
COORDINATING IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN GERMANY

MAINSTREAMING AT THE FEDERAL
AND LOCAL LEVELS



COORDINATING IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN GERMANY

MAINSTREAMING AT THE FEDERAL AND LOCAL LEVELS

By Petra Bendel

August 2014

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is particularly grateful for the assistance of Sabine Klotz and Christine Scharf in research and useful critiques. She would also like to thank all her interview partners in the different ministries and agencies at the federal and state levels as well as local administrations for their frankness and for providing useful material on 'best practices'.

This report, part of a research project supported by the Kingdom of the Netherlands, is one of four country reports on mainstreaming: Denmark, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. MPI Europe thanks key partners in this research project, Peter Scholten from Erasmus University and Ben Gidley from Compas, Oxford University.

© 2014 Migration Policy Institute Europe.
All Rights Reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission from MPI Europe. A full-text PDF of this document is available for free download from www.mpieurope.org.

Information for reproducing excerpts from this report can be found at www.migrationpolicy.org/about/copyright-policy. Inquiries can also be directed to communications@migrationpolicy.org.

Suggested citation: Bendel, Petra. 2014. *Coordinating immigrant integration in Germany: Mainstreaming at the federal and local levels*. Brussels: Migration Policy Institute Europe.



TABLE OF CONTENTS

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY** 1

- I. INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT OF IMMIGRATION AND INTEGRATION IN GERMANY** 2

- II. MAINSTREAMING: TO WHAT EXTENT AND HOW DELIBERATE?** 4
 - A. Cooperation across levels and actors* 5
 - B. Youth as a central focus* 9
 - C. Educational policy* 11
 - D. Employment policy* 17

- III. CONCLUSION: WHERE TO FROM HERE?** 20
 - A. Evaluation of integration policies for Germany’s youth* 20
 - B. Policy recommendations for the central government* 22

- WORKS CITED** 23

- ABOUT THE AUTHOR** 27

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study concentrates on the institutional and empirical framework and subsequent immigrant integration policies with a special focus on education and employment of young persons in Germany. It points out that Germany's integration policies have, for a long time, presented a puzzle of single measures at the different levels of its federal system. Although important steps for both vertical and horizontal coordination have been taken in the last decade, 'mainstreaming' (the practice of reaching people with a migration background through social programming and policies that also target the general population) is still not commonly used in German discourse and policy concepts, in contrast to other European countries.

Although criticised by nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) and some employees in public services, policies tailored to the needs of specific groups, such as young immigrants, still exist alongside those that target society as a whole or young people in general (sometimes simply out of economic necessity).

Integration policies in Germany face the problem of a highly complex political and administrative system and culture.

Reluctantly recognising that it had become a country of immigration, Germany developed integration policies as well as a welcoming culture for immigrants, and fostered diversity systematically only after 2005. A Federal Integration Programme coordinated by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge) was developed and a 'National Integration Plan' installed to pool, vertically coordinate, and monitor the multitude of formerly uncoordinated integration projects. A nationwide integration course was designed on the basis of the Dutch model emphasizing language learning. Different measures to meet the needs of young people were developed at *Länder* (state) and local levels. They focus on education, professional orientation, career counselling, prevention of early school leaving, or the participation of parents in the school system. With regard to labour, another key element fostered by the National Integration Plan, an important step for the integration of immigrants, was the 2012 *National Law to Improve the Assessment and Recognition of Vocational Education and Training Qualifications Acquired Abroad*, which is now being applied at the federal level, but still not regulated in the *Länder*.

These examples show that integration policies in Germany face the problem of a highly complex political and administrative system and culture. They still need more vertical coordination among the different levels of decision-making and implementation—federal government, *Länder* and local governments. At the same time, immigration policies have to be coordinated horizontally among the different governmental departments cross-cutting on integration and on youth—education, labour, demographics, economy, and urban development. Nongovernmental organisations, too, have traditionally played a key role in integration matters. This complex picture leaves room for uncertainty and often handicaps attempts to coordinate or even mainstream policies. Autonomy at *Länder* and local levels often still leads to fragmented integration policies, especially when combined with highly decentralised competences on education (purview of the *Länder*), making top-down coordination impossible.

Providing more transparency, improved and more coordinated statistical data, and increased political will for policy learning, this system could—and should—nevertheless be used as a 'learning laboratory' making use of a whole puzzle of measures at the different political levels that affect the general population.

I. INTRODUCTION: THE CONTEXT OF IMMIGRATION AND INTEGRATION IN GERMANY

To understand the origins of immigrant integration policies in the Federal Republic of Germany, it is useful to go back in time.¹ After World War II, Germany did not receive immigrants from colonies like many other European countries, but rather saw a massive immigration of displaced persons (*Vertriebene*) and repatriates. Right from the start, these Germans benefited from integration measures that were not offered to immigrants with non-German passports until 2005.

Most of those immigrants with non-German passports were the so-called guest workers who Germany had started to recruit as a consequence of its ‘economic miracle’. Between 1955 and 1973, an estimated 14 million workers from Italy and other Southern European countries, as well as from the former Yugoslavia and Turkey, had immigrated to Germany, mainly to enter the industrial and service sectors. As in the Netherlands, German politicians had the idea that guest workers would not stay but would instead return to their countries of origin; and most, in fact, did go back.²

In 1970 the central government formulated integration measures for the first time. The Basic Principles for the Integration of Foreign Employees (*Grundsätze zur Eingliederung ausländischer Arbeitnehmer*) were developed exclusively from a labour market perspective. From that time on, the federal government published reports on integration. Before the recruitment of foreign workers was stopped in 1973, government policy had a dual aim: to support integration measures, and to reduce the number of foreigners. The ending of recruitment created unintended consequences, however; immigrants settled in Germany, and family reunification followed. As a result ‘integration’ became a major topic, although state actors and civil society ascribed different meanings to it—political and administrative incorporation versus equal rights for German and foreign-born people alike.

In terms of integration measures, the 1980s might be called ‘the lost decade’.

To better coordinate integration measures, Chancellor Helmut Schmidt’s administration created the administrative office of a commissioner for foreigners (Ausländerbeauftragter) within the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, BMA) in 1978. The commissioner’s memorandum on the status quo of immigrant integration, published in 1979 (*Stand und Weiterentwicklung der Integration der ausländischen Arbeitnehmer und ihrer Familien in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland*), accepted the fact that Germany was a destination for immigrants, and demanded better integration measures, particularly for young immigrants, to improve their access to professional education and labour. Both BMA and the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Wissenschaft, BMBW) published recommendations for integration measures (though not as far-reaching as the Ausländerbeauftragte’s proposals, which were never accepted by the central government).

In terms of integration measures, the 1980s might be called ‘the lost decade’,³ although the necessity for integration measures became clearer among political circles. Programmes to support the labour market integration of young people also affected immigrants, most of whom had recently arrived in Germany via family reunification channels. The bulk of these courses involved intensive instruction in the German language and in information needed on the labour market. The ‘Measures for Social and Professional Integration’ (*Maßnahmen zur sozialen und beruflichen Eingliederung*), put in place in 1987, aimed at integration into labour. On the other hand, the government actively fostered return migration.

1 For a longer study see Petra Bendel, ‘Mainstreaming immigrant integration policy in Germany’ in *Experiences of mainstreaming immigrant integration in Europe: lessons for the Netherlands*, eds. Elizabeth Collett, Milica Petrovic, and Peter Scholten (Brussels: Migration Policy Institute Europe, 2014), 141-82; Karl-Heinz Meier-Braun, *Integration und Rückkehr?—Zur Ausländerpolitik des Bundes und der Länder, insbesondere Baden-Württembergs* (Main/München: Kaiser, 1988); Klaus Bade, ‘Politik in der Einwanderungssituation: Migration—Integration—Minderheiten’, in *Deutsche im Ausland—Fremde in Deutschland*, ed. Klaus Bade (München: C.H. Beck, 1993); Hans Mahnig, ‘Ist Deutschland wirklich anders? Die deutsche Integrationspolitik im europäischen Vergleich’, in *Deutschland—ein Einwanderungsland? Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen*, eds. Edda Currle and Tanja Wunderlich (Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius, 2001).

2 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Hintergrundinformationen Integration in Deutschland—Zahlen, Daten, Fakten, Zweiter Integrationsbericht* (Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, 2011).

3 Bade, ‘Politik in der Einwanderungssituation’.

In 1990, following German reunification, a new ‘aliens’ act established certain instruments relevant for integration: it laid down the principles of formal judicial equality and equal access to social security, and made integration measures more coordinated. In 2000, a new nationalisation act was passed.

In 2001, an Independent Commission on Immigration (Unabhängige Kommission Zuwanderung)—led by the former president of the German Bundestag, Rita Süssmuth—compiled a list of recommendations to improve integration, including better coordination among the various departments involved in integration processes across government levels.

But it has only been in the past 15 years that the integration of immigrants and their descendants⁴ has become an important issue. The result of a long political process, German law categorises immigrants according to their residence status and grants them the possibility of political and social participation, depending on their status. From 1998 on, a coalition of Social Democrats and the Green Party worked to effect a paradigm shift in immigration policy.⁵ Under their leadership, the government first recognised Germany as a long-time destination for immigrants—although many still regard the nation as a ‘reluctant’ host at best.⁶ Naturalisation law and integration regulations, as well as a nascent channel for high-skilled immigration, were introduced under this government. Other reforms, meanwhile, have not succeeded, such as an envisaged overhaul of the regulations on economic migration. In addition, German immigration law still contains no initiatives to promote ‘diversity’ or even ‘mainstreaming’, since immigrants are treated according to their residence status. Under the third Merkel government (since December 2013), however, a slow change of paradigms has been taking place, evidently linked to the recognition of demographic change and the subsequent shortage of skilled and highly skilled labour.

It has only been in the past 15 years that the integration of immigrants and their descendants has become an important issue.

A new immigration law (which came into force in 2005, and was amended in 2007) addresses integration using what may be called a two-track approach. The federal government offers so-called integration courses (including 600 hours of instruction in German as a foreign language, and a 30-hour introduction to German civilisation and culture) to immigrants, who must take an examination on the material covered. These courses rely on cooperation between the Federation and the states (*Länder*) and are monitored and evaluated by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge). They are a central element of federal integration policy; since 2005, the Federation has provided budgetary funds amounting to 1 billion euros; in 2011 it allocated 218 million euros for the integration courses, increasing the budget to 224 million euros in 2012. Since then, 780,000 immigrants have participated in these courses.⁷ The governing coalition that took office in 2009 committed itself to enhancing the importance of the integration courses, upgrading the contents and tailoring them to specific target groups, and expanding provision across the country. The federal government also finances ‘Migration Counseling for Adult Immigrants’ (Migrationsberatung für erwachsene Zuwanderer, MBE) and ‘Youth Migration Services’ (Jugendmigrationsdienste, JMD), as described below. Counselling is also partly organised at the *Länder* level. The Saarland, for instance, offers special integration counselling for immigrants to improve their opportunities on the job market.

Today, an estimated 15.6 million people ‘with an immigrant background’⁸ live in Germany. More than half of this population (8.6 million) are German citizens. People from Turkey (15.8 per cent) compose the largest group, followed by those from Poland (8.3 per cent), Russia (6.7 per cent), Italy (4.7 per cent), and Kazakhstan (4.6 per cent).⁹ Around two-thirds of people with an immigrant background have immigrated themselves (first generation), whereas one-third

4 The German Federal Statistical Office defines ‘persons with an immigrant background’ as all those persons who have immigrated after 1949 to the territory of the contemporary Federal Republic of Germany as well as all those aliens who have been born in Germany; it also includes those persons who have been born in Germany as German citizens and have at least one immigrant parent or one parent born in Germany with a foreign nationality. The author’s definition is that first-generation immigrants (or ‘persons with an immigrant background’) are all those who have immigrated themselves to Germany. Second-generation immigrants are all those persons who have been born in Germany with at least one parent born in a different country.

5 Andreas Ette, ‘Germany’s Immigration Policy, 2000-2002: Understanding Policy Change with a Political Process Approach’ (Working paper no. 3, Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development, Arbeitspapiere, Bremen, 2003), www.uni-bielefeld.de/tidrc/ag-comcad/downloads/workingpaper_3.pdf; Marion Schmid-Drüner, ‘Germany’s New Immigration Law: A Paradigm Shift?’ *European Journal of Migration and Law* 8 (2006): 191–214; Dieter Oberndörfer, ‘Zuwanderung nach Deutschland—eine Bilanz’ (Politische Essays zu Migration und Integration 2/2007, Rat für Migration, Osnabrück, 2007).

6 Triadafilos Triadafilopoulos and Karen Schönwälder, ‘How the Federal Republic Became an Immigration Country, Norms, Politics and the Failure of West Germany’s Guest Worker System’, *German Politics and Society* 24, no. 3 (2006): 1–19.

7 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland: Eine Kurzdarstellung* (Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, 2012), 77.

8 These are, according to the definition of the Statistisches Bundesamt 2010, all those people who immigrated themselves to Germany as well as those born in the country with at least one immigrant parent.

9 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*.

were born in Germany (second and third generations).¹⁰ Over the past decade, the number of immigrants to Germany declined, but it has begun to rise again during the last two years. In 2013, Germany experienced its highest level of immigration in 20 years, with approximately 1.2 million people moving to the country—a 13 per cent increase from 2012.¹¹

As noted by Wido Geis and Hans-Peter Klös, ‘Germany has (...) experienced difficulties in integrating those with migrant backgrounds into the labour market (...) Even if the skill level is the same, the labour force participation rate for immigrants is lower than it is for non-immigrants. Moreover, immigrant children, on average, reach a significantly lower level of educational attainment than children without a migrant background’.¹² Discourse on failed integration policies is now closely linked to that on remedying the effects of an aging population.

