

# Chapter 3

## A Place for Every Child: Inclusion as a Community School's Task

By: Dr. Jeannette Doornenbal  
Hanze University of Applied Sciences Groningen

## Introduction

The International Convention on the Rights of the Child (United Nations, 1989) establishes every child's right to participate, to be of importance and to learn. Every right-minded person will support these rights, but what do they mean in real terms and are we successful in putting them into practice here in the Netherlands? Guaranteeing every child these rights is no simple matter. Children differ from one another in myriad ways. This is a complex task that cannot possibly be the sole responsibility of the education sector. It is a shared obligation, a fact well expressed in the African proverb, much used in recent times, that 'it takes a village to raise a child'.

For this reason, primary schools, day care centres and pre-school playgroups, after-school facilities (childcare and after-school activities) and local child welfare authorities in the Netherlands have been working together since 1995 to form 'brede scholen', literally 'broad schools', in other countries known as 'community schools' or 'Ganztagsschule' (Doornenbal, Pols & Van Oenen, 2012). This cooperation was a novelty in 1995; now they are standard practice. Today, almost all primary schools in the Netherlands work in cooperation with one or more pre-school, day care or after-school facilities (Kieft, Van der Grinten & De Geus, 2016). The primary reason for working together originates in educational theory. The motivation most frequently cited is the need to provide children with uninterrupted learning lines and optimal opportunities for development. In practice, the extent to which teachers and childcarers (or day care professionals) work together, varies considerably across community schools. There are four distinct forms of cooperation: stand-alone; face-to-face; hand-in-hand, and all-in-one. The most common form of cooperation appears to be the hand-in-hand model, a systematic method of cooperation; followed by a method in which cooperation is generally incidental (the face-to-face model). The all-in-one cooperation model is rare. This form is known as the Integrated Child Centre (ICC), which was first introduced into the Dutch community school landscape in 2012 (Doornenbal, 2012). ICCs know the highest level of cooperation. There are no dividing lines at all between the sectors; for children aged 0 to 12, there is one single team providing education, childcare, and in some cases even health and welfare services, working under a single management and with combined funding. It also provides a single point of contact for parents. This kind of cooperation demands considerable efforts. Approximately half the principals of community schools and managers of child centres report difficulties. The most commonly cited problem concerns cultural differences between the organizations, as education and childcare are two distinct worlds, each with their own visions, ambitions and training programmes. Problems with legislation and regulations and with funding have also been reported.

As described, there are many different forms of cooperation between schools, day care, after-school care and pre-school play groups in the Netherlands. But in all cases, cooperation between the different sectors is expected to improve children's opportunities for finding their place in society later on. This chapter is based on the knowledge and experience we have acquired with

the development of community schools and ICCs in the Netherlands (Doornenbal, Pols & Van Oenen, 2012; Doornenbal, 2012; Doornenbal & De Kruijter, 2016). It starts with a message to the reader and then I pose a key question, to which I formulate an answer in four steps.

## One Message

We have all gazed in amazement at a flock of starlings flying in formation. At the way the flock is constantly changing shape without disintegrating and the way every starling remains part of the flock. Even though the flock does not fly to a plan, has no centre, nothing directing it, no leader. The starlings simply improvise. The idea of a flock flying in formation appeals to me because the starlings seem to know instinctively how to deal with differences, with diversity. No bird is excluded, inclusivity seems to be a given. But people are not starlings. We don't form a flock instinctively. Therefore, if we want to do justice to children's rights to participate, to be of importance and to learn in everyday life, then we will need to work on diversity and inclusion. So my message is: we must work towards an inclusive ICC where there is a place for every child. Where every child is allowed to participate, to be of importance and to learn. Or, to use the words of Dutch pedagogue Gert Biesta (2013), where every child is given a chance of qualification, socialization *and* subjectification. If we adopt these aims as our frame of reference, this means that the ICC must ensure that every child:

1. is able to obtain the qualifications matching its abilities, to follow the curriculum best suited to increase its opportunities in the employment market;
2. is raised to be a democratic citizen participating in an open society; and
3. discovers who it wants to be and what it wants to contribute, and how its identity takes shape.

Achieving these three functions together results in children 'coming into the world' (Biesta, 2013; Pols, 2016). This is also my interpretation of the concept of talent development.

