



D6.3 Lessons learned and best practices report

Analysis and identification of best practices

Due date - M34

Submission date - 31/10/2023

Document identifier: D6.3

Version: 1

Author: UAB

Dissemination status: Public



D6.3 Lessons learned and best practices report

Grant Agreement n°:	101004717
Project acronym:	REFUGE-ED
Project title:	Effective Practices in Education, Mental Health and Psychosocial Support for the integration of Refugee Children
Funding Scheme:	H2020-MIGRATION-05-2018-2020: Mapping and overcoming integration challenges for migrant children
Project Duration:	2021/01/01 - 2023/12/31 (36 months)
Coordinator:	UNIVERSITAT AUTÒNOMA DE BARCELONA (UAB)
Associated Beneficiaries:	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI FIRENZE (UNIFI) NEW BULGARIAN UNIVERSITY (NBU) KENTRO MERIMNAS OIKOGENEIAS KAI PAIDIOU (KMOP) THE PROVOST, FELLOWS, FOUNDATION SCHOLARS & THE OTHER MEMBERS OF BOARD OF THE COLLEGE OF THE HOLY & UNDIVIDED TRINITY OF QUEEN ELIZABETH NEAR DUBLIN (TCD) RED BARNET (STCD) DANSK RODE KORS (DANISH RED CROSS) (PSD) SUPPORT GROUP NETWORK (SGN) ASSOCIAZIONE CULTURALE COOPERAZIONE INTERNAZIONALE SID SUD (CISS)

Project no. 101004717

REFUGE-ED

Effective Practices in Education, Mental Health and Psychosocial Support for the integration of
Refugee Children

MIGRATION-05-2018-2020: Mapping and overcoming integration challenges for migrant children

Start date of project: 01/01/2021 Duration: 36 months

History Chart				
Issue	Date	Changed page(s)	Cause of change	Implemented by
0.10				
1.0				
2.0				

Validation			
No.	Action	Beneficiary	Date
1	Prepared		
2	Approved		
3	Released		

Disclaimer: The information in this document is subject to change without notice. Company or product names mentioned in this document may be trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective companies.

All rights reserved.

The document is proprietary of the REFUGE-ED consortium members. No copying or distributing, in any form or by any means, is allowed without the prior written agreement of the owner of the property rights.

This document reflects only the authors' view. The European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

Table of Contents

1. Executive Summary	5
2. Sources	5
3. Brief description of the project: What were the issues the project tried to address?	6
4. REFUGE-ED: What were its major outputs?	7
5. Lessons learned and best practices	7
5.1. Co-creation process	8
5.2. Implementation	13
5.3. Evaluation	14
5.4. Dissemination	15
6. References	16
Annex 1: Fieldwork in detail	17

1. Executive Summary

Building on the social impact of previous EU research in the field of education and mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS), REFUGE-ED identified, implemented and evaluated evidence-based practices in education and MHPSS that have been shown to promote educational success, well-being and sense of belonging for all children, focusing on those in recent migration cohorts, refugees and asylum seekers, unaccompanied minors, including those residing in hotspots, reception/identification centres and institutionalised care. This was done through a dialogic process of co-creation, involving all members of the education community (children and families, civil society organisations and local service providers, schools, and teaching staff; including school counsellors or other focal points focusing on MHPSS needs in education; and policy makers working in different educational settings).

At this point, this report synthesises lessons learned and best practices towards the end of the project period. At the same time, it suggests effective strategies and actions not only for the pilots involved, but especially for those interested in implementing them.

2. Sources

The **D6.3 Lessons Learned and best practices** report was developed based on the several dialogic and co-creative spaces along the project, and with the contributions of all partners. This way, the report puts together the acquired knowledge by the researchers and by the beneficiaries. The report's main focal point is to highlight what will contribute to the sustainability and replicability of the actions implemented.

The following insights were considered in the drafting of the report (see more in detail in Annex 1):

- Focus groups with the educational community of the pilot sites at the beginning of the project. The identification of needs was key to the co-creation process.
- General Assemblies and wrap-up meetings with the educational community of the pilot sites during the implementation phase. The benefits and positive results obtained as well as the detection of opportunities for improvement were essential to adjust the actions undertaken in the project.

- Follow-up meetings with consortium partners to identify what worked and possible shortcomings in the implementation process and additional training needs of the centres in both, SEAs and MHPSS.
- Interviews with members of the pilot centres. These inputs have been essential in deepening the analysis of what has worked well and what requires a different approach.
- At the end of the project, a lessons learned template was developed for all partners to systematise what worked well and what did not in all stages of the project, i.e. the co-creation process, training, implementation, evaluation and dissemination.

3. Brief description of the project: What were the issues the project tried to address?

The REFUGE-ED project identified, implemented, and evaluated evidence-based practices in education and MHPSS that have been shown to promote the educational success, wellbeing, and sense of belonging of all children, targeting those from recent migration cohorts, refugees and asylum seekers, unaccompanied minors, including those residing in hotspots, reception/ identification centres and institutionalized care. This way, the identified practices covered the fields of formal, non-formal and informal education and had already showed to be effective in promoting the above-mentioned areas.