II. MAINSTREAMING: TO WHAT EXTENT AND HOW DELIBERATE?

The term ‘mainstreaming’, as used to describe elements of immigrant integration in other European countries, is not yet used in German immigration policy or discourse. The concept refers to an effort to reach people with a migration background through social programming and policies that also target the general population.

Instead Germans speak of ‘coordination’, ‘cooperation’, or ‘collaboration’ among the different levels of government (vertical cooperation) and across ministries (horizontal cooperation). Among nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) and some political parties, the German debate seems to be more inspired by the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (where the term ‘inclusion’ is used instead of ‘integration’) than it is by the debate on gender mainstreaming.

These terms are connected with two different debates involving diversity in the German economy.¹³ The first focuses on business benefits. For example, human resource departments discuss ‘diversity management’—an instrument that aims to make more use of the faculties and potential of an enterprise’s employees. ‘Diversity pays off’ and ‘immigration is worth it’ are slogans often heard in this context. A business initiative of German employers, the Diversity Charter, sees diversity ‘as an opportunity’ and aims to identify best practices in creating working environments without prejudice, characterised by participation and respect. This attention to diversity in public discourse stems from the U.S. human-rights movement and reflects practices implemented in transnational enterprises. The discussion on diversity management has also been extended to the German societal and political debate. Developing a welcoming culture for immigrants and fostering cultural diversity is now viewed as a means to gain foreign investment and qualified workers.

By contrast, a second debate about diversity and inclusion is drawn from a rights-based approach to immigrants. This perspective underlines the rights and faculties of individuals, and holds that individualisation and value change, socio-economic change, changes in demographics, as well as various waves of immigration have led to a layered and diverse German society. Individuals can no longer be distinguished by single attributes—such as immigration background—but rather show different characteristics and belong to different identities at the same time. This discourse differs widely from the long-standing one in Germany, which for decades had maintained that Germany was not a country of immigration.

It may be noted that some sociopolitical actors and parties prefer to talk about ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusion’ rather than use the term ‘integration’. This tendency indicates that there is a conceptual and ideological difference between policies directed to the whole population (as indicated by the terms ‘diversity’ and ‘inclusion’), in those contexts where other countries would speak of mainstreaming.

Several advocacy groups have criticised policies that target immigrants, saying that this strategy tends to regard immi-

10 Iris Hoßmann and Margret Karsch, *Deutschlands Integrationspolitik* (Berlin: Berlin-Institut für Bevölkerung und Entwicklung, 2011), www.berlin-institut.org/online-handbuchdemografie/bevoelkerungspolitik/deutschland/deutschlands-integrationspolitik.html.

11 Statistisches Bundesamt, ‘Migration’, accessed 16 June 2014, www.destatis.de/EN/FactsFigures/SocietyState/Population/Migration/Migration.html.

12 Wido Geis and Hans-Peter Klös, ‘Migration und Integration: Wo steht Deutschland?’ *Sozialer Fortschritt* 1, no. 2-13 (2013): 2f.

13 Petra Bendel and Roland Sturm, ‘Federal Republic of Germany’, in *Diversity and Unity in Federal Countries*, eds. César Colino and Luis Moreno (Toronto: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2010), 168–99.

grants through an ethnic lens and may, in effect, stigmatise the people it means to help. This opinion is shared by some employees in public services, yet both types of policies continue to exist: those directed toward specific groups and those directed toward society as a whole. Meanwhile, some municipalities (e.g. Berlin) mainstream immigrant policies simply out of economic necessity, arguing that they do not have the financial means to target immigrant groups specifically.

Integration courses and programmes tailored to the needs of special immigrant groups (such as youth, women, or young parents) persist. Others, meanwhile, target young people in difficult conditions in general (such as the initiative *Jugend Stärken*, or Encouraging Youth), and tailor just some components to the special needs of young immigrants. Other programmes—for example, those that aim to help young people with their transition from school to jobs or apprenticeships—may help youth regardless of background, even if those with an immigrant background form one of the largest groups of beneficiaries. These practices, relatively new in the German context, are, in effect, examples of mainstreaming even if they are not labelled as such in Germany.

A. Cooperation across levels and actors

With regard to coordination and cooperation, integration policies in Germany face at least two challenges: on the one hand, coordination in a federal system such as Germany's can only be realised vertically, at various levels of political decision-making and implementation (the federal government, governments of the 16 *Länder*, local governments); on the other hand, policies have to be managed and coordinated horizontally, across various governmental departments. Policies relevant to both integration and youth are cross-cutting—touching upon education, labour, demographics, the economy, and urban development.

Also in this mix are NGOs that work for charity (*Wohlfahrtsorganisationen*), which enjoy a special status in Germany.¹⁴ To compensate for the long-standing lack of state-level integration policies, not-for-profit civil-society organisations (CSOs) act at the local level, but also have federal representation at national and *Länder* levels. Huge service enterprises are active at almost all stages of political decision-making and implementation, with respect to nearly every integration issue. Together with business associations, trade associations, and chambers of commerce, they form the backbone of a very strong civil society that actively participates in integration matters at all political levels in Germany. This is a fact well known to German politicians, who therefore include civil society as a welcome partner in action plans and dialogue, and at the same time rely on NGOs to carry out many policies.

With regard to vertical coordination and coherence, there is no single German integration policy.¹⁵ Matters of nationality, freedom of movement, passports, immigration and emigration, and extradition are exclusive domains of the federal level; that means that the *Länder* cannot legislate in these areas. Laws that touch upon residence are concurrent, meaning that the *Länder* have the right to legislate whenever the federal government does not make use of its competence to legislate. This is relevant to, for instance, employment services and unemployment insurance (where the Federation has made broad use of its competences) and youth welfare (where the *Länder* still have room to manoeuvre). In areas where the federal level has neither the exclusive nor the concurrent right to legislate, only the *Länder* may pass bills. One example of their power is within the policy area of education—including professional schools, and, since the most recent federalism reform, universities.

This often-complex allocation of competences and at times unclear assignment of legislative jurisdiction handicap any attempts to mainstream, either top down or bottom up. Regulations to foster vocational education and training, for example, fall under the category of education—the exclusive competence of the *Länder*—but not the promotion of employment, public aid, and in-firm training, where the Federation uses its concurrent legislative rights. The Federation may regulate common standards for child care and language integration in day-care centres, but regulating the qualifications of teachers and pedagogical staff—with the aim to further integrate children in schools—lies within the competence of the *Länder*. The municipalities do not have legislative competence, *strictu sensu*, of their own, because they

14 These organisations typically support mostly disadvantaged groups of society within their own country through charity work for children, young people, seniors, families, immigrants, etc. They do social work; they carry out projects in health care, consulting, and education; and include, for instance, Arbeiterwohlfahrt, Deutscher Caritasverband, Deutscher Paritätischer Wohlfahrtsverband, Deutsches Rotes Kreuz, and Evangelisches Werk für Diakonie und Entwicklung. As integration policies were, for a long time, practically uncoordinated at the state level, these organisations have played and continue to play a key role in realising the integration of immigrants.

15 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System: Bund, Länder und die Rolle der Kommunen* (Essen: Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, Jahresgutachten 2012 mit Integrationsbarometer, 2012), 55ff.

form part of the administrative structure of the *Länder*, but they do have the right to set executive legal norms (for instance, on the use of public spaces). Also, the *Länder* are executors of the bills passed at the federal level regarding migration and integration.¹⁶ That means that not only do laws differ across the *Länder* but that the implementation of federal laws varies as well.

Despite these and other complexities in the German political and administrative structure, integration—and coordinating integration instruments and measures—has been regarded as a major task of the central government in the past decade. Chancellor Angela Merkel, who took office in 2005, immediately announced her intention to pursue a long-term, multilevel dialogue on integration. The *Immigration Act* names the Federation as an actor in its own right, not only as a coordinator of integration policies. In 2006, the federal government announced that integration was a cross-policy task at all political levels. With regard to substance, the Home Office or Federal Ministry of the Interior (Bundesministerium des Innern, BMI) has developed the ‘Federal Integration Programme’ (Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm),¹⁷ which is coordinated by the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, BAMF). Representatives of states, cities, and towns as well as integration commissioners from the federal, state, and municipal levels participate in programme development, as do religious communities, unions, employers’ associations, and welfare organisations. This integration programme includes four main fields of action: language education, integration into the labour market, general education, and social integration. Meetings with BAMF personnel aim at policy recommendations directed at all levels of governance.

1. Enhanced coordination through the ‘National Integration Plan’

Parting from what had been an uncoordinated puzzle of integration projects and programmes realised by various state and civil-society actors, a ‘National Integration Plan’ (*Nationaler Integrationsplan*) and subsequent National Action Plans are the most promising signs of progress made in the past several years. BAMF has coordinated project support programmes for the *Länder* and municipalities, in consultation with the *Länder*. The federal government has started several initiatives to pool the multitude of measures at different political and administrative levels, to develop comprehensive concepts and action plans, and to include nongovernmental actors. Rather than mainstreaming, the central concept in German integration policies is vertical coordination.

With the National Integration Plan—the result of the first integration summit in 2006—the Federation, the *Länder*, as well as cities and towns committed themselves explicitly and deliberately to an ‘activating and sustainable policy’. The plan aims to promote closer coordination and networking of policies across levels, establishing integration as a cross-cutting policy task, and demanding regular evaluation on the basis of specific indicators. At the same time, it defines integration as not only a task for the state but one that requires an active civil society and the concrete and sustainable commitment of all actors within the German state and society. The National Integration Plan has since evolved to become the ‘National Action Plan on Integration’ (Nationaler Aktionsplan Integration, NAP). In 2007, an overall integration concept was presented for the first time that included all the relevant political and administrative levels and all the important actors in integration policies (governmental or nongovernmental), setting out more than 400 measures and commitments that provided local and state officials with a federal framework for conducting immigrant integration programmes.¹⁸ Since 2008, their implementation has been monitored in ‘Progress Reports’ (*Fortschrittsberichte*) presented by both social and political actors and published by the federal government.¹⁹ Also, 11 ‘dialogues’ were created in 2010, concentrating on issues and the evaluation of integration measures for children, education, labour market access, immigrants within public service, health, communal integration, language and integration courses, sports, political participation, media, and culture.

It is no secret that the preparation of both the National Integration Plan and the NAP were, in part, difficult: the *Länder* play an important role in many policies, yet the development of the national plans was led by the Federation. Representing the concerns of the *Länder*, the Conference of Integration Ministers developed a common contribution to both the National Integration Plan and subsequent NAP.²⁰

With regard to horizontal cooperation on mainstreaming, the second *Handbook of the European Commission* (2007)

16 Wolfram Vogel, ‘Die Migration im Hintergrund: Strukturen der Integrationspolitik in Deutschland’, in *Migration und Integration in Europa*, ed. Frank Baasner (Baden-Baden: Nomos, 2010), 43–56.

17 Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, *Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm. Angebote der Integrationsförderung in Deutschland—Empfehlungen zu ihrer Weiterentwicklung* (Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, 2010).

18 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland; Elisabeth Musch, Integration durch Konsultation? Konsensbildung in der Migrations- und Integrationspolitik in Deutschland und den Niederlanden* (Münster: Waxmann, 2011), 229.

19 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*, 46–8.

20 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 67.

highlighted the report *Integrationsaktivitäten des Bundes: Bestandsaufnahme im Rahmen der Interministeriellen Arbeitsgruppe Integration, Kompendium mit Aktivitäten der verschiedenen Bundesministerien und –behörden*. The Interministerial Working Group on Migration and Integration (Interministerielle Arbeitsgruppe Migration und Integration, IMAG) is the main coordinating instrument of the various departments at the federal level. The compendium edited by this group, however, was terminated in 2009 and has still not been followed by another instrument. Meanwhile, ministers at all political levels continue to meet.

2. Integration efforts at the federal level

The main responsibility for integration policies in general lies with the Home Office (or Bundesministerium des Innern, BMI), with its federal agency, BAMF, in Nuremberg. Among its other tasks—including asylum, reception, and repatriation—BAMF fosters and coordinates the integration of immigrants into language, education, and social integration programmes. Since 2005, BAMF has been tasked with developing a federal integration programme, developing and executing integration courses for immigrants, fostering counselling for migrants, supporting projects for the social integration of immigrants with permanent legal status, and developing information for immigrants as well as for institutions offering integration courses.²¹ In order to foster integration projects and support recent immigrants, the Home Office may make use of both private and public services. However, BMI and BAMF do not have special competences in youth, education, or labour. This makes the integration of young people a shared, but often diffuse, policy competence.

Within the Home Office, the Federal Government Commissioner for Matters Related to Repatriates and National Minorities (Beauftragter für Aussiedlerfragen und Minderheiten) coordinates integration matters exclusively for ethnic Germans and acknowledged minorities.

Within the Federal Chancellery (Bundeskanzleramt), the Minister of State in the federal chancellery and federal government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees, and Integration (Staatsministerin für Integration im Bundeskanzleramt) acts as the main coordinating commissioner for integration. From 1978 to 2002, this department (formerly known as the Amt des Beauftragten der Bundesregierung für Ausländerfragen) belonged to the Federal Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales, BMAS); from 2002 to 2005, to the Ministry of Family; and since 2005, has formed part of the Chancellery. The tasks of the current incumbent, Maria Böhmer, are mainly communicative and informative.²² There is still ongoing discussion, headed by the commissioner herself, on creating a Ministry of Integration to further coordinate the federal government's efforts on integration.²³ In the meantime, she has installed an Advisory Board on Integration (Integrationsbeirat).²⁴

The legal separation of competences between the Home Office and the federal government Commissioner for Migration, Refugees, and Integration has been blurred in practice.²⁵ Böhmer initiated an evaluation of integration policies, especially integration courses, which prompted the creation of language courses tailored to the special needs of targeted immigrant groups, including youth (as well as immigrant women, women with children, and those with limited abilities to read and write) and an endorsement of workforce integration (successfully implemented in several communities) at the national level.

