hungary, 10 September 2015**
 - 7. 4th Consortium Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 3-4 March 2016**
 - **7a. Management Committee Meeting, Antwerp, 3-4 March 2016**
 - 8. Scientific and Policy Meeting, Dublin, United Kingdom, 26 August 2016**
 - 9. Scientific Meeting, London, United Kingdom, 15 February 2017**
 - 10. 5th Consortium Meeting, Warsaw, Poland, 16 -17 March 2017**
 - **10a. International Seminar: Reducing Early School Leaving in the EU: Findings of Comparative Research, Warsaw, Poland, 15 March 2017**
 - **10b. Management Committee Meeting, Warsaw, Poland, 16 -17 March 2017**
 - 11. 6th Consortium ECER Meeting, Copenhagen, Denmark, 25 August 2017**
 - 12. Management Committee Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 8 September 2017**
 - 13. Scientific Meeting, Barcelona, Spain, 20 October 2017**
 - 14. Policy Meeting, Brussels, Belgium, 16 November 2017**
-

1. Kick off - 1st Consortium/Scientific Meeting – Antwerp, Belgium, 12-13 March 2013

RESL.eu members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Cristina Rocha

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Maurice Crul, Elif keskiner

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała, Paulina Marchlik

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Àbel Bereményi

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS): Agnes Kende

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU): Marie Gitschthaler, Barbara Diexer

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Jody Gelber, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

EU Project Officer: Monica Menapace (13 March)

Scientific and Policy committee members: Marcelo Suárez-Orozco, Suzanne Conze (12 March), Catherine Pérotin (12 March), Ilko Yordanov (12 March)

Hosted by UA at Hof Van Liere, Antwerp

Welcome

The Project Coordinator, Christiane Timmerman (UA) welcomed all the participants present at the first RESL.eu Consortium meeting (Annex 1: participants' list with email addresses).

After a round of the table allowing each person to present him/herself to the others, the program of the meeting was adopted.

Overview objectives RESL

Christiane Timmerman presented an overview of the objectives, research themes and questions, work packages and the project's management structure. The project's two main research questions are: 1) How does the complex and often subtle interplay of factors on a macro, meso and micro level predict early school leaving?; and 2) Which interventions are successful in keeping 'a pupil at risk of ESL' in school /alternative learning arena and which specific approaches /concurrences of variables explain this success?

WP1 and WP2 focus on the foundations of the project, namely: 1) the theoretical framework on ESL; 2) a field description of the education systems throughout the nine partner countries; 3) developing a workable definition of ESL; and 4) a description / analysis of education policies and instruments to tackle ESL.

WP3 and WP4 on the other hand constitute the core of the research project and its analytical finality. These WP's aim to understand the mechanisms of ESL from the systemic/structural over the institutional to the individual level of 'the pupils at risk of ESL' and their community (parents, peers...). The second goal is to identify, analyze and extrapolate the intervention and compensation measures that are successful for pupils, in spite of their risk of ESL on a EU scale. This will be done by applying a sound mixed-method design on a population consisting of: 1) pupils with a profile at risk for ESL (some of whom stay in school, others leave entering an alternative learning arena, while others still stay without education, employment, training (NEET)); 2) school staff from the focus schools (WP4); and, 3) policy-makers on different levels (WP2). The quantitative part of the data collection will consist of 25,200 surveys, the qualitative part of 994 contact moments.

WP5 and WP6 pertain to the normative finality of the project, and aim to make recommendations for policy and instruments to tackle ESL on a EU scale, taking into account country specific sensitivities and processes influencing the possible resistance-to-change. The focus is on the development and implementation of policies and specific measures to influence ESL that should also be relevant to policy makers and school staff as well as representatives from civil society. WP7 will assess the cost-benefit structure of the proposed policies and instruments using existing data within and outside the EU context.

Finally WP8 contains the dissemination plan aiming to valorize the research results towards different audiences and stakeholder groups (such as EU- and national policy makers, school staff, representatives from civil society, organizations working with youngsters at risk to leave school early, and academics). The communication team consisting of one person from each of the partners will design a tailor-made approach of the different target audiences.

The planning of RESL Consortium meetings and their respective agenda's as listed in the DOW were also presented:

CT I (Antwerp, M3): Kick – off meeting

CT II (Porto, M13): Definition ESL, selection of research areas, and focus schools, theory development, mapping of ESL policies, planning of quantitative empirical cycle

CT III (London, M25): Discussion of quantitative instrument A1, qualitative instruments;

CT IV (Antwerp, M37): Discussion of quantitative instruments B & A2, of qualitative instruments, of empirical fieldwork

CT V (Warsaw, M49): Discussion of completed fieldwork and quantitative and qualitative analyses

CT VI (Antwerp, M57): Integration of all insights gathered during the project and refinement of theoretical model, discussion of policy implications and final dissemination strategies.

A first comment to this planning came from MU, suggesting that the “discussion of quantitative instrument A1” currently scheduled for CT III (M25) should be rescheduled to CT II (M13).

Uporto suggested that there needs to be more clarity on the difference between the group of “9” partners and the group of “7” partners. It does not suffice that the 2 extra partners are not involved in collecting empirical data, their tasks should be explicitly specified in each of the WP activities.

The suggestion from UAB to report the deadline of the first deliverables was referred for discussion to the planning session at the end of the kick off meeting. The project coordinator did however emphasize the importance of respecting the deliverables deadlines mentioned in the DOW.

Both MU and EUR expressed concern about the delineation of the RESL project data and the data collection by the PhD students employed by the project, yet working on their individual PhD projects. One suggestion was to make a project wide overview of the PhD topics within each partner institution.

WP1 - Theoretical and methodological framework ESL

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the objectives and timeframe for WP1. In WP1, there are three major objectives: 1) Elaborate and refine the initial/tentative framework (state of the art, theoretically sound and methodologically operational framework, links between concepts, theories, methods and data collection) (Month 1 to 9); 2) Theoretically support data collection in WP3 and WP4, in relation to the national and local policy insights collected during WP2 (Month 7 to 9); and, 3) Final refinement incorporating all the collected data (Month 55-57).

Project Paper 2 on the project's conceptualization and theoretical framework is due by month 9, i.e. 31st of October 2013.

In view of this deadline, UA proposed to have all countries' input for WP1 sent to them by May 31st; complete the discussion during a skype conference in the month of June; have a first draft of PP2 sent to the partners on September 2nd so as to receive feedback by September 20th; have a 2nd conference call in the week of September 23rd; have a final draft of PP2 ready by October 1st to send to the SPC members for feedback by October 18th.

The ensuing discussion on 1) the linkages between WP1 & WP2, 2) the need for smaller meetings in between CT and 3) the need for a template which will ensure that all countries send the same type of information (in particular including non-English literature from the year 2000 onwards) and yet which will also allow for sufficient flexibility so as to include country specific accents, resulted in the following decisions.

- UA to work together with Uporto on developing 1 template for the 2 WP's; template draft to be sent out to other partners by March 23rd for feedback;
- Final template WP1/WP2 to be ready by March 31st so as to allow sufficient time for the country papers to be ready by May 31st (suggested length was 5,000 words);
- Schedule an in between meeting in Brussels during the month of June (to replace proposed June Skype conference).

WP2 - Policy analysis ESL & field description

Helena Araújo (UPORTO) presented WP2 on Policy analysis ESL and field description. WP2 consists of three major components: 1) Identify research areas & develop a definition on ESL (Month 1 to M6); 2) Analysis of ESL policies phase 1 - Desk study (Month 5 to 8); and 3) Analysis of ESL policies phase 2 - Interviews (Month 7 to 12). The Project Paper 1 on the formulation of a common working definition of ESL is due in Month 6, 31st of July 2013, while Deliverable 2.1 – Publication on the Comparative analysis of the development and the implementation of ESL policies is due to be submitted to the EU by Month 12, 31st of January 2014.

WP2 – Objective 1 - Concerning the *choice of regions/research areas & schools*, it was generally accepted that the 1st region could be an urban environment (probably in the vicinity of each partner institution's location), while the 2nd region/research area should be selected considering certain context variables. Not all schools where qualitative research will take place need to be included in the quantitative data collection, yet quantitative and qualitative data collection may take place simultaneously in the same school. However, because in some countries a lengthy ethical approval procedure needs to be followed before the data

collection can take off, it is essential to choose the regions/research areas and schools by the end of May already. In order to introduce the project to the potential schools, a document (brochure/leaflet) needs to be developed explaining its goals of research.

WP2 – Objective 2 - The issue of the formulation of a *common working definition* of Early School Leaving centered not only on the necessity (or not) of having our own definition different from the EU definition, but also on the implication on the choice of the age groups that the data collection would focus on, particularly considering the longitudinal aspect of the survey. A round of the table to clarify each country's schooling system's specificities was proposed in order to arrive at a common workable solution for this issue.

WP2 *Policy Analysis – Phase 1 (Desk study)* consists of three objectives: 1) Objective 3 – to identify and analyze education/ social policies and measures regarding ESL in the 9 partner countries; 2) Objective 4 - To examine processes of implementation and resistance to European initiatives related to issues of ESL; and 3) Objective 5 - To identify and analyze good practices concerning the development and implementation of policy measures in partner countries. WP2 *Policy Analysis – Phase 2 (Primary data collection)* consists of 7 interviews and 2 focus group discussions with a variety of policy makers at different levels and civil society representatives. The combined results of phase 1 and phase 2 will generate Deliverable 2.1/Publication 1 by January 31st, 2013.

From the discussions following the presentation, the following decisions were withheld.

- Leave out the differentiation of certain interviews by research area so as to allow Hungary and Austria to fully participate in WP2;
- Not necessary to limit the interviews to government officials, members of the opposition parties should be included (because government officials may just repeat what is already in the policy documents), since the ultimate purpose of the Phase 2 is to collect a variety of views to complement the output of Phase 1;
- Interviews will be done on the basis of a topic list proposed by the WP2 leader by June; interviews for this WP do not need to be transcribed in full in English in NVivo (local teams are free to do so if they wish).

WP3 - Quantitative analysis of ESL

Alessio D'Angelo and Louise Ryan (MU) presented WP3 Quantitative Analysis.

WP3 comprises two main phases. Phase I (M1 to 12) concerns the systematic review and analysis of secondary statistical sources on ESL resulting in Project Paper 3 by January 31st 2014, while phase II (M11 to M48) consists of the collection and analysis of new quantitative data through questionnaires A1 (Young people survey), A2 (Follow-up young people survey, and B (Staff survey).

Regarding *Phase 1*, MU will send out a template by April requesting information from the nine partners on the existing databases and their outputs in national reports and publications which should be send back to MU by June (example UK Annex 6b). The goal of the exercise is that MU analyses the secondary sources in order to identify the gaps that subsequently need to be addressed in the primary data collection. At the end of a discussion on using EUROSTAT, Suzanne Conze promised to give to MU the name of the Eurostat person to contact regarding ESL.

For *Phase 2*, the development of the questionnaires A1, A2 and B will take place by December 2013/January 2014, so that training in and use of the questionnaires can be discussed at one point during or after the 2nd Consortium meeting in February 2014. Surveys A1 and A2 will target 2 different age cohorts across several schools, while survey B will be administered to school staff (which comprises not only teachers, but also management or other technical school staff members). Survey A1 (2,000 respondents per country) starts in March 2014. Survey B is a descriptive tool, the number of respondents being too small to do any meaningful extensive differential analysis.

A2 will be administered to the same respondents as A1 after 2 years, many of whom may have left the school where they were first interviewed by then, hence the challenge will be to track down the ones that left their school (perhaps through the use of incentives). 25% was considered a very 'optimistic' attrition rate, so it may be that if the attrition rate is much higher, the option of adding new respondents may have to be considered. Both surveys will be administered online, for example using Survey Monkey, which means that for A2 it suffices to send the link to the respondent, there is no need to meet with him/her in person for A2.

A lot of emphasis was put on the crucial importance of building good relationships with the schools that we wish to work with. Not only is the topic of ESL often already "over researched" in certain schools, some schools may also be unwilling to "publicize" that they have a problem by participating in our research. In order to enhance schools' "ownership" of the project results, one option could be to organize events where the school principals "sign a contract" symbolizing their partnership into the project. In addition, with regard to respondents' informed consent procedures, in the UK, for example, parental approval for a pupil's participation in research is needed, hence the need for the school's commitment. A brochure on RESL presenting schools' participation in the research project as privileged is needed.

In a previous Swedish research project on ESL, where researchers intended to follow up on respondents, there was a clear refusal from most to give their contact details for future surveys under the argument of anonymity. One suggestion to keep track of A1 respondents over time, could be the presence of the qualitative research that will be ongoing in the schools for a period of around two years, as well as the connection to the survey B respondents.

Finally, a discussion ensued on the selection criteria for research areas, schools and pupil cohorts. A large number of arguments were brought forward by each of the project participants, and it was decided that UA as the project coordinator would summarize and streamline the arguments concerning the discussed selection criteria in a succinct proposal by the following day.

- MU to send out template on information on existing databases to partners in April
- Partners to send requested information to MU by June
- Suzanne Conze to give to MU name of Eurostat person regarding ESL

RESL.eu in the context of FP7 and Horizon 2020

Monica Menapace, the EU Project Officer for RESL.eu, gave a presentation on "RESL.eu in the context for FP7 and Horizon 2020". The Europe 2020 target is to bring back ESL to less than 10% by 2020. One of the initiatives towards this goal, is the group "Open method of coordination" that Suzanne Conze coordinates and where members communicate and work together on ESL in "soft" law. Following the Commission's recommendation, the DG for Employment and Social Inclusion now has a fund available that can support activities for investing in children, under the motto "Investing in children is breaking the silence of disadvantage".

Six other FP7 projects on education are: WorkAble - Making Capabilities Work; GOETE - Governance of Educational Trajectories in Europe. Access, coping and relevance of education for young people in European knowledge societies in comparative perspective (<http://www.goete.eu/>); EDUMI-GROM - Ethnic differences in education and diverging prospects for urban youth in an enlarged Europe; EERQI - European educational research quality indicators; YIPPEE - Young people from a public care background: pathways to education in Europe; REMC - Religious education in a multi-cultural society: school and home in comparative context.

The FP7 philosophy will continue in 2020. Essential is that stakeholders are included into the projects from the beginning, not just invited to the projects' final meetings. Guidelines exist to improve this stakeholders involvement in the documentation "Communicating research for evidence based policies". It is expected that a fund of 71 billion Euro will be approved by the European parliament for

the 7 years of Horizon 2020. The call for proposals will come out in January 2014, with a focus on three pillars 1) Excellent science, 2) Industrial leadership, and in particular 3) Societal challenge. With regard to administrative issues: while the DG research and Innovation is the DG that manages FP7 projects (and where Monica Menapace is the RESL.eu Project Officer), both the DG for Education and Culture and the DG for Employment and Social Affairs are important DG's to the RESL.eu project. FP7 has complex legal and financial rules that coordinators should be aware of. Deadlines of reports and deliverables have to be respected, if this proves not to be possible their rescheduling needs to be negotiated with the Project Officer before they expire. Amendments to the Grant Agreement are possible, but because they require a lot of work, they should not happen frequently.

Selection criteria for Research Areas and Schools (and Cohorts)

UA presented a proposal concerning the selection criteria for research areas and schools. A Research Area has to 1) be an urban neighborhood / borough / ward / district; 2) be under a single education, training and work policy; 3) have high youth unemployment; and 4) have a population of 100,000 to 500,000. The two research areas in each country should be different in at least one of the following areas: 1) different migration /ethnic background of population; 2) different socio-economic characteristics; 3) different local policy; or 4) difference in labor market opportunities.

All schools participating in the project should have a (theoretical) high risk for ESL and be motivated to participate. Schools should differ in at least one of the following : 1) different tracks at risk for ESL (vocational, technical, general training); 2) school composition; 3) ESL policies; 4) governing bodies (religious denomination, public & private,...). Both selection criteria proposals were accepted, and the discussion moved on to the selection criteria for cohorts. A round of the table was held to allow each partners to elaborate on the specifics of their respective school systems and its implications for the cohort choices in the RESL project.

An overview of the partner suggestions on possible key moments in educational trajectories with respect to ESL. These moments will inform the choice of the cohorts and a more elaborate and integrated design will be discussed at the June meeting.

- Partners to come to Brussels meeting in June with Research Areas and schools proposal

WP4 - Qualitative analysis & Evaluation of measures

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the objectives and timeframe for WP4. As presented in the DOW, WP4 has 3 objectives. Objective 1 is the in-depth study of the interplay between psychosocial and social causes leading to ESL (November 2013 – September 2014) leading to the publication of Project 4 in September 2014, and consist of 2 phases: 1) Phase I – data collection through intake interviews in school year 2013-2014; and 2) Phase II – data collection through case studies (selected from phase I) starting October 2014.

Objective 2 of WP4 is the Evaluation of the school policy and the impact of intra-muros measures to tackle ESL (October 2014 – May 2015) and Objective 3 the Evaluation of extra-muros measures to tackle ESL (June 2015 – May 2016).

The usefulness of doing intake interviews for the qualitative data collection before the survey was heavily debated, and it was ultimately decided to not have the intake interviews, but to do the case selection for phase II after the first survey (NOT after the survey analysis). The qualitative interview techniques trainings and pilots will take place in October 2014.

- UA to rework WP4 activities schedule in view of deletion of intake interviews, and to present this at June meeting in Brussels

WP 8 - Website & dissemination

Roos Willems (UA) gave an overview of the objectives of WP8 that runs through the entire period of the project (M1 to M60). The first activity in WP8 will be the setting up of the Communication team (CT) which will consist of one focal person from each of the nine partners. The CT will prepare the Program of Dissemination (by the 2nd Consortium Meeting in February 2014) with identification of target groups, dissemination strategies, communication partners and dissemination channels. At each Consortium Meeting, the CT will follow up on the Program of Dissemination and report back to the plenary session.

The distribution of policy briefs and the setting up of Action Platforms will take place later on in the project, from respectively month 55 and month 36 onwards. The website will be developed during

the first six months (by end of July 2013) under the responsibility of UA and will contain an intranet and a document library for the exchange of relevant documents on ESL among partners.

In the discussion following the presentation, there was a lot of attention for the EU clause on Open Access. It was mentioned that Green Open Access means that the publisher agrees for the article to be published in an Open Access database after about 6 to 12 months after publication, this arrangement is generally free. On the other hand, Gold Open Access means that the publisher agrees to immediately publishing the article in an Open Access database for which in the UK, the journal usually charges the author an amount of up to a 1,000 GBP.

A discussion on the period after which the project's database should become accessible to the public led to the proposal of the Communication team working on a protocol governing authorships issues as well as access to the project data by the next CM. The project brochure with which to contact potential schools for field research was generally considered to be the most urgent issue to be tackled by the CT, should be ready preferably by month 5, June 2013.

Planning M3-M13

All deadlines discussed and decided upon during WP sessions, were compiled into one schedule.

1a. Management Committee/Team Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 13 March 2013

RESL.eu members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Maurice Crul, Elif Keskiner

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

Hosted by UA at Hof Van Liere, Antwerp

Agenda

1. Evaluation of current Consortium meeting format and planning of next Consortium meeting in Portugal;
2. Cohort preferences – How to go forward?
3. Access to the project's database

Consortium meetings

The current format of 1,5 days was considered too short, hence it was decided to have the 2nd Consortium meeting in February 2014 in Portugal over two full days with participants staying three nights. The precise dates of the meeting will be decided through electronic communication.

The attendance of PhD students to the Consortium meetings is encouraged.

For the in-between Brussels meeting in June, it was decided to agree on a date by electronic means. In order to allow partners to come to Brussels and return home on the same day, the meeting will take place from 10h to 16h.

There will be room to discuss WP1 and WP2 issues, as well as WP3 and WP4 topics.

Cohorts

WP1 and WP2 leaders accepted putting forward a proposal on how to proceed with the cohort selection criteria in their template.

Access to the project's database

All RESL.eu members (including junior researchers and PhD students) will have unlimited access to the RESL.eu project database. The members of the Scientific and Policy Committee are not RESL.eu members, they will therefore have the same access to the database as other members of

the public. The length of this period will be discussed through the Protocol proposal that has to be prepared by the Communication Team.

2. Scientific and Policy meeting – Brussels, Belgium, 7 June 2013

RESL.eu members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui, Kasja Rudberg

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Maurice Crul, Elif Keskiner, Thalita Stam, Malin Grundel

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Àbel Bereményi

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU): Erna Nairz-Wirth, Marie Gitschthaler

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

Hosted by UA at the Golden Tulip Brussels Airport Hotel

Welcome & Round of table

WP1. Theoretical & methodological framework

Noel Clycq and Ward Nouwen (UA) presented the state of the art and the planning of WP1. All country reports have been received over the past few days, except Spain's which is still in translation from Spanish into English and will be sent as soon as possible. He reminded the meeting of the ultimate goal of WP1 which is to develop a theoretical framework and conceptual tools to link WP2, WP3 and WP4. The final theoretical framework incorporates four elements: a multilevel approach, the incorporation of grand theories & middle range theories and the individual outcome and interactions. From this model, testable hypotheses are to be derived that will be tested in WP2, WP3 & WP4 (see slide 10). A first empirical cycle proposal was presented based on the Flemish experience from previous research.

The UK team commented that in the UK, class rather than ethnicity was assumed to play a role in ESL and missing from the proposed model. The Spanish team remarked that the proposed hypotheses were all formulated in the negative sense while RESL.eu wants to find out about protective factors beyond the resiliency model, hence the need to include the analysis of trajectories of success. Also missing from the proposed model seems to be the assessment of teaching methods. And lastly, it was recommended that an intersectional perspective be incorporated in the model.

The Dutch team suggested that the argument of socio-economic class be inserted at the meso-level rather than the micro-level in order to take into account the issue of (lack of) resources. All teams agreed that we are at the beginning of the project, so it takes time to build a common model or framework that all teams coming from different backgrounds will feel comfortable enough with to work throughout the project.

It was agreed that UA would send out all the country reports to all the partners, so each team could familiarize themselves with the ESL background and experiences of the other countries. On the basis of this, each partner will draw up a one page comment on the proposed model, taking into account that not all perspectives can be included and that the research project necessarily needs to focus on an innovative element. The output of this exercise will subsequently be integrated by UA into the common model.

- UA to send out all country reports to all partners by 15 June.
- All partners to send to UA a one page comment on how to finalize the common framework by the end of July.
- UA will send out the draft of Project Paper 1 by 2 September for partner feedback

- There may be a Skype conference on 23 September on the PP1 draft (to be confirmed)
- UA, after consulting the Scientific and policy committee members for their feedback will finalize Project Paper 1 by 30 October.

WP2 Policy analysis ESL and field description

Helena C. Araújo and Eunice Macedo presented the current state and further planning of WP: Part 1 on the ESL definition and Part 2 on the Policy analysis (Desk study & interviews and focus group discussion with policy makers).

Part 1 on ESL definition: All country reports on the ESL definition had been received and feedback given. The feedback mainly consisted in asking partners to add a conclusion to their paper and possible suggestions towards the formulation of a common definition. After some discussion, it was decided to come up with a common ESL definition during the meeting. Finally, the issue of compulsory school age was replaced with obtaining a qualification at the ISCED 3 level (which is the same in both the 1997 and 2011 version).

In the RESL.eu project, Early School Leaving = **leaving the education system without obtaining an upper secondary school degree/certificate, similar to and ISCED 3 (2011)**. The fact that this is different from the Eurostat definition is not important, since RESL does not wish to repeat the same statistical analysis as Eurostat.

The data collection tools of WP3 and WP4 will be based on the RESL definition.