Building on the social impact of prior EU research in the field of education and mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS) as well as the combined two fields, through a dialogic process of co-creation, it involved all members of the education community, i.e., children and families, communities, civil society organisations and local service providers, school staff and teachers throughout the process. In doing so, REFUGE-ED aims to address the challenges of the refugee crisis in Europe, which has had a significant impact on the education, social services, and mental health sectors in host countries.

Considering, on the one hand, that Successful Educational Actions have proven their positive effect towards social cohesion and improved learning in any context (De Botton, et al., 2014)(Diez & Cabré, 2015) (Diez, et al., 2011) (Flecha, 2015) (Duque, et al., 2021) (Khalifaoui, et al. 2020), to name a few, and, on the other hand, that MHPSS practices have been used in a wide diversity of contexts, the project has implemented these practices in 46 pilots in six countries: Bulgaria, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Sweden, and Spain.

Therefore, the project was expected to deliver results on three main components: wellbeing, sense of belonging and academic success each with interrelated advantages. This means that belonging will have an impact on well-being, well-being on academic success and so on in all combinations.

4. REFUGE-ED: What were its major outputs?

The project's overall results, especially, highlighted the interconnectedness of these three pillars –wellbeing, sense of belonging and academic success– which altogether, can impact refugee and migrant children integration with their environment. The enhancement of sense of belonging promoted children's wellbeing which in turn supported their academic success. This means, when children feel emotionally supported, they are better equipped to handle academic challenges and perform their potential.

Considering the involvement of different actors in the SEAs, the sense of belonging and well-being has in many cases been expanded beyond those directly involved in the centres to the whole community. Likewise, results have been shown that active participation and social interaction further enhanced children's engagement, and academic motivation. In this regard, SEAs and MHPSS practices can horizontally support the development of a broader climate of cooperation, trust, respect, and encouragement. This translates into an inclusive education that promotes solidarity and active participation, inside and outside the classrooms, regardless of abilities.

Furthermore, the principles of egalitarian dialogue and equality of differences, promoted through the SEAs, have laid the foundation for children in vulnerable situations, like migratory and refugee backgrounds and learning difficulties, and their families to take a leading role, share their ideas and opinions, and improve academically.

The following section covers that which has worked well and have shaped the results of the project.

5. Lessons learned and best practices

As mentioned above, one thing that should not be overlooked is that the common thread running through the project is the dialogic process of co-creation. This entails not a common consultation of decisions to the beneficiaries but a real involvement of the community in the decision making in every phase of the project. This in turn has implied adjusting the actions foreseen in the project according to the needs and possibilities of each pilot project.

In this way, the REFUGE-ED dialogic process of co-creation is the first key aspect that has laid the groundwork for breakthrough ideas to flourish and produce a social impact among its beneficiaries, ultimately contributing to a current societal challenge: the inclusion of migrant and refugee children in Europe. On this basis, through an analysis of the actions implemented during the project as well as by taking stock of the results and critical issues, key actions have been identified that give rise to the shaping of lessons learned. Once the lessons learned from the

analysis have been identified, best practices are established as recommendations that will serve to reinforce the work carried out and for its replicability in other contexts. The most relevant ones at each stage are mentioned below:

5.1. Co-creation process

Context matters without hindering the core elements of SEAs and MHPSS. Due to the fact that each context is different, adaptations had to be made throughout the process. In this sense, the identification of needs through a dialogic process of co-creation, with the participation of the community, has been the key starting point to know how best to approach each stage of the project in each of the pilots. An important challenge that needs to be mentioned here is how to adapt to the context without changing the key elements of the SEAs and the MHPSS approaches. In both cases, while a set of aspects can be changed and adapted to the contexts, other crucial aspects might lead not to obtain the same good results as expected. An example very often found is the discussion around the choice of reading classical books in the Dialogic Literary Gatherings (DLG), if a centre chooses otherwise, it will not be a DLG and not obtaining the same results. However, how pilot sites organize the preparation of the DLG whether all together in class or after school program or as individual assignment or whether they organize it once a week or once a month, or as part of their language class or as an optional one would not alter the expected outcomes. It is important to mention that some Greek centres dropped out, due to the mobility of the refugee/migrant population caused by government decisions and policy changes, as they lacked a refugee/migrant population, leading to the Greek partner look for alternates.

Meaningful participation of the community in Decision Making. Related to the above, the involvement of the wider community and stakeholders led to more positive and effective outcomes, as in many cases they showed an increasing interest in participating in the activities and greater eagerness to come together as a team. In addition, through the dialogic co-creation process, the mobilisation of the schools' administration was achieved; in some cases, teachers and educators were motivated to also participate as volunteers in the project's activities. At this point it is also important to mention that some educators ask for a comprehensive guide and a schematic picture of the pilots' involvement at the beginning of the project, for them to have a more concrete idea on when and where they should put more effort.