Talent development is interpreted in many different ways. It is often limited to cognitive development and specifically that of pupils with outstanding performance in cognitive tasks. In this view, talent development, giftedness and excellence are closely related terms. That is not what I mean by talent development. The approach I advocate is the one developed by the Dutch knowledge network TalentenKracht (see [www.talentenkracht.nl](http://www.talentenkracht.nl)), in which talent is regarded as every child's ability to develop itself optimally when it is stimulated by its surroundings in a talented way. The TalentenKracht approach is based on every child's innate curiosity and teachers' and other educational professionals' task to recognise that curiosity and respond adequately to it. Talent, therefore, is not something one simply has, but something that professionals are able to bring out and stimulate, and that may lie in many different areas: art, culture, music, movement, programming, caring, building, gardening, etcetera. When we define

talent development in this way, it is the school's task to ensure that every child is able to develop itself with talent regardless of its abilities.

That implies that an inclusive ICC aims to develop every child's talents regardless of its origins, religion, sexual orientation, disposition and ethnicity. From the perspective of inclusion, diversity is more than a starting principle. It goes deeper than that. We actually need to engage with those differences. Diversity then becomes a moral duty, a call to connect with differences (Kramer, 2013; Kramer, 2014). Precisely this engagement is the most difficult aspect. It is something that has to be worked at, because it goes to the core of your own standards and values, your own opinions, beliefs and convictions.

The rights of every child to be of importance, participate and learn are not adequately respected in the Dutch education system. Evidence for this is found in the fact that, compared with other countries, the educational system in the Netherlands is highly segregated. This can be seen in the table below, provided by the OECD (2012, p. 59). In the first place, the table shows that the Netherlands has the highest number of special educational facilities for different 'target groups', children who for various reasons require extra care. So, in both absolute and relative terms, many children fall outside the scope of basic educational services. Inclusion of children with different care needs is certainly not a given in the Netherlands.

In the second place, the table shows that, compared to other countries, selection for the different types of higher or secondary education happens relatively early in the Netherlands. Around the age of twelve, at the end of primary school, children are admitted to a secondary school on the basis of their performance in a national final examination (CITO) and the advice of their primary school teacher. This selection is a key predictor for their further school career. Once allocated to a particular education level, it is difficult for pupils to move to a different level (Dutch Inspectorate of Education, 2016). There are various reasons for this, including the performance pressure schools are dealing with.<sup>1</sup> Due to this, secondary schools do well not to admit the most demanding pupils. Relatively, they cost more time and energy, and bring down the final results. For this reason, downstreaming to lower types of secondary education has become easier than upstreaming to higher types, also called 'stacking'<sup>2</sup>. The fact that upstreaming to higher forms of education is becoming more difficult, has primarily a negative effect on the educational progress of children from deprived backgrounds. These children often need more time to develop and now their perspective at rising socially via stacking, has been reduced.

<sup>1</sup> Performance means that schools are successful in having as many students as possible pass their final examinations with good marks within the shortest possible period.

<sup>2</sup> Stacking means that pupils move on from pre-vocational secondary education to senior general secondary education or pre-university secondary education. That way, they can obtain a higher secondary education diploma that will give them access to higher professional education or university education respectively.

	Age of first selection	Number of school types or distinct educational programmes available to 15-year-old students	Percentage of students in schools where students' record of academic performance are considered for admittance (1)	Percentage of students in schools that group students by ability (1)
Australia	16	1	60	95
Austria	10	4	74	46
Belgium	12	4	52	46
Canada	16	1	53	90
Chile	16	1	70	65
Czech Republic	11	5	69	69
Denmark	16	1	24	50
Estonia	15	1	73	56
Finland	16	1	18	58
France	16	1	w	w
Germany	10	4	77	51
Greece	15	2	27	15
Hungary	11	3	90	68
Iceland	16	1	8	75
Ireland	15	4	24	96
Israel	15	2	78	97
Italy	14	3	55	56
Japan	15	2	99	67
Korea	14	3	61	90
Luxembourg	13	4	95	71
Mexico	15	3	59	69
Netherlands	12	7	97	80
New Zealand	16	1	43	98
Norway	16	1	7	73
Poland	16	1	49	46
Portugal	15	3	16	32
Slovak Republic	11	5	73	73
Slovenia	14	3	68	55
Spain	16	1	11	60
Sweden	16	1	5	74
Switzerland	12	4	70	75
Turkey	11	3	66	62
United Kingdom	16	1	20	99
United States	16	1	45	91

**Table 3.1** Types of differentiation in lower secondary education across countries.

In this context, I would also like to mention that children in pre-school care or day care are already categorised children at the age of two into target group children and non-target group children.<sup>3</sup> Target group children are children who are raised by parents with low socio-economic status and who run a high risk of delayed language development. To ensure that target group children catch up in this area at the earliest possible age, they are offered programmes for pre-school and early-school education (*Voor- en Vroegschoolse Educatie* or VVE). Although early investment in the language development of children growing up in families where the use of 'school language' is less usual is very important, the VVE policy does result in children, as early as two-year olds, being categorised into target group children and non-target group children. This means that the VVE policy is a target group policy rather than an inclusive policy.