Based on this definition, RESL may include as ESL cases, pupils who are in the post compulsory group when they have not obtained a qualification at the ISCED 3 level.

- Partners have the time until 15 June to send to UPORTO their further feedback and refinement of this definition
- UPORTO will prepare the draft of Project Paper 1 by 20 July and send it out to the partners for a final consultation
- By 30 July, UPORTO will have finalized Project Paper 1.

Part 2 on Policy Analysis: The intermediate country reports, based on a desk study on ESL policies are still due 30 July 2013. Each partner (including UPORTO) will concentrate on national policies or on the effect of EU policies on national policies, while UPORTO will, additionally, analyze the EU policy in itself. Each intermediate report will be maximum 5,000 words long.

With regard to WP2 Part 2 Phase 2, UPORTO sent out a first version of a protocol and a topic list for the interviews and focus group discussions to be held with policy makers on June 6th, because some partners need to start the procedure for ethical approval within their universities as soon as possible. After some debate, it was decided that from this first list UPORTO will prepare a more complete version of the final interview topic list and guidelines that will be sent out for partners feedback in the 3rd week of June.

The final report will also contain the field description on the Research Areas that the 7 major partners have chosen to do data collection, based on the criteria that were defined during the Antwerp Kick off meeting.

In order to allow UPORTO sufficient time to synthesize the nine final country reports into one deliverable, due to be submitted by the end of January, it was also decided to advance the deadline for the final country reports to the end of October.

- The intermediate country reports on the desk study of the policy analysis (Part 2 Phase 1) should be maximum 5,000 words long, and send to UPORTO by 3 July
- UPORTO sends to the partners the draft of the final interview guidelines and topic list (Part 2 Phase 2) for feedback from partners by 3rd week of June. Feedback from partners to UPORTO is expected by 30 June.
- Partners incorporate the outcome of the interviews and focus group discussions as well as the field description into the intermediate report in order to arrive at the final country reports (Part 2 phase 1 & 2) which will be maximum 10,000 words long and send them to UPORTO by 31 October.
- UPORTO prepares a draft of Deliverable 2.1/Publication 1 on the comparative analysis of ESL policies in RESL partners countries, by early January (the final version needs to be submitted into the EU system latest on 31 January 2014).

WP3 Quantitative Analysis ESL

Alessio D'Angelo and Neil Kaye (MU) presented the state of affairs and planning of WP3; WP3.1 being the systematic review and analysis of secondary statistical sources on ESL; and WP3.2 the collection and analysis of new quantitative data.

For **WP 3.1**, a template and guidelines for the template were developed, as well as an example from EU and UK data sources. Both the catalogue and country reports are expected by 5 July, for MU to draw up the draft of Project Paper 3 by December (Final PP3 due January 2014). The goal of the exercise is to know the existing body of evidence and which gaps there are that can be filled by the RESL data collection.

Important to remember is that the partners will not do any analysis of the data sets, the goal of WP3.1 is to assess the quality and availability of existing data. The secondary data collected by the partner countries should be as recent as possible, and if time series exist they can be included as well. If for example in Sweden ESL was registered officially from 1990 onwards, then including the datasets from 1990 till now in the catalogue suffices.

The catalogue includes not only national official statistics, but also academic and one off studies both at local and national level. Partners will record in the catalogue the characteristics of existing databases including those which are not accessible or for which access is payable (no need to acquire the database itself). Even a database not compiled around the topic of education, but containing f.e. questions on education, school, etc. may be included in the catalogue.

Only local databases related to the chosen research areas should be taken into account.

No need to take up databases that are included in Eurostat since these will be taken up by MU. Even projected databases may be included when the metadata are available, and it is certain that they will take place in the near future.

It will not be possible to include all scales for each variable, however partners happen to come across an interesting scale to measure attitudes, they should flag this in the comments. The idea is not only to know which data exist, but also to find out the interesting ways that data have been presented/measured.

- Countries send to MU the catalogue and country report by 5 July
- MU prepares the draft of PP3 by December 2013 for feedback
- MU finalizes PP3 on basis of feedback by 31 January 2014 at the latest.

Regarding **WP3.2**, MU drew up a table to help avoid a possible confusion between unemployed, inactive, ESL, etc. MU intends to request Eurostat for country specific data. RESL will use the official ILO definition of "unemployed", namely a person that is able to work and that has been actively looking for a job, while the term "inactive" indicates a person that has not been looking for a job for a certain amount of time.

Timetable: The timing of Survey A1 among Cohort 1 is crucial because the persons for the biographical interviews of WP4 will be selected from these, and while the survey takes place in 2 (two) research areas the qualitative data collection takes place in only 1 (one) research area. The number of schools to be included in the survey will vary from country to country because depending on the number of respondents that can be included from each school (size of the school).

Because of the expected attrition rate by the time of survey A2 (optimistically estimated at 25%), there was the suggestion to modify the size of (one of) the cohorts to be surveyed.

However, no consensus was reached on the subject, amongst others because issues of bias could come up and influence final analysis results. Finally, there was also a concern in some countries on the timing of the surveys within the school year.

Cohort table: after a long discussion, "n" was defined as ISCED 3 level, and each country is expected to choose a cohort at level "n" and another cohort at a level earlier than n, perhaps one year, perhaps two years. However if different countries choose different levels at which to survey respondents, cross-country statistical comparison may be jeopardized. The concern of not having enough "older" ESL persons in the research project, was solved by the decision to pay extra attention to the number of older informants (18-24y) selected for the WP4 biographical interviews.

Questionnaire A1 will be ready in draft form in September. This version can be used to start the procedure for ethical approval by those partners who need do follow this (the Swedish partner was advised to fast track their 6 to 8 months long regular procedure by involving EU support).

The draft questionnaire A1 should be tested in a number of pilots by MU and (some of the) other partners. The pilot will include translation and back-translation and testing out of the online survey

instrument (Monkey survey) in different contexts. The exact arrangements for the pilots will be discussed and agreed upon during the following weeks. MU affirmed that the online survey could be filled from anywhere, meaning that there would be no need for respondents to be all in one room accompanied by a researcher.

Yet, this issue remained to be further discussed in detail later.

- MU will revise the timetable and cohort table and circulate separately for further fine-tuning
- MU will have a draft of questionnaire A1 ready by September to allow countries to apply for ethical approval where necessary
- MU will initiate the discussion around the pilots using the draft questionnaire A1 so as to come to an arrangement over the next few weeks
- Based on the pilot results, MU will finalize the A1 questionnaire by January 2014.
- Each partner is responsible for having the necessary number of schools on board on time to have Survey A1 take place in the Spring of 2014 (Mar-Jun)

Other issues

The next Consortium meeting will take place in Porto (Portugal) during the last week of January (exact dates to be confirmed later).

Updated timetable

The integrated planning table (until the next Consortium meeting) was updated following the Brussels meeting decisions.

3. 2nd Consortium Meeting, Porto, Portugal, 28-29 January 2014

RESL.eu members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui, Kasja Rudberg

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Cristina Rocha, António Magalhães, Alexandra Oliveira Doroftei, Sofia Marques da Silva

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Elif Keskiner, Thalita Stam, Malin Grundel

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Ábel Bereményi (day 1), Laia Narciso, David Curto Kozep-Europai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Julia Szalai, Agnes Kende

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU): Erna Nairz-Wirth, Marie Gitschthaler

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Marjolein Braspenningx, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

Hosted by the University of Porto in Porto, Portugal

Welcome & Round of table

WP1. Theoretical & methodological framework

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the state of affairs in WP1 (see annex 2), of which the first output, namely Project Paper 2 on the Initial/tentative theoretical framework, was published on the RESL.eu website in October 2013. With this, WP 1.1 and WP 1.2 are concluded, and the next phase of WP1, namely the final refinement of the theoretical framework will begin in August 2017.

When revisiting the theoretical framework (slide 4), a discussion ensued around whether the institutional level is sufficiently incorporated, f.e. school practices, or school culture. It was agreed that such concepts, which are included in the survey should be more explicitly visualized in the theoretical

framework. UAB (Spain) suggested to draft a short document on these school practices and culture for further discussion.

WP 2 Policy analysis ESL and field description

Helena C. Araùjo (UPORTO) presented the overview of the country reports on the policy reviews, interviews and focus group discussions (see annex 3), which form the basis of the final output of WP2, namely Publication 1. The fact that three templates were sent to keep partners up to date with the process of template construction lead to some ambiguity about which template to use for the country reports. Therefore, there was a lack of matching up between the policy reviews and the focus group discussions in some of the country reports, complicating the comparative work of UPORTO.

From the meta-analysis, three issues came to the fore, namely that (1) for some countries it is clear that EU policies were taken as central by education policy makers; (2) there is a frequent emphasis on education as an instrument for access to the labor market; and (3) ESL is often assumed to be connected solely to immigrant people or minorities (overlooking the socio-economic and gender related aspects). For the analysis for Publication 1, UPORTO decided to use the concepts “drivers” and “rationales” which are often used in policy related research. In order to do this, they identified for each country the Main Drivers and Rationales mentioned by National/State policymakers in Table 1 and Other Drivers and Rationales by Non-state and other stakeholders (political, economic, social or educational) in Table 2. Because in a number of country papers, the source of the quotes cited was missing, it was not always possible to categorize the drivers and rationales in the same manner for all countries.

However, considering that the terms “drivers” and “rationales” may be confusing to a larger non-specialist audience (which we are trying to reach through Publication 1 and particularly through Deliverable 2.1), it was decided that the term “drivers” be replaced by the term “policy aims” or “policy goals”.

In order to streamline the analysis, UPORTO will send to all partners the preparatory summary – which they had made of each country report in order to identify drives and rationales for each tables - for completion. This means that countries which had not sufficiently described their informants when quoting them, should first complete their country’s summary report. In a 2nd step all partners should, each for their own country,

check whether the drivers and rationales mentioned in tables 1 and 2 are complete.

- UPORTO sends out preparatory country reports to partners (done)
- Partners check country summaries, complete informant information (state/non state, political, economic, educational, social, etc.) where necessary, and review tables 1 & 2 for their country by 10 February
- Partners also give feedback on the draft of publication 1 (in particular the conclusion) to UPORTO by 10 February
- UPORTO finalizes Publication 1 by 27 February.

WP 3 Quantitative Analysis ESL

Neil Kaye (MU) presented the draft of Project Paper 3 on Data Availability and Reporting (see Annex 5). Both the PP3 and the presentation were very comprehensive. There was a request to add a general conclusion to the paper, summing up the data gaps announced in the introduction and the various possible hypotheses mentioned throughout the paper in the different sections, as well as how the RESL.eu survey will complete the existing gaps across a large number of countries.

The question on what is/could be the connection between ESL levels and policy efforts could be very interesting for the conclusion of deliverable 1.

- Partners will give more detailed feedback to PP3 by 17 February
- MU will finalize PP3 by 10 March

Alessio D’Angelo (MU) presented the state of affairs of survey A1 incl. the feedback on the pilots and the planning for the actual survey that will take place in Spring 2014.

The feedback from the pilots held in 7 countries led to a number of changes in the final version of the questionnaire (slide 10-15). The final questionnaire is a compromise; not all the wishes of all partners could be catered for. The innovative aspect of the RESL survey is that it is holistic meaning that a few questions on a large number of concepts are necessary in order to include as many concepts as possible and yet make the questionnaire still workable.

With regard to translations and adaptation, there was a lot of discussion on the question regarding minority groups/ethnicity and the legal constraints that exist on this type of question in a number of countries. The ESS website was consulted to see how the issue was resolved there. Finally, it was decided that the MU team would send out a proposal regarding the ethnicity and discrimination questions, and if considered unsuitable in one of the countries, the partner could send an alternative formulation to MU. It was stressed that the back-translation of the questionnaire has to be done by an external translator who has never seen the questionnaire before.

Most countries foresee to administer the entire survey online, only Belgium foresees 40% on paper and Sweden will do the entire survey on paper. The questionnaires have to be scanned into Qualtrics (not SPSS!) in order to have a project-wide database in Qualtrics from which the descriptive statistics will be drawn. MU liaises with Qualtrics regarding the necessary arrangements for the scanning.

- MU puts international version of the questionnaire (including ethnicity and discrimination questions) online and sends out Word copy by 4 February
- Partners can send to MU an alternative formulation of the ethnicity and discrimination questions by 7 February
- Partners translate questionnaire in Qualtrics and have it back-translated into English by an external person to be sent to MU in Word by 18 February at the latest. If sent in earlier, MU will give feedback and go ahead earlier
- Country specific additional questions may be sent to MU via the translation and back-translation; MU can add a limited number of additional questions in Qualtrics for each country.
- MU liaises with Qualtrics regarding arrangements adapted to specific country situations to scan surveys in order to ensure compatibility with the MU system.

With regard to engagement of schools as well as participants, MU has already prepared a written info-sheet with consent form; they will circulate this to the other partners. Always there should be present in the room where the survey is done, one school staff (“to keep order”) and one RESL staff; both should be aware of not walking around too much so as to make students feel that their answers are really confidential.

Schools can be promised anonymized survey results of their school (via the individual ID number which comprises separate digits for the school and the classes).

In presenting the project to schools and students, RESL members should always describe it in positive terms, as a research project on school careers and trajectories, and not in terms of “drop-out” so as to avoid either schools or pupils to feel stigmatized.

One of the major problems encountered in the pilot was the fact that some students seemed to be overwhelmed by the questions and tended to reply randomly. Even though we accept that some students will go into the non-response rate, it is probable that these would be the very students likely to become ESL and that we wish to capture in the survey. If language is an issue, one option could be to prepare ahead of time

with the school head and perhaps arrange for a separate administering of the survey with extra assistance, so as to minimize the risk of losing those students that are difficult to capture. Members of national RESL teams have to be present during the survey because they are in the best positions to answer students’ questions. A good advice would be for the first survey to choose a smaller group of students so as to gain sufficient experience before surveying large groups.

With regard to the prize draw for pupil retention, in the form of iPads for example, partners were informed that in principle EU funds cannot be used for “prizes”, “gifts”, or “raffles”, etc. The Dutch team mentioned that their finance department suggested iPads could be purchased under equipment for fieldwork. The meeting did not come up with a general solution, each partner needs to check with their finance department what is possible. Ways of keeping in touch with the pupils in between the two surveys were discussed.

Using Facebook was not considered a good option because of the risk of bullying which may, even unintentionally, harm the project’s reputation. Finally, doing a micro-survey somewhere halfway in between the two surveys was decided to be the least labor intensive way to confirm that pupils were “still on board” with the project to participate in the 2nd survey which will take place in 2016 by email only.

WP4 Qualitative analysis ESL and Evaluations of measures

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the planning of activities of WP4. Instead of doing intake interviews to select the informants for WP4, it was decided at the Brussels meeting that the qualitative informants

will be largely selected on the basis of the survey results. After some discussions on the UA proposal for the selection of pupils and schools from survey A1, it was agreed upon to work with the UA-proposal to select in a first step >16 (still in school) + 8 (ESL) pupils on the basis of survey A1 data and their status in September 2014, and simultaneously make profiles of the different schools on the basis of survey A1. In a 2nd step both the information on the pupils and on the schools are matched together to select these schools that have

1) a sufficient number of interesting pupils, and 2) an interesting profile, to be included in WP4.

The first phase of the qualitative fieldwork, focusing on the intra-muros evaluation, takes place between September and December 2014 and includes bio interviews with 16 pupils who are still in school in Sept 2014 (non-ESL), 4 FGD with staff, 4 FGD with peers and 4 interviews of parents. After some debate on the definition of peers, it was concluded that the FG for peers will consist of those friends chosen by the pupils themselves (minimum and maximum number of peers to be included in a FG to be decided at a later stage). However, if these peer groups do not include (sufficient) pupils member of the school, partners need to consider other ways to gather sufficient information for the intra-muros evaluation. Possible solutions - such as extra FG with classmates and/or the use of ethnographic observation protocols - were suggested and will be elaborated on by the coordinating team. A proposal on these issues will be sent out by the latter. The evaluation of the intra-muros activities will inform Project Paper 6 that needs to be ready by May 2015. Country papers are expected to be sent to UA by March 2015.

In January 2015, the 8 ESL pupils that were selected in September 2014 will be contacted for a bio interview. The fieldwork concerning extra-muros measures takes place between September and December 2015 and an additional 8 young people selected from the extra-muros activities will be added to the 8 ESL pupils identified in September 2014. The detailed scheme for the extra-muros fieldwork and with NEET youngsters will be discussed in more detail at the next consortium meeting in February 2015.

A WP4 training on the topic list and fieldwork is proposed for September. The documents for this training will be developed by UA and feedback requested from partners during the period from May till September 2014.

- Partners will choose 1 region for the qualitative fieldwork by June 2014
- UA will have the lists of pupils and schools selected from A1 ready by mid-September
- UA will prepare the document for qualitative fieldwork in draft by May 2014; partners are requested to give feedback in June; the final version will be ready for the meeting end of September in Antwerp on 29 and 30 September 2014

WP8 Dissemination

Roos Willems (UA) presented the Final draft of the Dissemination Strategy Document which was prepared by the Communication Team largely on what was already mentioned in the DOW , and which needs to be validated by the consortium.

In the DOW, only the 7 major partners are required to be member of the Communication team and set up Action Platforms as of year 3. However, Hungary and Austria, who are member of the Communication team are free to set up Action Platforms in their respective countries as well to disseminate project results to relevant stakeholders.

With regard to the feedback on the survey that individual schools have asked for, which can be included under 'briefs by request from institutions', the Communication Team will design a template to ensure uniformity. One of the dissemination objectives, namely 'translating deliverables into local languages', was adapted to 'translating *summaries* of deliverables into local languages'.

Partners can have their country reports for the various WPs, which will be posted on the intranet in the next couple of months, published on the public side of the website on two conditions: (1) language is edited by a native English speaker, and (2) peer-review of the document by at least one of the other partners. There will be the possibility to request for an ISSN number. The decision to publish a country paper depends on its authors. The procedure of preparing it for publication will be monitored by the Communication Team.

With regard to the procedure to initiate new publications, the May 22nd version of the Protocol on authorship, acknowledgement and data access, was slightly adapted by the consortium after a long debate. Instead of

- In general, RESL.eu researchers are allowed to access project-wide and country- specific data to write papers IF no clash with other researchers' specific plans.

- Need to inform the Project Coordination (with at least 45 days prior notice before the planned start of the analysis) about the aims, research questions and methods of the analysis (max 1 page)
- Project Coordination administers requests and communicates to Management Team, which may object within 30 days of notification.

It now reads as follows:

- In general, RESL.eu researchers are allowed to access project-wide and country- specific data to write papers IF no *conflict* with other researchers' specific plans. *If one team wishes to use the data collected by another team, they need to negotiate this with this other team before submitting proposal to Project coordination*
- Need to inform the Project Coordination about the aims, research questions and methods of the analysis (max 1 page). Project Coordination administers requests *via a list on intranet which will be updated every 1st working day of the month*
- *Management Team members may object within 30 days of list update.* It was decided at the same time to include ALL the partners in the Management Team, and not only the WP leaders.

The question as to how publication initiatives (including presentations to conferences which are also dissemination activities) that come up after the end of the project will be treated, since there will in principle no longer be a management team, remains open.

UA will enquire with the Project Officer on how these issues are dealt with in other FP7 projects.

It is important to note that ALL dissemination activities need to be reported to the Communication Team since this is a list that has to be included in all reporting to the EU.

- CT will post dissemination list on intranet and update at the beginning of each month
- RESL members will follow the procedure outlined in the Protocol on Authorship, Acknowledgement and data access when initiating new publications or presentations at international conferences
- Project Coordination will enquire with EU Project Officer on what procedure to follow after the end of the project on the basis of her experience with other FP7 projects

The first deliverable D 2.1 will be compiled from (1) Publication 1, (2) Tables from PP3, and (3) 1 page country contributions. UA will send out a draft template for the country contributions on which feedback can be given. Both publication 1 and the 9 country contributions will be edited by a native English speaker. The final layout of the deliverable will be done by the external agency which also designed the logos and the flyer.

- UA sends draft template for country contributions by 10 February, and partners give feedback by 17 February. Final template ready by 21 February
- Partners will send country contributions to UA by 3 March
- All materials are sent to external agency for layout by 10 March, and draft deliverable will be sent to partners for feedback on 17 March
- Deliverable 2.1 "Comparative analysis of development and implementation of policies concerning ESL" is ready for submission and printing by 31 March

Other issues

RESL.eu who have not yet done so, are reminded to send a **bio** in a paragraph to UA, in order to complete the partner descriptions on the website. The RESL.eu website will include an **intranet** that should be ready by the end of April 2014. All partners will have the same username and password to access the intranet.

Because of many questions on proposed **budget** changes, there was a brief explanation on the tables A3 (DOW p. 5) and WT8 (DOW p. 30) on the one hand, and the budget sheets prepared by partners during the negotiation phase which have a lot more detailed information, on the other hand. Within this detailed budget sheet (excel) partners may shift amounts from year to year if needed. Shifts or reshuffles may also be done within the categories of Personnel costs or within Other Direct costs, yet only within the category of RTD, of Dissemination, or of Management. However, *amounts can never be moved in between these categories*. In other words, the totals and subtotals that figure in tables A3 and WT8 in the DOW cannot change.

There was the proposal to have the **3rd consortium meeting**, not in London, but in the research area in North UK. However, the precise dates and the place of the 3rd consortium meeting will be decided upon at the meeting in Antwerp on 29 & 30 September 2014.

Partners were notified that the first period of the project ends 30/9, and that the first **intermediate reports**, both narrative and financial have to be submitted to the EU before 30/11. Reporting guidelines will be presented at the September meeting in Antwerp.

- Members should send in their bios for the website (those who have not yet done so) as soon as possible; members may also send a photograph to be added to their bio if they wish to do so.

Updated timetable

During the final session of the consortium meeting the planning sheet for the period until the next consortium meeting was completed with all the deadlines decided upon during the previous sessions.

3a. Management Committee/Team Meeting, Porto, Portugal, 29 January 2014

RESL members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Elif Keskiner

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Paulina Marchlik

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Julia Szalai

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU): Erna Nairz-Wirth

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

Excused:

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco

Hosted by the University of Porto in Porto, Portugal

Agenda

1. The enlargement of the Management Committee to all partners
2. The agenda of the Antwerp meeting on 29-30 September 2014
3. AOB

1. Enlargement of the Management Committee

As previously discussed during the session on dissemination, the entire consortium agreed to have the senior members of each RESL.eu partners included in the Management Committee instead of only the WP leaders.

2. Agenda of Antwerp meeting, 29 – 30 September 2014

Regarding WP3, there will be the preliminary findings of survey A1, particularly with regard to the selection criteria needed for the identification of WP4 informants. In addition, a first discussion on the suggestions for survey B will take place. Regarding WP4, the following topics will figure in the meeting program:

1. The lists of schools and pupils for WP4
 2. The topic guide for the intra-muros interviews and focus group discussions
 3. The interview and FGD guidelines
 4. The transcription of interviews and further dealing with the data
 5. The possibility of setting up a shared nvivo-server
 6. The consent forms for archiving data in a public database
 7. The initial planning for the extra-muros and NEET's phases of WP4
 8. The planning for WP6 on the evaluation of intra-muros measures due May 2015, country reports expected by March 2015
- No particular topic for WP8 is expected to be discussed.

Regarding WP9, we will discuss the scheduling and planning of the 3rd RESL.eu consortium meeting in the UK.

3. AOB

There was no any other business.