Apart from the Islamic Conference (Islamkonferenz), which concentrates on the special needs of Muslim communities, five integration summits in the Federal Chancellery (Bundeskanzleramt) have been organised since 2006. These bring together all executives responsible for integration policies alongside their partners from civil society. In comparison with the highly institutionalised (and older) structure of the Netherlands, the German integration summits foster more open, less formal dialogue.

Once a year, the federal integration commissioner also invites all integration commissioners at the state and municipal levels to the Federal Conference of Integration Commissioners (Bundeskonferenz der Integrationsbeauftragten, BuKo). In 2010 the focus was education and labour integration. The connection between the two topics is expressed

21 §§ 43-35 Aufenthaltsgesetz (Gesetz über den Aufenthalt, die Erwerbstätigkeit und die Integration von Ausländern im Bundesgebiet); in der Fassung der Bekanntmachung vom 25.02.2008 (BGBl. I S. 162) zuletzt geändert durch Gesetz vom 29 August 2013 m.W.v. 6 September 2013.

22 §§ 92-94 Aufenthaltsgesetz; Musch, *Integration durch Konsultation?*

23 Spiegel Online, 'Integrationsbeauftragte: Böhmer fordert eigenes Ministerium für Integration', 25 October 2010, www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integrationsbeauftragte-boehmer-fordert-eigenes-ministerium-fuer-integration-a-725055.html.

24 Ibid.

25 Musch, *Integration durch Konsultation?* 226.

in the 2011 conference statement ‘More enforcement and an educational offensive are necessary in order to give more persons with an immigrant background easier access to the labour market’.²⁶ Participants included Integration Commissioners of the Federal Employment Agency (Bundesagentur für Arbeit, BA) and representatives of business associations, chambers of commerce, and trade associations.

According to Article 50 of the German Constitution (Grundgesetz, GG), the *Länder* cooperate through the second chamber, the Bundesrat, both legislatively and administratively. Of the 16 standing committees of the Bundesrat that prepare legislation, none focus exclusively on integration. In 2012 the Conference of the Ministers (or Senators) responsible for integration at the state level demanded that the Committee for Labour and Social Policy within the Bundesrat should develop integration measures. This committee has asked that the *Bund* (that is, federal level), *Länder*, and municipality governments cooperate more closely on integration management as a whole and, in particular, integration courses and the recognition of professional skills gained outside Germany.²⁷

3. Immigrant integration by the *Länder* and municipalities

Each of the 16 *Länder* manages integration policy in its own way. This is in part because each has its own competence on integration matters and the execution of federal law. Also, immigrants are distributed unevenly throughout the *Länder*. Immigrants in the so-called five new *Länder* to the east (the former German Democratic Republic, GDR) compose small portions of the population: 2.6 per cent in Brandenburg, and as little as 1.9 per cent in Saxony-Anhalt (Berlin is an exception, at 13.9 per cent eastern and western part together). Labour recruitment from other countries was systematically avoided in the former GDR, where, before unification, there was no open debate about immigration. For these and other reasons—such as networking, living conditions, and family reunification—more immigrants are to be found in those *Länder* that are ‘city-states’ (such as Bremen, Hamburg, and Berlin) and in the West (the ex-Federal Republic of Germany). Of *Länder* that are not ‘city-states’, Baden-Württemberg is the most popular destination. Here, almost 50 per cent of immigrants come from just three countries: Turkey (296,000), Italy (166,000), and Serbia and Montenegro (105,000).

As on the national level, the *Länder* and federal levels have known consolidated coordination since 2007 through the Conference of the Ministers Responsible for Integration (Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister, Senatorinnen, und Senatoren der Länder, IntMK). Half of them bear the title of integration minister, whereas in most of the other federal states they work within BMA; in Thuringa the responsibility lies within the Home Office, in Bremen within the Senatskanzlei. During the conference, the Federation is represented by the Home Office and the commissioner for migration, refugees, and integration.²⁸ They have established their own integration monitoring of the *Länder*.²⁹ There are also agreements among the head of governments at the federal and *Länder* level, such as the ‘Qualification Initiative for Germany’ (*Qualifizierungsinitiative für Deutschland*, QID), as described below.

Each of the 16 Länder manages integration policy in its own way.

Also, most of the *Länder* (excluding Hamburg, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, and Saxony) have set up a post for an integration commissioner, who closely and regularly cooperates with the federal commissioner. These commissioners execute coordination at the vertical level and realise the integration plans at the federal level but do not have a uniform portfolio. Some of the *Länder* have upgraded the integration commissioner to a ministerial rank; for example, in Baden-Württemberg the integration minister is exclusively responsible for integration measures. While the actions in one state may influence another, there is still no common approach across Germany, let alone a bottom-up approach.

In 2010 the integration commissioners met twice a year, but as of 2011 they decided to meet once a year, always inviting the federal commissioner. On the other hand, the federal commissioner also invites the commissioners at the *Länder* level for talks with the Chancellery, thus establishing a system of two-way dialogue and networking.

26 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*, 64.

27 Beschlussniederschrift 7, ‘Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder’ (Überherrn, Saarbrücken, 21-22 March 2012).

28 For an overview of the responsible ministers/senators see Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*, 58–9.

29 Länderoffene Arbeitsgruppe, ‘Indikatorenentwicklung und Monitoring’ der Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Ländern (IntMK), *Zweiter Bericht zum Integrationsmonitoring der Länder 2011* (Sachsen: Länderoffene Arbeitsgruppe, 2013), www.tagesspiegel.de/downloads/7974450/1/integrationsmonitoring.

At the local level, several cities openly promoted multicultural concepts of integration in the 1980s. The terms ‘multi-’ or ‘intercultural’ were chosen to make clear that integration measures were directed at both immigrants and at the German host society, either by offering participation in district projects, or by providing protection against discrimination. That is, integration problems were regarded as problems of the community as a whole (as observed in Frankfurt). Following the federal example, Berlin was the first city to institutionalise ‘integration policies’ (in 1981).

Municipalities exchange information on integration management with their head organisations: the Deutscher Städtetag, Deutscher Landkreistag, and Deutscher Gemeindebund. Focussing on municipalities and identifying ten main topics, including education and labour market access, the *Länder* have published an own chapter in the NAP. They also exchange best practices through the ‘Quality Circle Integration’ (Kommunaler Qualitätszirkel zur Integrationspolitik) and the Municipal Association for Administration Management (Kommunale Gemeinschaftsstelle für Verwaltungsmanagement, KGSt). KGSt is coordinated by the City of Stuttgart and fosters integration as a cross-cutting policy; defined indicators measure municipal integration management.³⁰

In practice, however, the autonomy observed at the local level implies that integration policies are fragmented, not only across distinct demographic situations and administrative cultures but also key structural differences. Municipalities are poor and rich, industrialised and postindustrial, rural and urban. Some have low unemployment rates and some have high; in some the political climate is influenced by inclusive consensus and in others by factional confrontations.³¹ Several cities and towns were early to acknowledge the necessity of integration measures at a local level and developed their own integration plans—Stuttgart being the first to coordinate integration across the arenas of politics, administration, public agencies, economic organisations, and CSOs. Topics addressed there include education and language training, integration courses, culture and sports, health, religion, political participation, and security.³²

B. Youth as a central focus

Approximately one-fourth of the estimated 15.6 million people with an immigrant background in Germany are under age 25. In highly populated areas of the former Western *Länder* (the ex-Federal Republic), up to 40 per cent of children and adults are immigrants of the first, second, or third generation. Around 3.4 million youth with an immigrant

Box I. The case of North Rhine-Westphalia

An example of good coordination practices, the state of North Rhine-Westphalia fosters close cooperation at the *Land* and municipal levels through a programme called Innovation in der kommunalen Integrationsarbeit (KOMM-IN NRW), which is part of the *Land’s Aktionsplan Integration*. It not only gives financial support, but also offers direct implementation advice to cities and towns. Handbooks on integration and training courses for policymakers and administrators are part of the project, which was externally evaluated in 2009-10.

Focusing on youth, North Rhine-Westphalia established Regional Centres for Children and Adolescents from Immigrant Families (Regionale Arbeitsstellen zur Förderung von Kindern und Jugendlichen aus Zuwandererfamilien [RAA] in Nordrhein-Westfalen), now called Kommunale Integrationszentren. For 30 years, in 27 towns, there have been multicultural teams organised by the municipalities and supported by the *Land*. They aim to open opportunities for young people with an immigrant background in school and vocational training (and through the network ‘Integrating by Educating’, *Integration durch Bildung*). They work to counsel parents, children, and schools; initiate conflict management; and develop intercultural concepts, teaching materials, and training courses for teachers. They also advise and train other organisations, schools, and institutions in how to address diversity and how to adapt their mainstream services to an increasingly diverse population, thus bringing intercultural awareness into the mainstream.

Source: Ministerium für Arbeit, Integration und Soziales NRW, ‘Integration—Aktuelles’, www.mais.nrw.de; Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, *Integration als Chance für Nordrhein-Westfalen und seine Kommunen: Potenziale nutzen—aus Erfahrungen lernen* (Düsseldorf: Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2007); Ministerium für Generationen, Familien, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, *Evaluation Innovation in der kommunalen Integrationsarbeit—eine Förderung durch das Land Nordrhein-Westfalen* (KOMM-IN NRW), Endbericht (Cologne: Ministerium für Generationen, Familien, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 2010).

30 Alfred Reichwein, ‘Kommunales Integrationsmanagement—Ansätze für eine strategische Steuerung der Integrationsarbeit’, in *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*, ed. Frank Gesemann and Roland Roth (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2009), 297–307.

31 Dietrich Thränhardt, ‘Migration und Integration als Herausforderung von Bund, Ländern und Gemeinden’, in *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*, eds. Frank Gesemann and Roland Roth (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2009), 271 and 274ff.

32 Stuttgart, ‘Bündnis für Integration’, www.stuttgart.de/item/show/234480.

background study in schools providing either a general education or vocational training.

As previously noted, efforts toward youth integration are divided across several ministries and departments. Policies that affect youth in general fall under the competence of the Federal Ministry of Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women, and Youth (Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, BMFSFJ), which recently began to implement a youth policy of its own with a special focus on educational spaces, transition from schools to the labour market, and participation in political and official contexts.³³ Coordination across the different political levels has only just begun.³⁴ Whereas youth policies are coordinated by BMFSFJ, education policy and access to the labour market are regulated by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, BMBF) and BMAS. As noted earlier, however, education policies lie almost completely within the competence of the *Länder*. On the other hand, initiatives to place students of vocational education and training into jobs are often coordinated at the level of the Federation by BMAS, BMBF, or the Federal Ministry of Economics and Technology (Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft, BMWi).

The initiative Encouraging Youth (Jugend Stärken),³⁵ with 800 focal points, is dedicated to those young people—with or without an immigrant background—who face obstacles to entering the job market. This programme fosters the social, educational, and professional integration of young people in need of special support and is financed through the European Social Fund (ESF). The focus of the four programmes within this initiative is the transition of youth (up to age 27) from school into the labour market. It concentrates on those youth who can no longer be reached by other actors. Jugend Stärken includes special Youth Migration Services (Jugendmigrationsdienste, JMD) established by the *German Immigration Law* (§ 45 Satz 1 AufenthG/§ 9 Abs. 1 Satz 4 BVFG) and financed by BMFSFJ, for 41.5 million euros annually. These services have been monitored using special software since 2011, and are carried out in part by charity and migrant organisations. JMD aims to develop individual plans—431 cases most recently—to foster the integration of young people (ages 12 to 27) with an immigrant background and their parents, and to train staff within institutions and initiatives relevant to migrants.³⁶ Furthermore, the ministry has developed and evaluated a Programme 18 within the Children and Youth Plan of the Federation, dedicated especially to the ‘Integration of Young People with an Immigrant Background’ (*Integration junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund*).³⁷ Thus, even within an overall ‘mainstream’ initiative, several programmes directly address the needs of immigrant groups.

BMFSFJ and the Home Office coordinate the provision of parental counselling, including that of young parents (ages 27 and under). However, the federal integration commissioner has repeatedly demanded that such counselling services be provided in closer coordination with other official services, such as those provided by job centres and departments for foreigners.³⁸

Box 2. The case of Duisburg

Duisburg in North Rhine-Westphalia developed the ‘Union for Youth in Rheinhausen’ (*Rheinhausener Bündnis für die Jugend*, 2009-12), supported by the European Union (EU), the ESF for Germany, BMA, and the City of Duisburg. Backed by migrant organisations and supported and evaluated by researchers, its main aim was to support the intercultural competences of young people. To this end, it created networks at all the stages of general and vocational education, with a focus on labour market training and integration.