Egalitarian dialogue in order to build trust and interest among all participants. Each of the points mentioned in this section resembles links in a chain. That is, they are interconnected, they are a result of the previous one. Knowing the needs through the main actors' contributions and bringing the scientific evidence of what works in education and MHPSS in each pilot project has been key in this process as they were both considered in equal footing. Thus, the egalitarian dialogue also

involved the inclusion of the community in the decision-making process which has cemented a relationship of trust, commitment and interest between the beneficiaries, the researchers and all the people involved in the project, which in turn has allowed the project to run smoothly. Without egalitarian dialogue, the trust and interest, the expected impact would not have been achieved. To sum-up, the continuous dialogue between science and society has been at the core of all the activities developed under REFUGE-ED.

Co-creative selection of practices. The selection of effective practices has been done collectively. Thus, through discussion between the parties, agreement has been reached on which of the selected practices (SEAs and MHPSS approaches) can best achieve the objectives. In the case of Ireland, the dotmocracy method was a useful way of involving the whole school community in selecting which of the priorities identified in the needs analysis should be addressed first. Members of the school community at all levels participated at a high level in this activity.

Setting up Communities of Practice and Learning (Co&PL). In each pilot site, a group of members of the educational community involved in the implementation of the practices was formed. This aspect has been key at each stage of the project. From the identification of needs to the construction of the Brokering Knowledge Platform. At this point, it is necessary to highlight that although the CoP&L were built in each pilot, in more advanced stages of the project spaces were opened so that they could be connected locally with other centres and, later, their transmutation towards a transnational network through the platform. In this way, the exchange and collective construction of knowledge is promoted at the same time as support networks are created, which might guarantee the sustainability of the actions once the project ends among those who have received the training and have implemented the actions.

Crossing the language barrier. During the process, especially in the need analysis, language was one barrier to overcome in order to promote participation of the community. The situation varied across pilots while informal translation networks were in place, in others no resources were available for translation making it challenging to include all parents and children during the co-creation process. For instance, in Ireland, site staff struggled in identifying needs of children who did not primarily speak English. Other experiences of implementing SEAs in similar contexts have shown that having people from the community who also speak the host language can help to improve communication. In some cases, the people of the community (mothers, fathers, members of nearby organisations etc.) can serve as a language bridge. Another recommendation for future projects would be suggest exploring translation options further with communities to better understand their translation needs and conduct an analysis of the available resources to see in which ways these needs can be better fulfilled. This could increase stakeholder engagement and help build trust and rapport between stakeholders and the research team.

Anyone can contribute to co-creation. Co-creation process implicates the involvement of all stakeholders along the project. It is not only a key requirement for all EU projects but also a step forward in the democratization of scientific research. This means that everyone can contribute to the collective construction of knowledge. Hence, the REFUGE-ED project is embedded in a community framework, and all the practices proposed for the pilot sites have involved community participation, using the communicative methodology to break down hierarchical interpretation gaps.

Training adjusted to every pilot site circumstances. In line with the dialogic co-creation process, the participatory aspect was further enhanced throughout the trainings, in the context of which the ways in which the trainings were arranged in each country and in each pilot. The flexibility offered by the combination of online and onsite trainings facilitated this process. Thus, trainings were also provided online and offline or they were delivered by specialists beyond the consortium. This was the case of Bulgaria where MHPSS was delivered by the OIM which was the responsible of one of the pilots' sites of the project.

Frequent and systematic follow-up meetings and visits. Formal and informal communication and coordination with the pilot sites' communities throughout the whole implementation period permitted the constant adaptation to each pilot needs and the creation of a path of action fitting the local context. In this way, teachers and educators felt very stimulated and encouraged, not only because they learned new effective practices for the inclusion of migrant children, but above all because it allowed them to update and get in touch with other peers and feel more part of a learning community.

Experiential training. It led to better understanding of the practices, along with the provision of additional material and resources upon the completion of the training. This type of training allows teachers and educators to observe how effective practices should be implemented but ultimately to observe the improvement of the school environment and how children's attitudes towards learning enhanced. For instance, in the case of Italy and Ireland, online training sessions were arranged in order to receive training of experienced educators in implementing SEAs. Similarly, in Spain, it has been also very important the arrangement of visits to schools that have a long experience in implementing SEAs for the professionals and unaccompanied minors of the pilot sites to see how they look like in practice.

Language-inclusive training. The training sessions were inclusive, allowing participants to express themselves in their preferred language, thanks to simultaneous or sequential translation, sometimes considering for two rounds. For instance, in the trainings delivered in Sweden on many occasions participants were speaking in Arabic being first translated into Swedish and then to English. In the case of Italy, part of the training was delivered into Spanish and translated into

Italian. Although it was a time-consuming effort, the translated presentation slides, exercise materials and evaluations exemplified the unwavering commitment to inclusiveness and were highly valued by the participants.