4. Scientific and Policy Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 29-30 September 2014

RESL.eu members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui, Kasja Rudberg, Isabelle Stromberg

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Elif Keskiner, Thalita Stam, Malin Grundel, Maurice Crul

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Ábel Bereményi, Laia Narciso, Marta Bertran

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Julia Szalai

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU): Erna Nairz-Wirth

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Marjolein Braspenningx, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

Hosted by the University of Antwerp in Antwerp, Belgium

Welcome

WP 3 Quantitative Analysis ESL – State of Affairs

Alessio D'Angelo (MU) presented the State of Affairs of WP3. A lot was accomplished since the Porto meeting: a total of 19,519 pupils have been surveyed, 54.9% in cohort 1 & 45.1% in cohort 2. The majority of respondents are native-born (85%) although a significant minority were born outside of the country of survey. With regard to ESL risk factors: 22% of respondents lived in one-parent families, almost 5% had parents with no formal education and 8.3% have a father who is unemployed.

Because there are no major outliers, the data may be considered representative, both project-wide and at country level. It is the first database of its kind, and will provide food for analysis for many years to come. An explorative Factor Analysis (a method allowing us to discover clusters and correlations by grouping questions) was used on all scale items in the original questionnaire to explore whether the items were measuring the concepts as supposed, or whether they loaded more suitably onto other factors. From this EFA, factor scales were constructed by combining items from the survey in a way that improved the internal reliability of the scales for measuring the latent concepts. Values around 0.7 and 0.8 indicate that this is a good scale. Questions can be aggregated into a score in order to compare pupils, and arrive at different discernible profiles. The next step in the analysis of country data is to do factor analysis (not yet done) at country level; however since there is an overall consistency in the results, we may assume that there are no major differences in-between countries. Ethnic minority, as discussed in Porto, is self-reported. The % of parents with a postsecondary or tertiary education of 40.5 seems odd. This could be because of missing info or because pupils being overly optimistic about parents' education level. From these factor scales, further dimension reduction was performed on the scales that related to social support and school engagement. The computer-generated loadings indicated that three main factors were present: namely, support from parents and peers, support from teachers and school engagement. The factor scales can be combined

to form higher-order 'meta' scales and intermediate subscales. These scales formed the basis for selecting potential students and schools for WP4 by generating a typology of people. Each individual was plotted on a graph combining the level of social support and school engagement. Those individuals too close to average values around "0" on all dimensions were excluded from the start (appr. 50%). Individual countries remain free to decide to include one or more of these individuals in WP4, however in order to keep the analysis as comparable as possible cross-country, it is preferable to work in a common frame. The common frame are the schools where there are most students that score either high or low on both "social support" and "school engagement". And for each of these schools, a list was generated with the names of the pupils who scored either highest or lowest in both dimensions. Each country may choose their WP4 informants from these lists, either solely on the basis of the pupils' scores (very high or very low), or taking into account other elements which they consider important. The WP4 sample is not expected to be statistically representative, its diversity is more important than its representativeness. Project Paper 5 on the preliminary analysis of the A1 survey is due May 2015 a draft for feedback will be sent around later. PP5 will look into the comparable dimensions of the data, then into a breakdown per country.

- MU will send out for feedback an outline for PP5 in December.
- The first draft of PP5 will be circulated for feedback in February; countries give feedback in March.
- The final draft of PP5 should be ready by April, in order to have the final version ready to go online by May 2015.

Follow up survey A2 is due to take place during school year 2015-16. The question is how to keep pupils interested in the meantime. A long brainstorming took place on this topic, as well on the method of contacting the pupils, the timing, and the content/layout of the message. Several possibilities were mentioned: sending email with links to web pages (featuring video's on the project with comments/intro from popular public figures); requesting updates on contact information or on current trajectories; giving updates on the awarding of the promised iPads; using mobile phones, Facebook, twitter, etcetera. No decision was taken, yet the general consensus was that some contact needed to be made before the end of this school year.

- Countries send their ideas on how to do this to MU by November
- In December a decision is taken on the best strategy.
- Pupils are (re)contacted somewhere between March and June 2015.

WP3.3 Development and designing of instrument B

Alessio D'Angelo (MU) presented the developments and planning regarding the questionnaire to be used for the survey of school staff. The DOW foresees the administering of survey B to 100 teachers and school staff per country, 25 per school in the 4 schools of WP4. Because this number is not statistically representative, the question is asked as to what the project aims to achieve with survey B. MU's alternative proposal is to send out survey B to all the teachers in all the schools in which survey A1 took place. A long debate took place on the practical modalities of this proposal, the extra time it would take to convince the school principals to accept to send out the questionnaire to all their teachers. Finally, a round of the table came to the following results: 4 countries will follow the MU proposal (UK/BE/SP/PORT), POL will approach the schools in 1 research area, NL will contact 10 schools and SW 4 schools. All will aim to have a minimum 100 respondents.

Content-wise, we aim to fill the information gap of what already exists in terms of teacher surveys. Included will be topics on amongst others: professional development, beliefs and practices, school climate and job satisfaction, mobility and teacher turnover. Feedback on the analysis results of the survey will be given back to the schools on sample level, not on school level in order to guarantee the anonymity of the participating teachers. Could be added are the following questions/issues:

- Ranking of the (perceived) causes of ESL
- Expectations of the school with regard to graduation %
- Extent to which parents are engaged
- Are pupils well oriented ?
- How effective do you think school policies are ?
- Do you have the resources to implement policies ?
- Actual time for teaching ?
- Discipline and behavior.

The survey should be administered Spring/Summer 2015, so the questionnaire should be ready by X-mas.

- Early draft of questionnaire for feedback by November; Overall draft by December (needed to submit to the Ethical Board in some countries)
 - Final questionnaire ready by January; to be translated and back-translated by February
 - The administering takes place between March and June 2015
- Preliminary results can be known by September (Publication 2 is due Jan 2016).

WP4 - Global aims, timeframe and planning of fieldwork

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the WP4 global aims, timeframe and planning of fieldwork. There are three parts : 4.1 Longitudinal Study of (non)-ESL Trajectories; 4.2 Intra-muros Evaluations; and, 4.3 Extra-muros Evaluations. The fieldwork for these three parts takes place over the course of 2014, 2015 and 2016. The initial case selection is (partly) for the intra-muros measures evaluation (IM) and informed by the survey A1 results. However, some youngsters from this initial case selection will also be followed up during the other research phases. Ideally, this first selection consists of 24 youngsters from 4 schools: 16 youngsters still in school (4 per school) that will be interviewed for intra-muros evaluations and for bio5 interviews; and, 8 ESL that dropped out (2 per school) (slide 4 - adapted after discussion at the meeting). It could be that the A1 selection does not have a single IM youngster, if that is the case, the A1 selection list should be re-consulted to find pupils that are in IM. Ideally each profile should have 2 pupils per school, but there is room for a different distribution of pupils across the schools.

Most importantly is that all pupil interviews need to be transcribed in English, so as to make one project-wide (coded) qualitative database in NVivo, accessible to all. Concerned with the difficulties of maintaining pupils' attention when interviewing them solely on IM, it was decided to do the Bio-interview and IM at the same time (not separately). Of these 16 interviews, minimum 8 would need to take place during the IM fieldwork (October-December 2014); the remaining ones can be done between February and June 2015 (and provide more input for WP5). Finally, the 4.2 fieldwork consists of the following, ideally but not necessarily, in this order:

1. 4 document analyses of school documents (1 per school)
 2. 4 interviews with principals discussing intra-muros interventions
 3. 4 focus group discussions with peers in school
 - Student-focused: pupils in intervention
 - School-wide: pupils in a class with a high risk of ESL
 4. 4 focus group discussions with teachers or other school staff
 - Student-focused: staff involved in intervention
 - School-wide: staff experienced with ESL
 5. 8 interviews with youngsters in school focussing on intra-muros interventions (school-wide or student-focused)
 6. 4 Interviews with parents from pupils in selected interventions
- Fieldwork for 4.2 IM takes place between Oct and Dec 2014
- All interviews with 8 pupils will be transcribed into English by January 2015; all other interviews and FG will be summarized in English.

WP 4.2 Finalizing documents for qualitative fieldwork intra-muros and bio

Marjolein Braspenningx (UA) presented the topics lists for the different types of interviews and focus groups planned for WP4.2 that had been sent around for feedback before in a longer version namely the template for the country reports on IM that need to be sent to UA by mid-March and feed into PP6: Description of schools (slide 5); description of measures; description of respondents.

Attention was drawn to the fact that not only pupils but also schools and teachers need to be anonymized in the NVivo project wide data base; only the country team will know the actual names of the schools and teachers. The analysis and reporting part of the country report will cover a minimum of 1 IM per school (more is possible) in minimum 2 pages. The total report will be around 10 to 12 pages. Each report should also contain illustrative quotes. Each (type of) interview/focus group will feed into the topic list of the next (type of) interview/ focus group. One proposal was that the teachers FG could take place first (discussing 1 IM perhaps in comparison to others); followed by the peers FG; then the parents FG, and finally the pupil interviews. There was concern on how to keep the pupils attention going during the interviews, and elicit more than really short answers. A lot of bio

questions will be needed to keep the conversation going and to get the pupil to talk more. Therefore FG could concentrate more on the evaluation of IM, and individual interviews on bio data. Another proposal was to trigger FG discussions by putting out a bold/provocative statement. ESL charts can also be used to feed into the debate(s). In particular, the FG with peers will need experienced interviewers to keep the pupils from going off in all directions during the discussions. The ideal size of FG is five persons. The choice of peers is somewhat flexible, they do not have to come from the A1 list (depending on the school culture which may not like top-down picking of participants); pupils may add other friends from school as long as they have something to do with the IM under discussion (depending on whether it is a student-focused or a school-wide IM). Evidently, personal questions cannot be asked during FG, only during individual interviews. Out of the 4 IM measures, minimum one needs to be student-focused, and a FG on it held with the respective IM pupils.

- UA will send PPP to all partners by the end of the week; feedback is expected by October 10th.
- Final fieldwork documents and country report template will be sent out by October 20th.

WP 4.2. Dealing with collected data

The total number of individual interviews with pupils to be transcribed in to English for WP4 is around 56 per country; of the approximately 58 other interviews and FGDs a detailed overview will be written in English. All these documents for the IM part of WP4 need to be put in to NVivo by January 15th, coding done by February 15th and the country analysis ready by March 15th. The audio-files do not need to be sent to UA since in many of the countries they need to be destroyed after transcription because of anonymity issues.

Each file will have a unique code in NVivo containing a country code, a sequential number for the interviewee, and the date of the interview. In each interview, an illustrative quote will be identified at the time of coding and coded under a separate node. For the detailed overview, UA will send a template with guidelines, and example.

In the NVivo dataset, there is a main folder per country; then one folder for each part of WP4; another level of subfolder for each school (compensatory measure in WP4.3); and the last level is subdivided into subfolders for each respondent type (pupil, teacher, parents, etc.). The thematic nodes are still in progress. Countries are allowed to add sub-nodes when coding. However, when coding a text in a sub-node, they need to remember to code the same text also under the respective head-node because when merging the country files into one project wide dataset, the sub-nodes will be deleted. Each entire interview needs to be coded under a case node which allows attributes to be defined for each individual interviewed. It will allow later on to filter quotes on the basis of certain attributes either of the individual pupil, the intra-muros measure or the Compensatory measure. A preliminary list of attributes will be sent out by UA for feedback.

- A list of attributes sent out by UA to partners for feedback
- English transcriptions in NVivo by January 15 and coded by February 15th.

WP9 – Period reporting

Roos Willems presented the guidelines for the reporting on period 1 February 2013 – 30 September 2014. The narrative part of the Periodic report is the responsibility of the coordinator (in collaboration with the partners) and relays the progress made and problems encountered in WP1, WP2, WP3, WP4 and WP8 so far. The management WP9 progress and problems encountered (and solved!) also needs great detail in the period report. The financial reporting is done in FORCE through the forms C and the use of resources reporting which is now incorporated in the form C. Each partner needs to fill in their form C and submit it through the system. The coordinator will verify and when accepted submit to EU. The next instalment of funds depends on the reception of the signed forms C. Detailed instructions with regard to the use of resources in the forms C have already been received from the EU Financial Officer.

- UA will soon send out a detailed email with instructions and planning for the period reporting

WP8 Dissemination

First WP8 topic was the finalization of the Working Papers which have all been peer reviewed but are still in the process of being revised. It would be good to receive and put online the Working Paper by the end of the year.

- Revised working papers expected to be received by UA by the end of the year to be put online on the website. There were several request to have the quantitative database with raw data accessible for further analysis as soon as possible. MU is currently working on cleaning the data and finalizing the coding sheets. When both are ready they can be shared through the intranet.
- MU to finalize dataset with raw data as soon as possible and send to UA to be put online on the intranet A proposal to organize a two day workshop in Barcelona to provide additional SPSS training with an eye to analyzing the data at country level was welcomed. It would take place around the 23 of March, organized by UAB and taught by MU.
- UAB will take the lead in organizing the workshop. UPORTO suggested to submit the RESL papers presented at the 2014 ECER conference as a Special Issue to the Journal *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas* (Education, Society & Cultures).
- UPORTO, as editors of the Special Issue, will take the lead in this and send out an email request working titles, and approach the journal.
- ECER 2015 takes place in Budapest and there could be enough material by then to submit two panels/symposiums by then: one on the survey results, and one on the intra-muros evaluations.
- MU will take the lead for the 1st panel proposal, UA for the 2nd one.
- The 2015 IMISCOE conference will take place in Geneva in June. There would be a possibility to submit a panel with RESL papers in the Standing Committee on Education and Social Mobility.
- UA (C. Timmerman) and EUR (M. Crul) will take the lead for this initiative. A request for a template for the feedback to schools from the survey was not deemed to be a necessity, because different promises were made to the schools in the different countries. It was agreed however to share whatever reports or briefs were developed to share with the schools with the other countries, who could draw inspiration from them.

Updated timetable

During the final session of the consortium meeting the planning sheet for the period until the next consortium meeting was completed with all the deadlines decided upon during the previous sessions.

Next consortium meeting

The next RESL.eu consortium meeting will be held in London and organized by MU. It will take place during the week of April 20th, preferably (but depending on room availability) on Tuesday 21 and Wednesday 22 April. As decided by the Management Team, participants will need to stay for the full two days, staying three nights.

5. 3th Consortium/Scientific meeting, London, United Kingdom, 21-22 April 2015

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc
 Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui, Kasja Rudberg, Isabelle Stromberg
 Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Sofia Santos
 Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Thalita Stam, Malin Grundel, Maurice Crul
 Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała
 Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Ábel Bereményi, David Curto, Marta Bertran Kozep-Europai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Julia Szalai
 University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Marjolein Braspenningx, Christiane Timmerman, Roos Willems

Excused: Wirtschaftsuniversitat Wien (WU)

Hosted by Middlesex University, UK

Welcome

WP 3.2 Findings of Survey A1 – Preliminary statistical report - PP5

Neil Kaye (MU) presented the State of Affairs regarding the analysis of the survey data that will be described more fully in Project paper 5, due to be finalized and posted on the RESL.eu website in May, now postponed to June. The database contains data from seven countries (BE, ES, NL, PL, PT, SE, UK) on 19 631 individual cases (12.1 % of whom born outside their current country of residence), with information on 432 variables. Using Factor Analysis, School Engagement, Social Support and Teacher Support were constructed as three higher-order latent factors composed in turn of lower-order factors derived from individual items on the Survey (school engagement, social support and teacher support). With regard to school engagement (SE), it appears that in the international dataset a higher proportion of students of native origin are in the 'low' SE group, compared with those in the 'high' SE group. National differences are clear though, e.g. more than 40% of first-generation migrants in Poland are in the 'low' SE group, whereas in the UK this figure is only 13.2%. In the international dataset overall, there does not appear to be a noticeable difference in the proportion of students appearing in the 'low' or 'high' SE groups according to their parents' highest occupational status. Overall and for most individual countries, the academic track does not seem to affect the proportion of those in Low and High SE. However, in terms of self-reported academic ability, it is clear that those students who report their grades as being poor or adequate are also those most likely to have 'low' SE scores to report. 38.3% of these students appear in the 'low' SE Group, more than 2.5 times the proportion seen in the 'high' SE Group. Student aspirations for occupational ambitions appears consistent across countries, except for Sweden. The average School Engagement score for the sample is 3.23; the average Social Support score for the sample is 3.96; and the average Teacher Support score for the sample is 3.53. School Engagement is moderately and positively correlated with both Social Support ($r = .402$; $p < .01$) and Teacher Support ($r = .460$; $p < .01$). Social Support and Teacher Support are also moderately and positively correlated with each other ($r = .405$; $p < .01$). The demographic analysis of those students in the lowest quartile of School Engagement shows the following:

- o Higher proportion of girls than boys, in vast majority of countries
 - o National differences in terms of migrant status but overall higher proportion of native students
 - o Greater proportion from one-parent families and step-families
 - o Low levels of academic achievement (self-reported)
 - o Unclear relationship to SES and high degree of national variability
- Using mean scores for School Engagement as the dependent variable (DV), a multivariate linear regression model was constructed using 'independent' variables (IVs) which displayed coefficients of correlation higher than 0.2. The model uses 13 IVs, which can be seen as clustering around five main areas. For the overall international dataset the model had an R^2 of .381; that is, 38.1% of the variability in a student's School Engagement can be accounted for by the model. The model produced an R^2 of between .38 and .53 for all individual countries' datasets with the exception of Sweden. By excluding the Swedish data from the model, it was shown to account for almost half (45.4%) of the variability seen in students' School Engagement scores. Further cleaning of the Swedish data count account for a large part of the deviance of the Swedish data compared to the other countries', it was suggested. During the discussion, it was explained that ESL was not included in this model as a dependent variable because at this stage we do not have any information yet on ESL, that will come from survey A2. However at this point, SE was chosen as a proxy for ESL, as a scale to measure the disengagement from school. While it is true that aspirations could also have used as a proxy for ESL/school disengagement, it was considered to have too few variables in the questionnaire contrary to SE. MU confirmed that at a later stage, analysis will show whether it is SE or Aspirations or another variable which is more determinative of ESL.

In PP5, there will be a major emphasis on higher level concepts, the role of lower level concepts will be further explored after PP5 (the analysis already done in Belgium on lower level concepts, such

as emotional ties (useful also for WP4), will be shared with others). The fact that the sample is neither random nor representative at national nor regional/local level will also be explicitly mentioned in PP5. Yet since the sample is representative of the schools included in the survey, it can reveal patterns, such as gender differences, differences between cohorts, between migrants versus natives, etcetera.

There was a suggestion that even if there can be no comparison across countries, there should be room for a comparison across (socio)economic systems which also (may) have a strong influence of ESL incidence levels. This was countered by the remark that as the sample, are not representative at the national level, it is not useful to do the analysis of the survey, results in a systemic framework. It was concluded that rather there should be an emphasis, on non-systemic differences.

- MU sends out final draft of PP5 for feedback in May
- Feedback is incorporated and final version of PP5 ready by the end of June

WP 3.4 Recruitment and retention strategies for survey A2

Alessio D'Angelo (MU) presented the development of ideas related to the recruitment and retention of the pupils surveyed last year for survey A2 due to take place in Spring 2016. The proposal is to do this Intermediate survey (A1.5) by email and to all Survey A1 respondents who provided an email address. It should be very short, perhaps 3 questions, which can be used to ascertain respondents' ESL status, for example:

- 1) What are you doing now? (educational status) (employment status if applicable)
- 2) What qualification(s) do you currently have? (level of education)
- 3) What are your plans for next (school) year? (possible future ESL/NEET status)

Other demographic information can be matched to responses in Survey A1. Timeframe would be early June, in any case before the end of the current school year. A short discussion on the scheduling of survey A2 led to the decision to have the A2 questionnaire online by the end of January, so that it can be administered as of February 2016. A longer discussion on the best way to incentivize as much as possible the young people to fill in the surveys and to design a time-efficient manner for the follow up of the 'bounced back' and 'not replied', led to the idea of considering the intermediate survey as the pilot of the retention strategies to be used in survey A2, and the following revised timetable:

- MU designs a short email with three questions in May and sends it (translated) through Qualtrics to the A1 respondents in those countries that wish to participate in the "pilot";
- MU will also design a "flow chart" with retention strategies to follow up on 'bounced back' and 'no replies' in May;
- Those countries participating in the intermediate survey will apply and test the flow chart on a selected number of 'bounced back' and 'no replies' during June and July;
- In September at the ECER conference, experiences on the effectiveness and time efficiency of the flow chart are discussed and flow chart fine-tuned for use in survey A2; the questionnaire A2 will be also be discussed
- Questionnaire A2 will be finalized in English in December;
- Questionnaire to be (back)translated and ready to go online by the end of January 2016;
- Survey A2 takes place from February until July 2016.

WP4.2 State of affairs: Extra-muros, NVivo database, cross country analysis

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the state of affairs on WP 4.2 Evaluation of extra-muros measures. Project paper 6 is based on 7 country reports (around 400 pages), 28 schools (4 per country), 48 measures (average of 7 per country), 56 interviews with youngsters on extra-muros measures, 31 interviews with principals & management staff, 28 focus group discussion with 133 school staff, 28 FGD with 154 peers and 23 interviews with parents. The main principle used in the categorization of the IM used was the difference between prevention measures, designed to tackle ESL before first symptoms are visible, versus intervention measures, meant to address emerging difficulties at an early stage. The discussion on the coding frame, jointly decided upon in September 2014 in Antwerp, being to constraining and not allowing to put new themes into the analysis (particularly those related to the way young people experience IM measures) therefore seemingly wasting a lot of rich information from the qualitative interviews, was concluded by the decision that MU would provide the first draft of the coding scheme for the BIO interviews by the end of June. Another point of discussion was the title "cross country analysis" used for PP6. Because the data collected in only 4 schools per

country, they are not nationally representative and thus there can be no cross-country analysis. The title will be changed, and the term cross country analysis left out. At the same time, there was consensus on the need for more contextual information in PP6 both on country conditions as on school specifics, hence the proposal to include one page on country context, and one half to one page on school context (per school), based on a template provided by UAB.

WP 4.2 Project Paper 6 – Evaluation of intra-muros (IM)

Marjolein Braspenningx and Ward Nouwen (UA) presented more content of Project paper 6, initially due in May, but postponed now to September, more specifically on Early Warning Systems and One-on-One Emotional and Behavioral Support. All 48 IM measures described in the country reports were categorized as either “Early warning systems” or “One on one emotional and behavioral support”. Analysis of the data showed that concerning the participation and ownership of EWS measures, stakeholders sometimes criticize “wait-to-fail approach” of (governmental) EWS, while teaching staff do not always take up signalling function of potential risk. Sometimes the most vulnerable students are the least involved in more qualitative EWS, and students at times criticize their lack of ownership of what is recorded in the case files. The main protective factor of ESW is the fact that the overall (government) attention for it is reflected in finding EWS as common school practice. As risk factors, the analysis identified the following: 1) the detection and monitoring of emotional (more covert) indicators is underrepresented, and 2) the quantitative indicators focussing on negative cognitive and behavioral aspects can lead to low sense of ownership (and stigmatisation) of youngsters (at risk). Concerning the participation and ownership of 1/1 support measures, it was found that some students are not eager to participate because of fear of overall distrust of school (staff) while at the same time, participation in reactive (punitive) approach is mostly obligatory and instills therefore a low sense of ownership in the participants.