Source: Duisburg am Rhein, ‘Projekt ‘Rheinhausener Bündnis für die Jugend’ zieht positive Zwischenbilanz’, www.duisburg.de/vv/ob_6/102010100000343057.php

- 33 Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, 14. *Kinder- und Jugendbericht. Bericht über die Lebenssituation junger Menschen und die Leistungen der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe in Deutschland* (Berlin: Stellungnahme der Bundesregierung zum Bericht der Sachverständigenkommission. Bericht der Sachverständigenkommission, 2013), www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/14-Kinder-und-Jugendbericht.property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf.
- 34 Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, ‘Ziele einer eigenständigen Jugendpolitik vorgestellt’, 24 April 2013, www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/kinder-und-jugend.did=197658.html.
- 35 Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, ‘Initiative Jugend Stärken’, www.jugend-staerken.de.
- 36 Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, *Grundsätze zur Durchführung und Weiterentwicklung des Programms 18 im Kinder- und Jugendplan des Bundes (KJP) ‘Integration junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund’*, Stand: 1 (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, 2011); Jugendmigrationsdienste, ‘Integration junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund’, www.jugendmigrationsdienste.de; Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*, 86.
- 37 Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, *Evaluation des Eingliederungsprogramms Programm 18 des Kinder- und Jugendplans: Eingliederung junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund, Abschlussbericht* (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, 2009), www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/Service/Publikationen/publikationsliste.did=119670.html; Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, *Grundsätze zur Durchführung und Weiterentwicklung des Programms 18*.
- 38 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*.

C. Educational policy

Education and employment are crucial for the integration of immigrants. For the first generation of immigrants there was no real integration policy in education and training. However, results of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA)—as well as of other studies such as the International Primary School Reading Study (Internationale Grundschul-Lese-Untersuchung, IGLU) or Trends in International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS)—demonstrated that within the highly selective German school system, children of immigrants have considerably fewer opportunities than their German-origin peers. This was confirmed by the UN Special Rapporteur on the Right to Education, Vernor Muñoz, on a visit to Germany in 2006. According to his 2007 report, foreign-born persons in only a few EU countries (Austria and Italy among them) have a lower level of qualification than in Germany.³⁹ This is confirmed by empirical studies⁴⁰ that indicate immigrant children still experience disadvantages in comparison to German-origin children.

1. The German school system and its regulation

Since the German Constitution gives the responsibility for education as a whole to the State, in principle the State has far more influence in this area than in other aspects of integration policy. Legislative competences, however, lie practically exclusively with the *Länder*. The system followed in most of them is highly selective: it is based on early separation among *Förderschule* (special-needs education for physically or mentally handicapped children), *Haupt- or Mittelschule* and *Realschule* (nonuniversity-track schooling), and *Gymnasium* (university-track schooling) from the fourth grade onwards. This structure complicates the social advancement of immigrants, because the very early selection for 10-year-olds in a quite impermeable system determines their future educational career.

The educational success of immigrant children overall seems to be decided by opportunities to participate in education.

The *Länder* are responsible for the different school types, targeting of teaching and education, and curricula and exams. In most of the *Länder*, teacher training is also regulated by *Land* law, but the municipalities must provide structural maintenance and teaching materials. The distribution of various school competences is reflected in finance: the *Länder* bear 71.5 per cent of education costs (92.4 billion euros in toto), the local level 20.7 per cent, and the Federation only 7.8 per cent (database 2007).⁴¹ Meanwhile, the Federation may provide fresh impetus to certain initiatives by granting them additional financial support—for example, in the creation of full-time schools (temporarily) and for innovations such as *Lernen vor Ort* (see Box 3).

Although there are differences to be observed across various groups, the educational success of immigrant children overall seems to be decided by opportunities to participate in education. A lack of German-language skills puts students at a disadvantage—a trend that affects migrant families in particular. Only 23 per cent of foreign-born students attend a grammar school (*Gymnasium*), compared to 46 per cent of German-origin students. Foreign-born students form 34 per cent of the elementary school (*Hauptschule*) population, while Germans comprise 13 per cent. Immigrant students are less likely to graduate from school, on average; 40 per cent leave with a diploma from the *Haupt- or Mittelschule*, 33 per cent from a middle school (*Realschule*), and only 12 per cent from a German secondary school qualifying for university admission or matriculation (*Abitur* or *Fachabitur*). This difference is even more marked among those without any diploma. Only 1.8 per cent of young people without an immigrant background leave school before graduation, compared to 14.2 per cent of those with an immigrant background. Young women, whose school performance is higher than that of young men on average, have more difficulty finding apprenticeships.⁴² Native Germans

39 United Nations General Assembly, *Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 60/251 of 15 March 2006 Entitled 'Human Rights Council'*, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Vernor Muñoz, Addendum, Mission to Germany (13-21 February 2006) (New York: UN General Assembly, 2007), www.netzwerk-bildungsfreiheit.de/pdf/Munoz_Mission_on_Germany.pdf.

40 Statistisches Bundesamt, *Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit: Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund—Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2008* (Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt, 2010); Rolf Becker and Michael Beck, 'Migration, Sprachförderung und soziale Integration: Eine Evaluation der Sprachförderung von Berliner Schulkindern mit Migrationshintergrund anhand von ELEMENT-Panel-Daten', in *Integration durch Bildung. Bildungserwerb von jungen Migranten in Deutschland*, ed. Rolf Becker (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2011), 121–37.

41 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 76.

42 Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, 'Schulische Bildung von Migranten in Deutschland' (Working paper 13 der

and naturalised Germans—as well as second- and third-generation immigrants—are generally more qualified to enter higher education than are foreign-born students.

Notwithstanding the fact that, over the past ten years children and young persons with an immigrant background are reaching higher levels of education than the immigrants before them, the gap between the foreign-born and the native population remains. The percentage of young graduates with an *Abitur* (diploma from a German secondary school qualifying for university admission or matriculation) among Germans is around 32 per cent versus around 12 per cent for foreign-born students. Among those who have passed the *Abitur* in Germany, only 3 per cent are non-Germans. Their participation increased between 2000 and 2006, but to a smaller degree than that of German students, leaving an even wider gap between the two.⁴³

This trend also proves true for professional qualifications. One immigrant out of every three between the ages of 25 and 35 does not have a professional qualification. Among second-generation immigrants, this is the case for one out of four. The percentage of young people with an immigrant background lacking a professional qualification is twice as high as that of young people without an immigrant background.⁴⁴ In the areas of vocational education and training, too, young people with an immigrant background are under-represented, although the apprenticeship offered in this track of German's dual system is still the silver bullet for access to the labour market.⁴⁵ Vocational training has traditionally offered job seekers an advantage in comparison with other countries; these days, fewer jobs mean fewer young people are able to begin an apprenticeship—and, more often than not, they do not find an apprenticeship in their desired profession.⁴⁶ The jobs available are characterised by lower income and worse promotion prospects.

Various systems (*Übergangssysteme*) help students after school and before beginning an apprenticeship; all are devoted to those young people with fewer opportunities on the job market (and not only to those with an immigrant background). In contrast to the dual professional system in vocational education and training, the *Übergangssysteme* does not endow professional diplomas, but rather imparts knowledge and skills that qualify participants to enter the system of vocational education. Here, and in the professional schools providing vocational education (*Berufsschule*, *Berufsvorbereitungsjahr*, *Berufsgrundbildungsjahr*), adolescents with a migrant background are clearly over-represented—especially in Baden-Württemberg, Hamburg, Hesse, Bavaria, Berlin, Bremen, and North Rhine-Westphalia. Meanwhile, these transitional programs do not redress the lack of equal opportunities seen in vocational education and training or employment.⁴⁷ Studies show that school performance alone cannot explain immigrants' lower rates of participation, indicating that structural discrimination (including the recruitment strategies of enterprises) may play a role in limiting immigrant access to vocational education and training.⁴⁸

The overall poor performance of young people with an immigrant background in the German educational system is, of course, due to a complex interplay of structural (that is, systemic), individual, and family variables. For example, the socioeconomic circumstances of parents may affect how they support their children within Germany's especially selective education system. A study published in April 2013 shows that two-thirds of teachers still think that pupils' opportunities vary according to the socioeconomic status of their families. Seventy per cent of adolescents with a relatively affluent social background attend a *Gymnasium*, compared to 30 per cent from a relatively low one.⁴⁹ However, according to the federal government, immigrant pupils with the same socioeconomic background as their nonimmigrant counterparts still have lower levels of education.⁵⁰

The Expert Council on German Foundations on Integration and Migration (Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration) is a group of experts, financed by eight German foundations, that studies immigration

Forschungsgruppe des Bundesamtes aus der Reihe 'Integrationsreport', Teil 1, Nürnberg, 2008); Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, *Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm*.

- 43 Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, 'Berufliche und akademische Ausbildung von Migranten in Deutschland' (Working paper 22 der Forschungsgruppe des Bundesamtes aus der Reihe 'Integrationsreport', Teil 5, Nürnberg, 2009).
- 44 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Soziale Teilhabe: Handlungsempfehlungen des Beirates der Integrationsbeauftragten* (Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, 2013).
- 45 Carola Burkert and Holger Seibert, 'Integrationspotenziale der dualen Berufsausbildung für Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund', Heinrich Böll Stiftung, Berlin, 2008, <http://heimatkunde.boell.de/2008/04/01/integrationspotenziale-der-dualen-berufsausbildung-fuer-jugendliche-mit>.
- 46 Mona Granato, 'Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund auf dem Ausbildungsmarkt. Die (Re-) Produktion ethnischer Ungleichheit in der beruflichen Ausbildung', *Sozialer Fortschritt* 1 (2013): 14–23.
- 47 Gerhard Christe, *Notwendig, aber reformbedürftig! Die vorberufliche Bildung für Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund* (Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung, 2011), <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/wiso/08037.pdf>.
- 48 Mona Granato et al, *Integration und berufliche Ausbildung, Expertise* (Bonn: Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung [BIBB], 2007); Burkert and Seibert, 'Integrationspotenziale der dualen Berufsausbildung für Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund'; Granato, 'Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund auf dem Ausbildungsmarkt'.
- 49 Vodafone Stiftung Deutschland, *Lehrer sehen große Chancenungleichheit an deutschen Schulen* (Düsseldorf: Vodafone Stiftung Deutschland, 2013), www.vodafone-stiftung.de.
- 50 Die Bundesregierung, *Nationaler Aktionsplan Integration. Zusammenhalt stärken—Teilhabe verwirklichen*, (Berlin: Die Bundesregierung, 2012), 65, www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/_Anlagen/IB/2012-01-31-nap-gesamt-barrierefrei.pdf;jsessionid=C058602B51C4F3B5682679692202B655.s3t2?__blob=publicationFile&v=5.

and integration and gives policy advice.⁵¹ The council indicates that after the ‘PISA shock’—that is, the alarming results of Germany’s performance in an international comparison within the OECD Programme for International Student Assessment⁵²—important competences have been delegated to the municipal level and to schools themselves’; the council applauds this move, because networking and actors’ cooperation work best at this level. Nevertheless, major responsibilities still lie with the *Länder*. Their monitoring of compliance with common education standards should be enriched by questions of diversity, intercultural competences, and language training.

a) *The federal level*

In the National Integration Plan and NAP as of 2005, language learning is given as a key step toward reaching a better integration level. Integration courses (with 600 language lessons and 30 hours of orientation in the German political, economic, and social systems) represent the main focus at the federal level, in part inspired by the Dutch model. Meanwhile, the amount of federal subsidies offered to those immigrants who cannot afford to pay the full cost of the courses has been decreased, and financial penalties (or sanctions, such as the denial of resident status) have been imposed on those who were required to take the courses but failed to pass. Although it has always been stressed that immigrants have the ‘right’ to participate, ‘it was never in doubt that attendance to an integration course was also obligatory’.⁵³ Evaluation of the long-term effects of these language courses indicates improvements in language learning and fluency.⁵⁴ Two-thirds of the more than 1,000 interviewed participants had reached level B1 (intermediate level) or higher (beginning mostly below A1) of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages. Of those interviewed, 55 per cent use German as a common language within their families, improve their knowledge of German on their own, use German media, and keep in touch with Germans. The integration course was amended as of 1 April 2013; since then, the final language examination has been combined with a test required to apply for citizenship.⁵⁵ After 600 hours of language instruction, immigrants must pass a language exam corresponding to level B1. And now, after 60 lessons of orientation courses, they must pass a test called ‘Living in Germany’ (*Leben in Deutschland*), with three questions out of 30 referring to the *Länder* level.

Also at the national level, language courses for children ages 4 to 5 have been developed. These are to prepare them for the German-language tests taken by all children—immigrant and nonimmigrant alike—at age 5. It is interesting to note that the language competence of children from socioeconomically disadvantaged backgrounds lags behind their peers. Children of migrant youth are disproportionately affected—an example of a mainstream, non-targeted program having a specific result. Further research is required on the possible correlation of early childhood education and higher education, in which immigrants are also less likely to participate. Meanwhile, policymakers have made the school entrance age more flexible, to account for different levels of language preparation, and are encouraging parental involvement in schoolwork.

Policies specifically tailored to the needs of immigrants have also been introduced. Examples include courses on cross-cultural competence for teachers, and the increased hiring of immigrant teachers. Additional language courses for immigrant students are offered; and together with BA and BAMF, the *Länder* have developed special programmes for immigrants—from learning the German alphabet to professional training. Only 8 per cent of university students have an immigrant background; the initiative ‘Getting Ahead through Education’ (*Aufstieg durch Bildung*) aims at increasing this percentage to 40 per cent. There is also a special programme for the integration of university students being developed at BAMF in Nuremberg.⁵⁶

b) *Policy response*

The above-mentioned ‘PISA shock’ gave rise to a series of new measures in educational integration policy at every political level, but mostly within the *Länder*. One important policy carried out in several *Länder* was reducing the highly selective, three-track school system to just two levels, and extending the period before students are divided by track.