The need to provide training on MHPSS. Most educators and teachers have expressed the need for training in mental health aspects and the improvement of coexistence, especially when dealing with children of migrant backgrounds and socially diverse centres. In this sense, the effective practices in education and mental health that the project has made available have served to fill the gap identified in the centres.

Timing is fundamental. In the case of schools, conducting trainings (SEAs and MHPSS) at the beginning of the school year allows teachers and educators more time to organise the implementation and include the practices smoothly in their curriculum. Because the training of MHPSS took place later than the SEAs one, some teachers and educators had changed their placement, and they could not take part in the MHPSS training. In addition, while in some cases, members of the pilots expressed the training sessions were scheduled at inconvenient hours, extending long into weekends, others were grateful for having organized beyond their work. In the case of Sweden, both trainings MHPSS and SEAs were organized in a full agenda over the weekend, and participants were enthusiastic. In other cases, like Bulgaria, trainings were also organized in a concentrated way during two full days. Also, the abundance of training information presented in a condense format made more challenging for participants to retain crucial details, in these cases, it was positive the combination of presentations with debates among the participants and practical sessions.

Beyond evidence-based practices into those with evidence of social impact. Addressing the training, showing the uniqueness of the practices as well as their added value, allows the educational community to distinguish this initiative from other existing methods in schools. Being this, the main added value of the REFUGE-ED project that differentiates it from other initiatives.

High quality training. The SEAs and MHPSS trainings were led by highly skilled experts in the field who struck a commendable balance between theoretical concepts and hands-on experiential learning. At the same time, the training sessions were structured in a way that is easy and clear to follow, accompanied by reinforcement resources.

Follow-up training sessions. Ad hoc online sessions were organised to support the pilots in the SEAs and MHPSS. Teachers and educators reported that they were helped to reinforce the knowledge acquired in the initial training, although the pilots expressed the need for more training support during implementation. Some of them requested more personalised training and more practical support and examples of how to use effective practices in the classroom. In the case of schools,

teachers expressed the need for concrete examples of how SEAs can be used within the curriculum. For UM centres and refugee camps, educators expressed the need for more concrete examples of how to implement the practices in a context with so much turnover of children.

Training open to the whole community. An essential component of Successful Educational Actions is the involvement of the community in the teaching-learning process as well as in decision-making. In this sense, training is not only promoted and delivered to school staff and students but is also open to the community. In Spain, most of the pilot centres have implemented various actions in the framework of Family Learning (one of the SEAs). This has proven to have a positive impact on community empowerment and capacity building, as well as a better relationship between families and the school.

Continuous training. Apart from initial training, it has been essential to promote continuous training with teachers and educators. At this point, one of the Successful Educational Actions focuses precisely on engaging teachers and educators in comprehensive professional development based on scientific evidence under the principles of dialogical learning. Thus, the Dialogic training for teachers consist of collective reading and discussing meetings where participants build collective knowledge to transform their practice in education. This SEA has demonstrated its contribution to a reflective collaborative process. Its results, published in multiple indexed journals, confirm its positive impact not only on continuous teacher training but also, as a result, on the improvement of student learning and coexistence in the school. For this reason, it is part of the European toolkit for schools as one of the key actions for the improvement of the teaching-learning process in schools.¹ Moreover, the systematic and frequent implementation of this action has proven to have a positive effect on the sustainability of the other SEAs.

A growing Community of Practice and Learning (CoP&L). A number of bottom-up networks and resources have been created to provide support and guidance to new schools, encouraging them to implement the practices. This has undoubtedly allowed the implementation of the practices to take place in a more fluid process, where the community is empowered and connected to each other. Some of these are mentioned below:

- **SEAs:** Learning Communities in Latin America, Association for evidence-based education in Asturias, Euskadi, Valencia, Madrid, Cantabria to mentioned a few. In addition, the permanent support of the CREA research group. Today, these networks and others have ensured the sustainability of the implementation of SEAs in countless centres worldwide. More than 15,000 centres implement one or more SEAs worldwide.

¹ For more information visit:

<https://www.schooleducationgateway.eu/en/pub/resources/toolkitsforschools/detail.cfm?n=5864>

- **MHPSS:** The Resource Library of the PS Centre and the resources section of the MHPSS Collaborative bring together a wide range of materials and resources for those centres or individuals interested in implementing MHPSS practices. Besides, there is also a platform The Mental Health & Psychosocial Support Network, for connecting people, organisations, and even other networks, through which materials can be shared.

5.2. Implementation

Addressing educational and mental health needs at once. Through effective practices (SEAs and MHPSS) safe spaces were created in which children's psychosocial needs were addressed. Many of the discussions and themes emerged from reading and reflection at the Dialogic Gatherings (one of the SEAs). Although, as explained in the previous section, the training of the SEAs and MHPSS did not occur at the same time, it is necessary to make clear that the SEAs have demonstrated their contribution not only in the instrumental dimension of improved learning and academic performance, but also in the development of safe spaces where children feel confident to share their stories, in the reduction of conflicts in the centre, by promoting pro-social behaviours. Thus, the inclusion of the MHPSS approaches is totally aligned with the main features of the SEAs in terms of involving the all the community members. In this way, the results are the product of addressing education hand in hand with children's mental health.

