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Executive summary

Background

The paper reviews four overarching examples of good practice in social inclusion through employment, based on a small study of experiences in Bulgaria with Roma integration. Each example is analysed in terms of rationale, essence, processes, evidence and transferability to the West London context, including potential or actual obstacles and ways to address them.

This research paper was prepared for the New Pathways to Work in West London (NPWWL) project, part of the Innovation, Transnationality and Mainstreaming strand of the 2007-2013 European Social Fund (ESF) programme. The project supports residents with employment barriers in the West London boroughs of Brent, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon and Hounslow. It does so under three broad activity strands: improving the links between frontline workers in a range of agencies and employment support services in West London; bringing mental health and employment support services closer together; developing new and improved pathways into employment for the most disadvantaged communities in West London.

One of the key aims of the NPWWL project is to build links with other European Union (EU) countries, and to commission research in those countries with a focus on good practice in supporting disadvantaged people into training and work.

Aims and methodological approach

The overall aim of this present research paper was to explore the integration and inclusion of the Roma community in Bulgaria. The research team worked in partnership with the C.E.G.A Foundation¹. The study sought to examine new or best practice in the area of social inclusion through supporting employability which could be applied to local UK services and support. Another goal was to share the findings with other organisations in the UK, Bulgaria and Europe. The key objectives of the study were therefore to:

- Research key employability policy, practice and other issues related to the social exclusion of the Roma in Bulgaria. This included questions of how the Bulgarian service providers are tackling issues with its Roma community.
- Analyse the ways in which initiatives work in Bulgaria and explore their transferability to the context in West London and beyond.
- Compare Bulgarian policy and practice with West London activity with communities facing social exclusion, identifying good practice.

¹See http://www.cega.bg
Given these aims, the study sought to address the following research questions:

- What are the key policies and practices in Bulgaria to improve social inclusion and employability of the Roma? How does Bulgarian policy and practice compare with UK work with the Roma and other excluded communities, taking into account different political economic contexts?

- What can be learned from Bulgarian and UK practices:
  a) Which are most effective, for whom and in what circumstances, and
  b) What ‘programme theories’ can be developed from both success and inconsistencies?

In particular, what can be learned about: engaging excluded communities, supporting them during project implementation and sustaining the achievements in a longer term? What can be learned about the most effective forms of communication with colleagues and partners?

- What lessons can be learned from both successful and not so successful practices? How this learning can be applied by local agencies, initiatives and policy-makers in the UK, Bulgaria and Europe? What successful practices cannot be applied because of the different contexts?

Structure of the paper

This paper is a product of iterative cycles of writing, thinking and discussions within the team and with key stakeholders. We start from introducing the background of our learning and the context of the paper, including the similarities and differences between the UK and the Bulgarian context from which we endeavoured to learn. We have interwoven the voices of our informants and literature review findings because in the iterative cycles both influenced our thinking and the presentation of findings. The application of good practices in West London is at the heart of this paper - it emerged from the identified need by local policy makers to know more about experiences and practices elsewhere. However, we have found that the good practices we identified can also be applied elsewhere.

The paper progresses as follows. Chapter 1 presents the West London employment and cohesion context, drawing on policy papers, data from the 2011 Census and stakeholder interviews. This is then contrasted, in Chapter 2, with a presentation of the Bulgarian context for Roma employment and inclusion. Chapter 2 draws both on published literature and on the experience of carrying out the fieldwork for this paper.

Chapters 3 to 6 present the key good practice approaches in social inclusion through employment that we identified through our fieldwork in Bulgaria. For each approach we discuss how it works in practice, whether the practices associated with each approach have been employed in West London and the challenges of implementing these approaches.
The Annexes include an overview of the methodology, a bibliography of further reading and a map with contact information about relevant organisations in Bulgaria, West London and at EU level. Accompanying this paper are five Practitioners’ Briefings:

- Adult Learning and Vocational Training
- Multi-Agency Needs Based Practice
- Prioritising Education and Training
- Linking with Businesses and Tailoring to Employers Needs
- Supported Entrepreneurship

The Briefings are available at www.tavinstitute.org

Findings and recommendations

Good practice 1 is an Integrated Policy Approach to Social Inclusion. In order to improve the employability of Roma, other migrants, and disadvantaged groups more generally, it is essential to simultaneously address a range of other social needs through an integrated approach. This includes education, health, housing, education, civic and political participation, cultural understanding and anti-discrimination. This good practice involves coordinated work by multiple actors (statutory and voluntary) across different policy areas. The recommendations to West London policy makers and practitioners cover:

- Strategic leadership and multi-agency policy-making;
- Exchanging knowledge and understanding community needs;
- Ensuring resources and sustainability.

Good practice 2 is Multidisciplinary Practice and Holistic Case-Management. Roma communities, as well as other disadvantaged groups, experience multiple barriers and complex needs related to social exclusion. Given this, working in multidisciplinary teams and/or adopting a tailored case-management approach will meet the diverse needs of individuals and families better on a practice level. The key practice messages for local policy-makers and services in West London are:

- Working in multi-disciplinary and multi-agency teams;
- Individually tailored case management;
- Holistic Work with the Wider Family or Community.

Good practice 3 is Participatory Design and Delivery. We analyse the importance of the active participation and involvement of Roma communities in the design and delivery of social inclusion and employability initiatives. The West London experience with the approach shows that it is also applicable to other
disadvantaged groups. Concrete recommendations for West London stakeholders are:

- Building trust and engagement of community leaders;
- Outreach and relationship building;
- Involvement of representatives of disadvantaged groups in design and delivery;
- Empowerment through advocacy and political participation;
- Supporting organisations run by disadvantaged groups.

**Good practice 4** is Combining Mainstreaming with a Targeted Approach. It entails a careful balance between implementing mainstream programmes and targeted work with specific communities and their particular vulnerabilities. Better ethnic monitoring and data collection on excluded groups will enable this process. In addition, efforts to mainstream the ethnic identities of these communities have to be in place. Not least, organisations need to implement internal changes. The latter includes staff training, anti-discrimination work, and improving cultural understanding and awareness of these communities. The key messages for local policy-makers and services in West London are:

- Mainstream programmes with explicit but not exclusive targeting;
- Improved ethnic monitoring and data collection;
- Organisational change and staff training;
- Cultural awareness and challenging discrimination.

**Conclusions**

The project started as a Roma specific study. In the course of analysing the data and writing the paper this changed. We expanded the conclusions to other disadvantaged groups whilst focusing on the West London context. Below is an overview of our findings in the order of the research questions established at the very beginning of the project.

*How does Bulgarian policy and practice compare with UK work with the Roma and other excluded communities?*

Bulgarian Roma integration policies are mostly framed by the National Roma Integration Strategy. However, all social policies have a component addressing disadvantaged groups, in particular the Roma and other minorities. The model on which the Bulgarian welfare system is based is close to the UK one. Both countries converge towards a neo-liberal model in which the state provides mainstream services mostly. Non-governmental organisations in cooperation with local authorities or individually cover needs of other groups. A key role in both countries is assigned to employability. Employability is addressed both in the context of social inclusion and in the context of measures to foster economic and social development.
There is a trend in both countries towards tailoring mainstream services to make them more accessible and supportive to disadvantaged groups. Non-governmental and statutory organisations cooperate more closely in Bulgaria where they often play a consultative role in policy making and programme development. They also take part in decision-making and policy-making initiatives. This is in addition to their function of residual service provision. However, the UK offers a more fertile environment for civil society organisations due to a greater number of independent funding bodies. Bulgarian grassroots organisations struggle nowadays to acquire funding from EU and state funds as these are characterised by less accessible, complicated and heavy bureaucratic procedures. By contrast, UK organisations have flexible opportunities, although diminishing in the current economic climate. Examples are organisations such as the Big Lottery Fund and Joseph Rowntree Foundation to name just two.

The policies on Roma specifically and their accompanying structures such as integration services and specialised organisations are more developed in Bulgaria as a country with a high proportion of Roma. However, UK organisations have a longer history and more intensive experience working with minority groups. This includes more established racial equality and anti-discrimination policies and practices. Bulgaria faces the challenge to enforce its existing Roma integration policies. By contrast, the UK needs to do significantly more work on a strategic level to explicitly support Roma and wider GRT communities. This includes supporting specialist organisations with adequate policies and funding.

While the Roma population is a relatively small percentage in the UK compared to Bulgaria, the lack of effective data collection and ethnic monitoring means that the size of these groups are significantly under-estimated in local areas and across the UK as a whole. Gypsy, Roma and Traveller groups remain a ‘hidden’ population. This is despite being one of the most vulnerable groups in the UK in terms of socio-economic difficulties and discrimination experienced. The current climate risks affecting social cohesion by increased social or inter-group tensions. This is particularly important as competition for particular jobs (i.e. the less or lower skilled ones) increases. At the same time, the economic/social climate generally becomes rougher.

Nevertheless, the UK and West London in particular have a longer tradition of multiculturalism and inclusion. By contrast, in Bulgaria stereotypes and prejudices still play a major role as barriers to inclusion. Economically, UK and Bulgarian GDP growth are comparable. Bulgaria confirmed GDP growth of 1.2% and the UK – 1% (both were reported by the respective governments at the end of 2012). However, as we have seen from the initial chapters, West London in particular has a greater advantage with an economy that is thriving. This is despite of the recession and the situation with unemployment is more optimistic than in Bulgaria.

Which are most effective practices, for whom and in what circumstances? What ‘programme theories’ can be developed from both success and inconsistencies?

In the main body of the paper we have analysed in detail each identified practice, the ways it works and in what conditions. In the table below we will summarise these again, but from a more general perspective. All practices can be applied successfully to a wide range of disadvantaged groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What works best?</th>
<th>What does this practice involve?</th>
<th>In what circumstances?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrated policy approach to social inclusion | • Strategic leadership & multi-agency policy-making  
• Exchanging knowledge & understanding of community needs  
• Resources and sustainability | • Democratic culture in which there is a creative tension between civil society, statutory organisations, socially engaged media and research/academic institutions  
• Accessible targeted funding in all policy areas  
• Consistent policies and projects  
• Supportive public opinion  
• Evidence base |
| Multi-disciplinary working and holistic case management | • Working in multi-disciplinary and multi-agency teams  
• Individually tailored case-management  
• Holistic work with the wider family or community | • Trained professionals in employment, psychology, social work, cultural mediation, health, education, etc.  
• Set up multi-agency case conferences  
• Dedicated funding for partnership working, communication and coordination  
• Person centred health and social system  
• Staff support structures and procedures |
| Participatory design and delivery | • Building trust & engagement of community leaders  
• Outreach & relationship building  
• Roma involvement in design & delivery  
• Roma empowerment through advocacy & political participation  
• Supporting Roma & BAMER organisations | • Inclusive environment, especially further and higher education opportunities  
• Culturally aware and sensitive media  
• Advanced empowerment programmes  
• Dedicated funding for advocacy |
| Combining mainstreaming with a targeted | • Mainstream programmes with explicit but not exclusive targeting | • Sophisticated ethnic monitoring and needs assessment  
• Trained community mediators and |
What works best? | What does this practice involve? | In what circumstances?
---|---|---
approach | • Improved ethnic monitoring and data collection | understanding of their role
 | • Established multi-disciplinary and multi-agency working | • Critical assessment of mainstream policies and services
Creating an inclusive culture in mainstream practice | • Organisational change and staff training | • Robust anti-discrimination and equality policies in organisations
 | • Cultural awareness and challenging discrimination | • Work with businesses

We have identified five programme theories that guide the embodiment of the above good practices in the area of social inclusion through employment. These are outlined in detail in the Practitioners’ Briefings accompanying this paper. These cover:

- Principles of vocational qualification and adult learning with a focus on ‘soft’ skills;
- Multi-agency needs based practice following a principle of shared responsibility;
- Prioritising education beginning with early education and following consistently through the whole educational path up to higher education;
- Linking with businesses and tailoring to employers’ needs combined with matching with the candidates’ needs; and
- Supported entrepreneurship based on principles of empowerment.

What can be learned about each step of the process?

Through this study, we had the opportunity to identify key learning about for key aspects of the process of social inclusion through employment. This can be summarised as follows:

- Engaging excluded communities: the key is improving understanding of excluded groups, building trust, focusing on relationship building, developing needs based practices and active involvement of communities in design and delivery.
- On-going support during project implementation: focus on progression rather than achievement; maintaining aspirations; celebrating success and systematic community involvement in delivery and feedback on what can be done better;
- Sustaining the achievements in a longer term: applying consistently all five good practices described in this paper; ensuring long-term support to both employers and employees; developing progression paths for employees and a system of encouragement;
- Communication with colleagues and partners from other organisations: this is not currently prioritised in both countries. This outcome is due to the current
economic crisis and a focus on survival rather than consolidation or expansion. Practice shows that without a dedicated funding for cooperation this area is neglected. At the same time, it is key area for the effective implementation of the good practices outlined in this paper. Policies need to acknowledge the perils of creating unhealthy competition and rivalry between organisations by limited funding pots.