Fostered by the Federation, this new model has spread across the *Länder*, as has an extension of full-time schooling (while at regular schools, pupils have traditionally been taught only in the morning). While the variations across states provide a sort of ‘learning laboratory’ in which different educational systems may be compared, they do not promise that educational policy will be mainstreamed across the entire population. On the contrary, educational policies seem

51 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 76.

52 Edelgard Buhlman, ‘PISA: The Consequences for Germany’ (OECD Observer, May 2002), www.oecdobserver.org/news/archivestory.php/aid/702/PISA:The_consequences_for_Germany.html.

53 Christian Joppke, ‘Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe’, *West European Politics* 30, no. 1 (2007): 13.

54 Susanne Lochner, Tobias Büttner, and Karin Schuller, ‘Das Integrationspanel: Langfristige Integrationsverläufe von ehemaligen Teilnehmenden an Integrationskursen’ (Working paper 52, Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Nürnberg, 2013).

55 Reinhard Pohl, ‘Neuer Test für Einwanderer: “Leben in Deutschland”’, 2013, www.brd-dritte-welt.de/pdf/2013-04-Leben-in-de.pdf.

56 Rita Süßmuth, *Migration und Integration: Testfall für unsere Gesellschaft* (München: C.H. Beck, 2006), 154; dtv. Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, *Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm*.

to be becoming even more specific and fragmented. The Federalisation Reform of 2006, for example, does not allow the Federation to extend educational policy that overlaps the competences of the *Länder*.⁵⁷ Education experts such as Jörg Dräger (Bertelsmann Stiftung)⁵⁸ claim that there is no need for nationwide educational reform, but point to federal financing of the *Länder* as a way to make educational performance more transparent. A national education board could provide regular performance comparisons that would in turn inform policy.

The National Action Plan lists myriad measures and instruments at various political levels and across state and nonstate actors for the 2010 to 2014 period in support of the plan's education and integration targets, discussed in previous sections. It highlights the QID, developed by both federal and state leaders.⁵⁹ This initiative is not exclusively directed to immigrant children and adolescents, but includes all young people in need of support. Targets and measures address all levels of the education system. They include preventive measures and a higher degree of permeability across the different stages of the system. To this end, the federal government has invested 6.5 billion euros into educational infrastructure; monitoring and research are financed at both the federal and state level. One target is to train pedagogical staff in early childhood education, and the other to reduce the dropout rate among pupils with an immigrant background, beginning as early as possible at school. The chancellor and the presidents of the *Länder* have agreed to raise investments in education and research, amounting to a target of 10 per cent of gross domestic product (GDP) until 2015. Under this initiative, the *Länder*—together with BMAS, BMBF, and BA—chose to focus on supporting language learning among children and adolescents, fostering cooperation between schools and parents, and raising intercultural awareness in schools. At the same time, NAP stresses better opportunities for young immigrants to begin their academic study with an aim to reach an academic quota of 40 per cent each year. This means that the number of immigrant adolescents and young adults who reach the *Fachhochschulreife* or *Abitur* has to be increased significantly.

Easing students' transition from school to vocational training is one of several connected initiatives and programmes provided at the federal level, the *Länder*, and municipalities. Examples of such cooperative structures are 'The National Pact for Vocational Training and Young Skilled Staff' (*Nationaler Pakt für Ausbildung und Fachkräftenachwuchs*), the Training Pact (*Ausbildungspakt*) in the period 2010-14, and the programme 'Vocational Qualification Perspective'. *Ausbildungspakt* brings together the Federation, the states (since 2010), the education ministers through the Conference of Ministers of Education and Cultural Affairs of the *Länder* (Kultusministerkonferenz, KMK), and the head organisations of the German economy. Another pilot project, 'Encouraging Youth' (Jugend Stärken: Aktiv in der Region), brings together the Federation and the municipalities in developing communal strategies to foster social work for young people. Within the *Ausbildungspakt*, BMBF has started the initiative 'Educational Chains Leading to Vocational Qualifications' (*abschluss und Anschluss—Bildungsketten bis zum Ausbildungsabschluss*), which focuses on the transitions between the educational stages up until individuals achieve a final tertiary degree. Until 2014 an investment of 360 million euros (EQ Plus)⁶⁰ was allocated to this initiative, which includes the integration commissioner and *Kultusministerkonferenz* as partners. It aimed to create 60,000 new apprenticeships and 40,000 new jobs for professional trainees, including 10,000 for underprivileged young people.

c) *Länder and municipalities*

Since 2006, the *Länder* have had exclusive legislative competence in school, university, and general adult education,

57 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 79, 84, 113.

58 Bertelsmann Stiftung, 'Chancengerechtigkeit in der Bildung verbessert sich nur langsam' (pressemeldung, 24 June 2013), www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xchg/SID-5DF767B2-93F9260A/bst/hs.xml/nachrichten_116881.htm?drucken=true&

59 Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, *Integration durch Bildung* (Bonn and Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2012), 4.

60 Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 'The Training Pact wants to offer all young people opportunities for vocational training', www.bmbf.de/en/2295.php.

Box 3. Example of federal-local coordination

A good example of fostering policy coordination, the project 'Learning on-site' (*Lernen vor Ort, LvO*) is an initiative of BMBF in cooperation with local school authorities. The project develops targeted local systems to respond to the growing heterogeneity of schools and the diversity of classrooms. It is supported at the federal level and by ESF, and has a budget of 60 million euros. It aims to create an incentive for the municipalities to provide communal education management: in networking and planning, and in monitoring, counselling, and improving transitions from school to work. The most important characteristic of this programme lies in the networking of state and nongovernmental actors: between BMBF, different foundations, and municipalities. It includes cross-municipal partnerships on different issues providing policy learning. This programme does not focus on single projects, but rather coordinates the planning and implementation of programmes, projects, and resources.

Source: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 'Das Förderprogramm "Lernen vor Ort" im Überblick', www.lernen-vor-ort.info/de/98.php; Kommunaler Qualitätszirkel zur Integrationspolitik, "Kommunales Bildungsmanagement" (position paper, Berlin and Bonn, 2009); Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 77.

as well as education planning. Although the Federation maintains concurrent legislation in academia, the *Länder* are free to legislate separately. Nevertheless, the Federation maintains partial competence within the special German so-called dual system for small children (nursery schools), which it shares with the *Länder* and municipalities, as well as for vocational education and training. The Federation and *Länder* may cooperate in evaluating the educational performances for international comparison.⁶¹

Among young people with an immigrant background, school participation and dropout rates vary considerably across states. This may be connected to the various education policies implemented at the state level. As noted earlier, some of the *Länder* (Berlin, Brandenburg, Saxony, Saxony-Anhalt, Saarland, Hamburg, Rhineland-Palatinate, Schleswig-Holstein, Mecklenburg-Vorpommern, and Thuringia) recently introduced a twofold education system, eliminating the *Hauptschule*. There seems to be little difference in student participation between those *Länder* with a twofold and those with a threefold system, probably because the changes have been recent. Meanwhile a publication edited by the Bertelsmann Foundation, the Institut für Schulentwicklungsforschung at Dortmund University, and the Institut für Erziehungswissenschaft at Jena University, *Chancenspiegel* (the ‘mirror of opportunities’) that compares integration, permeability, the fostering of competences, and certification among the different *Länder*, indicates that integration opportunities grow alongside a high number of all-day schools.

Education policy across the *Länder* is, in principle, coordinated by the Standing Conference of Education Ministers (Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der *Länder* in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland). In 2007, these ministers declared that they would develop integration measures in close cooperation with migrant organisations (Gemeinsame Erklärung der Kultusministerkonferenz und der Organisationen von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund).

The Standing Conference of Education Ministers also supports the National Integration Plan and NAP at the *Länder* level.⁶² As such, it aims toward recognising and fostering the potential of children, adolescents, and young adults with an immigrant background by improving the transition between schooling and vocational training. They advance permeability of the different education systems and provide continuing quality management and education research, as well as develop a monitoring system for education policies in Germany.

In addition to those responsible for education, local officials and politicians see the need to reform the German educational system. Many observe that the future of cities and towns depends on well-educated young people. Any such reform would need to encompass a wide array of differences across municipalities: in size, shares of immigrants, unemployment rates, economic structure, and demographic changes. For example, there is a marked difference in immigration and employment rates between the east and west, and in income between the north and south. Better investment possibilities generally correlate with higher integration measures. But even in adverse conditions, a smart integration policy may lead to excellent integration success, as seen in some empirical examples highlighted by the *Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration* (SVR)⁶³ (examples include ‘Integration by Education’ in Arnsberg, the practice of fostering immigrant-owned enterprises in Rostock, and efforts to avoid segregation in Stuttgart and other cities).

With regard to job opportunities, the Federation supports a programme (*Förderung der Berufsorientierung in überbetrieblichen und vergleichbaren Berufsbildungsstätten*) designed to give pupils at vocational schools an insight into different professions. It also provides career start coaches (*Berufseinstiegsbegleiter*) for those young people who might have difficulty getting their degree in a general school or transitioning from school to work.

Box 4. An example of state-municipality cooperation

An example of *Land*-municipality cooperation in education is the initiative ‘Immigrants Give Lessons: Diversity in the Classroom—Diversity in the Faculty Room’ (*Migranten machen Schule: Vielfalt im Klassenzimmer—Vielfalt im Lehrerzimmer*). It fosters cultural diversity as a method of improving learning, by supporting the participation of teachers with an immigrant background. This project develops intercultural training in school education, and also within the academic training of teachers at the university level. Started in 2008 as a local initiative, it has since become a *Land* project in Baden-Württemberg, setting intercultural perspectives and competences in school curricula and networking with universities and ministries. Its partners are the Ministry of Cultural Affairs; Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the *Land* Baden-Württemberg; Government (Regierungspräsidium) of Stuttgart; and Commissioner for Schools (Staatliches Schulamt Stuttgart).

Source: Landesbildungsserver Baden-Württemberg, ‘Migranten machen Schule’, accessed 18 June 2014, www.schule-bw.de/entwicklung/schulentw/migrantenmachenschule/.

61 Arts. 91a GG, 91b GG, 91 b 1 neu GG, Art. 91 b2 neu Grundgesetz für die Bundesrepublik Deutschland vom 23. Mai 1949 (BGBl. S. 1), zuletzt geändert durch das Gesetz vom 11. Juli 2012 (BGBl. I S. 1478).

62 Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der *Länder* in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, ‘Aktionsplan zur Umsetzung des Nationalen Integrationsplans—Beitrag der Kultusministerkonferenz’ (Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 10. Juni 2011).

63 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 140.

Box 5. *Schlau*: Example of federal-state cooperation

The initiative *Schlau* ('Clever, smart') in Nuremberg promotes cooperation across different levels of governance on the one hand and networking among business and civil society on the other. It is focused on improving transitions from school either to vocational education and training or to further education. Supported by ESF, BA, and two Bavarian ministries (the Bavarian Ministry of Education [Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus, StMUK] and the Bavarian Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs [Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Arbeit und Sozialordnung, StMAS]), *Schlau* is directed toward students, parents, teachers, and enterprises. The project fosters individual and group counselling at all relevant schools, and networking between the various partners involved in education and training. It also tries to match demand and supply for those looking for an apprenticeship.

Source: Schlau Nürnberg, 'SCHLAU versteht unter Bildung: die Bandbreite der Möglichkeiten aufzeigen und verantwortungsvolle und selbstständige Entscheidungen herausfordern', accessed 18 June 2014, www.schlau.nuernberg.de/.

As stated in SVR, there are various ways to support young people with an immigrant background, along with other disadvantaged young persons. But relevant strategies are not followed all over the country. State initiatives, when successful, may serve as examples to be followed by other *Länder*. Towns and cities are good facilitators, creating incentives for local businesses to become involved in vocational training. Nevertheless, measures to improve the transition from school to vocational training must not only depend on the engagement of individual municipalities, but also should be established across the country and supported by the Federation.⁶⁴ All in all, although the National Integration Plan and its action plans promote the coordination of policies, fragmentation and rigidity remain.

2. An assessment of initiatives within a mainstreamed framework

As noted earlier, several ministries share responsibility for educational policy; meanwhile, *Länder* competence makes a top-down approach to coordination all but impossible. Moreover, many measures—regarding language learning, for instance—fall within the competence of municipalities. Measures that affect the general population and focus on professional orientation, career counselling, the prevention of early school leaving, and the participation of parents in the school system can be found at different political levels, forming a puzzle of initiatives that might—and should—be better coordinated.

Within the context of slow-developing integration policies and a complex allocation of competences within the German federal system, considerable efforts have been made over the past decade to coordinate education policies both top down and bottom up, as well across each political and administrative level. These efforts have been set on paper and put into practice by the National Integration Plan and NAP, including information on which political level and which entity within it manages each of the measures.

Despite these coordinating efforts, more remains to be done. The former integration commissioner, Maria Böhmer, (succeeded by Aydan Özoğuz in 2013) repeatedly called for closer cooperation and greater transparency across the various departments at all political levels, as well as for a nationwide integration monitoring system.⁶⁵ The commissioner's Advisory Board on Integration (Integrationsbeirat) criticised the complicated competences assigned across the three layers of German politics, publishing the statement that this 'shall not affect the promotion of immigrant children'.⁶⁶ Moreover, Ms. Böhmer called for the use of clear and common criteria across the entire education system, from day-care facilities to universities.⁶⁷ She appealed to the Federation, the *Länder*, and the municipalities to cooperate more closely in order to provide qualified personnel, sufficient child-care facilities, and more full-time schools (which are still the exception rather than the rule in the Western *Länder*). She also demanded a more efficient language-learning system and the intercultural opening of schools, which would foster the participation of immigrant parents. Meanwhile, integration commissioners of several municipalities⁶⁸ have advocated for the intertwining of education and integration efforts; closer cooperation among federal, regional, and municipal actors; and a better educational monitoring system.