Implementation tailored to the needs and realities of each pilot. As explained in the co-creation process as well as in the training, adaptations were done during the implementation phase. For instance, in the reception centres for unaccompanied minors where there is a high turnover, educators tend to prioritise literacy and language learning over educational development in other disciplines. Children are constantly moving in and out of the centre, which makes it difficult to implement a practice to address long-term educational needs. On this point, while in a school, students can read an entire book during the school year, working with articles or shorter classic stories in UM centres and refugee camps has been a good practice that has allowed the involvement of the children even though they have not participated in the project from the beginning.

Language and communication challenges. As in the case of the training phase, the language barrier added further complexity to implementation. However, although in some schools this gap made it difficult for children to fully collaborate with each other, in most cases, effective practices such as Dialogic Gatherings fostered language learning as well as the development of an inclusive environment where children help each other. The project results reveal how during the Interactive Groups and Dialogue Gatherings (SEAs) the host pupils help and encourage their peers who have difficulties with the language, also contributing to a good learning environment.

Turning difficulties into possibilities. Challenges in non-formal and informal settings. Despite the high turnover of children, as explained above, non-formal and informal settings (UMA centres and refugee camps) found it difficult to recruit volunteers. Unlike schools, where most volunteers are parents and family of children, in these settings' parental involvement is limited and, in some cases, non-existent. In this case, the participation of members of associations surrounding the centres, as well as administrative staff of the centres, was promoted. The vast experience of implementing SEAs and appealing to one of their principles (cultural intelligence) has shown that community participation, extended to everyone surrounding the centre, is useful and valuable. In many centres where SEAs are implemented, the volunteers are university students in need of internships, retired people, exchange students, etc.

5.3. Evaluation

High quality evaluation process. REFUGE-ED capitalised on the social impacts of prior EU research in the field of MHPSS and education, using the Supportive Process for the Inclusion of Children's Experience (SPICE) under the framework of the communicative methodology of research, as part of the dialogic co-creation process. It included diverse and complementary data collection methods, both qualitative and quantitative, which gave a more comprehensive understandings of the project's outcomes.

Research Ethics. In order to protect the dignity, rights and welfare of research participants, all the activities under the project have been carried out in compliance with ethical principles (including the highest standards of research integrity) and applicable international, EU and national law. The research has been reviewed by an ethics committee to ensure that the appropriate ethical standards are being upheld. Special attention has been paid regarding the participation of children and youth in the project.

Challenges in data collection. Overtime, sample dispersion is inevitable due to natural life transitions participants experience, such as moved to another centre, city, or country, thus, one of the main challenges of the evaluation process concerned the follow-up of participants over time. Many of the beneficiaries who participated in the baseline did not participate in the mid-term and final evaluation. In this vein, try to delimit the sample in such a way as to limit dispersion over time, could be recommended for future projects.

Effective research instruments. The tools comprised psychometric and sociometric elements that corresponding to SEAs and MHPSS actions. At the same time, the focus groups and interviews were adapted to each target group. For example, in the case of children, pictures were used to better explain the researched notions. However, some educators stated that the questionnaires were too long and that the children could not fill them in on their own.

Time allocation and Language. Along with the design of the instruments, adequate time allocation for end-users has been essential. Language barriers have been addressed using translators for effective communication. However, all the tools used were translated into local languages before being distributed.

Timetable consensual with the community: In Greece, some schools reported that the evaluation was carried out when they were unable to organise it, which led to difficulties in collecting the planned questionnaires and made it difficult for professionals, children and parents to complete them. In this sense, it is important to work on the development of a consensual timetable with the community in order to avoid this type of difficulty.

Rounds of evaluation. The evaluation process was made by identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the implementation and focused on new solutions so another phase of implementation and training could be done to incorporate the lessons learned.

5.4. Dissemination

Multiple channels of dissemination. The project and its practices were disseminated through official channels such as the website² and social media³; but also, they were introduced in some centre's newspapers, blogs, and websites. On the other hand, project's progress and outcomes have been disseminated through several events (congresses, seminars, webinars, roundtables, etc.).

The potential of social networks. Social media channels and the Brokering Knowledge Platform appear as a solid opportunity to connect educational staff from different countries who would exchange ideas and material, following the opportunity to explore the current mode of implementation of SEA and MHPSS through the provision of the Training Curriculum. However, space where opportunities to connect teachers from the partner countries should have been settled at early stages of the project given that the co-creation process among communities was a vital part of the project.

Ensuring that the results are clear to all. While the evaluation provides feedback from end-users and has a positive impact, it has been essential to return the project results to the community in all pilot sites in a clear way.