The inequality in opportunities in Dutch education has therefore grown rather than decreased, and the gap between privileged and underprivileged children (high and low) has become wider rather than narrower. With a view to narrowing this gap, we would therefore do well to prevent early selection and reduce the number of special education facilities by working on a basic inclusive childcare/educational facility in which differences between children are respected. Moreover, there is a good pedagogical reason for taking a more inclusive approach. Recent research by Annika de Haan (2015) shows that mixed ability groups have a positive effect on young children with delayed language development (and the evidence is reassuring for high-flyers: children with advanced language development are not adversely affected). According to De Haan, the positive effect of mixed ability groups is primarily achieved through the interaction with peers. Children learn from one another. We should not deprive them of that opportunity.

<sup>3</sup> The current pre-school system consists of various facilities with differing objectives, target groups and funding. All children can go to pre-school play groups to prepare them for primary school. For children of working parents, a day care subsidy is provided so that parents are able to combine work with childcare. For disadvantaged children, targeted intervention is provided in the form of pre-school education.

## One Key Question

In short, inclusion still has a long way to go in the Netherlands. This is why a **breakthrough** is needed to create an inclusive ICC. Which brings me to the key question: **how does one do this?** How can we move closer to this appealing goal? I shall attempt to answer **this question in four steps: where should what be done by whom and how?**

### The answer

#### Step 1: Where?

The first step is to ask oneself *where* inclusion needs to be worked at.

Of course, the place for this is the community school or ICC, which can be regarded as a miniature society (Dewey talks about an embryonic society, 1999) in which children prepare for their future in a safe environment. However, this miniature society is not an island. The ICC forms part of a local environment; of a community, town or neighbourhood. For this reason, it is important that the ICC is familiar with the local context. It should know who the parents and children are, what the issues are, what facilities are available, what volunteer initiatives and so on. It would be helpful for the ICC and the other organizations in the community to work together towards a common result, based on this analysis of the **local area**. University professor and expert on cooperation in networks Patrick Kenis (2015) talks about **result** with a capital R. According to Kenis, for effective cooperation in a **network** it is crucial to agree on a common Result that all parties (a) understand the **necessity and urgency** of and (b) commit themselves to by contributing to it based on their own role.

Practice has shown that agreeing on a common result at local level or cooperating to achieve this in a network is difficult. Particularly in **deprived neighbourhoods**, many government agencies are involved and **energy and funds** are fragmented.

The multicultural, deprived neighbourhood of Selwerd Paddepoel Tuinwijk (SPT) in the town of Groningen is a good example. I know this neighbourhood well due to the research we are carrying out there. In relative and absolute terms, many children grow up in poverty there, raised by young single mothers and/or unemployed parents. Core funding for education is not sufficient to provide the children in SPT with what they need to 'come into the world'. For this reason, there are all kinds of compensatory projects: isolated short-term projects carried out simultaneously, well-intended initiatives that come to an end because the money has run out. Such random projects result in very little. These children would benefit more from sufficient systematic core funding and a stable pedagogical and educational infrastructure so that they are also able to participate, be of importance and get ahead. In some places in the Netherlands, such as Stedenwijk in the town of Almere, efforts are being made to prevent this fragmentation. All the relevant parties in the community are working together to create and implement a pedagogical community plan. But this is still in the early stages. It was only

with the introduction of the new Jeugdwet (Dutch Youth Act) in 2015 that local authorities, in this case the municipalities, were given responsibility for child welfare services including prevention and minor assistance (Dutch Youth Act, 2014). Previously, responsibility for child welfare lay with national government. Coordination of this system intervention has therefore been decentralised to rest with municipalities.