64 Ibid, 90.

65 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Soziale Teilhabe*.

66 Die Beauftragte für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration, 'Integrationsbeirat: Soziale Teilhabe vergrößern', 8 March 2013, www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/IB/Artikel/Beirat/2013-03-08-soziale-teilhabe-beschluss-beirat.html.

67 Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Soziale Teilhabe*.

68 Kommunalen Qualitätszirkel zur Integrationspolitik, 'Kommunales Bildungsmanagement'.

On the monitoring and reporting side, the Training Pact (Nationaler Pakt für Ausbildung und Fachkräftenachwuchs or, simply *Ausbildungspakt*) between the federal government and the economic lobby organisations, was founded in 2004 and has since been extended every three years. It aims to improve statistical data; collect information on immigration backgrounds and their correlation with data on education, vocational training, and labour market statistics; and intensify the coordination of research efforts between the Federation and *Länder* levels. As of now, however, educational qualifications are regulated and evaluated at the *Länder* level.

D. Employment policy

Many people with immigrant backgrounds are less qualified to work in Germany than nonimmigrants. As a recent study published by the Berlin Institute for Population and Development (Institut für Bevölkerung und Entwicklung in Berlin) revealed, Turks have the lowest qualifications and thus fewer opportunities on the job market.

Regional differences—not only related to distinct integration policies but also to different job market opportunities—account for some of the variation. But, consistently, people with immigrant backgrounds are more likely to be unemployed or, if employed, to be receiving lower wages than their German-origin peers. The so-called *Beschäftigungslücke* refers to the gap between the labour force participation rates of the two groups. This gap was 11.9 per cent in 2005, 12.4 per cent in 2009, and 12.3 per cent in 2010—showing a difference of 9.6 per cent in persons with migration experience and 23.7 per cent in persons without that experience. (The registered unemployment rate has decreased slightly of late.)⁶⁹ Only 9.9 per cent of employees in the civil service and only 1 per cent of civil servants (*Beamte*) are immigrants. Of immigrants participating in the labour market, a significant number work in short-term employment (12 per cent of employees with an immigrant background versus just 8 per cent of their German-origin peers).⁷⁰

Across Germany, the overall percentage of blue-collar workers decreased from 48.8 per cent in 1950 to 30.2 per cent in 2002, and the number of white-collar employees rose from 16.5 per cent to 51.8 per cent in the same period. In 1991, 69.3 per cent of non-German employees were blue-collar workers. This percentage fell to 54.5 per cent in 2002, which indicates that the second generation is slightly more mobile, better qualified, and may move into a changing labour market with new goals. Nevertheless, one can still argue that there are gaps in life opportunities between citizens with and without immigration backgrounds in Germany: the latter remain less qualified, more affected by unemployment, and more likely to be in lower-income groups. Reasons normally given for these statistics are immigrants' relative lack of secondary and tertiary education (whether of professional or academic qualifications) and the migration-induced degradation or nonrecognition of qualifications or degrees acquired outside Germany.⁷¹

Box 6. Mainstreamed integration initiatives in Berlin

Compared to other big cities, the economic status of people with an immigrant background living in Berlin is significantly worse, as is their success in the educational system—one out of four does not have a school degree. Their participation in vocational education and training fell by about 50 percent between 1991 and 2006. In response Berlin's Senate has started a series of initiatives to foster the inclusion of unemployed and underemployed people and to support the vocational education and training of youth—both for newly arrived immigrants and for those who have lived in Berlin for a longer period. One example of good practice is the 'Vocational Qualification Network for Immigrants' (Berufliches Qualifizierungsnetzwerk für Migrantinnen und Migranten, BQN Berlin), a network for professional qualification that develops innovative procedures in vocational training, including intensive language learning, certification, and the development of incentives for training companies led by persons with an immigrant background.

Source: Frank Gesemann, 'Berlin: Einwanderungsstadt "under construction"? Von der Beauftragtenpolitik zur strategischen Steuerung', in *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*, eds. Frank Gesemann and Roland Roth (Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 2009), 311–33; BQN Berlin, 'Kompetenzen fördern, Horizonte öffnen', accessed 18 June 2014, www.bqn-berlin.de/.

69 Die Beauftragte des Bundes für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Zweiter Integrationsindikatorenbericht* (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2011), 57.

70 Geis and Klös, 'Migration und Integration', 3.

71 Andreas Damelang and Max Steinhardt, 'Integrationspolitik auf regionaler Ebene in Deutschland', *Focus Migration*, Kurzdossier nr. 10, Berlin, May 2008.

1. Distribution of competences for labour market policies across the German federal system

Compared to the education sector, the German State as a whole, both at the federal and at *Länder* level, has less influence on labour. The labour market is regarded as a relatively autonomous space, controlled by demand and the supply of workers. Although the state serves as an employer, immigrants' participation in the public sector has, up to now, been poor, since it has been restricted to German citizens. Only recently has there been an effort to recruit people with an immigrant background and increase their participation in civil services.

a) *The federal level*

On the legislative level, qualifications from abroad should be accepted more easily, thus granting foreigners better access to the German labour market. To achieve this, the federal government passed a bill that came into effect on 1 April 2012: the *Law to Improve the Assessment and Recognition of Vocational Education and Training Qualifications Acquired Abroad* (*Gesetz zur Verbesserung der Feststellung und Anerkennung im Ausland erworbener Berufsqualifikationen*) or 'recognition law'. It covers all the professions recognised at the federal level (for instance, in health care and law). Meanwhile, regulations for the *Länder*, which have competence to recognise certain professions—for instance in the education sector (including but not limited to teachers) and engineering—are still lacking, and it is unclear whether a harmonised standard can be reached. Although the new law at the federal level is, of course, a big step toward the recognition of qualifications for immigrants, there is still no real coordination between the *Länder*. The ministers who are responsible for integration measures in the *Länder* have already supported a model centred on federal law that provides for uniform procedures in each state.⁷² Although a new Centre for Foreign Skills Approval (IHK-FOSA) has been installed that compares qualifications and approves them, the competence for the approval of foreign skills remains fragmented.⁷³

By passing the new law, German integration policymakers take into account the demographic shifts that are leading to skills shortages. Other, previously noted, aims include lowering young migrants' obstacles to participate in the labour market (the focus of the National Pact for Vocational Training and Young Skilled Staff in Germany, *Nationaler Pakt für Ausbildung und Fachkräftenachwuchs in Deutschland 2010-2014*)⁷⁴ and increasing immigrants' participation in civil services (addressed by a special policy within the National Action Plan).

Integration into the labour market is a key element of NAP. To this end, it defines the following four strategic targets: to improve opportunities for engagement and employment as well as qualification schemes, to ensure the intercultural and migration-specific qualifications of counselling staff in employment agencies, to ensure better integration within companies, and to ensure a foundation for qualified employees.

Across these measures, the Federation has committed itself to enlarging the spectrum of vocational choices and to developing target groups in public support services. Instruments are largely found within mainstream funding systems, and are only partly directed to immigrants. Although measures to support adolescents transitioning from school to work (i.e., assistance with job hunting, mediation with parents and teachers in case of problems) exist, critics have long noted that a lack of transparency and coherence constrains the benefits that young immigrants might otherwise gain from subsidy schemes.⁷⁵ In order to improve this situation, the Federation has started several programmes.

As with the promotion of vocational training, labour integration policy developed at different administrative levels of the German system. While chambers of commerce are in large part responsible for vocational training in business and trade, and are legally under the control of the *Länder*, the Federation has principal competence for the promotion of employment overall, as well as for measures that prepare people to access the labour market; it shares its competence in part with municipalities. One initiative to promote the employment of youth is the 'Entry Level Qualification for Young People' (Einstiegsqualifizierung für Jugendliche, EQJ). This programme supports businesses that provide adolescents with internships of 6 to 12 months by covering a portion of the remuneration and insurance costs. This benefits young people who, due to the lack of a diploma, have difficulties finding a training job. As it targets young people with and without an immigrant background, it may be regarded as an example of mainstreaming immigrant integration. So-called 'second-chance qualifications' are often important for not only first-generation immigrants who

72 Beschlussniederschrift 7, 'Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder'.

73 Geis and Klös, 'Migration und Integration'.

74 Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, *Berufsbildungsbericht 2013: Die Ausbildungsmarktsituation weiterhin gut* (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung, 2014), www.bmbf.de/de/berufsbildungsbericht.php.

75 Markus Wilp, *Die Arbeitsmarktintegration von Zuwanderern in Deutschland und den Niederlanden. Hintergründe, aktuelle Entwicklungen und politische Maßnahmen* (Münster: Waxmann, 2007), 188.

Box 7. Antidiscrimination policies in Germany

The *General Act on Equal Treatment (Allgemeines Gleichbehandlungsgesetz, AGG)*, following the EU antidiscrimination regulations, aims to prevent discrimination on the basis of ethnicity or race, sex, religion or philosophy of life, handicap, age, or sexual identity and orientation; and to protect social diversity. Lacking a tradition of antidiscrimination laws (such as the race-relations law in the United Kingdom), Germany faced significant political and judicial obstacles to transposing the EU regulation to its own national law. There was an important debate about the validity of a national law for private contracts.

Today the AGG is valid both for labour legislation and for certain areas of private contract law, which means that the protection of citizens does not only refer to discrimination by the state, but also obliges the state to protect its citizens from discrimination by private entities. Nevertheless, it does not include positive discrimination.

The broader Xenos programme, held by BMAS, has developed measures to prevent exclusion and discrimination both on the job market and in society, as well as activities to foster the integration of adolescents and young adults into juvenile social casework, juvenile detention centres, schools (including those providing professional education and training), intercultural opening up of business and administration, and awareness raising for diversity in cities, rural areas, and the European border areas.

A German pilot and model project implemented by the Federal Anti-Discrimination Agency (Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes) included four worldwide enterprises and three public administrations at the federal, regional, and local level. It implemented anonymous applications for German employment, as already used in the United States, the United Kingdom, and Canada (and on a trial basis in the Netherlands, Sweden, France, and Belgium). The goal is to avoid discrimination (by gender, age, and also immigrant background). The study concluded that anonymous and qualification-oriented applications have a positive effect on diversity management.

Source: Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes, Kooperationsstelle Wissenschaft und Arbeitswelt an der Europa-Universität Viadrina (KOWA), and Institut zur Zukunft der Arbeit (IZA), *Pilotprojekt 'Anonymisierte Bewerbungsverfahren'—Abschlussbericht* (Berlin, Bonn, and Frankfurt/Oder: Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes, KOWA, and IZA, 2012), www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/publikationen/AnonymBewerbung/Abschlussbericht-anonymisierte-bewerbungsverfahren-20120417.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.

were educated outside the German system, but also for second-generation immigrants who often remain without formal qualifications for work. BA provides professional training for those without qualifications.

Also, social security provides the active promotion of employment (support for persons in search of work and support for children and adolescents).⁷⁶ The competence of municipalities supporting the integration of young people into the labour market is growing, including new competence for handling social security (following reforms in 2005). There are two different federal organisational options competing with each other in the exercise of social security and promotion of employment: one is a cooperation between BA and the municipalities, and the other is the sole responsibility of the municipalities. The latter model has been harshly criticised after an evaluation commissioned by SVR.⁷⁷ When municipalities alone are responsible for promoting employment, people with an immigrant background, among others, are often overlooked. A lack of central and cross-regional monitoring and regulation were identified as possible reasons. Thus, SVR requires more cooperation with the federal structures and more inclusion of nongovernmental economic and social actors to promote employment.⁷⁸

The programme 'Qualification of University Graduates for the Labour Market' (Akademikerinnen und Akademiker qualifizieren sich für den Arbeitsmarkt, AQUA) under BMBF is directed particularly toward young university graduates. It supports qualification measures, language courses and training, as well as internships, and is tailored to the needs of unemployed university graduates (with or without an immigrant background).⁷⁹ It was not until 2005 that, through the *Immigration Act*, foreign students with a German diploma were assigned the right to reside in Germany for a maximum period of 12 months in order to find employment. In addition, there were around half a million persons living in Germany who had not yet had their qualifications recognised. Recently, the federal government has passed a bill that facilitates this recognition.

With respect to demographic changes, in 2011 the federal government implemented a concept designed to ensure the availability of skilled labour: two Internet portals, tailored to attract immigrants, have been put in place since 2012.⁸⁰

76 See the *Book of Social Code (SGB) II and VIII. Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB II)*, accessed 18 June 2014, www.sozialgesetzbuch-sgb.de/sgbii/1.html; *Sozialgesetzbuch (SGB VIII)*, accessed 18 June 2014, www.sozialgesetzbuch-sgb.de/sgbviii/1.html.

77 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 97–100.

78 Ibid.

79 Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Technologie, 'Förderdatenbank', www.foerderdatenbank.de.

80 Make it in Germany, www.make-it-in-germany.com; Das Portal zur Fachkräfte-Offensive, 'Das Portal zur Fachkräfte-Offensive', www.fachkraefte-offensive.de/DE/Startseite/start.html.

b) *Länder and municipalities*

NAP devotes an entire section to municipal integration programmes. In some *Länder*, the strategic orientation of municipal integration practices is already supported from above: as, for instance, in North Rhine-Westphalia with the programme KOMM-IN NRW (see Box 1); in Hesse with the programme ‘Model Regions for Integration’ (Modellregionen Integration); and in Lower Saxony through the funding of staff for integration coordination centres. Such coordination is welcomed as positive for integration, and is fostered by improved networking and synergies among various programmes at the federal level. A federal-level analysis of municipality-level initiatives, with support from leading CSOs, is also planned.