² <https://www.refuge-ed.eu/>

³**Facebook:**

https://www.facebook.com/refuge.ed.project/?paipv=0&eav=AfZ3e5L_GKMifOaWmg-JGptne3354W33U65othwawvAZBEyJwU3WzWrXZ-KcKB3WYU0&_rdr,

X (twitter):

https://twitter.com/ed_refuge?ref_src=twsrc%5Egoogle%7Ctwcamp%5Eserp%7Ctwgr%5Eauthor

Brokering Knowledge Platform. The ultimate goal of the project is to put all the co-created knowledge on a platform that opens up SEAs and MHPSS resources and tools to pilots who want to strengthen their training or explore new practices, as well as to every teacher, educator or school looking for answers on how to properly integrate migrant and refugee children in diverse settings. In this way, the sustainability and scalability of the project is strengthened over time. In the same vein, the platform offers the possibility to interact with peers for the exchange of valuable material and experiences, continuing the process of co-creation of knowledge.

6. References

- De Botton, L., Girbes, S., Ruiz, L., & Tellado, I. (2014). Moroccan mothers' involvement in dialogic literary gatherings in a Catalan urban primary school: Increasing educative interactions and improving learning. *Improving Schools*, 17(3), 241-249. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1365480214556420>
- Díez-Palomar, J., & Cabré, J. (2015). Using dialogic talk to teach mathematics: the case of interactive groups. *ZDM Mathematics Education*, 47(7), 1299-1312. doi: 10.1007/s11858-015-0728-x
- Diez, J., Gatt, S., & Racionero, S. (2011). Placing Immigrant and Minority Family and Community Members at the School's Centre: the role of community participation. *European Journal of Education*, 46(2), 184-196. doi: 10.1111/j.1465-3435.2011.01474.x.
- Duque, E., Carbonell, S., de Botton, L. & Roca-Campos, E. (2021) Creating Learning Environments Free of Violence in Special Education Through the Dialogic Model of Prevention and Resolution of Conflicts. *Frontiers Psychology* 12:662831. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.662831>
- Flecha, R. (Ed). (2015) *Successful Educational Actions for Inclusion and Social Cohesion in Europe*. Springer briefs in education. INCLUD-ED Consortium. Berlín. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11176-6>
- Khalfaoui, A., García-Carrión, R., Villardón-Gallego, L., & Duque, E. (2020). Help and solidarity interactions in interactive groups: a case study with Roma and immigrant preschoolers. *Social Sciences*, 9(7), 116.
- REFUGE-ED Consortium. (2022). *Selected actions to address the integration challenges of migrant children*.
- REFUGE-ED Consortium. (2023). *Final Activity Report*.

Annex 1: Fieldwork in detail

The fieldwork in each of the centres throughout the project is described below.

A) Schools

Country	Pilot site	Evaluation method	Date	Topic/subject	No. of Participants
Spain	CEIP Sant Vicent Ferrer, Primary School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	26
		SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	38
		Midline evaluation focus group	23/02/2023	Project evaluation	5-10 participants
		Open assembly & wrap-up meeting	05/06/2023	Project evaluation	32 in the open assembly (families, students, teachers) and 15 teachers in the wrap-up meeting
	IPI Karmengo Ama, Primary & High School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	23
		SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	49
		Midline evaluation focus group	31/01/2023	Project evaluation	5-10 Teachers, students, families
		Wrap-up meeting	06/06/2023	Project evaluation	15
	CEIP República de Venezuela, Early childhood & primary education school	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	28
		SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	47
		Midline evaluation focus group	08/02/2023	Project evaluation	5-10 participants
		Open assembly	08/06/2023	Project evaluation	28
	CEIP Bernat Calvó, Primary School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	15
		SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	18
		To be scheduled			
	CEIP Aranbizkarra, Primary School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	13
		SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	34
		Midline evaluation focus group	06/02/2023	Project evaluation	5-10 Teachers, students, families
		Wrap-up meeting	05/06/2023	Project evaluation	7
	Eibar BHI	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	22
		To be scheduled			
	IES Alfonso II, High School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	24
		SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	66
		Midline evaluation focus group	16/02/2023	Project evaluation	5-10 Teachers, students, families
		Interviews	Jun-Jul 2023	Project evaluation	22 (students, teachers, volunteers)
	IES Veles e Vents, High School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	28
		Interviews with refugee minors	26/05/2023	Project evaluation	minors
		Open assembly	26/05/2023	Project evaluation	10 (students, teachers, parents)
CEIP Martina García, Early childhood and primary education school	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	18	
	SEAs Baseline evaluation	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	95	
	Midline evaluation focus group	31/01/2023	Project evaluation	5-10 Teachers, students, families	
	Open assembly	07/06/2023	Project evaluation	40	