#### Step 2: What?

The second step involves the important question of *what* children need in an ICC. By way of introduction to this issue, I would like to mention 'The Dark Horse', a beautiful, moving, profound film, which I saw at the International Film Festival in Rotterdam in 2015. The Dark Horse is set in New Zealand and is based on a true story. The main protagonist is Genesis Potini, a chess champion. He suffers from bipolar disorder and has spent time in a **psychiatric institution**. The film begins when he is discharged from the institution and goes in search of a meaningful life. He wants to participate and integrate into society. An opportunity arises when he meets a group of underprivileged Maori children and decides he wants to do something for them. He will teach them to play chess, so that they can take part in a **national chess tournament** six weeks later. I mention The Dark Horse because Genesis Potini is a **great** teacher, who does five important things that enable every child to come into the world and **develop** its talents.

First, Potini builds a relationship of **trust** with the children, who have had little positive attention, by believing in them. He has **absolute confidence** that every one of them can learn to play chess. Belief in a child's development potential creates an affective relationship between the child and the adult, which is an essential prerequisite for development and learning. This basic confidence is precisely what vulnerable children lack, as the American science journalist Paul Tough (2013) shows in the convincing study *How Children Succeed*.

In the second place, Potini acknowledges the children's need for relationships, for joining in, for belonging. He places a **large chess board** by the door with all the pieces on it and on arrival, each child takes the piece that has been allocated to it from the board. This symbolises that they are all part of the **game**, of the community, each with its own position. I would like to look at this more closely. Paying attention to diversity is not the same as each individual getting what he wants. Children also need to learn that they are part of a group. That boundaries are necessary in the interests of the group, of society. Derksen, a Dutch psychiatrist, pointed out in *Het Narcistische Ideaal (The Narcistic Ideal, 2009)* that bonding does not imply that parents and other adults need to **respond to every signal** given by the child. On the contrary. Children need to learn that their impulses cannot always be satisfied immediately, here and now. They need to develop tolerance for **frustration**, in the interests of other people and the group. And even more importantly, to experience that you can do something for another person that does not benefit yourself but the group.

Thirdly, Potini sets high expectations: learning to play chess to competition level within six weeks. It is well-known that high expectations stimulate development. However, research shows that teachers in the Netherlands often have lower expectations of children from underprivileged backgrounds and/or with different ethnic origins than of children who grow up in opportunity-rich families. In academic literature, this is referred to as the Pygmalion effect (Rosenthal & Jacobson, 1968), which leads to referral to lower-level secondary education programmes and underuse of talent (Timmerman, De Boer & Van der Werf, 2016). High expectations induce development, at least this is the case if children receive maximum support to achieve that high aim. And that is exactly what Potini does.

In the fourth place, his interactions in guiding the children to learn to play chess are of high quality. Much can be said on the subject of quality of interactions. What do high-value interactions consist of and how do you achieve them when working with different children? For now, I will simply give an example. Young children appear to develop more quickly in groups where many stimulating activities are offered, for example in enriched play, than in groups where professionals offer fewer activities of this type (Veen & Leseman, 2015). Scaffolding (Van Geert & Steenbeek, 2005), which literally means creating supportive structures for learning purposes, such as providing feedback and feed-forward, is also an important factor for success that is currently underused in educational practice.

Finally, children need an expert, a master in the subject, who will introduce them to the culture, in this case the rules of chess. It is therefore important that Potini himself is a good chess player. Children need to stand on the shoulders of the previous generation, so that they can build on 'old' knowledge to create a 'new' world (Arendt, 1974; Dasberg, 1975). The importance of old knowledge, of mastery of a subject, is often underestimated these days as a result of the information society we live in. This has, for instance, been pointed out by the British educational researcher Daisy Christodoulou in her book *Seven Myths of Education* (2014). One of the seven myths is that children no longer need knowledge. After all, they can look everything up. But you really need knowledge, such as the meaning of terms (lower-order skills), in order to acquire higher-order skills (reasoning). For example, children were unable to get to grips with an assignment on global warming because they did not know what a glacier was. To put it metaphorically, don't send children into the woods (ask them to do something complicated like carry out an assignment) until they're able to recognise enough trees. They need teachers who teach them basic skills and concepts, which they can use as a basis for acquiring more skills.

In step 1, we saw that the coordinating role about the 'where' of inclusion lies with the municipalities. The coordinating role in establishing a common vision on the development, raising and education of children, and a warm educational climate, emphatically rests with the ICC principal responsible for implementation in the ICC. In the Netherlands this is often the school principal, who in addition to coordinating the educational facilities is also in charge of childcare and, in some cases, child welfare.