In addition, for each of the good practices identified in this paper, we have identified key steps and activities. These are recommended in order to effectively implement these practices within West London. They are summarised in the table below, but full details can be found in the main report at the end of each chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Practice</th>
<th>What are the key steps to implement the practice?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Integrated policy approach to social inclusion | • Setting up expert working groups or task forces, linked to existing statutory governance structures and led by senior council staff.  
• Involving statutory & voluntary agencies, across sectors (e.g. housing, employment, health, education, cohesion) to agree joint & realistic solutions.  
• Developing specific local policies & action plans across multiple agencies e.g. on new arrivals, or integration of vulnerable BAMER groups e.g. Roma.  
• Improving research, monitoring & data-collection (ideally involving communities themselves) to better understand needs e.g. of Roma.  
• Exchanging knowledge, experience & best practice from specialist organisations & NGOs already working with specific groups.  
• Ring-fencing funding or using multi-agency programming to avoid duplication, pool budgets e.g. across organisations or local authorities.  
• Seeking innovative sources of funding e.g. EU & philanthropic funds. |
| Multi-disciplinary working and holistic case management | • Setting up teams with staff from different backgrounds e.g. education, employment, youth work, social work, therapeutic and health.  
• Having a multi-disciplinary team based in one geographic location or a central ‘hub’ to facilitate access to staff based in different locations.  
• Employing comprehensive assessment of an individual’s needs e.g. employability, education, housing, health, family situation etc.  
• Appointing single case-managers as mediators between services, providing trusting relationships, and regular support in accessing provision.  
• Working with the whole family as the needs are often interlinked, including home visits to build trust and engagement. |
| Participatory design and                | • Identifying and building relationships with trusted community leaders, NGOs or frontline services as an entry point to access excluded groups. |
### Application of the learning

To begin with, the main learning covers the understanding of the vastness of the policy and practice fields in which social inclusion through employment happens. The focus of this paper was primarily on Roma social inclusion. However, the good practices we have highlighted are equally applicable to a range of vulnerable groups in West London and the UK. Attached to this paper is a map of documents for further reading. There is also a map of organisations which is intended to facilitate further exchange of experience, learning and good practices. The communication between both policy makers and frontline practitioners is a must. This is so given the complexity of the area and the huge space for improvement in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>delivery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Allowing time &amp; resources to meet communities face-to-face in geographic areas they are located, to build trust and meaningful partnerships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertaking research to assess needs, involve communities themselves in service design and delivery e.g. as community mediators, social work roles etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving information about community involvement in participation structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting specialist and frontline organisations working with under-served groups such as Roma e.g. funding and building organisational &amp; staff capacity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combining mainstreaming with a targeted approach, including creating an inclusive culture in mainstream practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Adopting ‘explicit but not exclusive targeting’ within mainstream programmes and policies e.g. wider initiatives such as work programme having an explicit focus on targeted excluded groups such as the Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Reviewing major mainstream policies and services to critically assess whether they are adequately reaching under-represented groups such as the Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Critically reviewing and revising existing ethnic monitoring and data collection to effectively capture excluded and ‘hidden’ groups such as the Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertaking research, profiles or needs assessments (involving communities themselves) to better assess the size of local populations and needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Building collaborations with specialist organisations e.g. Roma and BAMER groups, to improve organisational &amp; staff understanding of these groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Running training workshops for frontline staff, delivered by community or specialist organisations e.g. social inclusion barriers &amp; best practice working with Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promoting more diverse workforce through positive recruitment measures, and employ community members e.g. health visitors or education workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developing cultural awareness activities to promote the positive contributions of Roma and other BAMER groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopting more flexible way of recognising employability skills of excluded groups e.g. uncovering strengths, and less focus on formal qualifications/ experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ensuring robust anti-discrimination and equality policies in organisations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---
the area. Despite differences between Bulgarian and UK contexts, there is a lot of potential for learning and exchange of experience. This can be made easier through the opportunities provided by new information technologies and especially internet communications. Organisations can instantly receive information about each others’ work at no postal cost and can meet via software like skype with no travel cost.

Second, it is important to keep in mind and comprehend the interwoven nature of the good practices identified in this report. A condition for the success of each of the good practices on the ground is the coordinated, coherent and consistent application of all of them as a package.

The third lesson is about the need to ensure structures and procedures to create and sustain organisational and multi-agency memory of successes, failures and the learning from them. It is also crucial to maintain forums for communication and the social and political levels in which experiences on the ground can be translated into policies.

Fourth, we have to emphasise the importance of research in the area of social inclusion through employment. This covers two inter-related areas: ethnic minorities monitoring and data collection on the one hand, and rigorous research of experiences to identify needs and the best ways to address them on the other. There is also a need for more robust research of what works to improve Roma social inclusion, and under what circumstances.

Fifth, we have identified the importance of always keeping an eye on the danger of reinforcing inequalities in subtle ways: through programmes intended to promote employment but in effect keeping disadvantaged people at the margins of society. For example, this happens if employment support focuses on low-skill, low-paid jobs, or if strategies are targeting self-employment without appropriate support for this. The result is changing the employment statistics but not the social and economic situation of the representatives of the community. This can also happen if participation of minorities and other disadvantaged groups is reduced to a minimum. Another example is when communities are put in a position in the organisations that reproduces their status in society. There is a risk that poor or patchy implementation of these practices can further reinforce inequalities and marginalisation.

Linked to the above is our learning about the need to prioritise the practicalities of implementation of good practices in social inclusion. We have found that there are excellent good practices and programmes in circulation. However, they are not always as effective as expected due to failures at the process level. Every little detail starting from accessibility and finishing with long-term support activities have to be carefully thought through and put into practice. This includes an understanding of the often neglected relationships between people within and between organisations.

Policy makers and practitioners need to also take into account the interactions between the psychological, the social, the technological, the cultural and the political. Very often the implementation of otherwise excellent practices fails because of not acknowledging frictions between these domains. For example, an
excellent project idea may not be funded because of bad internet connection that results in a missed deadline for funding applications. Similarly, a project based on excellent employment support techniques may fail because there is no psychologist in the team who can help beneficiaries overcome the consequences of their traumas. Furthermore, how can policies aiming to involve people in employment work if some people are so depressed that even going out of their homes is not an option? Or how can these policies work if those who need support most do not live in areas where effective organisations are available? In short, policy makers and practitioners also need to consider the links between everyday practicalities of living and the big picture of policies and theories.

In conclusion, we have presented a rich picture of the important findings we made and how they can be implemented in practice. It would be interesting to study in greater detail the differences and specifics of applying these practices to working with different disadvantaged groups. Another follow up project could be to compare experiences across the EU. This will help to obtain a better overview of which good practice mechanisms are context dependent and hence more vulnerable to fluctuations in the environment.
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‘In thinking about good practice is it very hard to only give one thing [that defines a practice as a good practice] - you have to appreciate the huge complexity of responding to children, adults and families in this situation’. – Bulgarian Policy Maker

‘The key is cultural mediation, conflict resolution, networking, liaising, research and disseminating models of good practice’ – Independent EU Roma inclusion consultant

‘If you work with marginalised groups by offering [them] tangible support (...) to get knowledge and skills to empower them to be independent [then] you invest in the future [of your society]. The other factor [of defining a practice as a good practice] is to understand the benefits of working together’. – West London Stakeholder and VO Leader

‘Success is not in individual policies and practices but how they are applied locally. We have to think of models of effective delivery (...). – West London stakeholder and VO Leader

‘Good practice is the practice that leads to a change in policies. ...[G]ood practice is to do something together [with other stakeholders] in order to change the relatedness to values...Good practice is not necessarily innovative, but it is the corridor to innovation... This should be practices which have an effect on a long-term plan that also engages people in [a process of change] ... – Bulgarian NGO Leader

‘Sustainability is a key criterion for good practice’. – Bulgarian Policy Maker.

‘How many people do no longer need us is the question we should ask ourselves [before evaluating our practice as a good practice]’. – Independent EU Roma Inclusion Consultant.

‘Good practices are practices which are based on underlying theory, they should have sound rationale rather than an ad hoc enforcement of ideas or entirely outcome driven strategies’. – West London Service Provider.

‘You have to communicate with [members of disadvantaged groups] as equals, as real people that are equal to us. You have to seek their opinion, what their views, ideas and expectations are’. – Bulgarian Policy Maker.
1. The West London employment and social inclusion context

1.1. The general employment and social inclusion situation

In this paper, West London (WL) is defined as the territory of the West London Alliance (WLA) or the West London Sub-Region as identified in the London Plan and the draft replacement plan. The WLA comprises six London councils that work together to improve services for the residents of Barnet, Brent, Ealing, Harrow, Hillingdon and Hounslow. These councils serve a population of 1.435 million people. Below are some figures of key facts about the councils which show that this is by no means a homogeneous region:

**Figure 1: Fact and figures about the West London Alliance Boroughs (Source: 2011 West London Economic Assessment)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Borough</th>
<th>Current Population</th>
<th>Est. Population in 2031</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
<th>Deprivation rank</th>
<th>Average house price</th>
<th>Average weekly earnings by workplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brent</td>
<td>255,500</td>
<td>262,700</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>£314,044</td>
<td>516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ealing</td>
<td>316,600</td>
<td>353,300</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>£322,458</td>
<td>548.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H&amp;F</td>
<td>169,700</td>
<td>177,900</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>£499,031</td>
<td>652.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harrow</td>
<td>228,100</td>
<td>277,000</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>£292,195</td>
<td>515.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hillingdon</td>
<td>262,500</td>
<td>313,600</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>£256,971</td>
<td>629.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hounslow</td>
<td>234,200</td>
<td>282,700</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>£291,092</td>
<td>597.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At present, the West London Sub-Region is one of the most economically vibrant areas of London with over 77,000 VAT registered businesses, nearly 700,000 active employees and Europe’s largest industrial location at Park Royal and Heathrow airport (the UK largest single employment location outside central London). Key sectors are:

- Banking, finance and insurance (together accounting for 24% of employment in the area),
- Transport and communications (16% - more than double the London average, due in part to Heathrow)
- The distribution, hotels and restaurants sector (23.6% of employment – a rise of 19% since 1995).

Cross Rail is under construction and High Speed 2 is proposed to run through the sub-region. Both are expected to significantly impact the local economy.
The West London Economic Assessment shows that WL boroughs generate around 17% of the total GDP of Greater London, second only to the Central Activity Zone (CAZ)\(^8\). West London is also home to a large number of small businesses that serve local communities and also provide a significant amount of jobs\(^9\).

As Figure 2 below shows, there are strengths and opportunities as well as obstacles and threats to the future of the region, which need to be taken into account when considering the consequences for disadvantaged groups:

**Figure 2: SWOT Analysis of West London (Source: West London Economic Assessment\(^{10}\))**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic location between central London and Greater South East</td>
<td>Identified Opportunity Areas have Commercial interest and are being Developed e.g. Wembley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home to many leading global businesses</td>
<td>Crossrail &amp; HS2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent communications with markets</td>
<td>New government funding initiatives for Business and public sector including TIF and CIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse range of business sectors Support the area’s resilience to cyclical Shocks</td>
<td>Community links with BRIC economies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong local knowledge/academic/R&amp;D base e.g. Brunel and GSK</td>
<td>Transition to low carbon economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathrow Airport – UK’s only International Hub Airport</td>
<td>Planning policy stability in London Provides comparative advantage when Compared with Greater South East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established business support and Networking</td>
<td>Global capital increasingly mobile Potential for new inward investment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congestion on transportation networks – Investment lagging behind need</td>
<td>GLA forecast additional population of 173,000 and 99,000 more jobs by 2031- Significant mismatch with working age Population and jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some town centres struggling to improve</td>
<td>Availability of finance for private sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air and noise pollution in parts of the sub Region</td>
<td>Rival locations building strongly – Magnets for new investment and R&amp;D Development especially Thames Valley And overseas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skills mismatch – residents need skills Employers require</td>
<td>Public Sector austerity measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedded worklessness</td>
<td>Lack of affordable housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table clearly shows that the area has a lot of advantages which provide a positive environment for employment, including that of disadvantaged groups. There are also a range of opportunities for the future, including a positive policy context with a range of relevant strategic documents.

\(^7\) Ibid.  
\(^8\) Ibid.  
\(^9\) Ibid.  
\(^{10}\) Ibid.
At the same time, the area faces significant threats and has important weaknesses. Some of these may create greater barriers for disadvantaged populations in the sub-region. Most significant are barriers to travelling because of the potential impact on successful job searches. More jobs will be needed closer to the deprived areas of the West London sub-region, especially given that many disadvantaged people have a variety of responsibilities such as care for often at least three children and significant number of family members with health needs. Availability of affordable housing and cuts of funding to services will remain a key challenge.

1.2. The situation for Roma and other disadvantaged groups in West London

Due to an attractive business environment and the proximity to Heathrow, West London is characterised by a significant cultural diversity.

**Figure 3: Ethnicities in West London: Brent, Ealing, Hammersmith and Fulham, Harrow, Hillingdon and Hounslow. (Source: ONS 2011 Census estimated resident population by ethnic group)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White: British</td>
<td>553,917.00</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Irish</td>
<td>47,129.00</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Gypsy or Irish Traveller</td>
<td>1,545.00</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White: Other White</td>
<td>197,856.00</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>18,335.00</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Black African</td>
<td>10,496.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: White and Asian</td>
<td>21,353.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed: Other Mixed</td>
<td>21,028.00</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Indian</td>
<td>257,715.00</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Pakistani</td>
<td>61,377.00</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Bangladeshi</td>
<td>10,797.00</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Chinese</td>
<td>18,445.00</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British: Other Asian</td>
<td>133,044.00</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Black African</td>
<td>82,830.00</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Black Caribbean</td>
<td>58,834.00</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British: Other Black</td>
<td>31,936.00</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Group: Arab</td>
<td>36,733.00</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Ethnic Group: Any other</td>
<td>35,736.00</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,599,106.00</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population diversity at present and in future**

West London is home to a multitude of cultures and communities drawn from every corner of the globe with over 150 languages spoken and representatives of all major religions in the world, ‘a living testament to the vibrant diversity that makes West London unique’\(^1\). In the 2011 census, 50.1% of the West London population

---


were from White ethnic groups, and 49.9% from Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) groups. The percentage of BAME groups in West London has risen significantly since the last 2001 census (from 37% to 49.9%), which is higher than estimated projections. While the population of people that identify themselves as Gypsy or Irish Traveller is comparatively small, this is a considerable under-estimation of the actual size of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities locally (see also below and Chapter 6).