As protective factors of 1/1 support, analysis showed that virtually all schools have at least some basic level of 1/1 emotional and behavioral support provision and there are a certain number of good practice examples of well-structured and tiered care team approaches in schools that are balanced proactive/ reactive. Risk factors however, are that many (if not most) schools predominantly react upon more overt symptoms like absenteeism, disruptive behavior and diminishing study behavior. In addition, when early signals about socioemotional needs are not picked up, personalized support can come too late. Also, reactive support is conceived as punitive rather than supportive, and lastly, participation is mostly non-voluntary, allowing for little room for the students’ voice and ownership and hampering the development of a caring and trusting relationship with support staff. Again the need for more systemic country context and institutional context information was felt, as well as more examples/citations from the interviews. The first would allow for country specificities to be mentioned (e.g. EUR requested that PP6 mentions explicitly that (some of) these IM measures in the Netherlands are considered ESL measures) while the second would help to portray students less as objects in a system, and illustrate their experiences and empowerment (a concern expressed by SU and MU). Towards the finalization of Project Paper 6, the following was agreed:

- (more) Feedback from partners on current PP6 draft by end of April;
- Template for school descriptions by end of April (UAB+UA);
- Partners will deliver by the end of May:
 - one page review on (systemic) country context from Pub 1, and
 - one half page (max full page) school descriptions (institutional context) from info in IM country papers;
- New version of PP6 sent out by UA by the end of June;
- Feedback by partners by the end of July;
- Final version PP6 by the end of September.

WP 4.1 & 4.3 Preparation of next steps: Bio + extra-muros measures

Noel Clycq (UA) presented the planning of the next stages of WP 4, namely the data gathering for the evaluation of extra-muros measures and for the bio interviews for the ESL trajectories.

By October 2016, there should have taken place two interviews with 24 youngsters with the following status:

- 8 youngsters that participated in the intra-muros measures
- 8 youngsters that participated in the extra-muros measures

- 8 youngsters that are identified as NEET

Ideally each of these youngsters is interviewed 2 times. The young people interviewed for the intra-muros measures may be selected from the 8 youngsters in-school (interviewed in January - June 2015). *The status of an interviewed person is based on his/her first interview, the point at which they 'entered the project' and were first interviewed.* This status may change over time, yet these changes will be captured during the second interview on trajectories. For the RESL.eu-project (based on the DOW) and to have 2 interviews with 24 youngsters, each interviewee was categorized as either NEET, intra-muros or extra-muros based on their first entry status in the project. Even if their status changes during their trajectory, for administrative purposes they will remain categorized on the basis of the status they had during their first interview.

Fieldwork during September – December 2015: 8 interviews with extra-muros staff / 4 FG peers in compensatory measures / 8 interviews youngsters in extra-muros measures (combined with bio interviews) / 4 interviews with parents of youngsters in compensatory measures *Fieldwork January – October 2016:* '8 first' interviews youngsters in NEET status / 24 final bio interviews case youngsters (8 IM – 8 EM – 8 NEET) / 4 interviews with parents of NEETs / 4 FGs with peers of NEETs. *Fieldwork to be finished by end of September 2015:* Selection of 24 youngsters informed by survey A1 (ideally) all from the same Research Area selected for WP4. All pupils from one of the four selected schools (ideally).

Done + ongoing: 16 youngsters still in school for intra-muros evaluations and bio interviews (ideally 4 per school) :

- 8 in period October 2014 - December 2014 (done)
- 8 in period January 2015 – June 2015 (ongoing).
Remains to be done by end of Sept 2015: 8 ESL that became NE(E)T*
Not in Education and Training, but could be in employment at the time of this first
- bio-interview
- Ideally 2 persons that left 1 of the 4 case schools;
- If not, can be two other persons from survey A1;
- If not to be found in Research Area 1 than recruited from Research Area 2, but
- who have participated in Survey A1

*Because of the confusion between the categories ESL, NEET and NET/NE(E)T, a visualization was created. The age of the person can be up to 24 years at the time of the interview. Because it is quite possible that a person interviewed the 1st time, cannot be traced, or refuses to participate in the 2nd interview, a total of 32 first interviews are foreseen, and only 24 second interviews. Doing focus groups with NEET's is estimated to be difficult if not impossible, it could therefore be 1 NEET with his/her friends and peers, even if these last ones did not participate in A1.

WP 4.1 & 4.3 – Topic lists and coding EM/BIO

Noel Clycq (UA) briefly presented the proposed topic lists for the data gathering for the evaluation of extra-muros EM measures and for the bio interviews. In order to avoid the problems that arose when applying a predetermined coding schemes onto the IM interview data, MU proposed to develop a first draft of the coding scheme for the EM and BIO on the basis of the interviews that already took place. The following planning was agreed upon:

- Draft topic guide and template for EM sent out for feedback in June
- Partners give feedback in July & all documents for EM fieldwork are finalized by the end of August
- Sept-Dec 2015 : 8 EM interviews, 8 staff interviews, 4 FGD EM peers, and 4 interviews with parents
- Coding of interviews to be completed by mid-January 2016 & country reports ready by mid-February 2016
- Draft PP7 be the end of April 2016 & finalization PP7 by end of May 2016.

WP 3.3 Survey B – State of Affairs and Implementation

Alessio D'Angelo (MU) presented the state-of-affairs and further planning of survey B. Survey B was finalized and has 6 sections:

- Demographics (14 questions);
- ESL (5 questions);
- School climate & leadership (5 questions);

- Teaching practices (6 questions);
- School resources & CPD (3 questions);
- Job satisfaction (1 question)

Within a week or two, the questionnaire should be translated and ready to be put online in all countries.

There is a massive variability in the number of staff and schools which will participate in survey B across the countries. UK, BE, PT and ES had already confirmed to including all survey schools in both RAs. ES and UK may go beyond the survey schools and include other schools as well. PL is considering including the survey schools of RA2 as well. NL has also decided to include all survey schools in RA2. SE will do 3 schools in each of the 2 RA's using paper questionnaires (not Qualtrics). The goal is to have a minimum of 100 teachers per country. The online questionnaire will be accessible 24/7 and this until the end of the school year. Data cleaning will be done by MU (except for country specific questions from Sept till November). The draft of Publication 2 will circulate for feedback in January 2016. Due date for deliverable is February 2016.

- Survey B questionnaire online and ready to go in max. two weeks
- Questionnaire online 24/7 until end of school year
- Data cleaning by MU from Sept till Dec
- Draft Publication to for feedback by January 2016
- Publication 2 finalized and delivered by end of February 2016

WP 5 – Determining youth at risk and good practices (intro)

Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała (WU) presented an introduction into WP5 on Determining youth at risk and good practices which is scheduled to take place from month 49 (February 2017) till month 55 (August 2017).

WP5 should produce 3 Project Papers and 2 Publications based on primary data from 7 countries and secondary data from 2 countries (Hungary and Austria). One of its objectives is to develop a risk assessment tool for determining youth at risk of ESL to be used by schools and other significant partners in the field. A discussion followed on what is a "risk assessment tool", and the suggestion to start with a literature review was generally accepted. Results from the literature review on what already exists within and outside of Europe (interesting to see if these tally with the RESL.eu results), can be shared through the intranet, and discussed at the next consortium meeting. There was also a general consensus that the proposed output was too much: whereas Project Paper 8 will feed into Publication 6, Project Papers 9 and 10 can be merged into one PP9 that feeds into Publication 7. All three WP2, WP3 and WP4 will provide information for WP5, yet the respective WP descriptions do not explicate what information is needed by when for WP5. Hence a timeline on what type of information is needed by when would be the first step in WP5. Another problem of definition concerns the term "good practices" and the term "practices" versus "measures". One of the UAB team members wrote a report on this, he will provide the link.

- UW to draw up timeline explicating what information precisely from WP2, WP3 and WP4 respectively is needed for WP5 and by when;
- UW to initiate a literature review on the definition, usage and practical applications of a "risk assessment tool";
- UAB to send link on paper on "practices" versus "measures"
- PP9 and PP10 merged into one PP9.

WP 8 – Dissemination State of Affairs and planning

Roos Willems (UA) presented a table on dissemination activities and one on papers and conferences. A mail to the communication team members a few weeks earlier requesting for an update on both had been responded to by the Portuguese team only. One of the highlights was a video developed by UPORTO with high school pupils on the RESL project. While widely applauded and admired, because the language used was Portuguese, it was felt that the video could not be used in the retention strategies for A2.

All other teams are strongly encouraged to still send their update. At the time of writing this report, PL, AU and HU have already done so. The updated lists will be posted on the intranet, activities by one team may inspire other teams to develop more dissemination events themselves.

Next consortium meeting

The next RESL.eu consortium meeting will be held in Antwerp, organized by UA. It will take place on Thursday 3 and Friday 4 March 2016. As decided by the Management Team, participants will need to stay for the full two days, staying three nights. In the intermediate term, there will be a meeting at the ECER conference in Budapest (7-11 September 2015), the exact date of which will depend on the scheduling of the two RESL.eu panels.

5a. Management Committee/Team Meeting, London, United Kingdom, 22 April 2015

WP 9 - Updated timetable

During the final session of the consortium meeting the planning sheet for the activities during the period until the next consortium meeting was completed with all the deadlines decided upon during the previous sessions.

6. Scientific and Policy Meeting, Budapest, Hungary 10 September 2015

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Magdolna Lorinc

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Sofia Santos

Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Talitha Stam

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Ábel Bereményi, David Curto, Marta Bertran

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Agnes Kende

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU) Marie Gitschthaler

University of Antwerp (UA): Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Rut Van Caudenberg, Roos Willems

Hosted by Central European University, Budapest (CEU CPS)

Welcome

Personnel changes in project teams

Before starting the meeting, it was suggested to do a tour of those teams that had incurred personnel changes. In the Netherlands, Malin Grundel has left the project but it was decided to not replace her. Talitha Stam her contract was extended until end 2016, and extra money was found to hire extra help in the form of work-students. In Belgium Marjolein Braspenninx has left, and Rut Van Caudenberg was hired to take her place. Noel Clycq leaves the project for 80%, he will continue to work on the project on a 20% base only. A post-doc with expertise in ethnographic fieldwork will be recruited to replace the other 80%. In Sweden, Isabelle Stromberg has left the project, yet she will continue to work for RESL.eu on a 20% basis to allow for a 6 month overlap period with her successor Marie Björklöf, newly recruited and coming in with a lot of job-centre experience. In Spain, Ábel Bereményi will leave the project for 50%, remaining for 50%. The new team member will attend the next consortium meeting in Antwerp on March 3 and 4.

WP 3.3 Survey B - Further planning analysis & outline Publication 2 (February 2016)

Alessio D'Angelo (MU) presented the results of survey B which were very different from country to country, the good news being that only three countries have not yet reached the target of 100 responses as required by the DOW (NL/UK/PL), other countries on the other hand reached up to 5 or even 800 responses (ES/BE). In a round of the table, each team described their approach in obtaining the final result. It appeared that those countries with large numbers of responses also put in a lot of effort (not only emails, but many repeated phone calls as well as reports on survey results to individual schools and events and workshops with teachers) to obtain that result. Because of the Summer holidays, it was generally accepted that the period for survey B could be extended to at least end of October, particularly also since Publication 2 need not be ready until February 2016. However, a long discussion ensued on the usefulness of Publication 2 particularly in view of its input (or not) into other WP/reports/PPs. There was a general consensus that Pub 2 would not compare countries, but rather do analysis at the institutional (i.e. school) level. This would imply that only schools from which a sufficient number of responses was received would be taken up in the comparative framework.

After some discussion, it was agreed that it would be difficult to set a quantitative/statistical criterion on the term "sufficient", and also that in any case the sample is skewed because the teachers are self-selected (not random) and thus the analysis of the Survey B results at project level (for Publication 2) would have be of a mainly descriptive, "qualitative" nature. Hence, it was agreed that those countries that had not yet reached the 100 target would try to find extra teachers from those schools that had already generated a substantial number of replies, preferably –if possible— from the four 'qualitative' schools in Research Area 1. If this proved impossible, than RA2 could be approached, and only as a very last resort look for additional schools outside of the two research areas.

- MU to send out to partners a draft table with the names of the schools where teachers have participated in survey B; and the number of responses of the respective schools as soon as possible
- Partners to verify number of responses received per school and to complete this table with the estimated number of teachers working in the respective schools & the number of schools per neighborhood
- MU to deduce from the compiled data a proposal on which would be the best common ground for a case study analysis at project level (Publication 2)
- From this a strategy can be developed on which schools to approach in order to obtain the goal of 100 responses latest by the end of October (some countries intend to recruit additional participants even if they have already reached the target)
- Questionnaire B will remain open in Qualtrics until end of October at least.

WP 3.4 Retention strategies for Survey A2 (update) & Questionnaire

Alessio D'Angelo (MU) presented the results of survey A1.5 (the intermediate survey) which was sent out to the 3,000 pupils in each country. The good news was that only 10% of email messages bounced back, the not so good news that only in between 40 to maximum 400 pupils per country actually responded to the email, giving a response rate of in between only 1.3% for PL up to 10% in UK and SP. After an automatically generated reminder email, the response rate doubled for some countries, going up to 2.8% for PL and 20% for SP. In general, most countries had an overall response rate of around 10%. This means that if we use only emails to administer survey A2, we would have a response rate of only 10%, while we envisaged a total of 1,500 responses in the DOW (which is 75% out of 2,000, or 50% out of 3,000). In the UK, 343 A1 pupils were contacted by telephone (this took 4 days of continuous calling by a few work students), out of which 106 (30%) complied and completed the questionnaire A1.5. If we extrapolate these results, we could foresee a total of a 40% response rate (or 1,200 responses) when combining email and tel. contact. . A similar pattern was found for telephone contacts of a 10% random subsample in Belgium. In the UK trial, few telephone numbers proved to be non-existent however it appears that in the NL and in PL, marketing strategies of tel. companies target young people with special offers that require a change of phone number. Thus the number of non-existent phone numbers could be a lot higher in these two countries when administering survey A2.

All in all, the general conclusion was that questionnaire A2 (by email or phone) needs to be as short or almost as short as questionnaire A1.5, thus no scales will be used. However, it could be considered to do scales in a follow up online questionnaire for those respondents willing to participate in

that. Information on the dependent variable (namely whether the pupil has become ESL or is still in school) seems to be accessible public information in some countries (NL/SE/BE) but definitely not in others (SP/UK/PT). Because it will evidently be easier to contact those A1 pupils that are still in school than those who have left school and became ESL, the sample is bound to be skewed towards the higher achieving ones, and thus some system of weights may have to be considered when analyzing the survey results.

- Questionnaire A2 will be short and a draft sent out by MU early October
- Feedback from partners expected by end of October so that final English version can be ready early November
- Questionnaire A2 to be (back)translated November/December and ready to go online by the beginning of January 2016;
- Survey A2 takes place from January until July 2016 on the basis of the contingency plan used for A1.5
- At the consortium meeting 3 & 4 March in Antwerp, partners will exchange on the experiences & results of the first two months of the survey in order to update the contingency plan for the remainder of the period set aside for survey B.

WP4 - Time Frame IM, EM, BIO and planning fieldwork 2015-2016

Noel Clycq (UA) : *Fieldwork scheduled to be finished by end of September 2015* included apart from the 8 intra-muros (+bios) that had already been finished earlier: 8 interviews with youngsters still in school, and another 8 interviews (bio and ESL experience) with youngsters that are NE(E)T. The last category of persons proved difficult to find. A round of the table took place to exchange experiences on strategies for locating these youngsters that are no longer in school. Finding them through social workers appears to be a workable strategy in some countries. In general, it was agreed – at this stage - to NOT add youngsters from the same research area that had not participated in survey A1, because even if they'd be asked to fill the questionnaire A1 at the moment of being NE(E)T they'd fill in the questions in hindsight/from memory. Rather, it is preferable to add NE(E)Ts from research area 2 that did participate in survey A1. In the ideal situation all interviewed NE(E)Ts come from one of the four WP4 schools. If not possible, add NE(E)T's from the another school that participated in survey A1 but in the same research area. If that still proves to be fruitless, go to research area 2 to locate NE(E)T's who participated in survey A1. *EM Fieldwork during September – December 2015* includes : 8 interviews with extra-muros staff / 4 FG peers in compensatory measures / 8 interviews youngsters in extra-muros measures (combined with bio interviews) / 4 interviews with parents of youngsters in compensatory measures. With regard to the extra-muros measures it is good to keep in mind the focus in on ISCED 3, so only measures that (in)directly lead to an ISCED 3 certificate can be considered as EM in the project. Just “on-the-job” training does not count as an EM if it does not lead to an ISCED 3 certificate. All EM measures sent in by partners were categorized by UA into 4 types (later to be re-categorized into 3 types). This categorization will be sent out to partners for feedback.

A question was raised whether it would not be more useful to compare types of institutions in the analysis, rather than types of extra-muros measures in view of the fact that PP7 is not to give an overview of the types of EM's, but to provide explanations to the question “why might EM's work better for some youngsters than formal education and why is that”. A round of the table was done to exchange on already gained experiences as well as strategies foreseen for the identification of EM's in the different countries. In the UK there are institutions that provide EM's and that can count up to 20,000 pupils. At the same time most EM's go to ISCED 3 and even higher. In Sweden there is some EM training towards professional certification, but not ISCED 3. In the NL only official schools can give out ISCED 3 certificates, there are no EM's in an alternative circuit that can lead to ISCED 3. A solution could be to look for programs that are initiated by companies even if in collaboration with official schools. In SP, EM institutes are happy to cooperate with the project because they feel under-researched in contrast to schools which are over-researched. On the other hand, because in SP school is compulsory to 16 years only, there are officially no ESLers over the age of 16. And yet it is this group of 16 to 18 year olds that is increasingly unemployed. In BE the plan is to focus on second chance education (2 institutions) and institutions providing work-based VET trajectories as alternative pathways to a ISCED III qualification. In PT, the list contains public institutions and cooperatives

that provide training and education (ISCED 3) courses. In Portugal the Traineeship and Apprenticeships programmes combine practical training in a job with study. Mostly, these courses are aimed at young people who left the school, aged between 15-20.

For the fieldwork, it was decided that there can be some flexibility in the choice between interviews or focus-groups with respect to the school staff data collection, partner teams should decide depending on the context which one is more expedient. Also there should be some flexibility on parent recruitment because even for the IMs this already appeared to be very difficult. As usual only interviews with youngsters need to be fully transcribed and translated in English, all others can be summarized in English.

The EM coding frame will be ready by Oct 15th. BIO coding scheme is ready in principle but might need to be complemented for the EM/ESL youngsters. This will also be done by mid- Oct. A draft of the template for the country papers on EM will be circulated as well at that time because it should be finalized by mid November.

- Sept-Dec 2015 : 8 EM interviews, 8 staff interviews, 4 FGD EM peers, and 4 interviews with parents (with some flexibility)
- 15 Oct : coding frame EM (+ extras for BIO) + template EM country papers circulated by UA for feedback by partners
- 30 Oct : Coding frames EM & template EM country paper finalized by UA
- Coding of EM interviews and of first BIO interviews to be completed by mid January 2016
- EM country reports ready by mid-February 2016
- Draft PP7 be the end of April 2016 & finalization PP7 by end of May 2016.

Because so much coding needs to be completed by Jan2016 (including the BIO interviews that took place during the IM phase since January 2015) it was suggested that UA requests a monthly update from partners. *The 2nd round of interviews for the longitudinal study of (non-) ESL trajectories scheduled to take place from Jan. 2016 to Oct. 2016* will thus start in February only given the amount of work to be completed by January.

It was again emphasized that the status of an interviewed person is based on his/her first interview, the point at which they 'entered the project' and were first interviewed. This status may change over time, yet these changes will be captured during the second interview on trajectories. For the RESL.eu-project (based on the DOW) and to have 2 interviews with 24 youngsters, each interviewee was categorized as either NEET, intra-muros or extra-muros based on their first entry status in the project. Even if their status changes during their trajectory, for administrative purposes they will remain categorized on the basis of the status they had during their first interview.

WP 9 – Wrapping up and closure of meeting

During the final session of the meeting a quick overview of the decisions made and deadlines scheduled was given in order to complete the planning sheet for the activities during the period until the next consortium meeting now including WP5 and extended until July 2017.

Next consortium meeting

The next RESL.eu consortium meeting will be held in Antwerp, organized by UA. It will take place on Thursday 3 and Friday 4 March 2016. As decided by the Management Team, participants will need to stay for the full two days, staying three nights. The consortium members decided that it was too early to invite either the EU Project Officer or the SPC members to the next meeting because the discussions are still more concerned with data gathering than with data analysis.

7. 4th Consortium meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 3-4 March 2016

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui, Kasja Rudberg, Marie Bjorklof

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Sofia A. Santos

Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Thalita Stam, Elif Keskiner

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Àbel Bereményi, Isidoro Ruiz, Jordi Pàmies

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Julia Szalai

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU) : Erna Nairz-Wirth, Marie Gitschthaler

University of Antwerp (UA) : Noel Clycq, Ward Nouwen, Christiane Timmerman, Rut Van Caudenberg, Lore Van Praag

Hosted by Antwerp University, BE

Welcome

WP3.4 - Update Survey A2 (Publication 4 - Jan 2017)

Neil Kaye (MU) presented in this session the state of affairs of the follow-up survey with young people. The surveys are sent out in Qualtrics during the last couple of weeks (concrete timing differed between partners). So far, we received different response rate across countries, depending on the timing of the mail and/or reminder mail was sent out. Neil will check whether the mails were sent to the original mailing list and whether this includes all mails that bounced back during the intermediate survey. The implementation strategy of Survey A2 is to start making phone calls to the respondents that did not completed the survey online. The MU partners will provide all partners with lists including these respondents contact information and individual reference numbers. For the telephone-administered questionnaires, it is important to note down the exact reference codes. It is recommended to copy paste them because of the length reference codes. This should decrease the risk of misspelling or errors.

Some suggestions based on the experiences of the different partners for making the tele-phone-administered questionnaires:

- The Dutch team (EUR) worked together with a student assistant who has already called each respondent that could be contacted by telephone twice. Although they reached a high number of respondents during the first phase of the Survey, there was quite a proportion of the respondents that did not want to be contacted again for Survey A2. The Dutch partner indicated that the telephone contacting seemed to be saturated and that the current sample includes a low (36) number of ESLers. They contacted the Ministry of Education and - although they did not provide more contact information – they will give more information about drop out, minimal educational qualifications, number of changes during educational trajectory (for all respondents). They will add this data to the survey. This will not provide answers about the other questions in Survey A2, but it will allow to have information on the main dependent variables.
- The Spanish team has a rather high response rate but the quality of the initial answers was found to be rather poor. They hope that the phone calls would improve quality. A WhatsApp campaign will be initiated to remind youngsters to fill in the questionnaire before the respondents will be contacted through the phone again. Both the Dutch and the Spanish team have set up a Facebook page for the respondents of the survey. The only problem with sending messages through Facebook is that these messages are not always shown in people's inbox. Additionally, you have to copy each individual code retrieved from Qualtrics into Facebook. Setting up a Whatsapp campaign is rather easy and cheap. You can send personalized messages with pictures. You should be able to make a personalized text and add the individual

response codes using an excel spreadsheet. Abel will look into this further and keep the other partners up to date. Neil, can provide us with individual links to the server in order to allow coupling with the data from survey A1.

- The Swedish team sent in October a letter to state that we are going to carry out a new survey. Now, they are going to send an email reminder (3 times). At the end, they will be able to know, based on the registered data of the government, whether respondents are still in study or working, otherwise, they are NEET. At the time of the intermediate survey (spring 2015), all students were contacted and were told that they were going to be contacted again for Survey A2, and asked them whether they want to participate. Student assistants going to contact all respondents.
- For the intermediate survey (Survey A.1.1.) the PT team called all students from Survey A1 (2223) and students were asked if they were willing to participate and be contacted again for Survey A2. The emails were already sent and the phone calls will start in early March with the help of two students. The Portuguese team has also set up a Facebook page for the respondents of the survey.