### Step 3: Who?

This brings us to the third step: *who* should work towards an inclusive ICC and, in particular, what this requires of professionals. In the discussion of cooperation competencies of professionals in a network, a recognised tool is the image of the *T-shaped professional* (Doornenbal, Pols & Van Oenen, 2012; Doornenbal & De Leve, 2014). The T-shaped professional is someone who is good at his job, who understands how to implement the 'what' (see step 2) to a high standard. But the complex task of working to achieve inclusion with a diverse group of children cannot be carried out by a teacher alone. The doors and windows of the classroom need to be opened. In the first place, various professionals are needed (the vertical axis of the T) to complete this complex task. Not just teachers, subject teachers and day care professionals, but also welfare workers, specialists and generalists from child health and welfare and family support services. Working in an integrated team does not imply that everyone does the same thing. On the contrary: complementary areas of expertise are needed. Plus connecting powers (the horizontal axis of the T), so that the various areas of expertise are utilised in such a way that they add value. Key aspects are the necessity for a shared vision on inclusion and diversity and for generic horizontal skills, particularly in the areas of cooperation and of design, reflection and learning.

What does an interprofessional dialogue look like in a T-shaped team of this kind? It should be noted that by dialogue, I do not mean a one-off conversation, but a continuous dialogue in both formal and informal settings, starting with the following questions: What is our objective in forming a team? What values do we share? What is our common ambition and what aim are we seeking to achieve? We have already mentioned (in step 2) that the ultimate aim of the ICC is to bring children into the world through qualification, socialization and subjectivization. These are complex terms to which professionals bring their own associations, partly derived from their professional socialization. A discussion about the associations this aim evokes in them is preferably conducted on the basis of specific case examples (children). Discussion based on case examples has proven very useful in revealing underlying patterns of thought and action. Once there is clarity about the team's aims for this child (or group of children), what objective they would like to achieve, the next question is how each of the team members can contribute to this from their own expertise. For this, each professional needs to be capable of voicing his own expertise, recognising and acknowledging its limitations and actively seeking complementary expertise. If the team establishes that insufficient expertise is available to respond to the complex needs of a child or group of children, the team will need to develop an innovative solution: what other ways are there to help, who is going to be in charge, how will we monitor implementation and how will we discuss its results? Conducting this type of dialogue in a T-shaped team is not easy, certainly in the Netherlands where the teacher's autonomy as an educational professional is highly valued and teachers are not yet used to having these kind of discussions with one another. So professionals will need to leave their comfort zone. It is therefore essential that discussions of this type are supervised – in some cases supplemented with advice from researchers – certainly in the early stages when no routine has yet been developed for such discussions.

The dialogue should not only take place between professionals but also always with *parents*. I will discuss this in more detail, as parental involvement is generally found to be difficult. Bé Poolman carried out doctoral research into delayed language development in young children in North-East Groningen (2016). A key finding was that parents' socio-economic background was not the primary predictor for a child's language development. It turned out that parents' expectations and views with respect to child-raising and education were more important (Poolman, Minnaert, Leseman & Doornenbal, 2015; Poolman, 2016). That's why programmes are carried out in the Netherlands, such as 'Op Stap' and 'Opstapje', to support parents in raising their children at home: what can they do at home to support their children, such as reading to them in the evenings? This is not always effective, probably because it does not fit with parents' social environment and habits, as the following example shows.

Each Tuesday morning, from eight o'clock to half past eight, I read with Nathaniel as part of what is called a 'reading breakfast'. Nathaniel is seven and a half and this is the second time that he is doing the third year of primary school. As many children at his school have delayed language development, the school puts a lot of effort into language development. They offer all kinds of stimulating activities such as the reading breakfast. Two mornings a week, parents are offered the chance to read with their child in the third and fourth year before school starts – between eight o'clock and half past eight – while having breakfast at school. Nathaniel's mother organises this. She makes tea and coffee and sandwiches. Parents are also asked to read with their child at bed time (or better still: to get their child to read to them from a book called *Mees* and talk about the story based on the questions provided with the book: see [www.successforall-nederland.nl](http://www.successforall-nederland.nl)). Nathaniel's mother regularly asks me: 'Would you get Nathaniel to read *Mees* with you and fill in the questions? I didn't get round to it yesterday evening because I read two stories from the Children's Bible.' But did she really fail in her duty to her son? I don't think so. Reading aloud from the Children's Bible creates a bond between mother and child and makes him part of the Christian family culture. Yet we have an opinion about her actions based on our own perspectives. For example, personally I am critical of the breakfast put in front of Nathaniel: a soggy roll with a sweet spread and an unidentifiable drink in a sachet with a straw. How do we deal with differences in lifestyles and the values they are based on? Because I'm quite certain that Nathaniel's mother has the best intentions for his wellbeing. That is a moral challenge for me – how do I engage with people in situations that summon up a negative judgment/emotion in me? Being with others, presence (Baart, 2001), meeting them, making contact and building a relationship with other people who are different from ourselves is a challenge, also from a moral point of view.