West London is a key employment area for international migrants, particularly since eight Eastern European (EE) states joined the EU in 2004. In 2007/08, there were 66,400 migrant workers intending to work in West London (25% of the London total and 9% of the national total). Thus, the percentage of migrant potential and actual workers as a proportion of the whole population remains the same. However, the actual numbers have doubled after the eight EE states joined the EU.

Data from the Workers Registration Scheme prior to lifting restrictions on employment for EU citizens from the eight EE states in 2011 shows that these workers are:

- Predominantly young: 40% of the registrations to work were from people aged 18-24 and more than 80% were aged 18-34.

- 60% of the jobs filled by workers from EE countries paid at around the minimum wage level of £5.35 to £6 per hour, suggesting that workers from these eight countries are filling relatively low-skilled jobs. It is not plausible to think that this is a reflection of the fact that a relatively high proportion of West London residents have low skills levels (around 13% have no formal qualifications and 20% lack basic literacy and numeracy skills). It is more likely that workers from EE are able to get mainly low-skilled and low-paid jobs (e.g. because of language and other issues explored in this paper). It is also possible that these are the kind of jobs that are available in the local area recently.

Understanding the Roma population in West London is linked to the history of GRT groups, which historically frequented West London, and especially Ealing. 'Caravan counts' consistently record Ealing as having one of the largest traveller populations in the Greater London area. However, these figures do not include the large and unrecognised 'hidden' traveller communities living in other forms of accommodation. The counting of the total Traveller population in Ealing is affected by mobility, but estimates put the total in excess of 2,000 individuals at certain times of the year. Currently, the traveller groups residing in the Borough are largely from the following traditional communities: Travellers of Irish Heritage; Roma of other European Heritage; and Occupational Travellers (English, European and international circus and fairground people).

---

13 We use the acronym BAME when refugees are not included in the text we review, and BAMER when refugees are included.
15 Based on the number of allocated National Insurance Numbers (NINO).
16 Ibid.
17 Ibid.
18 Ealing GRT Achievement Service on their website: http://www.ealingtravellers.com/E4511/Information.aspx (l.a. February 2013)
2011 data from the WLA suggests that in the next decades the BAME, GRT and migrant groups will compete for jobs with more candidates, whilst the employers will have to work with a more diverse workforce:

- The WLA population is expected to grow by approximately 10% by 2021, leading to an increase in residents by 145,000 residents. At the same time, the economy in the sub-region is estimated to grow between 6% and 12% by 2031.

- There will be a significant increase of around 13% in residents aged 65 and over by 2021.

- The school age population is expected to increase markedly. The number of children and young people aged between 5-16 is expected to increase by 22% by 2031. This means there will be more people with child care responsibilities.

- Around 80% of the young people entering the workforce will be from BAME communities by 2031.

- The international migrant community will continue to be present by 2031.

Barriers to employment faced by disadvantaged groups in West London

This comparatively high proportion of BAME, GRT and other migrant groups is associated with a range of barriers to employment. These often link to the specifics of other vulnerable groups, such as young people, women, older people, people with disabilities, low income families and lone parents, and ex-offenders:

- A significant proportion of West London residents have relatively low-level skills: around 13% having no formal qualifications and 20% lacking basic literacy and numeracy skills.

- When compared with the needs of employers, there is clearly a skills gap: around 20% of residents have a level two qualification or lower but only around 10% of jobs are suitable for individuals with skills at this level. There are forecasts that future skills and employment needs of the economy will result in a greater demand for skills at National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) level 4 or above.

- Unqualified and poorly qualified residents are concentrated in some areas (e.g. parts of Brent, Hounslow and Hillingdon) and in some ethnic groups (Bangladeshi, Black Caribbean, and Irish). This relates to patterns of social exclusion and deprivation.

- The high number of young people not in education, training or employment, is a concern in Hammersmith & Fulham and Harrow, but not that much in other WL boroughs.

These challenges lead to worklessness which is closely linked with both disadvantage and poverty:

- Whilst West London is relatively prosperous, there are significant pockets of deprivation, such as southern parts of Brent and in smaller pockets spread across

---


22 Ibid.
the area (especially in Ealing). This puts many young people and families at risk of a generational vicious circle of poverty.

• There is an embedded problem of homelessness in parts of West London which is closely associated with worklessness.

• Inactivity is more significant in the sub-region than unemployment: in 2010 there were approximately 1,020,700 residents of working age, approximately 24% were economically inactive.

• There is also a continuing challenge of low female employment rates, particularly amongst ethnic minority women.23

Overall, poverty and worklessness affect a range of groups in the West London sub-regions, including but not limited to the Roma and wider GRT population, such as: long-term unemployed or economically inactive residents, lone and low income/workless parents, residents with disabilities, mental health needs or health related barriers, young people (16-25) leaving full-time education, particularly those with limited qualifications, BAME residents, refugees and asylum seekers, ex-offenders, residents in social or temporary accommodation and those who are out of work in private accommodation, older people.24 These groups are also at a particular risk of being affected by the trend of significantly growing population with the associated greater competition for jobs. This is already becoming an issue in the current economic climate.

Socio-economic pressures, implications for Council services and links to the situation of Roma in Bulgaria

These demographic and social pressures apply increasing demands on Council services at a time when Councils are expected to make cost reductions of around £300m per annum whilst seeking to ensure the quality of key services.25 Investing in tailored employment support, we argue, is one of the most promising ways to strategically and cost-effectively tackle societal challenges in a context like that of West London that is rich with business opportunities. To do this one needs to understand the whole spectrum of barriers to disadvantaged groups that lead to worklessness and increased risk of poverty and homelessness. The various disadvantaged groups have certain barriers to employment in common, as they are often disadvantaged because of similar reasons. This applies to Roma and other vulnerable groups alike. The barriers outlined are very similar in the UK and Bulgaria (as well as the EU more widely), and we have chosen to highlight these similarities below in advance of a more detailed discussion of the Bulgarian context in Chapter 2:

• Economically inactive people are those people who are not in work and are not looking for jobs. This is the most numerous workless group as unemployment in West London is not very high. The Bulgarian component of our study showed that inactivity is due to a range of barriers similar to those faced by Roma, who are the highest group of inactive Bulgarian citizens.

23 Ibid.
24 See for example the Ealing work and skills strategy, 2010-2012, available online at: http://www.ealing.gov.uk/info/200142/regeneration/20/employment_and_skills (as February 2013)
25 Ibid.
• Young people between 16-24 years old are of special interest for policy makers in West London as they are the future drivers of the economy. A similar role was seen by some of our informants for young Roma in Bulgaria due to the relatively rapid growth of this demographic compared to the mainstream population.

• People with disabilities: the notion of disability incorporates the theory that it is not the impairment that is the obstacle but the social barriers to participation in the community. This theory underpins the good practices of Roma inclusion that we explored in Bulgaria. However, it has to be kept in mind throughout that the social dynamics, structural obstacles, prejudices and stereotypes behind the lack of opportunities are very different in each of these groups.

• Members of communities which are historically stigmatised and marginalised such as BAMER and GRT. The approaches and practices we present further in the paper emphasise the consideration of cultural factors which is a key finding to be transferred from GRT to wider BAMER groups.

• Lone parents face the key obstacle of juggling care responsibilities and work to an extent greater than parents from nuclear families. This can also be an issue in Roma communities, particularly in cases where only one parent was able to migrate, or was forced to flee to the UK as a refugee in the past.

• Women regarding access to jobs and pay gaps. Roma women are particularly vulnerable because they suffer the double burden of being minority members and women. The practices in the report can gradually contribute to overcoming the problem if applied systematically and consistently in the long term.

• Poverty and low income individuals and families with multiple disadvantages: there is a direct link with the work with Roma because the main reason for their disadvantaged position is poverty which leads to a vicious circle, including intergenerational.

• Homeless people are very difficult to engage in employment because multiple factors such as unprotected exposure to adverse weather conditions and lack of access to utilities to mention just a few. They share a lot of similarities with Roma who live in over-crowded and/or abandoned houses and bad infrastructure, often without access to utilities. This has direct consequences for employment because of the consequences for mental health, physical appearance, and physical health.

• Migrants from less developed countries who lack language skills, soft skills such as interview presentation skills or assertiveness, advanced qualifications, technical skills, adaptive models of behaviour to help them settle in settings characterised by diversity and high pressures. All these factors put Roma in challenging circumstances.

• Ex-offenders tend to fall below the poverty line, face prejudices and suspicion, multiple disadvantages (including mental health and behavioural difficulties). Their characteristics also link to the barriers for Roma that are addressed by the explored approaches.
• Community members with cross-sectional disadvantage, for example, women members of BAMER communities who have disabilities and Roma women or disabled Roma.

• Older workers, facing ageism and outdated skills. Parallels with the situation of Roma can be drawn here, though to a lesser extent. For example, both older people and Roma are disadvantaged through social stereotypes and prejudices. In addition, practices for Roma older people are underdeveloped and can learn from the work with older population more generally. However, Roma face a range of challenges which are not applicable to older job seekers.

The next section looks at the barriers to employment for these groups in a greater detail.

### 1.3. Barriers to employment for disadvantaged people in West London

Our informants in West London are aware of numerous barriers that contribute to both unemployment and inactivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers to employment</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access barriers that result in low motivation of the job seekers</td>
<td>Lack of alternative provisions for care responsibilities, such as childcare or care for family members with health issues - as many BAMER and GRT families have three children on average; Lack of knowledge of job seeking and application processes; Available jobs often are limited to working unsuitable shift hours; Access only to low paid jobs hence reluctance to work; Difficulties of statutory and other services to reach inactive and hard to reach people and to engage them in support programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social barriers</td>
<td>Rising competition for low skilled and low paid jobs because of the recession; Small companies do not advertise so job seekers need to have a strong social network; Education system that does not engage effectively with disadvantaged children results in lack of qualifications which leads to problems finding a job; Employers want experienced workers which means young</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

26 For example free of charge crèche facilities or social work support to elderly and disabled members of the family.
27 BAMER is abbreviation that also includes refugees among the disadvantaged minorities; where the literature or the informants are mentioned refugees among the supported group we speak of BAMER; if not mentioned we speak of BAME.
people and long-term inactive people struggle to access available positions.

| Cohesion issues | Individuals are isolated either because of experiences of discrimination and exclusion that means they do not have a sense of belonging to a wider community, or strong in-group cohesion that can keep people in closed groups with those of a similar background. As a consequence they can lack the wide social networks, and have barriers in accessing services which could help them to find jobs. |
| Systemic issues | There is a variety of needs in this diverse population. This requires a variety of services to work together, which does not always happen well; Lack of knowledge how the social system works is another barrier due to great complexity and bureaucracy. |
| Skills shortages and gaps in training | Everyday skills such as communication skill, time-management and organisational skills; Hard skills such as vocational skills and core competencies to do a job (language, IT skills, numeracy and literacy, proficiency in using work equipment). |
| Disenchantment | Disadvantaged people have the same core aspirations as mainstream population. The constant fight with the above challenges however leads to disenchantment and lack of faith and trust in society. |

Despite similarities with other groups listed above, the literature suggests that Roma and Travellers, including those living in West London, face specific barriers. Firstly, they experience higher levels of social exclusion than other ethnic minorities due to being a trans-national minority and historical experiences of discrimination across Europe. Secondly, they experience specific barriers in accessing the job market due to a lack of cultural understanding, discrimination, issues such language barriers and a lack of formal qualifications. Thirdly, there are difficulties for them navigating the benefit system and its complex procedures and forms. All this can frequently leave families in poverty.

In addition, access to employment for Roma from Bulgaria and Romania in the UK is connected to immigration status: at present Roma from these countries are not legally entitled to work in the UK so often remain hidden from official statistics and local services. Similarly, due to fear and experiences of discrimination, many

---

30 Bulgarians and Romanians will gain the unrestricted right to live and work in the UK from December 2013. This may have positive impact on the discussed problem area.
Roma do not openly declare their ethnicity nor openly promote their Roma identity or culture. Mainstream support services such as employment or housing providers often struggle to engage with this group: they do not know that members of the community are using their services, and are often not aware of the most effective approaches to meet their needs. The Roma thus remain one of the most socially excluded communities in the UK and London. As the communities minister Andrew Stunnell notes ‘Gypsies and Travellers are being held back by some of the worst outcomes of any group across a range of social indicators’. Our West London informants explained in different words these specific barriers:

• ‘The way Roma are viewed and seen is an enormous problem, there is an unprecedented bias against them’, says one of them. An example is the eviction of Roma in France, which has been addressed by the European Court of Human Rights. Interviewees both in Bulgaria and in the UK pointed out that, in the words of one informant, ‘this is a population historically marginalised and disenfranchised’.