A key policy at the local level is the intercultural opening of public administration and services. So, too, is supporting people with an immigrant background in vocational education and training. Such aims are realised in cooperation with youth and migrant organisations. The federal integration commissioner has suggested that the intercultural opening of municipal institutions may be criteria for the federal support of ‘model’ regions. The programme Jugend Stärken, previously discussed, is implemented in 35 towns⁸¹ across Germany.

2. An assessment of initiatives within a mainstreamed framework

The above mentioned recognition law is an important step toward integrating the labour market. It may, indeed, also serve as a sort of harmonising legislation, if the *Länder* provide a corresponding law in order to guarantee uniform procedures across individual states. As the effects of demographic change and growing demand for skilled labour become more clear, there is a growing political will to support initiatives that make use of immigrant potential, such as the ‘Future Initiative for Securing Skilled Personnel’ (*Fachkräftesicherung*), which brings together the private and public sectors at all administrative levels.

In contrast to education, where the *Länder* play a central role, the competence for integration into labour markets is shared mostly between the Federation and the municipalities, but is not actually mainstreamed. The lack of a central mechanism makes it difficult to coordinate municipal and regional activities, targets, instruments, monitoring, and reporting.

III. CONCLUSION: WHERE TO FROM HERE?

A. *Evaluation of integration policies for Germany’s youth*

Any assessment of German integration policies that affect young people in general, and education in particular, has to take into account, first, that the federal government declared integration as an aim only in the last decade. Maybe this is why Germany is lagging behind in efforts to, in effect, bring itself into the ‘mainstream’ of immigrant integration seen in other European countries.

Second, any assessment must consider the very complex structure of the German federal system, characterised by the (jealously guarded) vertical allocation of competences; the marked autonomies of the Federation, the *Länder*, and the municipalities; and the horizontal distribution of competences across governmental ministries. The Federal Republic of Germany’s structure makes its integration policies difficult to compare to those of other, more centrally organised, countries.

81 Baden-Württemberg: Landkreis Calw, Stadt Ulm, Stadt Pforzheim; Bavaria: Stadt Aschaffenburg, Stadt Kempten; Berlin: Berlin-Lichtenberg, Berlin-Neukölln; Bremen: Bremen; Hamburg: Hamburg Harburg; Hesse: Landkreis Gießen, Landkreis Groß-Gerau, Stadt Offenbach, Stadt Wiesbaden; Mecklenburg-Vorpommern: Stadt Wismar, Landkreis Nordvorpommern, Landkreis Uecker-Randow; Lower Saxony: Landkreis Diepholz, Stadt Göttingen, Landkreis Osnabrück, Landkreis Soltau-Fallingb.ostel; North Rhine-Westphalia: Landkreis Düren, Stadt Herne, Stadt Iserlohn, Stadt Dortmund, Stadt Lüdenscheid; Rhineland Palatinate: Landkreis Kusel; Saarland: Landkreis Neunkirchen; Saxony: Landkreis Görlitz/Weißwasser, Landkreis Meißen; Saxony-Anhalt: Stadt Halle; Schleswig-Holstein: Stadt Flensburg; Thuringia: Landkreis Kyffhäuserkreis, Landkreis Saalfeld-Rudolstadt, Landkreis Nordhausen, Stadt Geraden. Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend, ‘Infomaterialien der ESF Programme (2007-2014)’, www.jugend-staerken.de/159.html.

Third, and above all, youth, education, and access to labour markets require cross-cutting policies; competences are intertwined, blurred, and often divided across at least four different ministries. The federal government commissioner for migration, refugees, and integration does not have a ministerial rank and is continuously calling for more cooperation in this highly fragmented area. Coordination should, in principle, come from the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, but it belongs to the Home Office, which does not have the competence to coordinate policies in social affairs, labour, family, and youth, let alone in educational matters—where the *Länder* alone may legislate.

Fourth, the German system relies on CSOs (such as the Arbeiterwohlfahrt [AWO], the Red Cross [Deutsches Rotes Kreuz], and der Paritätische Gesamtverband) and various church organisations. It also relies on migrant organisations and the private sector. The important role of civil society at all political levels and in practically every integration policy may be linked to the poor performance of the German state in integration policies beyond welfare integration decades ago—a gap that was partly filled by the work of NGOs. These organisations continue to play key roles in the recognising of qualifications acquired abroad, counselling and training, advising decisionmakers and implementing administrative structures, networking, and exchanging experiences among the different layers of society. The involvement of civil-society organisations touches upon a key and crosscutting question: How far does it make sense to privatise integration measures within these crucial state policies that are so important for integration?

Undoubtedly, immigrant integration policy has become more coordinated in the past few years. Since the adoption of the *Immigration Act* in 2005, the development of a National Integration Plan in 2007 and the subsequent NAP, many integration measures for young persons with an immigrant background have been realised and coordinated. NAP—itself a result of dialogue and coordination—is, indeed, an important step forward. It collates information on the multiple levels, initiatives, programmes, and projects that once were only loosely linked or even disconnected. Meanwhile, practical experience is exchanged and compared in regular, institutionalised dialogues and conferences at several levels, be it between the Federation and the *Länder*, the *Länder* and the municipalities, or among the *Länder* or municipalities themselves.

Undoubtedly, immigrant integration policy has become more coordinated in the past few years.

But further progress is hampered where cooperation is not valued. On the one hand, the separate chapters that both the *Länder* and the municipalities added to NAP illustrate their willingness to cooperate to a certain extent. On the other, they insist on their own competences and on their own approaches and policies. This is, of course, an effect of the federal organisation of the German state and the interests pursued at each level; but this legislative and administrative segmentation hinders integration measures. Such differences also make it difficult to change policies when governments change, or to consistently focus on particular policies such as language learning, integration courses, education, and training.⁸² In sum, the German system's many levels and parallel and overlapping competences make it extremely difficult to coordinate—let alone mainstream—integration policies in general and integration policies for youth in particular.⁸³

How German policy affects the integration of young immigrants is a case in point. On the one hand, several policies now target disadvantaged youth in general but affect immigrants in particular (for example, the above-mentioned programmes 'Qualification Initiative for Germany' and 'Entry Level Qualification for Young People'). Such policies have moved from an integration-centred approach toward an inclusion-centred approach, from a potentially stigmatising ethnic focus to one that includes all young people in need of special attention.

On the other hand, mainstreaming integration policies may not always be the method of choice. The needs of certain groups may be more effectively met through tailored measures. The effects of specially targeted initiatives within larger, mainstreamed policies require more data collection and research.

With regard to evaluation and reporting, since 2003 the federal commissioner for migration, refugees, and integration has reported once a year on the status of foreigners in Germany.⁸⁴ In 2007 the federal government committed itself to developing nationwide integration monitoring, and its outcomes have since been published twice (*Integrationsindikatorenbericht 2009 and 2012*).⁸⁵ Since 2008, the federal government has published progress reports (*Fortschrittsberichte*) outlining the implementation of the National Integration Plan. The National Action Plan emphasizes the importance of monitoring and reporting at all levels. The *Länder* have established their own *Integrationsmonitoring der Länder* after an initial pilot study in Bavaria, Berlin, Brandenburg, Hesse, Saxony, North Rhine-Westphalia, and Rhineland-

82 Musch, *Integration durch Konsultation?* 90.

83 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*, 67.

84 As of this writing, the most recent report is from June 2012. Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration, *Integration in Deutschland*.

85 Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*.

Palatinate, which compares data from 2005 to 2009.⁸⁶ But the coordination of monitoring remains a work in progress.

B. Policy recommendations for the central government

Although federalism has—rightly—been described as a factor of fragmentation, plurality is exactly where its potential strength lies: Germany may offer a rich field of experience and policy innovation, free from a single philosophy or state concept (as in the former multiculturalism of the Netherlands) of integration or a centralised ‘mainstreaming-from-above’ approach. The *Länder* may learn from one another in a relatively quick process of trial and error. Whereas centralised states depend largely on the innovation capacity of one actor, a federal system offers opportunities for multiple actors to contribute their political ideas and progress. No one government level holds a monopoly on agenda setting, as it does in a centrally organised state. In Germany we find best practices both in the education and labour market integration of youth with an immigrant background. In most cases institutionalised networking seems to be the method of choice, fostering the advantages of federalism (which lies in the local or regional testing of new ideas and in the spreading of good practices across cross-municipal or cross-regional structures). Both horizontal and vertical networking in the form of cross-departmental integration commissions and cross-*Länder* exchange groups as well as increased connectivity across databases would make more use of this living laboratory.

Nevertheless, in these special federal structures no central institution coordinates municipal or regional activities, whether in regard to targets or instruments, or to monitoring and reporting. Uncoordinated, fragmented, often parallel, initiatives and measures across different levels and actors lack transparency; they are inefficient at best and ineffective at worst, as the wheel is again and again reinvented. To counter such trends, communication channels are needed to foster the exchange and evaluation of experiences and to formulate new recommendations, policy lessons, and incentives. Although some progress has been made by the recent initiatives in the National Integration Plan and the National Action Plan these channels still leave much to be desired.

Germany may offer a rich field of experience and policy innovation, free from a single philosophy or state concept...of integration or a centralised ‘mainstreaming-from-above’ approach.

Such challenges are most obvious in the German education sector. The implementation of a twofold (instead of a highly selective threefold) school system in several *Länder* is expected to first foster integration, and second, inspire other states to follow suit. Yet the German education sector remains fragmented, and lacks common standards in language learning or in the recognition of qualifications acquired outside Germany. Few institutions exist to improve policy coordination and share lessons across states. Policy learning mechanisms are only just developing, as is evident in the case of a *Länder*-level law that might implement a uniform procedure for recognizing degrees acquired outside Germany.

This is why SVR⁸⁷ calls for an intensified exchange of experiences and greater cooperation across states. In addition, the document recommends that quality standards and management procedures be instated across the *Länder*, and finance structures be reformed to include greater oversight at the federal level. Examples of good practices—that foster higher levels of coordination and cooperation—have been given throughout this report. The Federation could encourage such initiatives by offering funding, and encourage national advisory boards to support innovation and policy learning around measures that have not (yet) been integrated into regular state programmes.

In order to best benefit from the lessons to be learned on the ground, the Federation should work to fill the many information and coordination gaps that still exist, both horizontally and vertically. A comprehensive database—following the example of the Integration Portal in the European Union—for instance, might help to coordinate and mainstream integration policies and instruments. Regular monitoring on the basis of indicators developed at the municipal (KGst), national (Böhmer-Indikatoren), or European (Migration Integration Policy Index, MIPEX) levels should also be implemented to evaluate the efficacy of various initiatives. Best practices may be highlighted, and lessons drawn. Such an undertaking requires the political will and administrative capacities of all the actors involved.

⁸⁶ Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder (IntMK), *Erster Bericht zum Integrationsmonitoring der Länder 2005-2009*, Teil 1 Ergebnisse (2011).

⁸⁷ Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration, *Integration im föderalen System*.

WORKS CITED

- Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes, Kooperationsstelle Wissenschaft und Arbeitswelt an der Europa-Universität Viadrina (KOWA), and Institut zur Zukunft der Arbeit (IZA). 2012. *Pilotprojekt 'Anonymisierte Bewerbungsverfahren'—Abschlussbericht*. Berlin, Bonn and Frankfurt/Oder: Antidiskriminierungsstelle des Bundes, KOWA, and IZA. www.antidiskriminierungsstelle.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/publikationen/AnonymBewerbung/Abschlussbericht-anonymisierte-bewerbungsverfahren-20120417.pdf?__blob=publicationFile.
- Bade, Klaus, 1993. Politik in der Einwanderungssituation: Migration—Integration—Minderheiten. In *Deutsche im Ausland—Fremde in Deutschland*, ed. Klaus Bade. München: C.H. Beck.
- Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge, und Integration. 2011. *Hintergrundinformationen Integration in Deutschland—Zahlen, Daten, Fakten, Zweiter Integrationsbericht*. Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration.
- _____. 2011. *Zweiter Integrationsindikatorenbericht*. Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration.
- _____. 2012. *Integration in Deutschland: Eine Kurzdarstellung*. Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration.
- _____. 2013. Integrationsbeirat: Soziale Teilhabe vergrößern. www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/Artikel/IB/Artikel/Beirat/Beirat-Archiv/2013-03-08-soziale-teilhabe-beschluss-beirat.html.
- _____. 2013. *Soziale Teilhabe. Handlungsempfehlungen des Beirates der Integrationsbeauftragten. Beschlossen bei der Beiratssitzung am 22.* Berlin: Die Beauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration.
- Becker, Rolf and Michael Beck. 2011. Migration, Sprachförderung und soziale Integration. Eine Evaluation der Sprachförderung von Berliner Schulkindern mit Migrationshintergrund anhand von ELEMENT-Panel-Daten. In *Integration durch Bildung. Bildungserwerb von jungen Migranten in Deutschland*, ed. Rolf Becker. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Beschlussniederschrift 7. 2012. *Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder am 21./22. Überherrn, Saarbrücken, 21-22 March 2012.*
- Bendel, Petra and Roland Sturm. 2010. Federal Republic of Germany. In *Diversity and Unity in Federal Countries*, eds. César Colino and Luis Moreno. Toronto: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Bendel, Petra. 2014. Mainstreaming immigrant integration policy in Germany. In *Experiences of mainstreaming immigrant integration in Europe: lessons for the Netherlands*, eds. Elizabeth Collett, Milica Petrovic, and Peter Scholten. Brussels: Migration Policy Institute Europe.
- Bertelsmann Stiftung. Chancengerechtigkeit in der Bildung verbessert sich nur langsam. Pressemeldung, 24 June 2013. www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/cps/rde/xchg/SID-5DF767B2-93F9260A/bst/hs.xsl/nachrichten_116881.htm?drucken=true&.
- BQN Berlin. Kompetenzen fördern, Horizonte öffnen. www.bqn-berlin.de/.
- Buhlman, Edelgard. 2002. PISA: The Consequences for Germany. www.oecdobserver.org/news/archivestory.php/aid/702/PISA:_The_consequences_for_Germany.html.
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge. 2008. Schulische Bildung von Migranten in Deutschland. Working paper 13 der Forschungsgruppe des Bundesamtes aus der Reihe 'Integrationsreport', Teil 1, Manuel Siebert, Nürnberg.
- _____. 2009. Berufliche und akademische Ausbildung von Migranten in Deutschland. Working paper 22 der Forschungsgruppe des Bundesamtes aus der Reihe 'Integrationsreport', Teil 5, Manuel Siebert, Nürnberg.
- _____. 2010. *Bundesweites Integrationsprogramm. Angebote der Integrationsförderung in Deutschland—Empfehlungen zu ihrer Weiterentwicklung*. Nürnberg: Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge.
- Bundesministerium für Arbeit und Soziales. Das Portal zur Fachkräfte-Offensive. www.fachkraefte-offensive.de/DE/Startseite/start.html.