The phone calls will be carried out until the end of March. After Easter, in a few weeks, preliminary analysis **by the 11th of April 2016** will be carried out to connect to dependent variable, and to look whether the sample is representative or not. The MU partner agreed to doing an intermediate non-response analyses in the week after Easter in order to inform partners of the coverage of at risk groups in their Survey A2 sample. The responses of these preliminary analyses will be send to each partner. The focus of these preliminary analyses would be to include schools we are recommended to focus on and to focus on factual risk factors/demographics, less on school engagement. The main purpose of the second survey is to check whether our ideas concerning factors at risk in the initial survey were correct or not. Based on this information they can do targeted efforts to increase the participation of these subgroups in ways that they feel that fits this target group best in their local context (e.g. school and/or home visits, social media, additional telephone calls or (e-)mails. The information collected through the schools can however only give information of students are still in school, but does not entail any information about students that have left the school: they could be early school leavers but also be enrolled in another school/institution. Because of this, this type of information is not enough information to say anything about ESL. The UK team remarks that they will never do house visits due to privacy reasons. Other partners will look into this option for targeted sub-groups in order to increase their participation in Survey A2.

The response rate might also depend on the timing of the emails and phone calls (e.g. during the week, weekend; morning, afternoon, evening). It is important to note that even when they just have ticked one box, we will keep the partial data (Neil Kaye will check the default settings)

For the subsequent stage of merging the dataset, each team might be asked to code occupations – as for Survey A1, the rest of the survey merging, data cleaning and analyses will be handled centrally.

WP 3.3 - State of Affairs Survey B and Publication 2 (March 2016)

Alessio D'Angelo (UK) presented the state of affairs of Survey B and the preparation for Publication 2 (deliverable 3.1).

Publication 2 (deliverable 3.1) will only include school data that are made anonymous, and is directed at a wider public. The survey results are meant as a way to raise starting point or to raise issues about ESL. The focus will be “Narratives about school environment”. Each team has to fill in the template to contextualize the results, collect information about the case study and to understand whether the figures are still meaningful, as these figures could be skewed, however, each country could give some idea about the ways it could be skewed so the UK could include this in their report. It remained unclear which definition of ethnic minority was used: based on birth-country or sense of ethnicity (all countries except for UK, sense of ethnic minority). The definition used for the publication would matter as, for instance, in Spain, only a small number of Catalans would perceive themselves as an ethnic minority. The aggregation of variables as presented in the slideshow was based on theory, the UK team will set them out for each factor separately (item by item). As the concept ‘ESL’ is not a recognized concept in the UK, we made this clear in the beginning of the questionnaire (this has to be made very clear in the Publication as well).

- **Template Case Schools**

The respondents on which Publication 2 is based will be anonymous.

In this template, the UK team will provide overall descriptive statistics from survey A1 to begin with. Each partner has to fill in page 3 of this template. Special attention has to be given to “measures” that are at work in this school, that are worth mentioning (and to link this publication to other publications). Each team has to provide more or less 1.5 pages, where each team can choose which characteristics are relevant to interpret the data. 1 page is completed by the UK team. Try to limit the number of pages and write a maximum of 800 words. Some teams opted for other schools in the different work packages (e.g. the NL team chose different schools), which makes it harder to link WP3 and WP4. The PT team kept to the decisions made in the Budapest meeting to contact all schools from Survey A1 from both research areas (22 schools) and to take the response rate as the main criteria for the selection of case studies. As the level of persistence by phone calls and emails was the same for all schools, the schools with greater number of responses from teachers were not necessarily those from the research area one. In general, each team has to pick 2 to 4 case schools. The reasons to select particular schools are more important than number of schools, to allow comparability. The most important criteria for case school selection are: the critical response rate and the information you have collected in this school. The structure of Publication 2 would be to present the data in general, 2*7 case studies of each country and a conclusion to wrap it up. Attention will be given to what can we learn from each country, what are the issues and how each school tries to deal with these issues. Try to include this in the template as well. The UK teams states that for the selection of case studies, there are little narratives of set-tings of schools trying to deal with ESL. Schools are not representative. The focus is set on a comparative approach as starting point to learn from distinct countries. The idea is to flag up the particularities from the distinct educational systems. The UK teams asks for comments from the distinct countries to be able to interpret the data, which is particular country-specific. The Swedish team suggests that the attitudes of teachers (the main actors of the schools) should be the focus. However, the UK team notes that there is not enough information of the attitudes of teachers to really state something. The Portuguese team asks to add a more conclusive comment about what we would learn from the schools. A remark has to be made in the methodology, due to case study approach, about the response rate. We will not focus on the response rate in each country, but rather, on the response rate in each school. It is not a country analysis, but rather a school analysis. The information in the template should be provided about the current status of the schools except when a dramatic change after data collection occurred, it is best to not include it. In order to present all data correctly, with enough N, and to avoid skewness, there will rather be a qualitative discussion of the quantitative data. To avoid looking too much at country lev-6 el, instead of school level, the PL team suggests that “a school in Poland” is preferred over “A Polish school”.

Timeline and deadlines for WP3:

A revised template will be send out to teams by the 11th of March. Each team sends a template back by the end of April. The draft Publication 2 will be send round for feedback mid-/end May. The final deadline for feedback is the end of May/early June. Publication 2 will be published online by the end of June.

WP4.3 - State of affairs: Extra-muros & bio interviews (PP7 - May 2016)

Lore Van Praag (UA) presented the state of affairs for WP4.3 ‘evaluations of measures in compensatory pathways’.

- **NVivo masterset**

NL and PT have new computers that automatically came with NVivo 11. The other partners still use NVivo10 and NVivo11 is not yet available at their universities. Since it is not possible to merge NVivo11 and NVivo10 datasets, it was not possible to include the data from NL and PT in the new master set. It was agreed that the UA team will buy a license for NVivo11 and, for the time being, provide the partners with 2 NVivo mastersets: 1 with NVivo10 data and 1 with NVivo11 data. Merging the datasets will be done by the UA team.

- **Fieldwork 4.3 and Project Paper 7**

The fieldwork for WP4.3 is finished and the UA received the country reports from all the partners. UA suggested to step away from the initial 3 categories that were used when selecting the different

compensatory pathways and measures (i.e. vocational education and training, second chance education and educational reintegration strategies) and instead to group the different compensatory pathways and measures discussed in the country reports by 5 'types' (i.e. innovative didactical approach, holistic approach, apprenticeship/workplace learning, career guidance, education reintegration strategies). In the first part of PP7 the measures will be discussed within those five types, using a similar structure as in PP6, namely: 'awareness about the scope and aims of the measure', 'participation and ownership', and 'outcome experience'. A second part of PP7 will focus on a more general discussion of the compensatory pathways. PP7 and PP6 (WP4.2) will be combined and result in Publication 3, therefore they need a more or less similar structure. Both PP6 and PP7, and Publication 3 will also need to feed WP5 (UW) on determining youth at risk and good practices. After discussion in the national teams, it resulted difficult to assign the measures to 1 of the 5 suggested types since they often can be placed under several types.

After a discussion in group it was decided:

- to keep the 5 suggested types of measures but leave out 'apprenticeship' in the third type
- that UA will provide the partners with a grid which they can fill in with the measures they discussed in their country reports
- since it is difficult to place the measures under one specific 'type' the grid will use dimensions so each measure can be placed under several types indicating the extent to which the type is relevant for the measure (from 'not at all' to 'completely')

Timeline and deadlines for WP4.3:

- UA will send the partners a grid for grouping the measures in the course of the week of *March 7th – March 11th*
- All partners will fill in the grid with the measures they discussed in their country reports and send it back to UA in the course of week *March 14th – March 18th*
- UA will send the partners the draft version of Project Paper 7 by *Mid May 2016*
- The partners will provide their feedback on the draft version by the *end of May 2016*
- The final version of Project Paper 7 will be ready by *Mid-June 2016*

WP 4.2 & WP 4.3 - Preparation and planning Publication 3 on intra & extra-muros (May 2016)

Lore Van Praag (UA) presented the plans for Publication 3 on intra & extra-muros measures – deliverable 4.1. Publication 3 will be a comparison of PP6 (intra-muros measures) and PP7 (extra-muros measures) and will consist of i) an overview of PP6 (extended version of the executive summary of PP6), ii) an overview of PP7 (extended version of the executive summary of PP7), and iii) a section on what regular secondary education can learn from compensatory pathways and vice versa. To illustrate intra-muros and extra-muros measures, UA suggested to include 'promising practices' on both intra and extra-muros measures from all the countries. After discussion in group it was decided not to call them 'promising practices', but 'interesting examples' instead. These examples do not necessarily have to be 'good' or 'promising' practices, they can also be something new, something that contains interesting information from which other countries, practitioners and policy makers can learn. They should serve as illustrations for the readers of Publication 3, to show them what we have seen during the fieldwork.

These 'interesting examples' should not be confused with the building of conceptual models for good practices of WP5. The idea of the interesting examples is to provide the readers with concrete examples, while the purpose of the analysis of good practices in WP5 is not so much providing concrete examples but rather developing a model of what should be included in a measure to make it work.

The deadline for Publication 3 (deliverable 4.1) was initially foreseen for month 40 (May 2016). Since it is not feasible to make this deadline, UA will contact the EU officer to negotiate the postponement of the deadline to month 44 (September 2016).

It was agreed upon that:

- each partner will select a total of 4 'interesting examples' of measures (2 intra-muros and 2 extra-muros). Out of those 4 examples UA will select 2 examples (1 intra and 1 extra-muros) that will be included in Publication 3.
- when the selection has been made each partner will provide UA with a short description of the example, what is interesting about it, and how it could be transferred to other contexts (around 350 words in total). UA will provide the partners with a template for this. Everybody who can provide a picture of the 'interesting example' is encouraged to do so. It does not necessarily have to be a picture of people if that is not possible, it can also be a picture of e.g. a location.

The UK asked if they could include 'apprenticeship' as an interesting example since they are invited to their graduation, which takes place mid-March 2016 and which will be a great opportunity to take pictures. Nobody objected to this so the UK can go ahead and work out this example.

Timeline and deadlines for Publication 3 (deliverable 4.1):

Phase 1: Collection of examples of intra-muros and extra-muros measures to be included in Publication 3:

- In the course of the week of *March 7th- March 11th* 7 UA will send a table to the partners in which each partner will rank 2 examples for intra-muros measures and 2 examples for extra-muros measures they wish to include in Publication 3
- All partners will send the table with the intra-muros measures (2 examples) and extra-muros measures (2 examples) back to UA in the course of the week of *March 14th – March 18th*
- UA will send a list with a proposal of the intra-muros (1 example) and extra-muros (1 example) measures for each partner by *March 21st*
- UA will send the final decision of the examples to be worked out by each partner, as well as a template for the description of these measures by *March 28th*
- All partners will send the description of the examples of the intra-muros and the extra-muros measure, including a photo (if possible) to UA by *the end of April*

Phase 2: putting together Publication 3:

- UA will send a draft version of Publication 3 to the partners by *June 22nd 2016*
- All partners can provide feedback on the draft version until *Mid-July 2016*
- UA will complete the final version of Publication 3 and send it to the publisher by *the end of July 2016*
- Publication 3 will be ready for print by *the beginning of September 2016*
- Distribution of Publication 3 can start by *the end of September 2016*

Note: since the deadline of Publication 2 on Survey B (deliverable 3.1) will also be postponed, Publication 2 and Publication 3 will now come out around the same time. It was agreed that UA and MU will keep each other updated on the progression of both publications. They will read each other's work-in-progress so both partners are aware of what is in the other publication.

EXTRA item: discussion on coding tree for bio interviews (WP4.1)

Before wrapping up, MU suggested to discuss the coding tree for the bio interviews of WP4.1. MU remarked that the coding tree includes too much nodes. While some partners may prefer to code the interviews more broadly, others prefer to use the more specific child-nodes. Therefore it was agreed upon that each partner can decide to either code their interviews on the main (10) mother-nodes, or on the child-nodes that are included under each mother-node. Since all partners will analyze their own interviews, they should decide amongst themselves which way of coding (broad or specific) they prefer.

All partners were reminded that in the next phase the interviews only need to be coded in the longitudinal coding tree (WP4.1). The partners were also reminded that for each node a short description of what is meant by the node can be found under 'properties'. PT remarked that there is no node for the ESLers situations after leaving schools and for the time 'in between' school and extra-muros, e.g. when a youngster is at home, not doing anything. Since the coding tree for 4.1 will be discussed in more detail during the session on WP4.1, it was decided to address this issue during that session.

Other

In preparation of the ECER conference in Dublin, SE suggested to create an online platform to exchange information (literature, etc.) to help each other in preparing for the conference presentations. All partners agreed that this was a good suggestion, not only for Dublin but also for writing papers, and preparing for other conferences further on. UA will look for the easiest way to make this exchange of information possible - e.g. using the closed site of the RESL.eu website; creating a Drop-box; ... WP 4.2 & WP 4.3 - Preparation and planning Publication 3 on intra & extra-muros (May 2016).

WP 4.1 - Longitudinal ESL Trajectories : State of Affairs and further planning (Publication 5 - January 2017)

Lore Van Praag presented the state of the art with regard to the first bio-interviews and discussed the plans for the second bio-interviews, as well as the WP4 part focusing on those youngsters Not in Employment, Education or Training (or so-called NEETs).

With regard to those youngsters selected as part of the second side entry of respondents (those who were Early School Leaver (ESL)/ Not in (Employment), Education or Training (N(E)ET) at the time of the first bio-interview), we decided that we would primarily focus on the ESL status and no longer in education or training. Part of the motivation was that these youngsters often move in and out of employment during this period. Partners who have not yet recruited all ESL/ N(E)ET youngsters for the first bio-interviews are encouraged to recruit the additional youngsters as soon as possible. Partners who already recruited ESL/ NET youngsters do not have to replace these youngsters with youngsters in a NEET status.

Regarding the second bio-interviews, the RESL.eu partners agreed to start contacting the respondents of the first bio-interviews that were still in secondary education at the time of the first interview as soon as possible. Those ESL and extra-muros youngsters that were interviewed at least 5 to 6 months ago can also be contacted again for the second bio-interviews already. We aim for interviewing 8 youngsters in every category (i.e. intra-muros, ESL/ NET, extra-muros), making up at total of at least 24 youngsters for the second bio-interviews. To enable each partner to meet these aims, we endorsed the following recruitment and re-placement strategies:

1) Over-recruiting those youngsters in a ESL/ NET and extra-muros categories to compensate for possible attrition in the second round of interviews.

2) As we try to contact youngsters as soon as possible, youngsters that cannot be interviewed for the second time can be replaced with youngsters with a similar back-ground and still be interviewed two times to keep the longitudinal perspective. The Antwerp team encourages all partners to try to match them on the basis of the characteristics in the NVIVO classification sheet (see *infra*).

3) We agreed that those youngsters that entered the project as a replacement of other case youngsters can be interviewed after at least 3-4 months starting from the first interview. We preferred having some longitudinal perspective rather than only asking retrospective questions to add a longitudinal perspective.

4) For recruitment of the remaining first bio-interviews, possible over-recruitment and/or replacements for the second bio-interviews we move past selection based on survey A1 only and we encourage contacting local NGO's that are working with vulnerable youngsters in the same research areas. These local NGO's can provide youngsters support, socio-cultural and sport activities and even basic training as long as it does not lead to recognized certification.

5) As a very last option, the team agreed to doing interviews over the phone rather than in person. Nonetheless, this option was not preferred due to methodological differences with face-to-face bio-interviews. The PT team alerted that this raises methodological issues and is not very feasible.

The use of the topic list for the second bio does not have to entail all sub-questions but rather provides the sub-questions in each section as probes. We do however encourage discussing all main themes with the youngsters as these themes also relate to the coding tree and the analyses providing content for the country reports and WP4 output.

The partners provided the following information regarding their strategies and expectations for the second round of bio-interviews:

□ PT: as clarified in the Budapest Minutes that the NEET/ESL case youngsters should be selected among the students from Survey A1. The PT team spent more than one month calling all participants again (more or less 2223 people) with the help of two students, in order to find those who had left school after filling the Survey A1. The PT team found 13 ESLers among those who answered the phone. Only 7 among these were interviewed, because the others refused to participate. This long process only finished in January 2016. The team is expecting problems with reconnecting to initial ESL/NEET youngsters and even more to gather their peer groups because they are in a vulnerable situation in terms of finding jobs, emigrating, having children and so forth.

- ES: will try among the 16 intra-muros and over-recruit for those in alternative learning arenas (already 16 respondents in Spanish NVIVO). Over-recruiting ESL/ NEET was not found feasible. They will just get to the initial eight and make sure they will participate again.
- SE: We will try to get 24 second bio-interviews. They have some over-recruitment already in place.
- UK: Optimistic in reaching sufficient youngsters for the different categories. Had already over-recruited in all categories.
- PL: aiming for reaching 8 of the initial 16 intra-muros. As they already had trouble with finding two more ESL'ers/ NETs even for first interview, they are not expecting to be able to over-recruit.

- NL: 8 intra-muros will be possible. Extra-muros secured through organisations. 12 ESL/ NEET in first round over recruitment
- BE: Are over-recruiting youngsters in a ESL/ NET position and expect the other second bio-interviews to be feasible to contact and interview again.

When additional case youngsters are added as replacement of other case youngsters from the first round of interviews (case youngsters 1-32), each partner should continue the numbering of cases from 33 onwards. Furthermore, a new case node should be added with the same name and the full interview can be coded on this case node. Once this has been done the case will automatically be added to the classification sheet for case youngsters. Each team has to add the additional code and fill in the classification sheet.

The Antwerp team would like to ask each partner to fill in the classifications sheet for case youngsters before the next merging of datasets (planned for October 15th). For each variable you can click on a list of potential responses and choose the most suiting response category.

In the topic list for coding the bio-interviews, we will recode all child nodes to the mother nodes (while keeping both) and add two new mother nodes ('Change' and 'NEET specific situation'). This is however planned for the next merge (October 2016). Partners who feel the current coding tree is too detailed can however code on the mother nodes (as was already the case before).

The focused group discussions with youngster in a NEET position will focus on youngsters in a NEET position or those in a similar vulnerable positions in relation to education and the Labor market. We thus decided not to focus on a specific NEET case youngster and his or her specific 'natural group' of friends but rather encourage everyone to find a group of youngsters in similar vulnerable (preferably NEET) situation through NGO's that come in regular contacts with these youngsters in the same research area as the rest of the WP4 fieldwork. These organizations can provide youngsters support and/or even some training, as long as it cannot provide them with officially recognized certification.

Timeline and deadlines for WP4.1:

- Each partner will provide the UA partner with their final NVIVO dataset including all sources, coding and filled in classification sheet by *October 15th 2016*.
- Each partner will provide the UA partner with their country report by *November 15th 2016*.

WP5 - Determining youth at risk and good practices

During the first day of the consortium meeting the WP3, 4 and 5 coordinators discussed opportunities for alternative outputs of WP5 in order to decrease the workload for the WP5 coordinators and to match the output better with the Schools Policy Thematic Working Group (TWG) of the EU Commissions Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC). As some of our consortium members are involved in the Working Group and the European Toolkit for Schools, we looked in to opportunities for matching the output with this large plat-form of practitioners and policy makers. Instead of the output that was currently included in the Description of Work (DOW), the work package coordinators discussed to also focus on specific practical tools that can be disseminated through this plat-form (i.e. a risk assessment tool for schools/ local policy and conceptual models for good practices in prevention, intervention and compensatory measures at the institution level). Specific system level and policy recommendations are included in WP6 (policy briefs and other policy oriented output).

During the second day we discussed these proposals with the full consortium. These discussion led us to conclude the following:

- The Antwerp partner, in collaboration with the Polish partner, will get in contact with the DG Research Policy Officer to look what kind of re-negotiations are possible regarding the WP5 output.
- The idea would be to propose the project papers as an official output and to integrate the initial deliverables 5.1 and 5.2 towards one publication on risk and protective factors for ESL; a typology of ESL, matched with specific conceptual models for prevention, intervention and compensations measures.
- As a compensation for the decrease in the number of outputs, we would then get in contact with the policy officers from the School's Policy TWG of DG EAC in order to see what kind of content would fit in the European Toolkit for Schools (e.g. a risk assessment tool for schools; easily accessible documentation on conceptual models for good practices in prevention, intervention and compensation).
- An important condition for the RESL.eu partners are however quality assurances for the content dissemination of the academic and empirical output of the research.

- Moreover, a change of focus for the output of WP5 should still provide sufficient opportunities of the triangulation of data from WP2, WP3 and WP4.

The UW team will consider the different possibilities with respect to the propositions they want to make to the DG Research Policy Officer and discuss this with the UA team. Subsequently, once the Antwerp team has made contact with the DG Research Policy Officer, they will provide feedback to the other partners and will get in contact with the WP3, 4 and 5 coordinators to discuss further plans, possibly by including Policy Officer(s) from DG EAC.

WP8 - Overview dissemination activities and further planning (e.g. ECER Aug 2016)

Lore Van Praag (UA) gave an overview of the dissemination activities and the further planning of activities within WP8.

- New RESL folder

There is a draft version of a new updated RESL folder. The new folder was sent to all the partners, but not everybody seemed to have received it. UA will send the folder again so the partners can give feedback on the content, if necessary. At the moment the folder is only available in English. The printing of the English folder will be done by the publisher. Each partner should inform UA about the amount of folders they want. Regarding the translation to the local languages: UA will contact the publisher to see if they can provide the Word Publisher version so each partner can translate the folder in the template and print it themselves.

- Mailchimp

The publisher developed a format for emails in Mailchimp that all the partners can use to send emails to their local networks. These emails can be used to inform stakeholders about upcoming activities, to make publicity for recent publications, etc. The format has six fixed blocks that can be included (or not) and of which the content can be adapted. UA made a tutorial on how to use the email format. This tutorial consists of two parts: i) how to import a contact list, and ii) how to adapt the format. UA will send the tutorials to all the partners. All partners should try to use the email format by following the tutorial. If they have questions about it, they can contact UA (Lore Van Praag). While the partners are responsible for sending out emails to their local networks, mailings to the international network of the project will be done by UA.

- Future plans for dissemination?

BE (UA) suggests to write an edited volume to present the content of the project as a whole. Previously published papers could also be included in this book. A concrete timeframe for the contributions can be decided upon at a later stage, but UA would like to have an idea of the structure of the book with some abstracts by the end of June 2016 so they can start contacting publishers (e.g. Routledge, Ashgate,...). UA will send out an email to the partners with some guidelines for the contributions.

PL (UW) are thinking about doing a thematic issue on WP5 in a journal of their faculty. The journal usually has articles in both Polish and English, but the special issue could be in English. UW will send the partners a link to the journal.

UK (MU) is interested in making a special issue of a journal. The idea is that the different partners in the project would cooperate with each other and write contributions together. MU (Louise Ryan), UAB (Silvia Carrasco) and UPORTO (Eunice Macedo) will take the lead, contact journals, and launch the call.

SP (UAB) remarked that so far there is no Spanish publication that gathers experiences on a European level. They are interested in making a special issue or a book in Spanish that brings together the results of the project so far. However, at this stage they cannot commit to take up this task, first they have to see whether they would have the time for it.

PT (UPORTO) informed the partners that they had the opportunity to become part of the ERASMUS + project *LINK – Learning In a New Key* – that invests in teachers' training to work adequately with vulnerable young people by means of music. The project started in September 2015. In April 2016 they will have a meeting with the project partners of this new project, where they will present the RESL project and link it with the objective of the other project.

- Twitter account

UA suggests to open a general RESL tweeting account so we can tweet whenever there is a new publication. UA will open the account and manage it. Everybody will get access to the account. The twitter account can also be linked to Mailchimp.