• Education is another barrier: often, people from GRT backgrounds only have basic education. This makes learning English even more difficult and is a significant barrier in accessing work and services. In addition, limited job opportunities in the countries of origin lead to difficulties when coming to the UK: it means the only work people from GRT backgrounds can access is low-skilled manual work. Consequently, Roma get trapped into a vicious circle of limited opportunities for employment and progression.

• Not least, as one informant explains, ‘as a result [of all these specific barriers], there is a feeling of not trusting the community and tapping into the range of skills that Roma people have, and so there is a feeling of defensiveness and the community is closed’. As a result, Roma people can feel isolated within their groups and find it difficult to access available support.

All of these barriers are shared by the Roma population both in Bulgaria and when they migrate to the UK and are addressed through the practices we have identified.

1.4. Support available to vulnerable groups in West London

The West London employment and skills system is fragmented and complex: the latest overview of the system is from 2007 and shows that there were 400 projects or services delivered by 200 organisations, but with only our key funders commissioning these services ‘who were not focussing on the needs of residents or the sub-region as a whole’. Today there is no significant change other than the start of the Work Programme, the flagship welfare to work programme of the Coalition Government. The majority of our West London informants pointed to the

---

34 It has to be noted however that there are some Roma, very few, mostly coming from NGO activism background in their home countries who find other positions in the UK.
problem that provision is still fragmented with little clarity about which services are available for what needs. Moreover, the index of access to services in the 2010 Deprivation Atlas for the sub-region is relatively poor (keeping in mind variation between boroughs), even though doing overall well in terms of general deprivation levels. The consequence is an incoherent journey through the system and poor outcomes of the received services.

Priorities and services to improve employability in West London generally

The West London Economic Assessment identifies three main areas of development related to people and community in order to improve West London employability (in addition to measures in business, infrastructure, and interventions):

- Tackle local concentrations of deprivation and worklessness;
- Support initiatives which bring education and skills providers together to provide education and training programmes which will ensure that West Londoners have the skills required by business to support local wealth creation; and
- Build more affordable housing to meet local need and to support sustainable employment.

At present there is a multitude of services delivered and led by the West London Councils: Jobcentre Plus, Further Education Colleges and Adult Learning Providers, Regeneration Partnerships and Agencies, Mental Health support agencies, Learning and/or Physical Disability support agencies, Social Housing Providers, Voluntary and Community services brought together by Community Networks and training and job brokerage providers. They work to enhance the existing system but often without much communication and coordination with each other. The current context of financial shortages affects communication and coordination because some West London interviewees felt that systematic and consistent communication is not possible if there is no specific funding for this. Even though one may argue that it is always possible, multiple pressures caused by austerity measures stay on the way of efficient processes. For example, we observed that WL Councils have dedicated and motivated teams responsible for this task of communication and coordination but the funding is limited and the teams are too small.

Institutional support for vulnerable groups in West London is affected by the national level policy changes. Significant reform of the welfare system is underway, and arrangements for the delivery of employment support provision are undergoing major changes: welfare reform moves services towards more work-focused benefits; outcome-based contracts are put in place for services which help residents find and retain work. Fewer and larger contracts are now let for the
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UK Case-Study: West London Local Authority Work - the example of Ealing Council

Within Ealing Council, the economic development and regeneration department is responsible for improvement of the local economy, including businesses, physical development, transport and wellbeing. The employment and skills team is situated here and works to improve training and employment skills in the Borough. It works strategically to address unemployment by tackling gaps in delivery, implications of changing policies and developing appropriate responses, with a focus on people facing the greatest barriers. Partnership co-ordination is a significant part of this work. This includes liaison with local providers in the skills and employment group, and with other Council departments (for example, intensive work with the children’s services department as part of the Troubled Families Programme). This partnership work involves developing projects and ideas around job brokerage, guided by the Ealing Work and Skills Strategy.

The New Pathways to Work in West London is one of Ealing Council’s key projects. The project seeks to demonstrate that the solution to working with disadvantaged groups is not to create more traditional jobs but to approach the whole process of employment and skills development in a different way, for example by bringing multi-disciplinary teams together to support employment. The aim is also to improve links with services covering other needs in the population, such as housing, education, and health. Or to improve links with voluntary sector organisations working with certain vulnerable groups, such as specific ethnic groups, people with disabilities or refugees. The New Pathways to Work project does this by identifying specific pockets of disadvantage in the borough and the diverse needs locally. These are then addressed in innovative ways.

Provision for Roma in West London and links with the UK policy context

As this research started from good practices in Roma inclusion, it makes sense to review here the provision in West London for GRT communities. We unpack below the key challenges:

- Limited national provision, closing services that have been or can offer adequate support at national level;
- Risks around working with Roma young people and children;
- Lack of understanding of the specific needs of Bulgarian and Romanian nationals (the last group of EE countries to join the EU who have significant Roma population).

We then look at the policy framework surrounding GRT integration in the UK which legitimizes and directs provision for Roma.

With the Roma Support Group, Ealing GRT Achievement Service, the Parent Pupil Partnership and the Traveller Forum in Hillingdon there is a saturation of services in GRT provision in West London. However, there can be particular challenges in the current climate due to cuts in local authorities funding as they are the main funder of these services. The financial cuts exacerbate the situation not only in
West London but UK-wide. One interviewee gave the example of services that are being upgraded to meet the needs of Roma or have been working with Roma. They are closing or are being restructured, particularly education services. The latter had worked successfully for the past 20 years with GRT communities until March 2011, i.e. the Traveller Education Support Service and Ethnic Minority Achievement Service.\(^\text{39}\)

The limited number of policies and practices on Roma integration nationally acts as a barrier to systemic change. This is so because local services cannot exist in isolation. There is a need of a critical mass of activities and like-minded individuals and groups to produce the context required for larger scale change. Whilst there is a range of basic policy and strategy documents, expert interviewees agree that there is not any enacted policy nationally on Roma issues in the UK: ‘Policy is blinded to this issue and ignores it’, says one of them. In another’s view: ‘The Roma are not talked about nationally here as they should be’.

The situation of young Roma and children can be particularly affected. As another interviewee, specializing in youth work, clarifies:

‘there needs to be more talks around [the situation of young Roma] nationally – it is up to us to deliver public services but there are challenges in services for young people more generally, […] more needs to be done for example for young people with mental health needs whose first language is not English and if we don’t address these problems it will lead to difficulties’.

Other experts point out that there are countries which ‘have difficulties with Roma street children on a scale that hasn’t hit us yet’. West London services like the Ealing GRT Achievement Service, the Parent Pupil Partnership and the Traveller Forum in Hillingdon would help meet these challenges. There is a lot of built expertise and experience.

Furthermore, some of our interviewees in West London observed that nobody provides specific services for Bulgarian and Romanian Roma. However, they need more specific advice on their employment rights which remain more restricted than for those of other EE countries.\(^\text{40}\) Our interviewees predicted that people from these two countries are likely to face increased pressures with or without restrictions being lifted. For example, one interviewee reported that the nationals of the eight states who joined the EU in 2004 and had their restrictions lifted on 1 May 2011, including Roma, face problems with Jobcentre Plus.\(^\text{41}\) They have to deal with lack of understanding of their specific cultural factors and fears that they may abuse the social system.

There are several UK policies in place to justify more focus on such provision. The UK National Reform Programme\(^\text{42}\) (NRP) does not mention the specific situation of Roma population, either in the broader sense of the word (including national gypsy and traveller communities as well as Roma immigrants) or in the narrower sense
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\(^\text{39}\) see also the series of publications by Margaret Greenfields and Andrew Ryder

\(^\text{40}\) The restrictions on work for citizens of these two countries expire at the end of 2013.

\(^\text{41}\) See the Glasgow JCP case for example here: [http://www.scotsman.com/scotland-on-sunday/scotland/revealed-abuse-of-roma-at-glasgow-job-centre-routine-1-2306203 (l.a. February 2013)].

sometimes used in the UK literature.\textsuperscript{43, 44} However, there are a number of other documents that will shape any initiatives going forward.

Most notably, the \textit{Council Conclusions on an EU Framework Strategy for Roma Integration up to 2020: United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland}\textsuperscript{45} presents policies specifically designed to target Roma populations. However, no specific labour market policies or actions are included. Particular education, health, housing and anti-discrimination measures are described, but the integrated approach used in the Bulgarian context is not reflected in this document.

The UK did not submit a \textit{National Roma Integration Strategy} (NRIS) as alternatively member states have the flexibility to develop sets of policy measures within wider social inclusion policies. As the executives of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland are responsible for these matters in their territories, they prepared individual documents regarding their policies to promote Gypsy and Traveller inclusion. Of relevance to this paper is the \textit{2012 Progress Report} by the ministerial working group on tackling inequalities experienced by Gypsies and Travelers\textsuperscript{46}. The Progress Report includes 28 commitments to improve the social mobility of Gypsies and Travelers, among which steps related to improved access to employment.

All these documents should be taken into account when considering West London future provision for GRT communities in the context of social inclusion of disadvantaged groups in the region.

1.5. Summary and implications

The preceding sections showed that the context of West London is rapidly changing due to economic changes and general policy reforms. These changes are affecting, and will affect, those who are in an already disadvantaged position most. This makes it important to explore how these groups can be best supported. As we have shown above, the situation of Roma shares a lot of similarities with the situation of other disadvantaged groups. The next chapter will look at the Bulgarian context and how it is comparable to that of the UK and other EU Member States. We will be showing that the good practices identified when studying the Bulgarian experience can provide a useful point of reference for both policy makers and practitioners who implement these policies regardless of whether they work with GRT communities or with vulnerable people more generally. Clearly, there are specifics of the different vulnerabilities but the general principles at the core of the different practices can be applied widely.

\textsuperscript{44} Despite the lack of official figures, the estimation of Roma population living in UK ranges from 60,000 to 300,000\textsuperscript{2}, which means about 0.15-0.5\% of total population. In this sense, its potential inclusion in particular policies targeted to ethnic minorities or vulnerable groups is not specifically considered in the NRP, except maybe for the case of Child Poverty Strategy or Scottish specific funding.
\textsuperscript{46} \url{http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/mwgreporttravellers}. The working group was established in November 2010 by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government which brings together ministers from seven Government departments.
2. The employment and social inclusion situation of Roma in Bulgaria

2.1. Employment patterns in Bulgaria generally

Bulgaria and the UK differ significantly from historic, geographic, demographic, social and political points of view. In employment terms, Bulgaria has been facing significant challenges throughout its transition to a capitalist. For decades the population did not experience the problems of unemployment and social stratification. Changes occurring over the last 20 plus years, however, have pushed the most vulnerable groups to the margins of society, including Roma which make up 4.9% of the total Bulgarian population (0.15 and 0.5% in the UK).

Figure 4 Employment situation in Bulgaria and the UK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BULGARIA</th>
<th>UNITED KINGDOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roma population</td>
<td>325,343 (4.9% of total pop.)&lt;sup&gt;47&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>480,000-300,000&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt; (0.15-0.5% of total pop.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant Roma</td>
<td>~10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National employment rate&lt;sup&gt;51&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>63.9% (pop. aged 20-64)</td>
<td>73.6% (pop. aged 20-64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62.3% of women</td>
<td>67.9% of women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>66.6% of men</td>
<td>79.4% of men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National unemployment rate&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The poverty rate in Bulgaria (20.7% in 2009<sup>53</sup>) is one of the highest in the EU (although declining), and 35% of Bulgarians live in severe material deprivation<sup>64</sup>. The poverty risk for the majority of households is determined by the nature of

---

<sup>52</sup> Ibid.
economic activity and participation in the labour market. In terms of economic status, the poverty risk is the highest for the unemployed, pensioners and other economically inactive people. In terms of age groups, the poverty risk is the highest for children aged up to 18 (26.7%) and for the population at above the working age of 16 (32.2%). Thus, employment policies are among the main tools to fight poverty.

Labour legislation in Bulgaria is mainly covered by the Labour Code, supplemented with some specific legislative acts on health and safety at work and collective labour disputes. The relevant legislative framework determines the relatively high flexibility of the labour market in the country. Several measures were adopted in 2009 and were subsequently supplemented in 2010 aimed at diminishing the negative effect of the economic downturn on the labour market:

- Measures encouraging flexible work and measures concerning skills enhancement;
- Measures supporting wages and domestic demand (e.g. subsidising the wages of workers who have moved to part-time employment and abolishing the upper limit of the unemployment benefit for persons who have lost their jobs because of manufacturing reasons;
- Measures supporting direct employment, especially for vulnerable groups;
- Amendments to the Employment Promotion Law, leading to: a decrease in the sanction period for registration renewal; an increase in the quality of public employment services; increasing the subsidised period for probation of youths; and an introduction of subsidised employment on “green jobs”.

However, the effectiveness of these measures to combat unemployment has yet to be comprehensively evaluated.

2.2. The situation of Bulgarian Roma: employment, poverty and education performance

The specific challenge of Roma inclusion is more embedded in Bulgarian policies than in the UK. This is reflected in the volume of documents on the topic: there are more than 30 strategic documents and more programmes, initiatives and interventions directed specifically towards this community. More specific information on the Roma population is available, not only from national but international authorities. Key aspects of this information are outlined below.