*Professionalization* can contribute to raising the quality of implementation in the ICC. Recent research into quality in day care centres (Slot, Leseman, Verhagen & Mulder, 2015) shows that continual professionalization in the workplace is a good predictor of quality. This involves more than refresher courses and extra training for individual employees, the effects of which

are limited. In April 2016, Trouw newspaper ran the headline 'School hardly benefits from extra training for teachers'. This was shown by a research study that teachers themselves had carried out among their colleagues. For example, a teacher following a master's course, will not be able to use his newly gained knowledge if he is the only one with this training in a school that is not innovative.

So, professionalization is an important aspect when developing an ICC, by which I don't mean with colleagues in your own subject area or on your own. Instead, I promote continual professionalization in the workplace in T-shaped teams in order to achieve effective learning together. Those learning T-shaped teams include not just staff from childcare centres and schools, but also from child welfare and support services. In the Netherlands, we usually pass issues relating to special needs pupils on to welfare advice teams. From the viewpoint of inclusion, however, it is preferable to add welfare specialists to the implementing teams, right where the children play and learn (see also Hermanns, 2009). That way, the welfare specialists can immediately put their expertise to work in the workplace, as part of the basic facilities provided. This enables them to support teachers and day care professionals and teach them to deal with diversity in an inclusive way.

T-shaped working in learning teams demands leadership. A good leader is a key factor for success. The ICC principal is the person in charge of this professionalization process. But, here again, he cannot achieve this without the support and facilitation of the governing bodies for schools, childcare and child health and welfare services. Ideally, this should happen in cooperation with local government, which after all bears responsibility for all its citizens growing up into adulthood.

#### Step 4: How?

Finally, step 4 deals with the ICC as a concept in development (Van Aken & Andriessen, 2011). The inclusive ICC that has a place for every child is a work in progress. Concepts need to be monitored and studied: what is going well, what isn't, what could be improved, what should be discontinued? Such questions can only be answered after thorough evaluation. In the Netherlands, ICCs are now trying out different applications of the ICC concept in different contexts. This offers opportunities to join forces to discover effective mechanisms for these concepts in different contexts.

No exhaustive list of all the ICCs and community schools in the Netherlands exists. There are descriptions of good practices, such as the pilot projects by PACT. In the PACT pilot projects, primary schools, day care centres and healthcare facilities work together to provide all children with high quality childcare/educational services, with the objective to reduce referrals to child welfare services and offer every child a development programme that matches its abilities. Although the pilot projects work towards the same objectives, practical implementation varies.

In Middelburg, De Aventurijn is developing continuous learning lines by increasing cooperation and team development for pre-school and first- and second-year primary education; and by having the primary school special needs coordinator work with pre-school children as well, so that alarming behaviour can be identified and acted on more quickly.

In Apeldoorn, the Sterrenschoon is expanding the existing integrated cooperation between professionals in childcare and education to include child health and welfare professionals. The school is also setting up a health and welfare system for children from 0 to 12 years.

In Lent, primary school Het Talent is working towards a continuous learning line for children from 0 to 6 years, together with the parents of children who give cause for concern. Child support workers provide child-focused, staff-focused and parent-focused support. This project is being carried out in cooperation with the municipality.

In the Amsterdam neighbourhood of IJburg, integrated child centre Laterna Magica is working to reinforce the expertise of coaches (teachers and day care professionals) in dealing with issues relating to the development of young children. For this, they use flexible child support workers from the local health and welfare system as co-teachers. This project is being carried out in cooperation with the municipality.

## Finally

If we seriously want inclusive ICCs in the Netherlands that offer every child the space it needs to develop its talents whatever its abilities and limitations, the pedagogical educational system needs to be expanded in three important ways:

- Creation of a sustainable local pedagogical infrastructure in communities and towns, for which local government is responsible.
- Creation of adaptive organizations and governing bodies for schools, childcare and child health and welfare services that go beyond the sectoral interests of their organizations and facilitate the ICC principals and their interprofessional teams in the complex task of including every child.
- Investment in human childcare/educational capital for the benefit of learning T-shaped professionals and T-shaped teams.