- National Action Platforms

Some partners shared their experiences with the National Action Platforms:

- UK (MU) had a successful meeting with their National Action Platform in December 2015. There were participants from different levels (local and EU), however including the national level resulted much more difficult. They plan to have another meeting when there is new data to share.
- BE (UA) also finds it difficult to engage politicians at the Flemish level, but the administration (appointed officials rather than elected officials) and local officials have been quite eager to participate so far. UA already organized two local meetings with local discussion platforms (LOPs) in Ghent and plans to have one with the LOP in Antwerp in 2016 when the publications are ready.
- SP (UAB) gave a presentation to the head teachers and inspection of two research areas. The participants of the meeting asked for another presentation when they have the results of the qualitative fieldwork. They were also very interested in the results of survey B. UAB plans to organize another meeting in July and in October.

All partners were reminded that setting up National Action Platforms is included in the DOW. The DOW also says that as of year 3 dissemination meetings for these stakeholders should be organized once a year. So all partners should make sure they plan 3 National Action Platform meetings throughout the course of the project.

- Using the right vocabulary

UAB raised a concern about the correct use of vocabulary. Since all partners (except MU) have to translate everything into English, two issues seem to be arising: i) we should agree on what vocabulary we use in English, ii) we should be aware of the constant changes in vocabulary. It was agreed upon that a good way to approach these issues is to create a Glossary that is made available to all partners. The national teams will draw up a list of words and concepts they are struggling with and send it to MU who will check it and draw up a Glossary. This Glossary will be uploaded on the platform (RESL website or Dropbox) that will be used to exchange information (see 'Other' above). This Glossary will be a work in progress, and will change regularly.

- Stays at partner institutions

So far, Thalita Stam (EUR) and Laia Narciso (UAB) spent some time at MU. Everybody was reminded that, within the framework of the RESL project, they are encouraged to visit a partner institution and spend some time there.

- **Other activities of dissemination**

UPORTO distributed the special issue of the "Educação, Sociedade & Culturas" Journal that could rely on five articles from five partners (UA; MU; WU; PT; UW) and was published by CIIE in 2015. The PT team will send the articles in PDF so they can be uploaded on the RESL website. Moreover, the journal will be sent to interested partners.

Deadlines for WP8:

- UA will send the word version of the draft for the new RESL folder to the partners by *March 7th*
- Partners can provide feedback on content of the folder and should inform UA about the number of copies in English they want by *March 14th*
- To get access to Mailchimp all partners should provide UA with the email addresses of the persons within their national team that will be in charge of adapting and sending out the RESL email format by *March 14th*

WP 9 - Planning overview and next consortium meeting

Lore Van Praag (UA) presented the updated timeline with an overview of the activities and deadlines until the next Consortium meeting.

Next consortium meeting

The next RESL.eu consortium meeting will be held in Warsaw, organized by UW. It will take place on **Thursday 16 and Friday 17 March 2017**.

If the RESL.eu symposium is accepted for the ECER conference in Dublin (23 - 26 August 2016), a small scale intermediate meeting will be scheduled during the conference with the partners who will be present. The exact date and moment will depend on the scheduling of the RESL.eu symposium.

7a. Management Committee Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 3 - 4 March 2016

Changes in WP5 „Determining youth at risk & good practices,,!

Objectives

1. To determine the individual and institutional risk and protective factors for ESL and identify those events, actions or factors in the process leading to leaving school early (based on the new data collected in Belgium, UK, Sweden, Portugal, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain & the secondary data collected in Hungary and Austria).
2. To isolate and analyze the risk and protective factors that lead to early school leaving *in order to* create a typology of ESLers and relate these to opportunities for reducing ESL (based on the new data collected in Belgium, UK, Sweden, Portugal, the Netherlands, Poland and Spain & the secondary data collected in Hungary and Austria).
3. To develop a set of research-based risk assessment tools, guiding stakeholders with an early warning system that helps to identify possible risk and protective factors of ESL and link these with types of ESLers.
4. To develop conceptual models for good practices prevention, intervention and compensatory measures aimed at the tackling of ESL and link these good practice models with the ESL risk typology.

Description of work

(As per objective 1) To determine the individual and institutional risk and resiliency factors for ESL and identify those events, actions or factors in the process leading to leaving school early by:

- Triangulation of the quantitative and qualitative data on the factors and processes predicting ESL, collected and analyzed in WP3 and WP4,
- Reporting on individual and institutional risk and resiliency factors to ESL in Project Paper 8 (M55) on determining individual and institutional risk and resiliency factors for ESL,
- Developing a risk assessment tool for determining youth at risk of ESL for schools and other significant partners in the field.

(As per objective 2) To isolate the factors that lead to early school leaving in order to create a typology of ESLers and relate these to opportunities for reducing ESL (Project Paper 8) by:

- Developing a typology of ESLers and address which sort of measures are most effective reducing the chance of ESL for a specific type of potential early school leavers based on WP3 and WP4 results,
- Linking the risk assessment tool and risk typology for ESL to the evaluative data on prevention, intervention and compensatory measures to tackle early school leaving from WP4.

(As per objective 3) To develop conceptual models for good practices in prevention, intervention and compensatory measures aimed at the tackling of ESL (Project Paper 8) by:

- Using the data collected in the evaluation of prevention, intervention and compensatory measures in the research (WP3 and WP4),
- The development of models will therefore be based on models on the findings of WP4.2, WP4.3 and WP2.

As per objective 4) To develop a set of research-based risk assessment tools linking the risk and protective factors with types of ESLers and conceptual models for good practices by:

- Linking the risk assessment tool, typology of ESLers and evaluative data on prevention, intervention and compensatory measures from WP3 and 4 to tackle ESL,
- Establishing collaboration with Schools Policy Thematic Working Group (TWG) of the EU Commissions Directorate-General for Education and Culture (DG EAC) and disseminated through the European Toolkit for Schools to provide a platform for the dissemination of the developed risk assessment tool through the School Education Gateway website.

8. Scientific and Policy Meeting, Dublin, United Kingdom, 26 August 2016

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): excused,

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui, Marie Björklöf

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Sofia Santos

Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Elif Keskiner

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Isidoro Ruiz

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Agnes Kende

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU) Marie Gitschthaler, Melanie Fraisl

University of Antwerp (UA): Christiane Timmerman, Lore Van Praag, Ward Nouwen, Rut Van Cau-
denberg

Agenda of the meeting

- Consortium
- Research
- WP4.1
- Publications and project papers
- Dissemination:
- Books and activities
- WP5
- Other issues

- Consortium

An **amendment** to the DOW has been drafted by UA. The amendment is ready and will be submitted once the second financial and scientific report has been approved – which will take another few months (see further).

The most important changes that are included in the amendment are the following:

- Louise Ryan will switch position from MU to Sheffield University. However, she will continue to take on her role as coordinator of the MU team within the RESL.eu project (everyone else of the MU team is staying at MU)

- Changes to the content and the time-schedule of WP5 – see further.

Personnel changes: Marianne Samson joined the UA-team. She is responsible for the financial follow-up and reporting of the project and comes with a lot of experience in this area. For all questions/uncertainties regarding financial aspects, from now on always contact Marianne with Lore and Chris in CC. Another new team member who will be responsible for the dissemination activities will join the UA-team in the coming months. Marie Björklöf from SU will be leaving the Swedish team by the end of the month. We thank her for all her hard work and commitment within the RESL.eu project. On August 12th the **second financial and scientific report** was submitted to the European Commission. Financial reports of all partners were included, except for 2. UA hopes to receive the missing financial reports asap. The European Commission is currently reviewing the report. Feedback is expected by mid-September. After that, the financial report will be re-submitted with all necessary corrections and with the financial reports of the missing partners. So far there is no delay in payment.

- WP 4.1

All partners were asked to send an update regarding the state-of-affairs of the 1st and 2nd wave interviews to Lore. The UA team gave an overview in the ppt.

All partners were reminded of the **deadlines for WP4.1:**

- **Mid-October 2016:** NVivo file with all coded 1st wave and 2nd wave interviews and FGDs with peers of ESLs/NEETS sent to UA (Ward Nouwen) by mid-October 2016 - please remember to fill out the Classification sheet

- **Mid-November 2016:** all Country Reports sent to UA

- **End of January 2017:** deliverable 4.2 (*Publication 5 "Understanding the processes of ESL"*, based on Country Reports)

NVIVO10 /11: UA has both NVivo 10 and 11. However, data from NVivo11 cannot be merged into NVivo10. Therefore, the partners who did not upgrade from NVivo10 to NVivo11 will only have access to the data from other partners with NVivo10; they will not be able to access the data from the partners with NVivo11. NVivo11 allows merging both NVivo10 and NVivo11 data so partners with NVivo11 will have access to all the data. For those with NVivo10, it could be an idea to buy an upgrade. However, that is up to the partners to decide.

Regarding the **2nd wave of bio-interviews** it was agreed upon in the last consortium meeting (Antwerp) to interview at least 24 youngsters for a second time. Ideally, the initial status (at time of 1st interview) of these youngsters should be as follows: 8 intra-muros, 8 extra-muros and 8 in ESL/NEET status.

It was agreed upon to maintain the goal of **24 (8-8-8) interviews**. While the intention should be to have as many youngsters as possible from the 1st wave interview participate again, it was discussed what should be done if the 24 target cannot be reached with only these youngsters. It was agreed upon that:

- A lack of 2nd wave interviews with youngsters in one group (e.g. initial status extra-muros) should not be compensated with youngsters with another initial status (e.g. initial status intra-muros). In other words we should really aim for an 8-8-8 division.

- When there is a lack of 2nd wave interviews in one or more of the subgroups, new youngsters with similar socio-demographic profiles should be recruited to be interviewed once using the topic list for the 2nd wave interview asking the student more retrospective questions. Although this is not ideal, it will allow us to increase the number of respondents.

- Recruitment of new respondents where necessary should ideally be as follows:

o Intra-muros: go back to survey A1 and identify respondents who at the time of the 1st interview were at the same school and belonged to the same age-cohort

o Extra-muros: use survey A2 to identify youngsters in extra-muros measures, or directly approach institutions that provide those measures. Each partner can decide which is more suitable. Since the purpose of the interview is not to evaluate the specific measure, it is not necessary that the new respondent(s) participate(s) in the exact same measure as the previous one but rather that s/he has a similar extra-muros experience

o ESL/NEET: start from identifying ESL youngsters from Survey A2 and contact them to see if they are willing to participate in an interview. If this approach is unsuccessful, use gatekeepers. Exceptions are Poland and Sweden who can-not use data from Survey A2 and will immediately use gatekeepers if they need to recruit new ESL/NEET youngsters

All partners were reminded that 4 FGDs need to be carried out. The participants of those FGDs do not have to be ESLs or NEETS but should be in a similar 'vulnerable' position. A summary of each FGD should be included in the NVivo file under 4.1 'longitudinal study of trajectories' (see slide 11).

- **Publications and Project Papers**

Project Paper 7 on the cross-case analysis of measures in alternative learning pathways is ready and available online on the RESL.eu website. **Publication 3** on school-based prevention/intervention and compensatory/alternative learning approaches is currently being lay-outed and made ready for print. The publication is expected to be ready in the course of September 2016.

Publication 2 on Survey B is delayed. It is now expected to be ready by October 2016. Since it is important that all partners have time to give feedback to the draft of the Publication, MU is requested to circulate the draft version to all partners by mid-September (Lore Van Praag will inform MU about this).

The next Publication (= **Publication 5**) on understanding processes of ESL (WP4.1) should be ready for lay-out by the end of January 2017.

- **Dissemination activities**

All partners were asked to send updates on published articles, participation in conferences, etc. to Marianne Samson with Lore Van Praag in CC. Once the new UA team member who will be responsible for dissemination activities has started, all partners will be informed about this. Everybody who gave a presentation at the ECER symposium, please also send your final ppt. to Marianne (Lore in

CC) so the presentations can be uploaded on the RESL.eu website. Lore will ask the discussant of the RESL.eu symposium, Leah O'Toole, to share her notes and comments.

Everybody was reminded of the existence of our RESL.eu twitter account (**#Resl.eu**). Tweet and retweet so we can enlarge our audience !

The **Newsletter tool** was used for the first time to send out a Newsletter about the RESL's participation in the ECER conference. The RESL partners were not included in the mailing list and therefore did not receive this Newsletter. UA will adapt the mailing list and include all RESL team members so that from now on everybody will receive the Newsletter. All partners were reminded that they can use the Newsletter tool to inform local stakeholders and interested parties about their activities etc.

- **Books and special issues:**

- **Resl.eu book** "*Reducing Early School Leaving in the EU: A Comparative Qualitative and Quantitative Research*": the book proposal with all the abstracts was sent to Routledge who are currently reviewing the proposal. Feedback is expected in September. The plan would be to have the book finished before the end of the project (see slide 14 for the expected time-schedule). It was decided to change the date for 'paper ready' to April 2017 instead of May 2017 so the reviewers have three months to give feedback. The suggestion was made to let someone else (e.g. symposium discussant) write the introduction of the book. Should Routledge not accept to publish the book other publishers will be contacted. Once there is an agreement with a publisher, negotiations will start regarding who does the proofreading etc.

- **Spanish book:** "*El Abandono Escolar Prematuro en Europa: realidades, políticas y 4ractices desde una perspectiva comparada [Early School Leaving in Europe: realities, policy and practice in comparative perspective]*". Silvia informed all partners that the Publisher who wants to publish the book is a well-rated publisher in Spain. They published a similar book on ESL in Spain (project Aina Tarabini) and are now looking to do something similar on European countries. The chapters can be written in English and the idea is to write in half report – half academic style. All chapters would be translated into Spanish by the same translator (the Spanish team will take care of this; but who will cover the costs of the translation would still need to be discussed). Silvia and Chris would be the editors of the book. The chapters should be about our national cases, the comparative perspective would be in the introduction and conclusion. There were still some questions about what exactly the chapters are supposed to be about so Silvia will work on an example in the next few weeks and send it to everybody, then each team can decide whether or not they will participate.

- **Special Issue 'International Journal of Social Research Methodology'**: the proposal has been submitted on July 20th and the first step of acceptance has been made.

All submitted abstracts (7) have been included. Each paper will need to be around 6000 words.

Other plans for special issues / books:

- ECER Network 7 (Social Justice and Intercultural Education) is interested in publishing the papers of a RESL symposium in the Journal of Intercultural Education. Network 7 has no influence in the acceptance process of a possible special issue, but they can inform Francesca Gobbo (one of the associate editors) so that she is aware of the application. Since the Journal of Education is very strict and only wants to publish final results, it would be advisable to use the papers of next year's symposium (22-25th August 2017 in Copenhagen). If we are interested in publishing a special issue, it would be useful to announce this idea early and not wait too long to write a proposal for a symposium and send it to the publisher.

- Elif Keskiner suggested the idea to try and publish the papers of this year's symposium in a special issue. She will take the lead, write a proposal to circulate to all the partners and contact journal editors.

- **WP5**

The changes made to WP5 are included in the amendment. The changes are mainly related to the outcome and the timeline of the WP. The changes are already included in the amendment. Officially UW will start working on WP5 in December 2016. Unofficially, they will already start in September 2016.

Chris summarized what was discussed during the meeting on WP5 that was held between UA and UW on Wednesday August 23th. The main focus of WP5 is to develop **1) a concept model**, and **2) a risk assessment tool**.

(See final deliverables in amendment):

Month 55: Publication 6 (Deliverable 5.1) on the processes leading to ESL including understanding the resilience and at-risk phenomenon, a typology of ESLers and conceptual models for prevention, intervention and compensation.

Month 56: Deliverable 5.2. (Set of) evidence-based risk assessment tool(s) for determining students and educational institutions at risk of ESL shared through a European dissemination platform for schools, including practical guidelines for the assessment and interpretation.)

For the development of the conceptual model UW will start with literature review on conceptual models on ESL and will look for what could be innovative/interesting to build on further. By the end of January/February 2017 UW should come up with a **framework of topics** that could be worked with. Next, UA will look at the qualitative database to see what the data tells us about these topics. Hypotheses made from the literature and the qualitative data will then be tested using the Survey. So, instead of starting from the survey – which was initially the idea – WP5 will now start from the qualitative fieldwork. The risk assessment tool will then be a spin-off of the conceptual model in which hypotheses about the typology of students at risk of ESL and understanding of the process of ESL, based on the literature and qualitative study will be tested making use of quantitative data.

Expected **input of the partners**: when coding and analyzing the data for the Country Report for WP4.1 each team should also look from a grounded theory perspective for (5 or more) “emerging key concepts” that we did not initially think of (~ theoretical framework WP1) and that can help to critically reflect on the data and provide insights to develop the typology of students at risk of ESL and the conceptual models for prevention, intervention and compensation of ESL. Whenever partners come across relevant literature regarding typologies of ESL, they are also requested to share this with UW, ideally linked to their own (country-specific) findings and “emerging key concepts” from WP4.1. Please add these “emerging key concepts” at the end of your country report.

Some content-related issues regarding the development of the conceptual model were discussed:

- when developing the conceptual model it is important to go back to WP1 but to also be innovative.
- it is important to look at trajectories when we think about typologies and see how we can turn ‘trajectories of risk’ into ‘trajectories of protection’.
- the conceptual model should not be a ‘typology of the problem’ but an instrument of where we want to get (solutions)
- it is important to not only look at the individual (danger of blaming the victim), but look at the interaction between the individual and his/her context

The remark was made that each country team knows their local context best and should therefore be essential in contributing to WP5. How the partners who did not collect data (WU and CEU) can contribute to WP5 is yet to be made more clear. The UW partner – together with the UA partner – will contact WU and CEU to work out the detailed contribution to WP5.

UW will work out a time-schedule together with UA with what has to be done and which information needs to be delivered to UW by when.

- **Other issues**

All partners were reminded that **international exchanges and comparative publications** are encouraged within the project. Those who want to spend some time at one of the partner institutions should start thinking about it now.

Some updates were given about the publications that are planned the next year. Elif Keskiner and Lore Van Praag will take the lead in the organisation of a special issue of the Journal of Work and Education, in which the participants of the symposium could contribute to publish their paper on the extra-muros measures. We also could suggest a special issue, based on the ECER network w participated in, namely the network on Social Justice, for the journal ‘Intercultural Education’, which is linked to this network. 7

It was decided to add an extra day to the **next consortium meeting** to discuss the chapters of the RESL.eu book as a way to share and discuss our findings. So the Consortium Meeting will now last 3 days and take place from Wednesday March 15th until Friday March 17th in Warsaw, organized by UW.

9. Scientific Meeting, London, United Kingdom, 15 February 2017

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Louise Ryan, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

University of Antwerp (UA): Christiane Timmerman, Lore Van Praag, Ward Nouwen, Rut Van Cau-
denberg

Hosted by Middlesex University, UK

Summary of the discussion on the Deliverable 5.1

“Determining youth at risk of ESL – toolkit for schools”

- Toolkit, which we imagine as a short brochure directed at schools (as short as possible), will be subject to minor changes mainly in structure or sequence of the proposed elements. The risk assessment tool will be part of the brochure, but each country team may decide to divide the publication into pieces while preparing national adaptation.

- The Polish team are responsible for preparing the core of the publication and the country partners for national adaptations. This core will therefore be the basis on which individual country teams can prepare a final version for schools, if they decide to prepare an adaptation in their language. The printed deliverable would include the “core” only.

- We agreed to the toolkit’s basic principles, objectives and users, though we believe it is necessary to narrow the users to principals and – in the context of the assessment of the individual risk – to professionals, teams of specialists available in the school. The users group might, however, require national differentiation depending on country-specific context.

- We decided that it is of crucial importance to take into account the ethical issues in the guidelines for users, especially addressing the stigmatization risk and personal data protection, sharing the assessment results etc. We should underline that the assessment should be done by a trusted person (e.g. school psychologist), who does not share students’ answers to teachers or other persons, but only the general conclusions resulting from the assessment if necessary to plan the individual support strategy. These guidelines will need to be well suited by the partners to the situation of the country while preparing national adaptation.

- The matrix analyzing the inspiring practices would be an element of the toolkit linked to the checklist on practices and policies towards ESL. The checklist itself would be a short self-administered tool for principals with the aim to provoke their reflection on certain dimensions of school functioning and available strategies and approaches to consider when addressing the ESL at school level.

Within the framework of the project we will not be able to prepare an online version or all the country specific adaptations but in the publication we might include suggestions on how to proceed in the preparation of a ready-to-use tool.

- If any country team would only see the opportunity to use the tool’s scales to count the results at the school or class level (here we are talking about part III and IV of the proposed draft), it would be appropriate that partners prepare different instructions for the need of national adaptation. Although benchmarks (norms for assessments) for meaningful interpretation of the results on aggregate level would require additional research in the country. We agreed that individual partners decide about the level at which they will recommend the use of the toolkit in the country.

- Preparation of national versions will be up to the partners (or even the subject of other projects in different countries), we suggest that they should be preceded by public consultations, but we cannot take any responsibility for them.

10. 5th Consortium Meeting, Warsaw, Poland, 16 -17 March 2017

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Neil Kaye, Magdolna Lorinc

Sheffield University (USFD): Louise Ryan

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Sofia Santos

Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Talita Stam, Elif Keskiner, Maurice Crul

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękala, Aleksandra Jasińska

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Ábel Bereményi, Jordi Pàmies, Silvia Carrasco (Skype)

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Agnes Kende

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU) : Erna Nairz-Wirth, Marie Gitschthaler, Melanie Fraisl

University of Antwerp (UA) : Ward Nouwen, Christiane Timmerman, Rut Van Caudenberg, Lore Van Praag, Marianne Samson,

Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) : Karolien Lenaerts

Hosted by Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW)

Thursday 16 March:

Welcome

WP3 – Discussion on the final findings of the data collected in Survey A1 & A2 and Publication 4 (Deliverable 3.2)

In order to prepare Publication 4, we should be aware that some statistical models will fit better in some countries compared to others. The main question we should discuss is how we are going to deal with this. Based on Project Paper 2, the theoretical model was translated into a model which could be empirically tested. The UK team adapted the original chart to test to which extent the survey matched the original model. When presenting the follow-up survey, the UK team pointed out that, overall, there are 100 early school leavers present in the follow-up survey. This could be due to rather low retention rate of the follow-up survey and the high probability that there is a selection effect of those participants that participate in the follow-up survey. As these 100 respondents are not equally distributed across countries, the question Maurice Crul (EUR) raised was that it would be best to not carry out these analyses at aggregate level (if not, some national samples will have a higher weight). He suggested to carry out national analyses (only country level). The consortium took this suggestion into consideration and the UK team decided to present analyses on the national level.

Ward asked to discuss the measurement of the ESL, because we are underrepresenting the number of early school leavers in the used dataset. Lore Van Praag (UA) asked to move beyond the bivariate analyses and not only focus on them when designing the other models (the use of bivariate analyses as a starting point, especially due to the low number of ESL and country-differences), but rather base these models on theory.

Alessio D'Alessio (MU) remarked that the data has a lot of limitations with regard to representativeness (originate from the original design of the data; and later the follow-up which are more unexpected) and suggested these data and data analyses should be rather seen as a starting point for something else instead of as an end result. In reaction to this, Louise Ryan (SU) mentioned that the quantitative data should be used as starting point for the data triangulation. Maurice Crul (EUR) suggested that the national analyses should be used as basis and other outcomes should be included. Abel Bereményi (UAB) suggested to create a database of a subgroup based on the initial ideas of those who are the risk groups and identifying the risk groups of people affected by these risk factors, and finding out, which of these factors are resilient and which are not. The main question, as remarked by Alessio D'Alessio (MU), is – considering time constraints – what would be the main idea of this publication: analyses of 7 different models or one larger theoretical model that should be

applied to 7 sub-samples. Ward added that ESL could also be conceptualized as engagement, and that behavioral indicators should be taken into account as well.