---

55 Ibid.
57 Ibid, p. 14
58 For the purposes of this report, the terms “Roma” and “Roma and other groups perceived as ‘Gypsies’” include persons describing themselves as Roma, Gypsies, Travellers, Manouches, Sinti, as well as other terms. It is to be noted, however, that general use of the term Roma is in no way intended to downplay or ignore the great diversity within the many different Romani groups and related communities, nor is it intended to promote stereotypes. Diversity within the Romani communities is, as with all communities, complex and multi-dimensional and involves differences of language and dialect, history, culture, religion, social class, and educational and occupational status. Some communities and individuals covered in this study are nomadic by culture, while others are sedentary. This study uses the term “Roma” as the plural noun form, as well as to name the group as a whole, and “Romani” as the adjective, in line with emerging and converging uses. Roma are an extremely heterogeneous group. There are five major Roma linguistic groups in Bulgaria: Daskane Roma, Xoraxane Roma, Kalderash, Kalaydjes (Coppersmiths), Ludara, and more than 70 subgroups based on traditional crafts, religion, the level of nomadism/SEDENTARIANISM and endogamy.
Poverty and unemployment as the greatest challenges facing the Roma community in Bulgaria

The biggest problems faced by the Roma population – as well as minority groups generally - are those of poverty and unemployment. Roma in Bulgaria face severe problems with unemployment, discrimination in accessing employment and education, and economic hardship.\(^5\) Most notably:

- Roma children and young people face barriers in accessing mainstream schooling due to the segregated education system.
- The Roma population in general faces difficulties accessing healthcare due to social assistance policies limiting the eligibility for healthcare as they do not account for the circumstances of disadvantaged groups.
- There is a lack of security in housing due to many Roma living in premises without proper documentation and official permit and risk of evictions;
- And high levels of racism and discrimination in accessing work.\(^6\)

Data published in 2011 from the Confederation of Trade Unions in Bulgaria estimate that: 74% of Bulgarian Roma workers fall into the three lowest income groups (concentrated in agriculture and construction); and that Roma are 4-5 times less likely to have opportunities for training and professional development than Bulgarians in general.\(^7\)

Bulgaria thus presents one of the most challenging contexts for Roma inclusion in Europe with a view to employment. Nearly 9 out of 10 Bulgarian Roma experienced per capita incomes that were equal to the incomes experienced by the poorest four-tenths of the Bulgarian population: 67% of Roma being among the poorest 20% of all people in Bulgaria; less than a quarter of Roma women are working compared to 58% of the ethnic Bulgarian women from the majority population; and employed Bulgarian Roma men earn nearly one third less than men from the majority population.\(^8\)

Among the Roma population, the early school leaving rate is particularly high (an estimated at 43% in 2008 compared to a national average of 14.7% in 2009).\(^9\) Long-term unemployment remains one of the main problems of the Bulgarian labour market. Lack of educational achievement is especially significant in this context as unemployment is highest among the low educated and low qualified. In addition to above national average early school leaving, it is therefore significant that only 7.2% of Roma attended tertiary or secondary education, 44.9% have

basic education, 27.4% primary education, 7.8% are without any educational degree and 12.7% are illiterate.64

Other factors contributing to Roma disadvantage

Our informants gave further granularity to the general picture of Roma disadvantage, providing us with a wealth of information on the specific barriers faced by Roma in Bulgaria. In the overview of vulnerable groups in West London we found that the barriers to inclusion and employment faced by Roma are quite similar to those faced by other disadvantaged groups. Here are some further details from the Bulgarian perspective that again support this view whilst highlighting some local specifics:

• The lack of appropriate education leads to problems with employment. A specific challenge in Bulgaria is that Muslim Roma especially often do not speak Bulgarian. A range of programmes targeting this issue are in place but funding and trained human resources are a problem.

• Roma segregated schools are a big problem because children learn and develop better in mainstream schools. Also, mainstream schools can provide the first multicultural environment thus setting up a model for future adult social life.

• A large proportion of Roma do not graduate from secondary education. Since the collapse of the socialist system in 1989, the education attainment of the Roma has declined so that those that are more educated tend to be older.

• Worklessness in Bulgaria links to complications in other areas. For example, as mentioned above, a large proportion of Roma are unemployed hence they do not pay health insurance. This becomes a barrier to accessing healthcare. Social security benefits are also linked to previous employment.

• Some interviewees highlighted that there can be negative practices within the Roma communities themselves. For example, in Bulgaria many Roma girls leave school as early as 12 in order to take on family responsibilities for housework. However, Roma representatives among our interviewees stressed that this practice is changing later in women’s lives: women maintain the closest contact with children and hence with education. As a consequence, a growing number of Roma activists are women. There is a stable trend of negative community trends disappearing from the contemporary everyday life of the Roma.

• Similarly to disadvantaged groups in West London, Roma in Bulgaria lack employment and attainment skills as well as technical skills. Paradoxically, abandoned Roma children do not have this problem because they have acquired technical skills in the state boarding schools.

• There are greater discriminatory attitudes among employers and customers than in West London, expert interviewees believe. The reasons given for this is that Bulgaria is not viewed as multicultural, as is the UK, so being different is a bigger problem. There is no comparative study to support this opinion, yet research


(La. November 2013)
shows that prejudices are a challenge in both countries\textsuperscript{65,66}. Furthermore, interviewees expressed concerns about the growing popularity of a Far Right political party, which ‘secured seats in parliament on the back of anti-Roma sentiment’ as they put it\textsuperscript{67}. This is confirmed by a range of published sources. Dimitrova, for example says:

“Ataka”, headed by the nationalist leader Volen Siderov infamous for his regular threats of the “gypsification of the Bulgarian society”, was the third strongest political actor [at the last elections] with 8-10% potential electorate\textsuperscript{68}.

These far right tendencies in society may affect the political will to enforce good practices for Roma integration as they promote a view of Roma as inferior and dangerous.

Because of all these barriers (most notably low skills, lack of qualifications and low expectations towards them), the main realistic employment opportunities for the Roma are in street cleaning\textsuperscript{69,70}. While interviewees observe that the wages are comparatively reasonable (e.g. approximately the average salary in Bulgaria), in most cases it is only one parent that works in large households of extended families, which means income is insufficient. Some Roma also work in the construction sector. Even though Bulgaria is cutting down on the shadow economy, informants reported that most Roma, however, work in the ‘grey-sector’ or informal economy. This means without legal contracts which has consequences for accessing health, unemployment and social benefits.

Roma migration is also a key disadvantaging factor. Whilst it is often empowering for the individual migrants, it weakens the community as a whole. A large number of Roma work abroad at certain times of the year (e.g. spring and summer). Anecdotal evidence suggests that 80% of Roma migrants go to nearby countries as Spain and Greece for seasonal agricultural work and 20% Roma migrants (mainly Turkish Roma) go to countries with large minorities like UK, Belgium or France to stay for longer (over six months).

Most of the challenges above are issues for which current service provision in the UK, including in West London, is prepared. However, as one Bulgarian interviewee puts it, ‘the Roma have lived here for centuries, but they have moved to the UK much more recently. To be seen as foreigners, newcomers or refugees and opposed to the local population is a very different problem to address’. Issues of inclusion of transnational minorities such as the Roma are a newly emerging field of research and as such they are not well understood yet. A key challenge is the representation of these groups and who speaks for them.\textsuperscript{71} This is particularly difficult when they face the double burden of disadvantage: both as a transnational

\textsuperscript{65} See for example the latest OSI survey on social distances in Bulgaria: http://opendata.bg/en/opendata.php?q=44&i=48&c=50&i=717&i=2&sel=1 (summarised by the leading Bulgarian sociologist Dr Petya Kabakchieva here: http://politiki.bg/?cy=249&lang=2&abi=2239498#amp;id=1015) (i.a. March 2013)  
\textsuperscript{67} See also an overview of Bulgarian Helsinki Committee lawsuit against the party at: http://www.novinite.com/view_news.php?id=147095 (i.a. March 2013)  
minority in countries in which they have suffered discrimination for generations and as migrants who have to integrate in a new host country.

2.3. Key policy measures and funding sources for Roma inclusion in Bulgaria

The section above outlined a relatively low performance on some key indicators and some particularities of the situation of Roma in Bulgaria. However, the action plan of the Republic of Bulgaria, which details the measures to implement the National Roma Integration Strategy, links well to key EU strategies such as the Decade of Roma Inclusion and the European Structural Funds (ESF) policies as well as to policies in the UK. Even though not much statistical evidence is available to document successes and inconsistencies, a range of good practices have been developed both at governmental and at civil society levels. The Bulgarian government, in co-operation with local non-governmental organisations (NGOs) has developed promising measures for the social inclusion and integration of Roma people.

In addition to the state budget, Roma integration projects are mainly funded via EU programmes. In fact, this is the main source of funding after the withdrawal of external funders from Bulgaria following its EU accession in 2007. Because of their thematic focus, the volume of funds and the fact that they present the main funding sources for Roma inclusion, the European Structural Funds deserve special attention so we review them below.

The ESF Operational Programme (OP) for Human Resource Development aims at improving employment, education, qualification, social inclusion, equal access to social and health services. It adheres to the principles of equality among all citizens in the Republic of Bulgaria and emphasises the importance of improving education and schooling for Roma children, enhancing the skills of Roma to improve employability and linking Roma participation in the labour market to health promotion and information activities, disease prevention, and better access to healthcare services.

Foreign donors considered EU accession a sign that the country is prepared to meet challenges through EU and national funds. But they did not acknowledge local factors such as the lack of tradition in charity and philanthropy which in developed Western countries are a key additional source of support to residual service provision, which means support that do not target the mainstream population. Our interviews found that it also takes time for grassroots organisations to develop skills to apply for EU funds. There are signs that national administration of EU funds is patchy due to emerging processes and technology.

Even though there are very few local independent grant making bodies, the Open Society Foundation Making the Most of EU funds for Roma programme is linked to the Human Resource Development OP, as a technical assistance scheme to provide support to Roma organisations to participate. America for Bulgaria Foundation is another key actor. Its Economically Disadvantaged Programme of

Funding is a key resource for Bulgarian NGOs after the withdrawal of foreign donors post EU accession.\textsuperscript{74} The European Regional Development Fund (ERDF) Regional Development Operational Programme provides opportunities to address poor housing, lack of education and access to health care, high unemployment and low income as key issues facing the Roma community in Bulgaria. Actions funded under Priority Axis 1: Sustainable and Integrated Urban Development (Operation 1.1. Social Infrastructure, Operation 1.2. Housing), and Priority Axis 4: Local development and co-operation are relevant to the issues identified above.

The Rural Development Programme (RDP)\textsuperscript{75}, and in particular actions funded under Priority Axis 3: Quality of life in rural areas and diversification of the rural economy and Priority Axis 4: Implementation of the Local Development Strategies (which includes Leader) are also significant. An interesting aspect of this programme is that for particularly isolated groups, such as Roma communities, special efforts were foreseen to provide information and guidance on what support is available under the RDP. This responds to a concern expressed by Roma NGOs about lack of information as a key barrier to participation. The specific business support facilities that have been established to support the Roma communities were among the main sources of information on good practices.

Outside the European Structural Funds, the following EU programmes fund projects on Roma integration: the Progress Programme (e.g. the projects "Equality as a path to progress project run by the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy" and "Strengthening capacity of the state administration for applying gender mainstreaming approach"); the Youth in Action Program; the Grundtvig Programme; the Daphne III programme and Europe For Citizens Program.

EU funds thus provide rich opportunities to link, replicate and sustain existing good practices and to develop new ones. Employment and fostering youth development are key priorities in these programmes. However, overall the programmes cover comprehensively provision needs in the area. There is a trend of adjusting these programmes to the specific needs of Roma. The programmes match well with the needs in the area of Roma integration and thus provide a promising framework for strategic development in this area.

This situation is comparable to the situation of Roma integration in EU countries in which this community has a shorter history of settling. The contrasting case vignette below shows that the difficult situation in which Roma is put is not caused by just the national policies alone or the peculiarities of one culture. Instead, it demonstrates that this outcome is a result of deeper social and political dynamics. It also shows that similar solutions are being tried in different countries which have in common their European heritage and EU membership.

\textsuperscript{74} Bulgarian interviewees pointed out that the current levels of access to funds are not making up for the withdrawn support as we had the opportunity to observe with local organisations that are struggling and often closing down.

Spanish Case-study: Contrasting Roma situation

Despite the lack of reliable data\textsuperscript{76}, the Roma population in Spain is estimated to be about 750,000 people, mainly comprising of urban, relatively young Roma\textsuperscript{77} and women\textsuperscript{78}. While some positive social changes are taking place, such as granting full citizenship to national Roma, their economic and social conditions remain unfavourable compared to the rest of the Spanish population\textsuperscript{79}. The Roma have suffered in the economic crisis to a larger extent because of their precarious social situation. In 2011, unemployment rates were 20.9\% for the whole of Spanish population, while this rate was 36.4\% for the national Roma population and 34.4\% for Eastern Roma\textsuperscript{80}. Similarly considerably more Roma are in less secure temporary or part-time contracts. However alongside labour market barriers other reinforcing factors hinder Roma social inclusion in Spain. Almost 8 out of 10 Roma households are in a situation of relative poverty\textsuperscript{81}, 14.5\% of the Roma population is illiterate and 30.6\% have no formal education (compared to 2.2\% and 9.7\% nationally)\textsuperscript{82}.