The good examples we see (such as the initiatives by PACT ([www.pedagogischpact.nl](http://www.pedagogischpact.nl)) and Kindcentra 2020 ([www.kindcentra2020.nl](http://www.kindcentra2020.nl))) show that we are working to achieve this in the Netherlands, in order to make sure that every child matters, belongs, participates and learns.

## Key Questions

- My ultimate goal is inclusion of every child (from 0 to 12 years) in the basic educational facilities. But how much inclusion can we handle in a community school or ICC? Is there a limit to inclusion or are we only restricted by the limitations of our (current) expertise in dealing with diversity?
- How can we achieve effective interprofessional learning in the workplace so that every child receives appropriate support to develop its talents (qualification, socialization and subjectivization)? Do other countries have effective methods for achieving this?
- I have advocated a system innovation in which professionals in the workplace, organizations' governing bodies and local authorities work together to make a sustainable difference to children's opportunities as they grow up. What are successful strategies for a sustainable system innovation of this kind? Are there any useful examples, documented success and failure factors?

## About the author

**Dr. Jeannette Doornenbal** is professor of Integrated Youth Policy at Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Groningen and chair of the research team at PACT, an organization promoting cooperation between the various educational institutions working with young children.

Contact: [j.m.doornenbal@pl.hanze.nl](mailto:j.m.doornenbal@pl.hanze.nl).



## References

- Aken, A., & Andriessen, D. (2011). *Handboek ontwerpgericht wetenschappelijk onderzoek. Wetenschap met effect.* [Handbook for design-oriented scientific research. Science with effect.] Utrecht: Lemma.
- Arendt, H. (1994). *Tussen verleden en toekomst.* [Between the past and the future.] Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Garant.
- Baart, A. (2001). *Een theorie van de presentie.* [A theory of presence.] Assen: Boom.
- Biesta, G. (2013). *A beautiful risk of education.* Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Christadoulou, D. (2014). *Seven myths of education.* Abingdon/New York: Routledge.
- CPB & SCP (2015). *De onderkant van de arbeidsmarkt in 2025.* [The lower end of the employment market in 2025.] The Hague: CPB & SCP.
- Dasberg, L. (1975). *Grootbrengen door kleinhouden als historisch verschijnsel.* [Raising children by keeping them down as a historical phenomenon.] Amsterdam: Boom
- De Haan, A. (2015). *Effects of preschool education in mixed and targeted classrooms.* Utrecht: Utrecht University (doctoral thesis).
- Derksen, J. (2009). *Het narcistisch ideaal. Opvoeden in een tijd van zelfverheerlijking.* [The narcissistic ideal. Raising children in a time of self-worship.] Amsterdam: Bert Bakker.
- Dewey, J. (1999). *Ervaring en opvoeding* [Experience and education] (translation and introduction by S. Miedema and G. Biesta). Houten/Diemen: Bohn Stafleu Van Loghum. [Originally published in America in 1938]
- Doornenbal, J. (2012). *Opgroeien doe je maar één keer. Pedagogisch ontwerp voor het kindcentrum.* [You only grow up once. Pedagogical design for the child centre.] Groningen: Hanze University of Applied Sciences, Groningen on behalf of the project 'Andere tijden'.
- Doornenbal, J., Pols, W., & Van Oenen, S. (2012). *Werken in de brede school. Een pedagogische benadering.* [Working in the broad school. A pedagogical approach.] Baarn: Coutinho.
- Doornenbal, J., & De Leve, C. (2014). *De pedagogische professional van de toekomst. 21<sup>st</sup> century skills professionals 0- tot 6-jarigen.* [The pedagogical professional of the future. 21<sup>st</sup> century skills professionals 0- to 6-year-olds.] PACT; available at: [http://www.pedagogischpact.nl/sites/default/files/files/21st-century-skills-13-6-HR\(1\).pdf](http://www.pedagogischpact.nl/sites/default/files/files/21st-century-skills-13-6-HR(1).pdf).
- Doornenbal, J., & De Kruiter, J. (2016). Twenty years of community schools in Groningen: A Dutch Case Study. In: H. Lawson & D. van Veen (Eds.). *Developing Community Schools, Community Learning Centers, Extended-Service Schools and Multi-Service Schools* (pp. 229-253). Cham, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, London: Springer.
- Inspectorate of Education (2016). *De staat van het onderwijs. Onderwijsverslag 2014/2015.* [The state of education in the Netherlands. 2014/2015 education report 2014/2015.] Utrecht: Inspectie van het onderwijs.
- Jeugdwet (Dutch Youth Act) (2014). Dutch Ministry of Health, Welfare & Sport and Security & Justice Dutch State Gazette 14-3-2014.