Proposal:

- Focus on national analyses in order to try to make comparable, national analyses, separately for each country
- Proxies of ESL (instead of NEET) as outcome, such as behavioral engagement level (suggestion Ward Nouwen (UA)), failed attempt to continue education, aspirations and expectations (suggestion Alireza Behtoui (SU)), turbulent trajectories based on dummy variables as outcome Anna Wrona (UW)), etc. to provide a broad overview of all factors related to ESL.
- The used methods for analysis would depend on the outcome, the model and the data available (e.g., stepwise logistic regressions, cross-sectional analyses (e.g., only Survey A1), SEM models)
- Similar models will be tested in different countries. The main point of our research project would be to see how these models work in each country
- Turbulent trajectories as outcome: Anna Wrona (UW)), suggested to include a dummy variable as outcome variable. Different suggestions were based on this proposal:

Maurice added that ESLers are different subgroups. It would be interested to create one set of people that have 'turbulent careers', which could be different in different countries: e.g. people that are disengagement in school, people that are in fights in classrooms, etc. The identification of more or less three groups and how are they 'surviving' in each country and how come some 'survive' better than others in each educational system could be interesting

Alessio D'Alessio (MU): Would you identify turbulent careers for each national subsample and run them at national models?

Maurice Crul (EUR): It might be interesting to run them across all national models and see what comes out.

Alireza Behtoui (SU) would it not be best to identify a dummy variable of at risk group and then give them to the UK team to include them in the national models

Ward Nouwen (UA): Could we look at different types of disengaged students?

Elif Keskiner (EUR): We could look at significant statistical predicting ESL in the Dutch case. For instance, being away from school more than a month or school engagement could be used as a proxy

Alessio D'Alessio (MU): The idea would be to identify other dependent variables and we run them at country level. Which outcomes should we use? The starting point would be based on the theoretical model of the RESL.eu project.

Aleksandra: Parental aspirations should not be used as an outcome; different levels of disengagement as a possibility to define distinct outcomes; we should be careful in choosing variables, not only the ones predicting ESL.

- Theoretical framework as a basis to carry out national analyses. Then look at outcomes such as: engagement, aspirations, trajectories.? When looking at the distinct outcomes that have to be considered, Maurice suggested to take into account the accumulation of issues: measures by trajectories and gender is important. Therefore, it would be important to look at gendered behavioral outcomes.

Alireza Behtoui (SU) suggested that at least for the Swedish case the inclusion of school segregation is important. For instance, it would be interesting to carry out analyses including school level factors of the first survey (multilevel analyses) to test whether the school level has an effect? Based on school sample? Would be a good suggestion, however, for this publication, we might not necessarily do this. Abel suggested that school level variables and institutional factors as dependent variable would be interesting as well. Hanna re-marked that in Poland type of track would make more sense. Marie: to assess a multidimensional typology of dropping out of school, Marie suggested a Canadian paper on which models can be based (Fortin et al.)

Ward: is any kind of training is sufficient? Or leaving a training leading to an ISCED III training sufficient? Conclusion: we will use the EU definition to be consistent.

Anna Wrona (UW),: Should we make a construct on turbulent trajectories? Conclusion: No, this will be too difficult for comparison.

Agreement for the minutes: "survey(s) analysis": national analyses will be carried out for more dependent variables than only ESL (school belonging, value of school/education (first as dependent

then as independent variable), aspirations, expectations, other forms of engagement). It would be interesting to also include research area (instead of national level). All partners should have a look at the dataset as soon as possible (on Dropbox) and send corrections to the UK team. Hanna already remarked that NEETs is not corrected in the entire dataset.

Deadlines:

End of the consortium: Neil will put the dataset on Dropbox

24th of March: teams send their dataset to the UK team

Final dataset to team: 13th of April

Analysis: 21st of April

Draft report 5th of May

Publication 15th of May

WP5 – Discussion on innovative findings and triangulation approach needed for Project Paper 8 (Deliverable 5.2) Publication 6 (Deliverable 5.1) based on guiding questions sent by UW

Partners agreed on general outline of the publication.

The triangulation needs further input of the UK team's findings from the statistical analyses of Survey A1 and A2, to be published in Publication 4.

The triangulation should start from our own project's findings – both qualitative and quantitative – but should be further compared to secondary findings and existing literature. So, not only triangulation of our own quantitative and qualitative data but also include further theoretical and empirical triangulation in the state-of-the-art literature.

The triangulation should also take into account country similarities and differences that might be supporting or contradicting each other.

The report can further explore the Dutch team's conceptualization of 'Early School Leaving as a moving target' based on quantitative and qualitative data from all partners.

The Polish partner UW will start from completed country reports, project papers, publications and the specific input already completed for the triangulation in WP5.

A large part of the slot on publication 6 addressed the starting/focal point of the triangulation of findings on the processes leading to ESL. Some partners expressed to prefer starting from the macro-level and work their way down to the individual level, the Polish partner planned to start from the perceptions of the students (micro-level).

- o The Dutch partner indicated that both can be done but as there are huge differences in ESL levels between education systems this needs to be taken into account because playing field is not equal. The Dutch partner concluded that we should start from similarities and differences across countries, which is also important for policy briefs.

- o The Portuguese partner supported the Dutch argument and wants more attention for the structural and sociological aspects, rather than too much focus on the individual psychological aspects.

- o The Spanish partner indicated that it is important – not only for policy briefs – but also for Publication 6 to understand what leads to ESL on the three levels of analyses (micro-meso-macro) and to look at similarities and differences between countries.

- o The Polish partner indicated that structural differences were not included as focus for this publications in the DOW but agrees that they are important to contextualize the findings by country.

- o The Belgian partner indicated that it might be interesting to distinguish risk status by country for the behavior/outcomes that is targeted to be changed by macro policy reforms and meso-level practice responses.

- o The Austrian partner agreed that there is currently too focus on the individualized level and proposed to use policy and school level structural indicators from the NESET II Report they participated in writing.

- o The Hungarian partner also confirmed the high risk for blaming the victim when starting from/focussing on the individual level. They proposed starting from the structural, move to the meso-level to change the individual level ideas and behavior.

- o The UK partner reinforced previous points.

- o The Polish partner agreed that it is better to start from the macro level.

The Spanish partner did not want to use the term 'turbulent trajectories' because it holds a too strong normalization of good and the bad trajectories. Also, The Spanish indicated that we cannot talk about the analyses levels separately, they need to be explicitly linked.

o The Belgian partner indicated that, although we do not want to normalize/stigmatize the attitudes and behavior of individual students too much, we cannot see every-thing all behavior and outcomes as relative, we have decided on what we want to change: "reducing early school leaving".

o Although the project was initially all about reducing as ESL, we now opened it up to other behavioral indicators as proxies for early school leaving in the statistical analyses of WP3.

o The Spanish partner referred to a Report from the London School of Economics on 'The Glass Floor' that showed middle-/upper-class youngsters with turbulent school careers did not end up ESL because they are served by the system better. We should therefore also look at what trajectories lead to ESL, keeping in mind the different levels of macro- and meso-level support mechanisms that might be different for different social groups.

o The Portuguese partner agreed with calling it trajectories at risk instead of turbulent and also want to link it more to the political/cultural/social background than to individual psychology and behavior.

WP5 – Publication 7 (Deliverable 5.2) Publication 6 (Deliverable 5.1): timeline and further planning:

The Polish team presented the proposed timeframe for Publication 6 after which the floor was opened up for discussion.

Summary of the discussion:

- It is important that the Polish team works with the output that is already there without expecting too much new input from the partners. The data as it was presented in the morning based on the triangulation exercise all the partners did, is already a very good starting point to start writing Publication 6.

- It is important that meso- and macro-factors are also included in the Publication. If certain aspects (e.g. regarding the educational system, policies, etc.) are unclear from the data presented in the different country reports, project papers and publications the Polish team can ask the partners for specific clarifications.

- In some countries substantial changes to the educational system were made since WP2. However, it was decided to not update the information provided for WP2 as the empirical data was collected when these old systems were still in place.

It was agreed upon that rather than coming up with a new concept for the Publication, the Polish team will start writing a first draft of the Publication based on the information that is already there. Partners will be asked for feedback and possibly additional input once the first draft is there.

As a general remark the Spanish team mentioned that in the previous Project Papers and Publications the Country Reports were almost always omitted from the reference list, thus making our own work invisible. They ask to amend the online versions of these PPs and Publication so these references are included. Also for future output it is important to always refer to our own work so the work of all the teams is acknowledged and made visible.

The new timeline for **Publication 6 (Deliverable 5.1)** as it was agreed upon:

o **28th of April 2017:** the Polish team sends out the instructions for the elaboration of 'portraits of youth' to all partners. These instructions will also include how the partners have to choose youngsters to draw up the portraits and how many portraits each partner is expected to provide

o **31st of May 2017:** all partners send their 'portraits of youth' (max. 1.5 pages per youngster) to the Polish team

o **June 19th 2017:** the Polish team sends out a first draft of Publication 6 to all partners

o **June 30th 2017:** all partners send back their feedback on the Publication, including, if necessary, additional contextual information

o **31st August 2017:** FINAL DEADLINE for Publication 6 (Deliverable 5.1)

It was agreed upon that only one round of feedback on the Publication is sufficient (as has been the case in previous Project Papers and Publications).

WP5 Toolkit for schools: discussion, timeline and further planning; Publication 6 (Deliverable 5.1) 'Set of Tools' (Deliverable 5.2)

The Polish team presented what the 'toolkit for schools' will look like.

To avoid confusion Marianne Samson informed how the Deliverables for WP5 are written down in the updated DOW:

- 1 Publication (Publication 6 - Deliverable 5.1)
- 1 'Set of tools' (Deliverable 5.2)
- so there is only one publication in WP5

In the framework of WP5 only one general 'toolkit' will be developed in English. If the teams want to adapt the toolkit to their national context, add specific information or translate the toolkit, this will be their own responsibility. The questionnaire in the toolkit will be based on what we already have (survey A1-A2) and will be accompanied with guidelines on how to administer the tool as well as information about ethical considerations. It is important to keep in mind that the purpose of the toolkit is that it will be easy to read and use for school staff and (local) policy makers. The Polish team highlights that they might need the help from the different partners in checking the table 'results in brief' (summary of findings), as they are not always sufficiently aware of the local context. To draw up this table they will start from the data provided in Publication 4 (WP3) which will include analyses at the country-level. The Austrian team mentioned that schools can also be at-risk of producing ESL, so it is not only an individual matter. The Polish team mentions that there is no national/regional benchmark for the interpretation of the data at the school level. However, the same can be said for the individual level. The Belgian team mentions that the guidelines could mention that policy makers could make their own baseline if they want to use the tool and could also include guidelines on how to make this baseline. During the UK-BE-PL London meeting (Feb. 15th 2017) it was indeed decided to not only focus on the individual level but also on the school-level. So there will be 1 tool with 2 dimensions: one looking at the school-level, and one looking at the individual level. This should also be made clear in the guidelines accompanying the tool. The focus of the 'toolkit' or 'set of tools' will be mainly on the tool itself (i.e. the questionnaire); rather than writing out detailed background information and developing our own matrixes and checklists references will be made to the material that already exists (RESL PPs and Publications, NESET report,...)

The timeline for the 'set of tools' (Deliverable 5.2) as it was presented by the Polish team (see slide with adaptations):

- o The Polish team will wait for the analysis of Survey A1-A2 to identify the risk and protective factors per country
- o All the partners will give their feedback on the indicators by the **end of April 2017**
- o Third dot on the slide (about developing a matrix and checklist) will be left out as the idea would be to use what already exists (NESET etc.)

WP6 – Policy recommendations – Policy Briefs 1-3 (deliverable 6.1, 6.2, 6.3)

We are in talks with the EU Commission about organizing a RESL.eu Policy Conference linked to a large-scale event of the EU Commission Directorate-General on Education and Culture – Education and Training 2020 Working Group on School Policy in Brussels in the Autumn of 2017. At this event there will be an attendance of all EU member states and other supra-national organisations. We are waiting on the exact dates for the event of the Commission and then will continue talks about linking both events. The Dutch team agreed about this being an interesting event to present the policy briefs. The Dutch team want to nest the main RESL.eu findings in different levels and to work down from the macro to the micro level while keeping in mind the country- and – if possible – a city/research area level differences and similarities. Policy recommendations can be linked to the reasoning but still be targeted at different levels (schools, national/regional, supra-national).

All partners agreed that the length should be very short. The Dutch partner will target 1-2 pages executive summary with a maximum of 10 page policy brief as background text.

The Dutch partner will start working with what is still available or is planned to be published in the near future (WP3 and WP5) and will ask the partners for concrete ad hoc feedback and input whenever needed. These requests for input/feedback directed at partners will be sent out to partners by the 1st of June. As the first draft of the WP5 triangulation publication is planned for mid-June, these findings can be included in the policy briefs.

Friday 17/03:

WP7 - Cost-benefit analysis Publication 9 Publication 8 (Deliverable 7.1)

After the presentation of the plans for WP7 by CEPS many partners had questions about how to calculate both the exact costs and benefits of policy measures. The effort planned for WP7 are however rather directed to hypothetically calculate the cost-benefit analysis. Or bring together the possible costs and benefits at different levels without planning to calculate these within the context of RESL.eu.

CEPS also indicate that we will build further on what is already there in the literature and the RESL.eu project and try to build on these findings and provide information on how to fill in potential caveats in the state-of-the-art.

CEPS will select one studied prevention and intervention as well as alternative learning approach per country based on Project Papers 6 and 7. The annexes of both project papers include overviews and categorization of all case studies, as well as information on how to contextualize these findings in the different education systems. CEPS will propose a selection that allows sufficient opportunities for cross-country and cross-case compatibility. All partners can then give feedback on the selection proposed by CEPS.

The UK team and other partners indicated that we should not call the output cost-benefit analyses but rather call it 'exploring the possibilities of performing cost-benefit analyses'.

The Austrian team together with other partners asked for sufficient attention for costs and benefits at the societal level rather than only for specific measures. For the costs and benefits of specific measures to reduce control groups might also be needed. The Spanish team also indicated that the overall costs and benefits of more holistic policies and funding programs should be covered when talking about the costs and benefits of reducing early school leaving. To target both macro- and meso-level costs and benefits of reducing ESL, CEPS will start the report from the overall societal costs and benefits that have been already quite elaborately described in the literature and then move on to exploring the cost-benefit analyses of some of the prevention, intervention and compensatory measures studied within RESL.eu Project.

CEPS will ask each partner specific ad hoc questions on information about the selected measures. CEPS and the Dutch partner will keep in close contact to connect the output of WP6 and WP7.

WP 8 – Dissemination activities & planning of the next consortium meeting

Lore presented an overview of the dissemination activities and the plans for the future

Dissemination activities:

About the **RESL.eu Publications:**

According to the DOW it is not necessary to print all our RESL.eu Publications and these printing costs were also not always calculated into the budget. Therefore, all Publications will be made available online on the RESL.eu website. If partners want to have printed versions of the Publications, they can always print it themselves. All partners that still have to produce Publications or other output are requested to use the RESL.eu lay-out so that everything is in the same style.

So far the **Newsletter** format has not been used very often. All partners are reminded that the template is there and that it might be a good idea to start using it more often, especially now that we are starting to create a lot of output. All the information on how to use this tool is available on News Monkey, or the partners can contact Lore.

Everybody was reminded of the **RESL.eu twitter account**. Everybody who is active on Twitter can follow us, retweet messages etc.

All **dissemination activities** should be submitted on ECAS so all partners are requested to always send their articles, presentations, etc. to Lore Van Praag and Marianne Samson. Marianne will also upload it on the RESL.eu website. The dissemination activity does not have to be in English (maybe just include a small summary in English).

Future plans and activities:

ECER Copenhagen (22-25 August 2017): our symposium was accepted so we can present at this year's ECER Conference - all partners except Sweden are going - the Portuguese team reminded us of the proposal to Network 7 to write a Special Issue based on this year's presentations (see Dublin meeting last year). If we are still interested in making this Special Issue we would have to let Network 7 know about it. It would be for the Journal EERC and the articles would have to be ready by the ECER Conference.

What we are presenting at ECER will be the chapters of the RESL.eu book, so what articles could we then include in this Special Issue? The focus of the Special Issue would be on intercultural relations and social justice.

It is not clear yet how many papers could be included in the Special Issue. Several partners are interested in writing a paper for this Special Issue. Eunice Macedo will contact the convener from Network 7 to ask for more information (also including timeframe etc.) and then get back to the partners. Erna Nairz-Wirth informed the teams about a **Special Issue on transition and exclusion** she is preparing together with Paul Downes for the European Journal of Education. The EC would be interested if there would be 1 or 2 articles on RESL results in this Special Issue. They are currently collecting abstracts and will compose the special issue based on this. Erna Nairz-Wirth will check with Paul Downes and send a call for proposals to the partners.

Silvia Carrasco gave an update on the state-of-affair of the **Spanish book on ESL**. They already received most of the chapters, some are still being translated. They will be working on it when Christiane Timmerman will be staying at UAB in May/June. They are in contact with the Publisher who is still interested in publishing this book. The aim is to submit the manuscript to the Publisher in July. Usually it takes about 4 months after the manuscript has been accepted for the book to be published. Ward Nouwen is going to the **CEDEFOP conference** in Thessaloniki in May. He will see there if there is a possibility to fit some RESL output into the European Toolkit for Schools.

Several research-stays abroad are planned for the coming months. If other people are still interested in spending some time at one of the partners' institutions, that is still possible.

Next consortium meeting: should we have an informal mid-year meeting in Copenhagen like we did last year in Dublin? The UK team weren't there last year and said that therefore they missed a lot of information, so they wouldn't recommend it since Sweden would not be there. Alireza Behtoui will see if he can maybe join for one day of participate via Skype. It would be a good occasion to be able to discuss questions that may still arise as well as the WP6 policy briefs, so it was agreed upon to schedule an informal informative meeting after the symposium, and preferably in the early evening (after the hours of the seminar)

Final RESL.eu Conference:

The idea is to have 2 conferences: 1 policy oriented conference in Brussels (autumn/winter 2017) and one academic conference in Antwerp (between 22-25 January 2018)

About the policy oriented conference:

The idea is to attach this conference to a EC conference so most stake-holders would already be in Brussels (the Belgian team is in conversation with the EC about this). We should limit this conference to half a day and bring a clear and concise message, if not we risk that many people will not attend the focus of this conference could be the Policy Briefs (WP6). It could be interesting to also provide some time for discussion (e.g. 1 timeslot on presenting the policy briefs and 1 more interactive timeslot) bringing local policy makers to this conference will be difficult as the EC always has high security regulations and always needs a lot of information about the attendees beforehand. We cannot just decide on our own to forward the invitation for this conference to our local policy makers. However, it might be a good idea to bring these local policy makers to the academic oriented conference (see further). Once the Belgian team has more concrete information about this conference (they are waiting on a reply from the EC), they will inform the partners.

About the academic conference:

Reservations of conference rooms were made for the dates 22-25th January 2018. It will take place at the beginning of the week as for the second half of the week everything was already fully booked. The idea is to have the conference spread over 3 days; we could start in the afternoon/early evening on the first day and end in the morning/early afternoon on the third day so participants can fly in/out on day 1 and 3. We will lance a call for proposals as people are more likely to show up if they can present their own research. If we only present RESL.eu findings we risk to be talking amongst each other. It was suggested to have 1 RESL presentation in each parallel session in order to mix RESL with other papers instead of creating a RESL 'silo' within the conference. The plenary/keynote speaker(s) should be RESL focused One part of the conference could take a more policy oriented focus so we can invite local policy makers. Each partner could cover the costs for 1 or 2 policy makers they would like to have attend the conference. If for instance we have an example of a 'good practice' we could bring over this person and have him/her present it, have roundtable discussions to discuss in a more informal way, etc. Whether or not participation in the conference will be free of charge or not needs to be checked as it is not sure whether within the RESL project we can ask for

a participation fee. An organizing committee will be installed with at least one participant from each partner. Lore Van Praag will take the lead and send an invitation for this to all partners, each partner is asked to send the name of the person that will be part of this committee to Lore Van Praag by **March 24th**.

RESL.eu Book (Routledge):

The deadline for submitting the chapters is **1st of May**; the internal review process will start then so we will not be able to include late submissions. We are on a tight schedule so we cannot allow any extensions of this deadline. Each chapter should have maximum 6000 words. Lore Van Praag will check whether this includes tables and will inform the partners about it. She will also forward information about the required style, format etc. We aim to have the book finished and published by the academic conference (January 2018). Once the RESL project ends everybody will be working on other things so it will be much more difficult to continue working on this book.

While we should be realistic and acknowledge that the timeframe for this book is ambitious, and that some things are out of our hands (particularly the external review process) we should at least try our very best to have the book finished on time.

Timeline Work Packages: March April May June July August September October November December January WP3 MU to circulate dataset 21st of March. TEAMS to send MU any amendment to national datasets, 24th of March MU to circulate revised dataset, 13th of April Analysis, 21st of April Draft report, 5th of May Feedback, 12th of May Publication published. 15th of May WP 5 Country risk and protective factors tables 31st of March. Instructions for portraits of youth 28th of April. Deliver portraits of youth 31st of May. Feedback for proposed indicators for creating guidelines of administrative data gathering and analysis taking into account partner country's context 30th of April. Partners' feedback on matrix and checklist design and full version End of March / End of April. Country specific recommendations and suggestions for further reading, tools and materials for toolkit's users 31st of May. First draft for feedback of publication 19th of June. Feedback and contextual information from country teams (if needed 30th of June). Deadline 31st of August. WP 6 Template or feedback June 1, Policy Brief 1 31st of August, Policy Brief 2 30th of September, Policy Brief 3 31st of October. WP 7 CEPS will make a proposal on the 2 policy measures to be examined for each country 30th of April. The full list of selected measures is then circulated for feedback to the partners, feedback by partners 15th of May. CEPS will contact partners with specific questions about the measures if needed by e-mail ad hoc (July). CEPS will prepare a first draft of the report begin October. Teams will be asked for feedback, with deadlines in the same period mid-October. Deliverable 7.1 (Publication 8) draft ready 31st of December. WP 8 1st of May. Submission chapters book Academic conference 22-24th of January.