Nevertheless, some steps forward are taking place, such as the programme ACCEDER\textsuperscript{83} to improve Roma access to the labour market, developed by the Spanish government and the Roma Secretariat Foundation, and funded by the ESF. Other programmes are focused on Roma women such as SARA and CLARA\textsuperscript{84}. Similarly, the “Spanish model” of full citizenship of the Roma population integrates a system of universal social policies with targeted policies for specific Roma inequalities. However, of those NGOs involved in receiving ESF funding, only the Roma Secretariat Foundation is a specifically Roma organisation (although other charities such as Caritas and the Red Cross have Roma inclusion within their wider objectives). Given this, there is an urgent need to develop capacity within Roma organisations, as the more representative national and regional organisations\textsuperscript{85} such as the Spanish Roma State Council (an umbrella body of Roma organisations)\textsuperscript{86}, do not have access to EU funds. While the Roma Secretariat Foundation is undertaking important work,\textsuperscript{87} such as its collaboration with mainstream NGOs to routinely include Roma in their target groups, the concentration of funds in one organisation may be hindering capacity building and learning among the sector, and reducing the capacity of diverse Roma groups to effectively influence policy decisions.

This is important as the principle of ‘explicit but not exclusive targeting’ is included in most mainstream Spanish social programmes aimed at vulnerable groups, where there is explicit reference to targeting Roma. For example, the Women’s Institute funded by the ESF to address gender discrimination and violence, includes the double discrimination suffered by Roma women within its work. Due to this, it may be considered nationally that Roma are already being sufficiently targeted. However, as described above, the Roma social movement is not very well embedded in the process of social change supported by


\textsuperscript{78} Rodríguez-Cabrero, Gregorio (2011) op.cit.p.5

\textsuperscript{79} Fundación Secretariad Gitano(2012) op.cit.p.175.

\textsuperscript{80} Fundación Secretariad Gitano(2012) op.cit. Part I.

\textsuperscript{81} Laparra, M. (Coor)(2011), Diagnóstico social de la comunidad gitana en España. Madrid: MSPSI

\textsuperscript{82} Fundación Secretariado Gitano (2005) Población gitana y empleo: un estudio comparado.

\textsuperscript{83} Fundación Secretariado Gitano (2009) Framework document: ACCEDER Programme. Europa, Structural Funds: investing in Roma. See:

\textsuperscript{84} www.inmujer.gob.es/areasTematicas/multiDiscriminacion/mujeresMigrantes/home.htm&usg=AFQjCNNGRYMHQmbdAv8il_avDAtNu5SeQg

\textsuperscript{85} ibid.

\textsuperscript{86} Members selected to represent the Roma associative movement in the Spanish Roma State Council in 2012 are considered as the most representative ones, see http://www.msc.es/politicaSocial/inclusionSocial/poblacionGitana/docs/ResolucionvocalesCEPG.pdf (l.a. October 2012)

\textsuperscript{87} ibid.

\textsuperscript{88} See www.gitanos.org/upload/60/99/empleo_e_inclusion_social.pdf (l.a. October 2012)
2.4. Opportunities for policy and practice learning between Bulgaria and the UK

There is considerable potential for an exchange of policy and practice learning between Bulgaria and the UK. Bulgaria has been presented by the EC as showing good practice in delivering schemes to reduce Roma unemployment. The state is increasing the numbers of Roma in employment, primarily through ESF support, by organising training courses to improve 28,000 people’s employability and by training 1,500 people in management and entrepreneurship. As the Roma population in the UK is comparatively small (about 0.15-0.5% of total population), most policy documents do not tend to make a specific reference to this group. Nevertheless, the main UK employment policies are supposed to pay special attention to the people less attached to the labour market and to the most vulnerable groups, as part of the new welfare reform. Similarly, the size of the UK Roma population is significantly under-estimated nationally and in local areas. It is in such cases that learning from effective approaches to Roma inclusion in Bulgaria can be beneficial to the UK.

Arguably, a number of cultural and political factors support a learning process between these countries. Starting at a very high level, both the UK and Bulgaria share a common European cultural heritage, very much linked to predominantly Christian values, social and behavioural patterns. Both countries are governed by a democratic rule, too - there are equivalent structures with similar functions in the society: institutions, civil society organisations, media. The ways in which civil society structures evolved are different, even though in both instances they are converging into becoming at the same time political actors and residual service providers. However, the two countries have different legislation and policies as well as historical differences in the formation, development and function of democratic structures. Consequently, implementation and challenges of integration and employment strategies will be different. Nevertheless, we have found that the basis of the various working approaches and practices to Roma inclusion we identified in Bulgaria can be applied in the UK (and West London more specifically). The question is how?

In answering this question, we need to look deeper at some contextual similarities and differences. As one Bulgarian informant says, ‘issues of social justice are affected by times of crisis’. There are always huge social contrasts as a result, especially in terms of polarisation between different groups and increased economic distances between the rich and the poor. Existing policies both in Bulgaria and in the UK may not be adequate in the current context of austerity with its deepening consequences. This affects not only the Roma but all those who are

---

90 For instance the Europe 2020 National Reform Programme
91 Residual service provision describes the model in which statutory agencies cover mostly mainstream services and the needs of the rest of the population are covered through more tailored services by other actors.
vulnerable to being pushed outside of the society. ‘Issues of access should not be declared but guaranteed’, argues another Bulgarian interviewee. This can become problematic in a context in which arrangements for funding integration work are privileging big players and the skilled elite. On the positive site, our informants in Bulgaria are confident that there is no risk of cuts in this area. On the contrary, a greater concern for socially vulnerable groups is reflected in available funding.

By contrast, both West London and the UK face austerity at present. Economically and socially disadvantaged groups are most affected by this and the policy measures taken. Our informants observed that there was a significant impact after the Government’s Spending Review in 2010. After the Review, a range of targeted services on the ground were withdrawn or restructured due to budget reductions. As a result access to provision was reduced and the well-working multiagency approach appears to be shrinking. The consequence is that in some specific areas at present ‘actors are very few and function as isolated individuals who are not much working together’ (EU level stakeholder based and working in the UK). Bulgarian actors have longer experience in dealing with the consequences of stagnation and an economic crisis. These were a common experience in the 1990s due to the transition from socialism and the consequent rapid economic change. However, that context also provided opportunities for learning, development of good practice and innovation.

Even though shorter, the experience of Bulgaria as a democratic welfare state is very intense. Tackling the problems of disadvantaged groups in the country was a priority. This was at the core of the conditions for EU accession and a priority for the intervention of developed Western European countries in the period up to the EU accession. Thus a range of good practices were developed and tested – there is a lot to be learned from them. Now, they face the challenge of being embraced by the Bulgarian government and incorporated into practice. The associated processes provide another site for useful learning.

The profile of the disadvantaged population is also very similar, except for the profile of minority groups. Bulgarian society is not as culturally diverse as UK society due to lower rates of migration to Bulgaria and the socialist history during which Bulgaria was relatively isolated from migration flows. Most of the Bulgarian minorities can be considered almost native as they have settled in these lands centuries ago. This is very different from being a recent migrant population or refugees as there are historical issues that need to be addressed. This provides useful opportunity for learning about working with trans-national and historically settled minority groups.

Roma situation as a recent challenge in the UK

The Roma issue is an EU problem, not just a problem of individual countries and the UK has to address the issue as a Member State. The Roma population in the UK is a small proportion compared with other minorities, however the actual size of the community is unknown and likely to be significantly larger than official estimates. There is also little research into the needs of this group, and whether and how they may differ compared to other disadvantaged groups. The extent to which existing services are prepared to work with them is an important question for policy makers. The contemporary practices and policies in Bulgaria have a longer
history of targeted provision for this group. Hence, the knowledge about them can inform future tailoring of existing approaches. The Bulgarian state has an updated programme of Roma integration and there is a dedicated section called Council for Cooperation on Ethnic and Integration Issues. The Council is very active and its work is included as an example of an integrated approach in this paper.

The final link between the work in the UK and in Bulgaria is therefore the common EU policy objectives with regard to employment, social inclusion and Roma. Promoting access to the labour market and improving the social integration of migrants and minorities within EU are key strategies. This has become especially important with the increased number of Eastern European citizens joining the EU. This is of paramount importance from a competitiveness and social cohesion perspective. Hence, the Europe 2020 Strategy gives priority to ‘empowering people in inclusive societies’. It also sets a headline target of increasing overall employment rates to at least 75% to maintain Europe’s competitiveness. Furthermore, the Agenda for new skills and jobs, sets out policy actions in the area of labour market mismatches (e.g. inadequate skills or limited mobility). These, at least in some regions, are the cause for rising unemployment parallel with rising vacancies.

The EC postulates that ‘[l]ife-long learning policies are essential to equip people with the right skills for the labour market’. Actions therefore focus on:

- improving the functioning of labour markets;
- equipping people with the right skills for employment;
- improving job quality and working conditions;
- creating jobs through supporting entrepreneurship.

At the same time, the Decade of Roma inclusion 2005-2015 prioritises education, employment, health, and housing. It also commits governments to take into account the other core issues of poverty, discrimination, and gender mainstreaming. The EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies on employment, education, healthcare and housing ‘encourages all Member States, in proportion to the size of the Roma population living in their territories and taking into account their different starting points, to adopt or to develop further a comprehensive approach to Roma integration’. Thus it sets up common policy objectives for Bulgaria and the UK. The implications for policy and practice learning

---

95 For example, more individually tailored help for people looking for work, better incentives to take up learning opportunities, more adjustable unemployment benefits.
on Roma integration between the UK and Bulgaria are that there is a need of a more intensive exchange of experience.

2.5. Summary and implications

This chapter reviewed the Bulgarian employment and social inclusion context, with a specific focus on the situation of Roma and the policies governing the processes of Roma inclusion. It made a reference throughout to the UK context in order to point towards opportunities for cross-country learning about good practices in Roma integration. The goal was to describe the context in which the practices we identified operate and to present the specifics in which the actors we interviewed are working. The key conclusion is that the two countries share a similar political framework for Roma integration (based on respective EU policies). In addition, both are affected by the current economic crisis which in turn affects the most disadvantaged groups.

However, the two countries are very different in terms of wealth, employment situation, employment policies, and demographics. These differences need to be taken into account when exploring the characteristics of the good practices we identified in Bulgaria. In order to see to what extent these differences should affect our conclusions about transferability of the identified good practices, we:

- a) reviewed the literature to find common underpinning theories and examples from elsewhere in the area of social inclusion;
- b) looked at whether the good practices identified in Bulgaria and supported through the literature are already in action in West London;
- c) included a question to our interviewees both in West London and in Bulgaria about what they think regarding the transferability of their programmes, and
- d) looked for commonalities between the two countries about both factors: what makes their programmes work and what are the obstacles.

These findings are summarised in the next four chapters.
3. Good Practice 1: Integrated policy approach to social inclusion

A central theme from the data collected is that an integrated approach, addressing a range of other social needs simultaneously is essential in order to effectively improve the employability of Roma, other migrants and disadvantaged groups more generally. These social needs include education, health, housing, education, civic and political participation, cultural understanding and anti-discrimination. As one Bulgarian policy maker we interviewed argued:

‘The projects are not that important here, what is important is the dedicated department at the Municipality\footnote{Municipality or ‘obshtina’ in Bulgarian is the smallest form of local authority in Bulgaria.}, the equal opportunities, the integrated approach\footnote{Institute for Strategic Dialogue, 2012, Integration and Cohesion in Europe: An Overview. Available online at: \url{http://www.strategicdialogue.org/allnewmats/Integration%20and%20Cohesion%20in%20Europe%20Literature%20Review%20FINAL.pdf} (l.a. February 2013)} that bring them together; the mechanism is the integrated approach. One needs to take a total approach with the Roma and address all the problems at the same time – health care, education, social support, employment, infrastructure – all have to be addressed at the same time, with all the minority groups.’

3.1. Why does the approach work?

As explored in the previous chapters, there is a variety of needs behind the process of social inclusion and integration of Roma and other disadvantaged groups. To address them it is necessary to cover simultaneously a range of interconnected social policy fields. Indeed, these findings (as well as the above quote) sit well with current thinking in the literature and at policy level on how most effectively to achieve migrant integration.