- Hermans, J. (2009). *Het opvoeden verleerd.* [The forgotten art of raising children.] Oration. Amsterdam: Vossiuspers University of Amsterdam.
- Kenis, P. (2015). *Over samen werken en netwerk opbouwen.* [On cooperation and network building.] Masterclass in Amsterdam in January 2015 for PACT. Available at: [https://www.google.nl/search?hl=en&q=P+Kenis+samenwerken+netwerken+resultaat&gws\\_rd=cr,ssl&ei=yDm8V4uTHOyRgAbizIOgAg](https://www.google.nl/search?hl=en&q=P+Kenis+samenwerken+netwerken+resultaat&gws_rd=cr,ssl&ei=yDm8V4uTHOyRgAbizIOgAg).
- Kieft, M., Van der Grinten, M., & De Geus, W. (2016). *Samenwerking in beeld.* [Focus on working together.] Utrecht: Oberon on behalf of the Dutch Ministries of Education, Culture & Science and Social Affairs & Employment.
- Kramer, J. (2013). *Wow! Wat een verschil! Diversiteit werkt.* [Wow! What a difference! Diversity works.] Zaltbommel: Thema.
- Kramer, J. (2014). *Deep democracy.* Zaltbommel: Thema.
- Landelijk Steunpunt Brede Scholen (Dutch Coalition for Community Schools) (2014). *Op weg naar een IKC.* [Heading towards an ICC.] Available at: <http://toolkit.bredeschool.nl/PDF/Op%20weg%20naar%20een%20IKC.pdf>.
- Masschelein, J. (Ed.). *De lichtheid van het opvoeden. Een oefening in kijken, lezen en denken.* [The lightness of raising children. An exercise in watching, reading and thinking.] Leuven: Lannoo Campus.
- OECD (2012). *Equity and quality in education; supporting disadvantaged students and schools.* Available at: <https://www.oecd.org/education/school/50293148.pdf>.
- Pols, W. (2016). *In de wereld komen. Een studie naar de pedagogische betekenissen van opvoeding, onderwijs en het leraarschap.* [Coming into the world. A study of the pedagogical significance of upbringing, education and teaching.] Antwerpen/Apeldoorn: Garant (doctoral thesis at Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam).
- Poolman, B.G. (2016). *Differences in language development among young children in the northeast of the Netherlands.* Groningen: University of Groningen (dissertation).
- Poolman, B., Minnaert, A., Leseman, P., & Doornenbal, J. (2015). Achtergronden van taalachterstanden bij jonge kinderen in Oost-Groningen. [Backgrounds to delayed language development in young children in East Groningen.] *Pedagogische Studien*, 92(4), 150-169.
- Rosenthal, R., & Jacobson, L. (1968). *Pygmalion in the classroom; teacher expectation and pupils' intellectual development.* New York: Holt.
- Slot, P., Leseman, P., Verhagen, J., & Mulder, H. (2015). Associations between structural quality aspects and process quality in Dutch early childhood education and care settings. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 33(4), 64-76.
- Ten Doesschate, S., & Van der Pol, M. (2013). *Een IKC dat staat als een huis. Hoe bouw je een duurzaam integraal kindcentrum?* [A solidly built ICC. How to construct a sustainable integrated child centre?] Utrecht: APS.
- Timmerman, A., De Boer, H., & Van der Werf, M. (2016). An investigation of the relationship between teachers' expectations and teachers' perceptions of student attributes. *Social Psychology of Education*, 19(2), 217-240.

Tough, P. (2013). *How children succeed. Grit, curiosity and the hidden power of character*. London: Random House.

United Nations (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child*. United Nations.

Van Geert, P.L.C., & Steenbeek, H.W. (2005). The dynamics of scaffolding. *New Ideas in Psychology*, 23(3), 115-128.

Veen, A., & Leseman, P. (Ed.) (2015). *Pre-COOL cohortonderzoek. Resultaten over de voorschoolse periode*. [Pre-COOL cohort study. Results during the pre-school period.] Amsterdam: Kohnstamm Instituut. (Report 932, project number 20541.)