Greece	2nd Primary School Redi	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	17	
	1st Primary School Karditsa	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	14	
	4th High School Karditsa	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	12	
	ANKA	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	14	
	2nd Elementary School of Pylaia	Interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	5	
	METADRASI	Interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	6	
	52 nd elementary school of Athens	Focus groups, daily life interviews, interviews		05/2022	Need analysis	14
		SEAs Baseline evaluation		Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	14
		SEAs Endline evaluation		Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	24
	21 st primary school of Athens	Interviews		05/2022	Need analysis	12
		SEAs Baseline evaluation		Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	24
		Midline evaluation Interview		13/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices and preliminary results	1
		SEAs Endline evaluation		Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	12
	2 nd elementary school of Agios Ioannis Rentis (Attika Region)	SEAs Baseline evaluation		Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	13
		Midline evaluation Interview		13/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices and preliminary results	1
		SEAs Endline evaluation		Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	24
	9 th elementary school of Piraeus	SEAs Baseline evaluation		Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	19
		Midline evaluation Focus Group		14/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices and preliminary results	2
		SEAs Endline evaluation		Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	19
	6 th intercultural elementary school of Kordelio	Interviews		05/2022	Need analysis	5
		SEAs Baseline evaluation		Jan 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	49
SEAs Endline evaluation			Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	47	
	Interviews		05/2022	Need analysis	8	

	13 th elementary school of Abelokipi	SEAs Baseline evaluation	Jan-Feb 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	15
		Midline evaluation Focus Group	13/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices and preliminary results	3
		SEAs Endline evaluation	Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	14
	1 st Lyceum of Markopoulo (Attika Region), Greece	SEAs Baseline evaluation	Mar-Apr 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	53
		SEAs Endline evaluation	Jun 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	53
	9 th elementary school of Piraeus & 2 nd elementary school of Agios Ioannis Rentis (Attika Region), Greece	Open Assembly	13/06/23	SEA & MHPSS Implementation Evaluation	50+
	Pilot sites and cooperating organisations of Attika region, Greece	Open Assembly	23/06/23	SEA Implementation Evaluation	20
Pilot sites of Thessaloniki region, Greece	Teleconference to report results of open assembly conducted at pilot sites' communities	27/06/23	SEA Implementation Evaluation	40+	
Stakeholders	Focus groups	05/2022	Need analysis	18	
Bulgaria	74 th School "Gotse Delchev" - Elementary and High School	Interviews	05/22	Need analysis	10
		Focus Group	13/02/23	Experience with the project & recommendations	5
		Paper evaluation forms - baseline	18-23/02/2023	Baseline evaluation for SEAs	79
		Paper evaluation forms - endline	20-24/06/2023	Endline evaluation for SEAs	40
	15 th School "Adam Mitskevich" - Elementary and High School	Focus Group, interviews	/05/2022	Need analysis	7
		Focus Group	10/02/2023	Experience with the project and recommendations	7
		Paper evaluation forms - baseline	21/12/22-10/02/2023	Baseline evaluation for SEAs	49
		Paper evaluation forms - endline	12-28/06/2023	Endline evaluation for SEAs	Around 50
	66 th School "Filip Stanislavov" - Elementary and High School	Focus Group, interviews	05/2023	Need analysis	7
		Focus Group	15/02/2023	Experience with the project and recommendations	4
		Paper evaluations forms - baseline	18-23/02/2023	Baseline evaluation for SEAs	55
		Paper evaluation forms - endline	20 - 29/06/2023	Endline evaluation for SEAs	Approx. 20
	74 th School "Gotse Delchev", 15 th School "Adam Mitskevitch", 66 th	Open assembly	19/06/2023	Overall evaluation of the implementation of SEA and MHPSS practices	Over 40

	School "Filip Stanislavov", other stakeholders, Bulgaria				
Italy	1 st Grade Secondary School "A. Volta", Italy	Focus group, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	22
		Focus group	13/02/2023	Mid-term feedback on the first period of implementation	5
		Wrap up meeting	13/06/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	5
	Primary School "Acate Centrale and Addario ", Acate (RG)	Focus Group, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	13
		Focus Group	17/02/2023	Mid-term feedback on the first period of implementation	7
		Open Assembly	05/06/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	79
	Istituto Comprensivo Vittoria Colonna, Italy	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	20
		Wrap-up meeting	18/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	24
	1 st Grade Secondary School "Silvio Boccone" - Palermo	Focus group, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	19
		Wrap-up meeting	5/06/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	19
	Primary School "E. De Amicis" - Palermo+	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	16
		Wrap-up meeting	31/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	4
	Primary School "La Masa" - Palermo	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	12
		Wrap-up meeting	22/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	2
		Open Assembly	25/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	76
	1 st Grade Secondary School "Archimede" - Palermo	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	14
		Focus group	10/02/2023	Mid-term feedback on the first period of implementation	4
		Open Assembly	25/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	23
	Primary School "Federico II" & ICSS Ferrara, Italy	Focus group	13/02/2023	Mid-term feedback on the first period of implementation	5
	Primary School "Federico II", Italy	+ 1 st grade secondary school, focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	15
Wrap-up meeting		23/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	3	