For instance, a recent review of European policy and practice literature found that successful integration needs to encompass: a) economic integration, such as access to education and the labour market; b) social integration, including prejudice, sense of belonging and interactions between communities; and c) legal integration, anti-discrimination framework, legal and civic rights\footnote{EC. (2004). Handbook on Integration for policy-makers and practitioners. European Commission, DG Justice, Freedom and Security. P11 Available at: \url{http://ec.europa.eu/eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:0957:FIN:EN:PDF} (l.a. February 2013).}. As another key European publication argues:

Integration is a multi-dimensional process of interactions between immigrants and the receiving society. It is not a single policy but a dimension which requires efforts in many areas and needs to be taken into account in a wide range of policy developments at various levels and involving numerous actors.\footnote{European Commission, 2011, EU initiatives Supporting the Integration of Third Country Nationals, p.2. Available online at: \url{http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:0957:FIN:EN:PDF} (l.a. February 2013)}

Similarly, EU guidance on integration and cohesion in Europe advises that the integration process needs to be supported by actions in numerous policy areas to ensure employment opportunities, inclusive education, access to health, housing, language learning, participation in public and political life, and building up cultural and social ties to achieve improved feelings of belonging\footnote{EUROPEAN COMMISSION (2011). EU initiatives Supporting the Integration of Third Country Nationals, p.2. Available online at: \url{http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=SEC:2011:0957:FIN:EN:PDF} (l.a. February 2013).}. And recommendations...
on policy-making for the inclusion of Roma suggest that there needs to be ‘an integrated programming approach in which the main policy responses are interlinked in order to ensure optimal policy effectiveness’ and particularly emphasised the connections between education, employment, housing and health policy.\textsuperscript{102}

This is described in a pan-European study on what works in Roma integration:

‘Housing affects the health situation … and influences access to job opportunities; the health situation influences educational attainment, and education affects health-related behaviours; … the level of education and professional training influences employment and employment in turn allows for an improvement in living standards, including changes in housing, which affects access to education and healthcare’.\textsuperscript{103}

The importance of adopting an integrated approach to the social and labour market inclusion of Roma (and other disadvantaged groups) was also a key finding from the stakeholder interviews conducted. Given that the Roma face multiple barriers in terms of their social exclusion, in order to improve their employability, it is essential to address wider needs such as lack of education, insecure housing, social and cultural discrimination and health difficulties. As described by one interviewee:

‘The gaps are everywhere – in education, employment, housing and health. My impression is that the initiatives implemented are not inter-related or integrated so they can only be limited in what they achieve’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

3.2. What does this approach entail?

An integrated approach means coordinated simultaneous work by multiple actors (for example government, civil society, businesses and academia) on multiple levels (including national, regional and local). It also entails joint policy-making between the different stakeholders, programme design, and inter-agency working across different policy fields such as education, housing, anti-discrimination, cohesion and culture, employment, health, family, crime, civic and political involvement. In this sense it is not just about different policy fields working together but about different organisations within multiple societal sectors working together as well. This is notoriously difficult. We found in our interviews, observations and the review of policies that in order for this to really happen there is a need of a strong policy or policies that require this, dedicated funding that aims at better communication, a developed political democratic culture and structures and joined strategies and action plans to outline concrete steps and measures. The concrete components are outlined below.

Bulgarian Case-Study: Empowering disadvantaged groups in multiple policy fields - C.E.G.A. Foundation


The CEGA Foundation (Creating Effective Grassroots Alternatives Foundation) was founded in 1995 and practices an integrated approach to Roma social inclusion. Its areas of work include:

- **Capacity building**: training and consultancy to local groups and authorities in working with disadvantaged communities and in accessing funds, especially in the sphere of education.
- **Facilitating dialogue**: between disadvantaged communities and decision-making bodies.
- **Improving policy-making**: for social inclusion of disadvantaged communities: undertaking community-based research to identify problems and good practices; participation in local and national structures to develop social inclusion policies for disadvantaged communities (e.g. National Council for Cooperation on Ethnic and Integration Issues); monitoring the implementation of these policies on local and national levels.
- **Changing attitudes**: towards disadvantaged communities: running training and seminars on human rights, intercultural dialogue and social inclusion; organising events and campaigns; capacity building and strengthening the activities of C.E.G.A.’s youth volunteers’ network.
- **International development**: supporting the “Official Development Assistance” process through the Bulgarian platform for international development; promoting good practices for working with disadvantaged communities in developing countries; promoting the inclusion of development education in Bulgaria’s formal educational system.

C.E.G.A. supports Roma groups in their efforts to deliver services to help Roma communities, families and individuals, but it is not a service provider itself. Through its work a range of Roma organisations, activists and groups have been established and fostered. As part of this role, C.E.G.A also engages in advocacy to ensure that good practices around Roma inclusion in policy fields such as education and employment, are adopted in local government policy. For example, a key challenge is that the Muslim Roma population does not speak Bulgarian, which prevents them accessing schools, social opportunities and employment. In 2001 after lengthy advocacy by C.E.G.A and other NGOs, pre-school compulsory education (in summer schools) was introduced in Bulgaria, which included language learning. The programme was designed by linguists based on a methodology for bi-lingual children, and was very effective with 75% of participating children learning Bulgarian in two months. Another advocacy success was the introduction of the Social Assistance Law that enabled NGOs to be service providers. This change enabled the development of essential services for Roma groups.

C.E.G.A current work focuses on:
- a) education with a view to realising the Millennium goals as well as EU-funded projects. This includes reforms in the educational system to promote more interactive teaching styles and develop Roma themes in the curriculum, to improve engagement with Roma pupils;
- b) creating employment and income in Roma communities by supporting economic initiatives, mainly agricultural and entrepreneurial initiatives;
- c) a combined approach to awareness raising and work on overcoming poverty.

To read more about the organisation: [http://www.cega.bg/](http://www.cega.bg/)
Strategic leadership and multi-agency policy-making

• For multi-agency policies on Roma inclusion and integration to be developed effectively, there needs to be clear strategic and political leadership. This means that leaders should be firm in thinking long-term and keep in mind the ‘big picture’, with an awareness of what the implications of power imbalances are and how the problems certain groups experience actually relate to the social conditions. For example, one policy maker who leads strategic initiatives on Roma inclusion across a range of social policy areas in his council says: ‘The most successful policies around the Roma are my policies! You need to take a total approach with the Roma and address all the problems at the same time—healthcare, education, social support, employment, infrastructure’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

• Clear overarching policy frameworks towards the inclusion of Roma and other vulnerable groups need to be developed by a range of actors from different social policy fields and agencies at all levels (national, local, within and between sectors): members of the community, practitioners, officials, activists, and independent experts working together. A strategic leadership facilitates this process. The ISD research review of EU policy and practice on integration found that ‘the impact of integration efforts would be enhanced through more coherent policy frameworks, particularly where responsibility for integration spans different government departments and administration levels.’

Bulgarian Case-Study: The integrated approach at local level - Kavarna local authority

There is a specific department in the local authority that focuses on the integration of minorities (the Department for Integration), including the Roma and other groups (e.g. Italian, Armenian and Turkish). It supports these groups across a broad range of social areas, such as employment, education, health, housing and regeneration. In the area of employment, job seeking Roma are given support with completing documents, applications for jobs, making contact with the labour agency. The department also delivers the project From Social Assistance to Employment (funded by the National Work Programme of the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy and targeting Roma as well as other ethnicities) which aims at activating long-term unemployed people to get into paid work. Key success factors include placing Roma in jobs that build on traditional skills (e.g. construction, crafts, social care) and also leading by example through employing Roma within the local authority e.g. 30 Roma are currently employed in the gardening department, working on regeneration projects to improve neighbourhoods and enlarging local parks.

In the area of education the department it runs a project for inter-ethnic education and trains teachers in skills to work with the Roma community. There are dedicated education workers employed from different ethnic backgrounds, including Roma, whose role it is to support minority children in going to school, including intensive work with parents. There is also a specific project which trains teachers to work with Roma children in order to create a more inclusive and tailored school environment. Another project seeks to improve the education of illiterate Roma adults who have not gone to school. In the area of health, the department runs a project where Roma representatives are trained as health carers to look after the disabled and provide daily care and support. Finally, the department delivers

housing and regeneration work to improve infrastructure in poor Roma neighbourhoods: installing new drainage systems, electric lights, gas heating, internet cafés, shops, hotels, and kindergartens. Most Roma in Bulgaria live in illegal housing, however Kavarna local authority legalised Roma neighbourhoods and now provides free planning support to families wanting to build new houses or improve their existing homes.

More information on this Municipality is available here: http://www.kavarna.bg/index.php?lang=en

• The involvement of both statutory and voluntary agencies is important in policy development to ensure policies and programmes are relevant and effective in addressing existing needs. The different political sectors in society implement different functions: they have different perspectives, priorities and missions. It is important that there is a creative tension between these different perspectives when addressing complex social problems and that solutions are democratically negotiated between them. As described in the European Agenda for Integration: ‘integration is a process that starts on the ground and integration policies should be developed with a genuine ‘bottom-up’ approach, close to the local level’. There also needs to be partnership working on national, regional and local levels.105

Bulgarian Case-Study: Strategic leadership and multi-agency policy-making = Government, NGOs and academia coming together in a Council

The National Council on Cooperation on Ethnic and Integration issues is a consultative body at the Council of Ministers in Bulgaria. Deputy Ministers from six national government departments attend, representatives from local government and NGOs. The Council is supported by a five person secretariat, responsible for the coordination of the national strategy, both horizontally and vertically. The Secretariat has small financial resource to support its activities as part of the NRIS and the Decade of Roma inclusion. The council is chaired by Bulgaria’s Deputy Prime Minister, reflecting senior strategic leadership and support for its work. The council’s goals are:

• To build administrative capacity at the Ministries: to establish experts in each government ministry on ethnic minority and integration issues, who participate in inter-agency working groups on Roma issues.

• To coordinate the Regional Councils for cooperation on the ethnic and integration issues: these are chaired by the regional governor and comprise of regional employment bureaus, local governments, NGOs and deputy-mayors.

• To strengthen Local authorities work on ethnic and integration issues: local authorities in Bulgaria always tend to include NGOs or experts that represent minorities106.

---


1064 As with the UK, of key importance is to consider the capacity of local authorities, called obshhtini, that is Municipalities. There are 264 municipalities in Bulgaria, with the average territory of a municipality - 420 m2, average number of 20 settlements, average population of 20 000 and one level of self-government with elected positions – Mayor and Municipal Council. Municipalities are crucial for the welfare delivery as they provide a range of key services: Education – 83% of Schools, 95 % of kindergartens; HealthCare – 50% of healthcare institutions; Social services – 83% or all services in the country: home care for elderly, social institutions for children and disabled people; Culture, sport, tourism – theater, libraries, local initiatives, music and dance formations, sport, culture and tourist facilities; Public utilities – streets; 63% roads, water supply and sewage; Urban development and planning; Administrative services – civil registers, permission of constructions and etc. Quite a few of the good practices that we will explore are owned by municipalities.
The key policies to support Roma employment are implemented by the National Employment Agency, which is an executive agency at the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. Its work is carried out via local employment bureaus, which aim to improve employment in local areas. The ‘employment mediation’ Department is a unit within the Agency that seeks to improve these local services. Employment bureaus are aimed at all people looking for work and prospective employers.

For more information about the Council and the Bulgarian National Roma Integration Strategy see: http://www.nccedi.government.bg/index.php

Exchanging Knowledge and Understanding Community Needs

- Learning from voluntary organisations working directly with Roma and other vulnerable groups is important for policy-makers ‘to understand the diversity of ethnic communities and the different needs within them, e.g. age, gender, education, legal status, labour market status, skills, qualifications, ethnicity’ 107. Voluntary organisations have a mission to represent people on the ground. In addition, they also work directly with the experiences of the people they serve in a safe and protected environment. It is important that statutory organisations work but also consult with them in developing their approach both to policy making and to service provision.

- Conducting a needs assessment of vulnerable communities can be an effective method to inform policy-making and the design of action-plans. Involving communities themselves are involved in this process is important, as undertaken by Harrow Council with local Somali communities and recommended in EU best practice literature 108.

Bulgarian Case-study: Understanding community needs - Amalipe Centre

Amalipe Center for Interethnic Dialogue and Tolerance works for the equal integration of Roma in Bulgarian Society. The organisation plays a central role in organising a Roma civic movement, advocacy and advising the government on Roma integration, including participating actively in consultative councils on national and local levels. For example, it is a member of the Consultative Council for Educational Integration within the Ministry of Education, and on the board of national programmes to improve Roma integration education field. Its activities cover the following fields:

- Employment: it has recently started a complex project with the Ministry of Social Affairs to improve Roma employment, along with housing and social issues.
- Education: focusing on rural local authorities to improve inter-cultural relations, and improving school dropouts in 180 schools in Bulgaria 109. It has also introduced a course in secondary schools on the folklore of different ethnicities, developed training for teachers and curriculum materials to improve understanding of Roma communities.
- Health care: training of medical students in engaging with Roma groups, in particular to help prevent HIV and tuberculosis in these communities.
- Community development: local centres have been established in 11 local authorities working on school dropouts, early marriages and employment.

108 Ibid.
109 School dropouts in their programmes fall down to 0.68% given that the average for the country is 2%
In addition, Amalipe cooperates with grassroots Roma organisations all over the country to organise campaigns and Roma integration activities in different fields such as education, health and social care. In all its work, Amalipe employs Roma mediators and three quarters of the staff of the organisation are Roma, but this is not a requirement.

Resources and Sustainability

- A key theme emerging from the Bulgarian and UK stakeholder interviews was the importance of sustainable funding to ensure that inclusion policies can be implemented effectively. In a context of austerity, funding is at risk of being reduced, especially resource-intensive work with vulnerable groups or multi-agency programmes. As described by one stakeholder, there is a central ‘challenge of a lack of funds and lack of programmes compared to the needs and numbers of Roma’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).


3.3. How does the approach work?

Below we outline example activities that need to be carried out and success factors for the practice to work. The table is based on an analysis of literature and interviews with stakeholders in both Bulgaria and the UK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Set-up strategic multi-agency expert groups or task forces to develop joint policies and programmes.</td>
<td>• Link with existing statutory policy and governance structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clear strategic and political leadership, involving round tables of senior representatives from government, civil society and academia.</td>
<td>• Ensure balanced representation of different stakeholders, especially disadvantaged groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Include representatives from different government departments and policy fields.</td>
<td>• Facilitate dialogue between the practice on the ground and policy making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Use existing and new research to</td>
<td>• Policies and programmes developed from robust evidence of needs and what works.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Activities

1. Understand and profile community needs.
2. Use different stakeholders and research to understand the wider context e.g. how different policy areas interlink.
3. Build on evidence of what works from previous government programmes and projects.
4. Long-term strategic planning, policy-making, delivery and funding cycles.
5. Develop realistic joint action plans.
6. Support active engagement of civil society, both as service providers and political actors.
7. Improve evaluation to better capture evidence of ‘what works’ e.g. build research skills and capacity.
8. Ensure there is sufficient funding to implement policies e.g. consider ring-fenced funding.
9. Ensure organisations and staff have adequate capacity, skills and resources to deliver action plans.
10. If not, put in place effective capacity building activities.