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung. The Training Pact wants to offer all young people opportunities for vocational training. Accessed 1 August, 2014. www.bmbf.de/en/2295.php.

_____. Das Förderprogramm ‘Lernen vor Ort’ im Überblick. www.lernen-vor-ort.info/de/98.php.

_____. 2012. *Integration durch Bildung*. Bonn and Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.

_____. 2013. *Berufsbildungsbericht 2013: Die Ausbildungsmarktsituation weiterhin gut*. www.bmbf.de/de/berufsbildungsbericht.php.

Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend. Infomaterialien der ESF Programme (2007-2014). www.jugend-staerken.de/159.html.

_____. Initiative Jugend Stärken. www.jugend-staerken.de/.

_____. 2013. Ziele einer Eigenständigen Jugendpolitik vorgestellt. 25 April 2013. www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/kinder-und-jugend.did=197658.html.

_____. 2009. *Evaluation des Eingliederungsprogramms Programm 18 des Kinder- und Jugendplans: Eingliederung junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund, Abschlussbericht*. Berlin: Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend. www.bmfsfj.de/BMFSFJ/Service/Publikationen/publikationsliste.did=119670.html.

_____. 2011. *Grundsätze zur Durchführung und Weiterentwicklung des Programms 18 im Kinder- und Jugendplan des Bundes (KJP) ‘Integration junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund’, Stand: 1*. Berlin: Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen, und Jugend.

_____. 2013. *Kinder- und Jugendbericht. Bericht über die Lebenssituation junger Menschen und die Leistungen der Kinder- und Jugendhilfe in Deutschland*. Berlin: Stellungnahme der Bundesregierung zum Bericht der Sachverständigenkommission. Bericht der Sachverständigenkommission. www.bmfsfj.de/RedaktionBMFSFJ/Broschuerenstelle/Pdf-Anlagen/14-Kinder-und-Jugendbericht.property=pdf,bereich=bmfsfj,sprache=de,rwb=true.pdf.

Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie. Förderdatenbank. www.foerderdatenbank.de.

_____. Make it in Germany. www.make-it-in-germany.com.

Bundesregierung. 2012. *Nationaler Aktionsplan Integration. Zusammenhalt stärken—Teilhabe verwirklichen*. Berlin: Die Bundesregierung. www.bundesregierung.de/Content/DE/_Anlagen/IB/2012-01-31-nap-gesamt-barrierefrei.pdf.jsessionid=C058602B51C4F3B5682679692202B655.s3t2?__blob=publicationFile&v=5.

Burkert, Carola and Holger Seibert. 2008. Integrationspotenziale der dualen Berufsausbildung für Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund. <http://heimatkunde.boell.de/2008/04/01/integrationspotenziale-der-dualen-berufsausbildung-fuer-jugendliche-mit>.

Christe, Gerhard. 2011. *Notwendig, aber reformbedürftig! Die vorberufliche Bildung für Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund*. Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung. <http://library.fes.de/pdf-files/wiso/08037.pdf>.

Damelang, Andreas and Max Steinhardt. 2008. Integrationspolitik auf regionaler Ebene in Deutschland. *Focus Migration*, Kurzdossier Nr. 10, Berlin, May 2008.

Duisburg am Rhein. Projekt ‘Rheinhausener Bündnis für die Jugend’ zieht positive Zwischenbilanz. www.duisburg.de/vv/ob_6/102010100000343057.php.

Ette, Andreas. 2003. Germany’s Immigration Policy, 2000-2002. Understanding Policy Change with a Political Process Approach. Working paper no. 3, Center on Migration, Citizenship and Development, Arbeitspapiere, Bremen. www.uni-bielefeld.de/tidrc/ag_comcad/downloads/workingpaper_3.pdf.

Geis, Wido and Hans-Peter Klös. 2013. Migration und Integration: Wo steht Deutschland? *Sozialer Fortschritt* 1 (2–13): 2f.

- Gesemann, Frank. 2009. Berlin: Einwanderungsstadt ‘under construction’? Von der Beauftragtenpolitik zur strategischen Steuerung. In *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*, eds. Frank Gesemann and Roland Roth. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Granato, Mona. 2013. Jugendliche mit Migrationshintergrund auf dem Ausbildungsmarkt. Die (Re-)Produktion ethnischer Ungleichheit in der beruflichen Ausbildung. *Sozialer Fortschritt* 1: 14–23.
- Granato, Mona, et al. 2007. Integration und berufliche Ausbildung, Expertise. Bonn: Bundesinstitut für Berufsbildung (BIBB).
- Iris Hoßmann and Margret Karsch. 2011. *Deutschlands Integrationspolitik*. Berlin-Institut für Bevölkerung und Entwicklung. www.berlin-institut.org/online-handbuchdemografie/bevoelkerungspolitik/deutschland/deutschlands-integrationspolitik.html.
- Joppke, Christian. 2007. Beyond National Models: Civic Integration Policies for Immigrants in Western Europe. *West European Politics* 30 (1): 1–22.
- Jugendmigrationsdienste. Integration junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund. www.jugendmigrationsdienste.de.
- Kommunaler Qualitätszirkel zur Integrationspolitik. 2009. Kommunales Bildungsmanagement. Position paper. Berlin and Bonn: Kommunaler Qualitätszirkel zur Integrationspolitik.
- Kommunales Bildungsmanagement. 2009. Positionspapier des kommunalen Qualitätszirkel zur Integrationspolitik. Kommunales Bildungsmanagement.
- Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Länder (IntMK). 2011. *Erster Bericht zum Integrationsmonitoring der Länder 2005-2009*. Teil 1 Ergebnisse.
- Länderoffene Arbeitsgruppe ‘Indikatorenentwicklung und Monitoring’ der Konferenz der für Integration zuständigen Ministerinnen und Minister/Senatorinnen und Senatoren der Ländern (IntMK). 2013. *Zweiter Bericht zum Integrationsmonitoring der Länder 2011*. Sachsen. www.tagesspiegel.de/downloads/7974450/1/integrationsmonitoring.
- Landesbildungsserver Baden-Württemberg. Migranten machen Schule. www.schule-bw.de/entwicklung/schulentw/migranten-machenschule/.
- Lochner, Susanne, Tobias Büttner, and Karin Schuller. 2013. Das Integrationspanel. Langfristige Integrationsverläufe von ehemaligen Teilnehmenden an Integrationskursen. Working paper 52. Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge, Nürnberg.
- Mahnig, Hans. 2001. Ist Deutschland wirklich anders? Die deutsche Integrationspolitik im europäischen Vergleich. In *Deutschland—ein Einwanderungsland? Rückblick, Bilanz und neue Fragen*, eds. Edda Currie and Tanja Wunderlich. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.
- Meier-Braun, Karl-Heinz. 1988. *Integration und Rückkehr?—Zur Ausländerpolitik des Bundes und der Länder, insbesondere Baden-Württembergs*. Main/München: Kaiser.
- Ministerium für Arbeit. Integration und Soziales NRW. Integration—Aktuelles. www.mais.nrw.de/000_Startseite/index.php.
- Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. 2007. *Integration als Chance für Nordrhein-Westfalen und seine Kommunen. Potenziale nutzen—aus Erfahrungen lernen*. Düsseldorf: Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen.
- _____. 2010. *Evaluation ‘Innovation in der kommunalen Integrationsarbeit—eine Förderung durch das Land Nordrhein-Westfalen’ (KOMM-IN NRW), Endbericht*. Cologne: Ministerium für Generationen, Familie, Frauen, und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen.
- Musch, Elisabeth. 2011. Integration durch Konsultation? Konsensbildung in der Migrations- und Integrationspolitik in Deutschland und den Niederlanden. Münster: Waxmann.
- Nürnberg, Schläu. SCHLAU versteht unter Bildung: die Bandbreite der Möglichkeiten aufzeigen und verantwortungsvolle und selbstständige Entscheidungen herausfordern. www.schlau.nuernberg.de/.

- Oberndörfer, Dieter. 2007. Zuwanderung nach Deutschland—eine Bilanz, Rat für Migration. Politische Essays zu Migration und Integration 2/2007. Osnabrück: Rat für Migration.
- Pohl, Reinhard. 2013. Neuer Test für Einwanderer: ‘Leben in Deutschland’. www.brd-dritte-welt.de/pdf/2013-04-leben-in-de.pdf.
- Reichwein, Alfred. 2009. Kommunales Integrationsmanagement—Ansätze für eine strategische Steuerung der Integrationsarbeit. In *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*, eds. Frank Gesemann and Roland Roth. Wiesbaden, 297–307. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Sachverständigenrat deutscher Stiftungen für Integration und Migration. 2012. *Integration im föderalen System: Bund, Länder und die Rolle der Kommunen*. Essen: Jahresgutachten 2012 mit Integrationsbarometer.
- Schmid-Drüner, Marion. 2006. Germany’s New Immigration Law: A Paradigm Shift? *European Journal of Migration and Law* 8: 191–214.
- Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. 2011. Aktionsplan zur Umsetzung des Nationalen Integrationsplans—Beitrag der Kultusministerkonferenz. Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 10.06.2011.
- Spiegel Online. 2010. Integrationsbeauftragte: Böhmert fordert eigenes Ministerium für Integration. 25 October 2010. www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integrationsbeauftragte-boehmer-fordert-eigenes-ministerium-fuer-integration-a-725055.html.
- Statistisches Bundesamt. 2010. Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit. Bevölkerung mit Migrationshintergrund—Ergebnisse des Mikrozensus 2008. Wiesbaden: Statistisches Bundesamt.
- Stuttgart. Bündnis für Integration. www.stuttgart.de/item/show/234480.
- Süssmuth, Rita. 2006. *Migration und Integration: Testfall für unsere Gesellschaft*. München. C.H. Beck.
- Thranhardt, Dietrich. 2009. Migration und Integration als Herausforderung von Bund, Ländern und Gemeinden. In *Lokale Integrationspolitik in der Einwanderungsgesellschaft*, eds. Frank Gesemann and Roland Roth. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Triadafilopoulos, Triadafilos and Karen Schönwälder. 2006. How the Federal Republic Became an Immigration Country: Norms, Politics and the Failure of West Germany’s Guest Worker System. *German Politics and Society* 24 (3): 1–19.
- United Nations General Assembly. 2007. *Implementation of General Assembly Resolution 60/251 of 15 March 2006 Entitled ‘Human Rights Council’*, Report of the Special Rapporteur on the right to education, Vernor Muñoz, Addendum, Mission to Germany (13-21 February 2006). New York: UN General Assembly. www.netzwerk-bildungsfreiheit.de/pdf/Munoz_Mission_on_Germany.pdf.
- Vodafone Stiftung Deutschland. 2013. *Lehrer sehen große Chancenungleichheit an deutschen Schulen*. Düsseldorf: Vodafone Stiftung Deutschland. www.vodafone-stiftung.de.
- Vogel, Wolfram. 2010. Die Migration im Hintergrund. Strukturen der Integrationspolitik in Deutschland. In *Migration und Integration in Europa*, ed. Frank Baasner. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Wilp, Markus. 2007. *Die Arbeitsmarktintegration von Zuwanderern in Deutschland und den Niederlanden. Hintergründe, aktuelle Entwicklungen und politische Maßnahmen*. Münster: Waxmann.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR



Prof. Dr. Petra Bendel is Professor for Political Science and Academic Director of the Friedrich-Alexander-University of Erlangen-Nuremberg, Germany. She is the author of many publications on borders, refugees' rights, asylum and integration policies in the European Union and abroad. She is also a political advisor on immigration issues.



Migration Policy Institute Europe, established in Brussels in 2011, is a non-profit, independent research institute that aims to provide a better understanding of migration in Europe and thus promote effective policymaking. Building upon the experience and resources of the Migration Policy Institute, which operates internationally, MPI Europe provides authoritative research and practical policy design to governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders who seek more effective management of immigration, immigrant integration, and asylum systems as well as successful outcomes for newcomers, families of immigrant background, and receiving communities throughout Europe. MPI Europe also provides a forum for the exchange of information on migration and immigrant integration practices within the European Union and Europe more generally.

www.MPIEurope.org

Residence Palace
155 Rue de la Loi
5th Floor
1040 Brussels
Belgium

Phone: +32 (2) 235 2113