	IISS Francesco Ferrara, Italy	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	27
		Wrap-up meeting	24/05/2023; 31/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	14
	IISS Pietro Piazza, Italy	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	23
		Wrap-up meeting	25/05/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	13
		Open Assembly	01/06/2023	Final feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	38
	Ireland	St. Joseph's Christian Brothers' School	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis
Baseline REFUGE-ED Questionnaire			May-Jun 2022 & Dec 2022-Jan 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	46
Midline Focus Group Discussions- staff			09/02/23-15/02/23	Reflection on the REFUGE-ED process	5
Midline REFUGE-ED Questionnaire			March 2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	33
MHPSS Pre-Training Evaluation			14/03/2023	Knowledge and confidence in MHPSS skills	4
MHPSS Post-Training Evaluation			15/03/2023	Knowledge and confidence in MHPSS skills	1
MHPSS Weekly Monitoring Survey			01/04/23-30/06/23	Use of MHPSS training	0
Endline REFUGE-ED Questionnaire			17/04/23- 19/06/23	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	33
Endline Focus Group Discussions- staff			09/06/23 19/06/23	Perceived effects of SEAs, strengths of project, challenges or project, considerations for future implementation	6
Endline Focus Group Discussions- students			13/06/23 19/06/23	Perceived effects of SEAs, strengths and challenges of the project, considerations for future implementation	8
Endline Focus Group Discussions- parents			26/06/23	Understanding of project strengths and challenges of the project, considerations for future research	4
Sweden	Möln dal/Åby	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	23
		SEAs pre-training evaluation questionnaires	15-16/10/2022	Teacher's knowledge of SEAs	34
		SEAs post-training evaluation questionnaires	15-16/10/2022	Newly acquired knowledge	2
		MHPSS pre-training evaluation questionnaires	11-12/03/2023	Assessment of teacher's knowledge of MHPSS	7
		MHPSS post-training evaluation questionnaires	11-12/03/2023	Assessment of the newly acquired knowledge	0

		Baseline evaluation children	11/12/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	9
		Baseline evaluation children	05/02/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	3
		Endline evaluation children	28/05/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	12
		Focus group discussion	18/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices' implementation	2
		Wrap-up meeting	27/05/2023	Evaluation of the practices' implementation	10
		Showing video about evaluation	07/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices' implementation	25
		Baseline evaluation parents	11/12/2022	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	7
		Baseline evaluation parents	24/02/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	1
		Baseline evaluation parents	25/02/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	1
		Baseline evaluation parents	05/08/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	1
	Vänersborg Intercultural Centre	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	24
		Baseline evaluation children	27/01/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	4
		Baseline evaluation children	02/02/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	3
		Baseline evaluation children	03/02/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	3
		Endline evaluation children	08/06/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	7
		Endline evaluation children	09/06/2023	Well-being, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	8
		Focus Group Discussion	02/02/2023	Evaluation of the practices' implementation	7
		Wrap-up meeting	02/06/2023	Evaluation of the practices' implementation	6

B) Institutional care centres

Country	Pilot site	Evaluation method	Date	Topic/subject	No. of Participants
Spain	CEPAIM, Spain	Baseline questionnaires	Dec 2022-Feb 2023	Pre-assessment	20
Italy	Casa di Giuseppe, Italy	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	18
		Wrap-up meeting	7/06/2023	Feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	18
	Comunità Arcobaleno - "GAP Senegal - GAP Gambia" (cooperativa LiberaMente), Italy	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	15
		Wrap-up meeting	30/05/2023	Feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	7
	CPIA Palermo 1, Italy	Focus Group, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	34
		Focus Group	13/02/2023	Feedback on first period of implementation	5
		Wrap-up meeting	29/05/2023	Feedback and insights about SEAs implementation and the whole project	10

C) Hotspots/Reception Identification centres

Country	Pilot site	Evaluation method	Date	Topic/subject	No. of participants
Spain	Centre d'Emergència el Pla de Santa Maria	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	26
		Baseline questionnaires	December 2022	Assessment of prior knowledge	14
		Focus group	07/02/2023	Project's evaluation and BKP	5
		Interviews with minors	12/05/2023	Expectations of migrant minors	5
		Wrap-up meeting	13/06/2023	Project's evaluation	4 educators
	Centre Orió	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	25
		Baseline questionnaires	December 2022	Assessment of prior knowledge	3
		Wrap-up meeting	19/06/2023	Project's evaluation	2 educators
	Centre Sirius	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	24
		Baseline questionnaires	December 2022	Assessment of prior knowledge	7
Bulgaria	RRC Sofia - Ovcha Kupel, Bulgaria	Baseline evaluation questionnaire	09/02/2023	Assessment of prior knowledge	13
	RRC Sofia - Voenna Rampa, Bulgaria	Baseline evaluation questionnaire	09/02/2023	Assessment of prior knowledge	7
		Endline evaluation questionnaire	05/05/2023	Wellbeing, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	5
		End of implementation interview with team and participants	30/04/2023	Wellbeing, sense of belonging, social support, academic motivation	5



Sweden	Restad Gård Asylum Accommodation Centre	Focus groups, interviews	05/2022	Need analysis	24
		Focus Group	02/02/2023	Evaluation of the pilot implementation	7
		Wrap-Up meeting	02/06/2023	Evaluation of the pilot implementation	6