10a. International Seminar: Reducing Early School Leaving in the EU Findings of Comparative Research, Warsaw, Poland, 15 March 2017

[https://www.uantwerpen.be/images/uantwerpen/container23160/files/Programme_RESL_eu%20seminar\(1\).pdf](https://www.uantwerpen.be/images/uantwerpen/container23160/files/Programme_RESL_eu%20seminar(1).pdf)

10b. Management Committee Meeting, Warsaw, Poland, 16 March 2017

https://www.uantwerpen.be/images/uantwerpen/container23160/files/RESL_eu_WP9_MGT_16032017_15032017.pdf

WP 9: Overview Management activities and further financial planning meeting with Marianne Samson

Present team members: Ábel Bereményi, Jordi Pàmies, Agnes Kende, Alireza Behtoui, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała, Marie Gitschthaler, Louise Ryan, Helena C Araújo, Christiane Timmerman, Elif Keskiner, Lore Van Praag, Silvia Carrasco (Skype)

- a) Contractual aspects: grant (GPF) and consortium agreement
Amendment n° 2 status
Ready to submit to the EC
Pending official approval from the EC
Modified GPF, DOW, ANNEX I and Request for Amendment 2
See website: <https://www.uantwerpen.be/en/projects/resl-eu/consortium/intranet/> (Consortium/Intranet/WP documents/WP9)
- b) Financial and administrative details
Final scientific report: published or not? In database? Content-wise: summary of the three periods: only scientific results: Lore is writing this with input of the partners
Periodic financial report (M41-M60): exactly the same as previous reports

11. 6th Consortium ECER Meeting, Copenhagen, Denmark, 25 August 2017

Carlsberg Conference Centre (Room 302)
Gamle Carlsberg Vej 15,
1799 Copenhagen V

RESL.eu members present

Middlesex University (MU): Magdolna Lorinc

Sheffield University (USFD): Louise Ryan

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Helena C Araújo, Eunice Macedo, Sofia Santos, Cosmin Nada

Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Talitha Stam, Elif Keskiner

Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW): Anna Wrona, Paulina Marchlik, Hanna Tomaszewska-Pękała

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS) Agnes Kende

Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU) : Erna Nairz-Wirth, Marie Gitschthaler, Melanie Fraisl

University of Antwerp (UA) : Christiane Timmerman, Lore Van Praag, Ward Nouwen, Rut Van Cau-denbergh, Mariana Orozco , Marianne Samson

Excused: Stockholms Universitet (SU)

Agenda

8:45 – 9:00 Welcome

9:00 – 9:40 Discussion WP5 (UW)

9:40 – 10:20 Discussion policy briefs WP6 (EUR)

10:20 – 10:30: Break

10:30 – 11:10: Discussion WP1: final refinement of the theoretical and conceptual framework (UA)

11:10 – 12:00 Preparation final conferences, dissemination activities and future projects (UA)

Discussion WP 5 (UW)

Publication 6:

Most partners sent their comments on the draft of Publication 6 to the Polish team. The Polish team will adapt the draft based on the feedback they received. UW already had a short meeting with UA about it. The main points that will be changed are:

- the Publication will be much shorter (around 50 pages maximum) and more coherent, with a clear message for the reader.
- the emphasis will be on Part 3 (the educational pathways)
- information on how the Polish team came to the typology of the different pathways – linking it with the literature on trajectories at risk - and how they analyzed the stories will be incorporated.
- the educational pathways will be described as a whole, with background and final status as part of each pathway; the Publication will look deeper into the different pathways and emphasize how we can make sense of them, and focus less on summarizing the stories; it will be emphasized why the typology of the educational pathways is useful, how it is linked with macro-level processes, what is innovative about it and what we can learn from it.
- the methodological section will only focus on what is related to the Publication without explaining in detail the methodology of WP3 and WP4.
- Part 1 on policy will be much shorter; the purpose will mainly be to give the reader contextual information that is important to interpret the pathways in the different countries.
- the Publication will be more in line with what is already written in previous Project Papers and Publications and use the same terminology. What is already mentioned in previous Publications and project papers should not necessarily be repeated in the new Publication.
- the title will be adapted (partners are welcome to give suggestions)

The following points were raised during the discussion:

The name of the pathway “*scratch on the glass*” does not make much sense in English. The name of this pathway will be changed, “*unanticipated crisis*” could be an alternative. It is clear that a lot of effort was put into this Publication. Making the Publication more concise is necessary, but we can look for other ways to disseminate the information that will need to be left out. The theoretical parts for instance can be used for the refinement of the theoretical and conceptual model (WP1). Some parts of the Publication can also be useful for the Dutch team as input for writing the policy briefs (WP6), particularly the boxes with the information about policies on ESL in the different countries and the partners’ comments on this, particularly if they agree with the information in these boxes for their country. Therefore, EUR asks if UW can circulate the feedback of all partners. The EU policy on ESL is more balanced than described in the Publication where the focus is very much on the economic aspect. The Publication should also refer to the EU’s focus on social inclusion. It was decided that the full stories of the youngsters won’t be included in the annex as this would make the Publication too long. It was also emphasized that the coherence of the publication as a whole is more important than to give equal space/voice to all the stories. An option could be to include only one story per type could.

On the other hand, the stories provide very rich data. If they will not be in the Publication, then what will we do with them? The idea was raised to use the stories for an additional project paper, using a more ethnographic approach. The Portuguese and Spanish team would be interested to do this work.

Timeline for Publication 6:

- 15 September: UW sends revised draft of the Publication to UA.
- UA sends feedback to UW asap so the draft can be sent out to all partners by 20 September.
- All partners can go through the Publication for a final revision (small remarks, check whether their countries are presented correctly; no fundamental feedback).
- The Publication should be ready by the end of September.

Partners should inform UW if they believe their cases illustrate another pathway than the one they’re ascribed to in the draft.

Toolkit

The toolkit is mostly done; UW still has some doubts about how they will organize the second part of the toolkit about analysis of administrative data. The questionnaire and further reading sections are almost ready. Some sections of the toolkit are written in Polish and still need to be translated into English.

Discussion policy briefs - WP6 (EUR)

EUR is preparing 3 policy briefs (see DOW). The policy briefs will not use ESL as such but rather focus on school disengagement. Several proxies for school disengagement have been identified and EUR did extensive analyses (using the student survey) for the different countries. The results of these analyses have been sent to each of the partners. Elif Keskiner presented one proxy for NL to illustrate what the analyses reveal.

The following points were raised during the discussion:

- It's important to clarify the identification of 'migrant background' and distinguish between migration-status and ethnicity; asking about ethnicity is not allowed in some countries (e.g. PT) so using this variable in the model can give distorting results. Migration-status (based on birthplace of respondent or his/her (grand-) parents) should not be a problem.
- We should be very careful in stating that 'migrant background' is a predictive factor and should think very carefully about what the dataset represents; on the other hand 'migrant background' remains important so we should not move away from that finding (as policy makers could interpret this as if they're doing a great job, while, as always, things can be improved); we should not focus on migrant background only, but should not leave it out either.
- EUR did control for SES in the analyses but since there are a lot of missing data they cannot argue it is a very reliable measure. However, data were (generally, not always) collected in schools with a high level of pupils with lower SES status. Missing data is mostly linked to parental educational status (less to parental occupation). The fact that most data were collected in schools with a high level of pupils with a low SES affects the analyses because there is not much variation within the SES variable and therefore cannot help to explain differences based on 'migration background'.
- We should think very carefully about how we write the policy briefs; we should avoid talking about 'Sweden', 'Poland', etc. as this could be read as though our findings are representative for the country; we should also think carefully about finding the right wording to explain our data to avoid giving a very stereotypical message.
- An option could be to talk about 'vulnerable schools' instead of 'vulnerable groups'; the main objective of the stepwise regression model is that we start from known risk categories and try to open the black box on why certain groups have more difficulties in leaving education qualified. There is no point in trying to avoid saying that certain groups are more at risk for ESL. What we want to bring to the table is explaining why that is, and how schools and policy makers can try to combat this.
- We should say something related to educational policies and guidelines for schools. Indeed, it needs to be stressed that the policies are written at an institutional level so that they are aligned to the affordances of the data (in terms of generalizability); it's important to start from the potential and how schools can work with that, e.g. "despite their very high aspirations, students with a migration background/lower SES show higher risk of..."
- The policy briefs could focus on protective factors.
- We should avoid shaming or blaming the teachers, we should say something about the structural level, send a message that there is also a structural problem that needs to be tackled.
- Although these structural factors are very important, our data do not directly allow us to make bold statements about structural effects. We can try to explain cross-country differences by quoting in large-scale internationally comparative studies like OECD studies about the negative effects of tracking, grade retention, segregation, ...

TO DO: by **8th of September** all the partners are asked to

1. look at the analysis they received from EUR, and see what is striking or valuable in the particular context of their country; if they have concrete questions about how the variables are constructed, they can ask Elif Keskiner .
2. let EUR know if have they have a preference for a particular DV on which to focus as a proxy for school engagement in the context of their country.
3. let EUR know if there are other publications that can be helpful.

Deadlines for Policy Brief 1, 2 30/09 and Policy brief 31/10. We will have to report the delay of the first policy brief to our EU Commissioner.

Discussion final refinement of the theoretical and conceptual framework - WP1 (UA)

In the next months, UA will work on the Publication 7 on the refinement of the theoretical and conceptual framework. During the discussion some suggestions about insights/perspectives/theories that could be included were already raised:

- Include something about the unawareness among the teachers about the issue of ESL.
- Make the connection with social justice.
- Introduce the issue of 'majority becoming a minority' in specific urban schools (e.g. see work Maurice; Louise also published on the subject already in 2011).
- Look at the work the Polish team has done for Publication 6 on school disengagement to reconsider what has been written in the initial theoretical framework.
- Incorporate changes to the grid that have been made in WP3.
- Talk about why there are vulnerable schools; say something about desegregation, if not it could be received as though we expect schools to be segregated (maybe this could be included in the policy briefs of WP6). - for the UK the schools included in the sample are not the most deprived schools; nonetheless it could still be interesting to reflect on why there are differences across schools
- Stress the importance of a changing macro-context (not only the socio-economic context, but also the ideological frameworks, e.g. radicalization, polarization, the emergence new 'grand narratives')
- Include something about the impact of austerity policies in the selection of the most needy students for school-based measures; include something about undertaking a generational approach and the fact that the youngsters of the RESL project were born at turn of the century, and should have been prevented from ESL right at beginning of economic crisis.
- The exercise of what new facts and new perspectives we are able to bring forward based on the RESL project could be the aim of the seminar at UAB on October 20th (see further).

TO DO:

- All partners are asked to go back Project Paper 2 and include their input and suggestions (if they have any) for the refinement of the theoretical and conceptual framework and send it to UA by the **15th of September** (no template will be sent).

Deadline for Publication 7 = 31st of October

Discussion dissemination activities – WP8 (UA)

All partners were reminded to send everything they do regarding dissemination to Lore Van Praag and Marianne Samson.

Final academic conference

Conference rooms (Hof van Liere, Antwerp) have been booked from **Monday January 22nd (4pm) until Wednesday January 24th (2pm)**. Depending on the number of abstracts we receive and accept we will have to decide whether to spread the conference over the 3 days or reduce it to 2 days. So far we did not receive many abstracts; everybody should make publicity !! The deadline has been extended to September 15th and can be extended again until September 30th. The 2 keynote speakers will be Russell Rumberger and Paul Downes (both confirmed). Paul Downes asked to not put the panel at the end of the conference as he is afraid many people will have left by then; on the other hand the panel could be why people decide to stay until the end. The panels should be at least 1.5 hours and should be organized around a particular topic; we will wait for the final RESL publications and the outcome of the seminar in Barcelona to identify the 'umbrella topics' for these panels and to decide who will participate in what panel. The suggestion was made to organize 3 panels instead of 2 to give all participants enough time to talk. In the parallel sessions everybody can present on their topic of choice; as long as it's related to the general topic of the conference (abstracts need to be submitted via the online tool).

Policy Conference

The policy conference will take place on **16th of November in Brussels**. We have been given a time slot of 2 – 2.5 hours at the EU working group on school policy to present the policy briefs of WP6. Maurice and Chris will do this. As this conference is organized by the EU, partners should let UA know if they would like to join. UA would need to check with the organizers whether this is possible.

Special Issue

Eunice Macedo reintroduced the idea of writing a special issue for Network 7. The journal would be the **European Education Research Journal (EERJ)** and Eunice Macedo, Helena C. Araújo, Erna Nairz-Wirth and Julia Szalai would be the editors. The umbrella topic would be something in the line of “drawing lessons about ESL-trajectories” or “learning from youngsters...”, and could be based on the presentations given at the RESL symposia (without repeating papers that are published elsewhere, e.g. Routledge book). The editors will refine the topic and communicate about the next steps to take. The Special Issue will most likely not be published before 2019.

RESL.eu book (Routledge)

So far everything is going according to schedule. Routledge informed that the manuscript won't be sent out for an additional review; unless we ask them to. The publisher will go through the manuscript and check for consistency across the chapters etc. and if they consider it to be okay, they will publish the book. This means that the chapters won't be double blind peer reviewed ! If authors need their chapters to be double blind peer reviewed, we can always see if we can send out these chapters individually for an additional review, or whether we will do this for the entire manuscript. (Talitha will inform us about the requirements of her chapter, if she wishes to include this in her PhD.). If there won't be an additional review, the editors will be quite strict in the second review of the chapters. The absolute maximum for each chapter is 6500 words, however authors are asked to focus on the 6000 word limit when reworking their chapter (if everybody writes 6500 words we will cross our overall word-limit).

Seminar @ UAB, 20th October

The idea of this seminar is to reflect on the outcomes of the project and on the contribution of RESL to the general knowledge on ESL, and to stimulate comparison across the countries. This will be a closed seminar – more like a working meeting – for RESL partners only. Silvia Carrasco circulated a call for the seminar a few months ago with some initial ideas on what the presentations and discussions could focus on. The idea is to have 4 (ideally comparative) presentation slots of 1.5 hour in which most time will be dedicated to discussion (e.g. how do the findings contribute to what we knew already; what questions can be raised; how can we interpret the material together,...). Power-Points or drafts of the papers could be circulated beforehand. Those who are interested in participating in this seminar should send their ideas by September 15th

HORIZON2020 call:

The call focuses on youngsters with a migration background and education, so very much in line with the expertise of the RESL consortium. UAB will take the lead; they can draw on the 2016 project proposal (EPEI). The idea would be to discuss the proposal on Saturday October 21st in Barcelona. The partners that cannot come to Barcelona and are interested in participating in the proposal, can always join via skype.

NEXT: Brussels Policy Meeting, 15 - 17 November 2017 (16th of November)
Antwerp, Final Meeting, 22 - 24 January 2018

12. Management Committee Meeting, Antwerp, Belgium, 8 September 2017

RESL.eu members present

Erasmus University Rotterdam (EUR): Maurice Crul, Elif Keskiner
University of Antwerp (UA) : Christiane Timmerman, , Lore Van Praag

Hosted by Antwerp University, BE

Discussion policy briefs template and policy conference:

In this management meeting, we discussed the templates for the policy briefs that would be send out to all partners. In Copenhagen (ECER), the EUR team already presented the new analyses of each country on which the policy briefs would be based. Initially, the templates as presented by the EUR team also asked each country more information to write the first policy brief. However, we decided to base the first policy brief more on the qualitative research findings (as presented in Project papers 6 and 7; and Publication 4) and hence, reduce this question from the templates that the EUR team initially wanted to present.

For the second policy briefs, we decided to make for each country a specific policy brief. Therefore, country-specific information had to be asked from all partners, in order to be able to interpret and contextualize the findings in a correct and suitable way towards national/local/regional policy makers. In this meeting, we discussed the outcomes we would like to present (we will include all four variables as presented in the analyses in August: Attentiveness, School compliance, Study behavior and Truancy) and the ways the templates would be organized.

Finally, we discussed the Policy conference, which will be held in November, and the way we will present the data.

WP6 Template

Policy Brief 1:

What message would you like to pass on to your policymakers on the school level in policy brief 1?

- What is the best practice on the school level that you have discovered during the course of this project- **why is it relevant for your country?**

Please describe why the measure you selected is relevant for your country (considering the system , etc.) regarding ESL? What do you see as one of the most crucial issues- what proactive measure address it?

- **In your study did you run into schools that seemed to have done a good job in tackling ESL? Could you let us know about the code of the school so we can conduct further analysis in this school?**
- Which school system characteristic came out as crucial in influencing the school disengagement of the students who participated in the survey?
 - Please describe max. in 3 sentences/ if you have extensively written about this measure in a previous publication , just mention the name and we will use the information there)

Policy Brief 2:

- **The Dutch team has conducted a quantitative analysis with the RESL. EU Survey, using four proxies for school disengagement; Truancy, School Compliance, Study Behavior and Attentiveness**

Truancy:

School Compliance:

The findings underline negative class environment and being victim of violence is crucial for reporting non-compliant behavior as well as changing schools and vocational tracks. **(Do you agree?)** While parental control significantly emerge as a protective factor, parental social support is a risk factor. **(how do you reflect on this?)**

Study Behavior

Predicting increased study behavior, we first controlled for background variables in a stepwise regression model. Then in a second, third and fourth model we included educational career, support and motivation variables. We see that in the fourth step only sex is significant as girls reported higher study behavior compared to boys. Again school career mattered; while changing schools was negatively related with reporting high study behavior; having high grades last year and those in vocational track reported increased study behavior (**How do you interpret this?**). Among support variables; increased teacher support, teacher social support, parental school support, and high peer aspirations emerged as significant protective factors in predicting the reporting of increased study behavior. Again increased peer social support was negatively associated with reporting of increased study behavior. Furthermore academic self-concept, school belonging, academic motivation and resilience were all significantly positively associated with reporting of increased study behavior.

Attentiveness

Regarding the vulnerable group of students in vocational training, being a victim of violence and negative class environment were negative risk factors, whereas parental school support and parental How would you reflect on the findings of the analysis? (which IVs are significant- that you would like to be highlighted to the policy makers)

- Which of these measure explains best the school disengagement problem in your setting in relation to the message you would like to pass on to your policy makers? Do you have a preference?
 - **How do you think the qualitative findings of the research speak to this analysis?** Please describe.
Are there certain qualitative findings you want to be highlighted?
Please provide information.
- **After answering all these questions; do you see something crucial to be missing for your policy brief message; please provide below**

13. Scientific Meeting, Barcelona, Spain, 20 October 2017

RESL seminar - UAB October 20th 2017

RESL.eu members present:

Middlesex University (MU): Alessio D'Angelo, Magdolna Lorinc, Neil Kaye

Stockholms Universitet (SU): Alireza Behtoui

Universidade do Porto (UPORTO): Sofia A. Santos, Cosmin I. Nada

Erasmus Universiteit Rotterdam (EUR): Talitha Stam (present) and Elif Keskiner (Skype)

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB): Silvia Carrasco, Ábel Bereményi, Jordi Pàmies, Laia Narciso

Közép-Európai Egyetem (CEU CPS): Julia Szalai

University of Antwerp (UA): Christiane Timmerman, Lore Van Praag & Rut Van Caudenberg

Sheffield University (USFD): Louise Ryan

Excused: Uniwersytet Warszawski (UW), Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien (WU)

Hosted by UAB, Torre Vila Puig, Barcelona

Agenda:

9:00 - 10:00: Elif Keskiner on policy briefs (WP6)

10:15 - 11:15: Lore Van Praag & team on renewed conceptual model and future research recommendations to be added in Publication 7 (WP1) and other issues.

11.15-11.45: Coffee break

11:45- 13:15: Presentations (20-25 minutes) and joint discussion (rest of time)

- Louise Ryan & team. Young People, School Engagement and Perceptions of Support: a mixed methods analysis of differentiated, diffuse and dynamic sources of support.
- Sofia Santos and Cosmin Ionut Nada. Shattered dreams and constrained aspirations difficult and challenging educational trajectories of young adults in Portugal.

13:15 – 14:45: Lunch break

14:45 – 16:15: Presentations (20-25 minutes) and joint discussion (rest of time)

- Talitha Stam & team. Aspirations in Practices; the role of internship experiences in shaping students' aspirations over time.
- Silvia Carrasco & team. The Spanish paradox: systemic, institutional and individual barriers to building on students' aspirations to prevent ESL.

16:15 – 17:00: Coffee, open discussion, pending issues.

The RESL.eu project is coming to an end. Before engaging in the preparation of the two general concluding policy and academic in Brussels (November 2017) and Antwerp (January 2018), a one-day seminar was devoted to discuss and reflect upon the potential outcomes of the RESL.eu project. We focused on the interpretation of the data and identifying key contributions and advances to understanding ESL and reducing it.

The idea is to meet at UAB to develop debates around a reduced number of presentations focusing on only a couple of overarching topics, allocating enough time for rich joint discussions and prospective further exploitation of our large amount of data, in order to stimulate comparisons and add to previous knowledge. Each presentation is prepared on the basis of key cross-country questions stemming from in-depth quantitative-qualitative analyses and key outcomes on macro-meso-micro factors across countries.

The first two sessions are devoted to the discussion of the findings as a final reflection on the deliverables that had to be provided for WP6 and WP1.

1. Discussion policy briefs (WP6)

Due to the pregnancy of Elif Keskiner, we opted to organize a Skype session to discuss the policy briefs. An overview of the to do list and the adaptations agreed upon during this meeting can be found below:

Policy Brief 1

A revised version has been circulated to address the concerns raised so far. Please check this document, react and approve by Tuesday 24th of October.

All team members are invited to include the policy recommendations addressed by AU team, if you can support it with data. Add your comments about further reading for policy makers to include them in the appendix.

Policy Brief 2

In general, the teams are happy about the structure except for section 4- lessons learned from other countries. The countries who are willing to pursue this exercise of section 4 are welcome and the others are not obliged to if they find it problematic. As mentioned by Cosmin in the meeting; this section is not meant to advise your policy makers to take measures in other countries as an example but more like pointing at them what you thought could be interesting. See if this works for you.

Policy Brief 2 will have one page executive summary. Major discussion was about this summary. Certain macro-structural issues were listed (please enlarge to this list if you find it necessary).

- Compulsory age of education being raised to 18
- School Segregation
- Tracking
- ESL being a good benchmark to study youth at risk
- ESL as an indicator to collect information about youth.

Each country has a different take on these measures; but our suggestion is to describe your positions without making normative policy suggestions (i.e., age of compulsory education). It is more an evaluation of well-known problems based on our research experience and the lessons learned from each other.

In addition to the list above; we need your country pages to write this executive summary. So those who have not send it in yet, the deadline for the country pages was Wednesday 18th of October, so it has already passed. Please send in your country page latest by 24th of October. The EUR team will analyze what the other teams have sent, write the executive summary and circulate it and include the feedback.

Policy Brief 3

We have not discussed this into detail in the meeting; since it will be based on the PB1 and PB2. So the speed of it, also depends on your speed to send us your feedback.

2. The renewed conceptual model and future research recommendations to be added in Publication 7 (WP1) and other issues.

Lore Van Praag presented the renewed conceptual model and received very insightful comments about the ways we should restructure the conceptual model, based on the findings of the RESL.eu project. We started from the conceptual model of WP1 to frame the future research directions of the RESL.eu project. All team members present provided additional remarks and suggestions for improvement. The proposed changes to the conceptual model of WP1, Publication 7, would be as follows:

- The change of titles: micro-, meso-, macro-level
- In macro-level: add 'policies' that affect all level variables
- Meso-level: add school culture and cultural capital
- Micro-level: place circle and processes of school disengagement outside the frame, it suggests too much the fact that it is only part of the individual level
- Leave out risk and "protective" factors (instead: resilience) and discuss together with social injustice (and include reflection about agency)
- Micro-level: add socio-demographics? Gender? Or discuss this in the text.

We should pay attention into the section of social imaginaries to social injustice.

Some additional comments have to be added to the actual future research recommendations:

- Compulsory education, age and qualifications
- Preparation students in education (i.e., as citizen; on the labour market; Well-being)
- Gender issues?
- School-to-work transitions: replace by school-to-adulthood
- Be careful with the deficit model when discussing family and social networks, best to add mismatch expectations schools and families (see also presentation Louise Ryan), use of multi-actor perspective, add more about parental involvement
- Add weight of social class and school across countries in section on success and failure
- Deconstruction migrant, generations, ethnic groups, etc.
- Flexibility of educational systems
- Social/ethnic segregation in schools
- School tracking

3. Academic presentations in the afternoon

During these presentations, the findings of the RESL.eu project were discussed in the team.

14. Policy Meeting, Brussels, Belgium, 16 November 2017

RESL.eu Policy Briefing:

[https://www.uantwerpen.be/images/uantwerpen/container23160/files/Policy%20Meeting%20BXL%20\(16-11-2017\)%20v2.pdf](https://www.uantwerpen.be/images/uantwerpen/container23160/files/Policy%20Meeting%20BXL%20(16-11-2017)%20v2.pdf)