### Critical success factors

1. Support active engagement of civil society, both as service providers and political actors.
2. Improve evaluation to better capture evidence of ‘what works’ e.g. build research skills and capacity.
3. Ensure there is sufficient funding to implement policies e.g. consider ring-fenced funding.
4. Ensure organisations and staff have adequate capacity, skills and resources to deliver action plans.

### 3.4. Main results of the approach

The main source of ‘hard’ evidence on the extent to which there are results from applying the approach are assessments commissioned by the European Commission. Other key sources are reports from the implementing institutions such as the 2011 Monitoring Report for the Implementation of the National Action Plan on the Decade for Roma Inclusion Initiative 2005-2015. These are sources of reach statistics on results, usually in the form of outputs: how many people have been supported, how many people have passed a training module, less often how many people have started jobs. These are also reports which are rather fragmented: they cover mainly the duration of a single project or the activity of a certain organisation, rather than the whole picture. Whenever available in succinct form, this information is included in the case vignettes below. The results of this approach, in terms of processes and impacts, both in West London and in Bulgaria, can be only measured systematically through an overall evaluation of the existing system and its activities which has not been done on such a scale. In this sense there is no robust evidence that the approach works on a large scale.

Such an evaluation was not the goal of this research and is beyond the scope of this paper. However, there is evidence that the approach would work when it is rigorously applied, through the stories of successful Roma and other disadvantaged people that we have learned and observed in both West London and Bulgaria. If one has good education, lives in decent housing conditions, has access to the social and health system, and advanced ‘soft skills’ such as skills to communicate in a complex environment, he or she is better positioned to apply for a good job. When accepted for work in an organisation which culture entails respect to diversity and human rights, these individuals do their job at least as well...
as their colleagues and sometimes even better. The problem is that such individuals are still just isolated examples because for the approach to start working in practice more time is needed.

3.5. Transferability of the approach: the West London experience, key obstacles and how they can be addressed

In order to implement this good practice, it is important to first explore the different contexts between Bulgaria and the UK. Bulgaria was able to develop an integrated policy approach to Roma social inclusion, due to an unprecedented increase in funding before its accession to the EU. For example, the pre-accession EU programme called PHARE, was seen by interviewees as crucial in developing integrated social, educational and health programmes for Roma. This differs from the UK, which has not received such large and accelerated levels of development funding or financial assistance.

The West London experience

UK practices around using an integrated policy approach to social inclusion have generally emerged slowly across a longer time-span. Nevertheless, there are examples of an integrated approach in the UK and West London. For example, policy documents by the West London Alliance stress the importance of combined work across different policy fields, such as improving infrastructure, health and education. Similarly, the NPWWL project in West London funded by the ESF, seeks to jointly address mental health, housing and employment needs. Additionally, most UK local authorities play a coordinating role in bringing together statutory, voluntary and private sector organisations for joint initiatives. The Harrow New Arrivals Task Force is a good example in West London, of joint policymaking across different statutory and community agencies.

UK Case-study: Joint policy making - Harrow New Arrivals Task Force

There is a growing Somali Community in Harrow, where new arrivals are trying to navigate their way through local systems and to engage with services. While there are a number of Somali voluntary community groups locally, statutory services were unsure who they were or how best to work with them. Harrow Council worked with local Somali groups to help them form an umbrella organisation called HASVO. The idea was that this organisation would liaise with statutory services on a strategic level, improve understanding of the community’s specific needs, represent the diverse ethnic Somali groups, facilitate a clearer exchange of information, give advice on engaging with the community, and help influence service provision. The steps involved included: Intensive relationship and trust building with the different community groups, facilitating negotiation and offering to support them in forming an umbrella organisation. Key factors in its success were:

• Using face-face and oral communication and outreach.
• Awareness of internal community complexities, past histories in country of origin, and differences within the Somali community.
• Support the umbrella group to conduct a community needs analysis.

115 We are not including concrete life stories as such an intrusion in the privacy of vulnerable people, even though healthy and successful, can be distressing and the whole process of validating the findings about their experiences is overwhelming. This can be a separate research on its own in a design that is more participatory and empowering than the small study we carried out to get a general sense of what is being done and with what effect.

116 These can be reviewed here: http://www.westlondonalliance.org/ (l.a. February 2013)
A multi-agency ‘New Arrivals’ Task force was set up, including employment agencies, local colleges & education, police, young offending & PCT.

Having strong senior support and political leadership, with a senior director in Harrow Council leading the task force.

Forming a joint strategic action plan on Somali New Arrivals across different agencies.

Working collectively over several years to address the actions in the plan e.g. HASVO has delivered training for frontline staff on cultural awareness of the Somali community.

This was not a straightforward process, as it requires considerable time (over a number of years) to build trust and understanding of different dynamics within the communities. Similarly, while this approach was effective in this case, it is not necessarily transferable to other groups. The Harrow New Arrivals task force has since been working with Afghan and Tamil communities, however these groups are not yet ready to work in the above way so different engagement models need to be developed. ‘This has to be community-led. There has to be consensus from the community that they want to work in this way. It is not a model that you can impose’. (Staff Member, Harrow Council).

Current UK programmes that aim for an integrated policy approach, include the government’s Troubled Families Programme and the Big Lottery Fund’s Fulfilling Lives: Supporting People with Multiple and Complex Needs. Similarly, education policy through the Every Child Matters agenda emphasises the need to address wider social inclusion issues, through improving multi-agency working and support children and families with multiple needs. At practice level, there are also a number of initiatives by voluntary organisations, such as the sports events of the Urban Youth Foundation and the work of the Roma Support Group. The voluntary organisations in West London interviewed often engage in both policy-making to represent their beneficiaries, communication and exchanging knowledge with local government departments, as well as direct service delivery.

UK Case-Study: Exchanging Knowledge and Understanding Community Needs - Roma Support Group

The Roma Support Group (RSG) is the only Roma-led charity in the UK. It has offices in Newham in East London and in Hammersmith in West London. Since its founding in 1998, the organisation has assisted thousands of Roma families in accessing welfare, housing, education, health and employment, as well as empowering Roma communities through a wide range of advocacy and cultural programmes.

It has built a wealth of knowledge and expertise on Roma issues in the UK and has become one of the leading experts in this field. It has developed best practice models for the integration and empowerment of Roma communities which has lead it to become advisors to government bodies, statutory and non-statutory agencies nationally and internationally:

‘Roma beneficiaries perceive the RSG to be a vehicle for communication with mainstream society and its institutions … to act as a bridge between Roma individuals, families or communities and mainstream society, while facilitating a meaningful dialogue’.

Staff member, Roma Support Group

In 2009 it was commissioned by the London Civic Forum to carry out an action research project in order to identify the barriers and enablers faced by London’s Roma refugee and migrant communities in engaging with mainstream organisations. The study has helped exchange knowledge with local authorities and policy-makers. It also helped building their understanding of the diverse needs of Roma communities when designing services. Key findings include:

- Need for the Roma community to have access to better information.
- Methods to engage Roma in shaping the design and quality of public services
- Exchanging knowledge with local authorities on how to improve Roma experience of education and health services.


Overall, there is much potential to apply an integrated approach to social inclusion in the UK and West London, as this approach is already in place. Another key factor that makes this possible is the UK’s social support systems, for example for the elderly, which are better developed than those in Bulgaria. There is also a wider range of minorities and a longer history of migration policy implementation. This means that the UK is much more experienced in working in this area. However, whilst the UK may have more developed social inclusion policies for ethnic minorities in general, there is a lack of policies to address Roma inclusion specifically.

If the contexts are too different then a good practice cannot be transferred effectively. For example, there was an innovative social housing project in Spain targeted at a range of different vulnerable people that the Bulgarian government tried to transfer in Bulgaria. However, even though this was a mainstream project for all groups not just Roma, our informants reported that there were large-scale public riots and protests by Bulgarians. Similarly, in West London if there are very negative attitudes against certain groups such as Roma the implementation of key principles of an integrated approach may fail.

**Key obstacles to transferability**

Our research has identified three key obstacles to transferring the approach from Bulgaria to the West London (and UK) context.

**Key obstacle 1: Financial difficulties.**

The first step in making this approach effective is to demonstrate to policy makers that working in an integrated way reduces duplication of effort and, longer-term, costs. Our informants both in Bulgaria and in West London argued that lifting people out of poverty reduces the burden on the public budget through improved health, and greater economic activity. Investing now in disadvantaged groups will help them join the effort to improve the economy in the current financial climate. Social inclusion issues are interconnected and affect employability, such as poor housing, physical and mental health, education and family difficulties. Unless there
are coordinated efforts to address the breadth of social inclusion issues, then problems can be transmitted to younger generations: ‘if [disadvantaged] people stay where they are now, their children will end up there, too’.

Key obstacle 2: Inter-generational worklessness is a problem, which cannot be addressed with short-term programmes.

This is so because change is a slow process. Our informants explained that it takes time to engage people, to encourage them to believe that a change is possible, to help them internalise and embed the acquired skills, to build their resilience against the hostile environment in which they live. Future policies should look beyond the current duration of up to three years of implementation. Current policies need to control for links with past successful initiatives.

Key obstacle 3: Lack of current evidence that this approach works, even though both practice and literature would suggest this is the only way forward.

The first step in overcoming this obstacle is to recognise that there is a need for more systematic rigorous research. The second step is lobbying for increased funding to support this. The third step is a consistent effort to apply research findings to practice. Without documenting initiatives and measuring their outcome and impact, relying solely on reporting outputs, there is a risk of inefficient use of public money.

Other challenges that need to be considered

In addition to the three key obstacles mentioned above, our research has identified a number of additional challenges to transferring the approach. We present them separately to denote the different degree of importance between what we call key obstacles’ and ‘challenges’. Challenges include:

- Fragmented social policy funding hinders the implementation of an integrated approach as resource gaps for particular policy areas can hamper sustainability. There is a need to apply the principle of an integrated approach as a matter of course in all public (and third sector) funded social policy initiatives. This would significantly advance life conditions for disadvantaged groups and their capacity to be contributing members of society.

- Unintended practical obstacles of administering funds, both governmental and EU, can privilege large providers of services for disadvantaged groups. This also applies to those aimed at employment support. Whilst large providers have their strengths, experience in West London suggests that they do not necessarily have enough impact on the ground. This especially applies to smaller vulnerable groups as large providers tend to lose sight on them because of the number of their members. As a result, current approaches are not always sufficiently tailored or access to hard to reach groups ensured. Mechanisms should be designed so that grassroots organisations have an equal chance to compete for funding or to encourage cooperation between smaller and larger organisations. This requires addressing their different capacity to write project proposals, contribute cash to funding and back up activities if funding transfers are delayed.
• The approach effects are delayed if there is a lack of consistency in the policies and practices. This is often the case as the process of implementation starts anew with each change of government. It is not realistic to make this problem disappear. However, it is possible to privilege a bottom-up approach to policy development as this way the policies will be less affected by political interests and more linked to the needs on the ground. This can be an effective mechanism to ensure consistency within and between parties, between legislative periods and between individuals among policy makers. An example of how this is addressed in Bulgaria is by involving NGOs in decision making processes through setting up Round Tables or Steering/Advisory Groups. The NGOs have a chance for a more consistent participation as they usually do not change dramatically their staff in such short periods. Thus, they become the depository for the knowledge about an integration strategy as well as safeguards for consistency. Another mitigation factor is to make sure that working groups on policies comprise middle level experts to lend ‘objective’ evidence and technical expertise. Middle level experts tend to have sufficient expertise whilst at the same they are less at risk of being replaced with the change of government. The dynamic between these vehicles and influencing policy will need a careful analysis and facilitation in order to work effectively. It has to be taken into account, that once a government is in power, policies have mostly settled. Consequently, the process becomes a matter of influencing within a given paradigm and a limited framework.

• Both in the UK and in Bulgaria there is an often unacknowledged competition between not-for-profit and statutory organisations. As a result, projects can be developed without the sharing of previous good practice. This leads to risks of inconsistency and duplication. Statutory organisations can often try to impose their preferred ways of working and of measuring performance that do not reflect the goals of voluntary organisations. In addition, voluntary organisations tend to look for or offer alternatives to government provision without linking between available local services. There is a need of a strong awareness and acknowledgement that this happens, so the competition can be used in an effective way.

• The approach works in a complex environment. Because of this, it needs systematic rigorous monitoring, evaluation and feedback to enable learning that improves policy and practice. The learning is often not taken into account sufficiently at present. That is why, policy makers need to support external monitoring, evaluation and capacity building of service providers in these areas.

3.6. Key messages and recommendations

This chapter has explored the good practice of an integrated policy approach to social inclusion, which involves coordinated work by multiple actors across different policy areas. Based on the literature review and fieldwork with Bulgarian and UK stakeholders, the chapter has explored the evidence-based rationale behind this approach. It also has outlined its practical requirements, including discussions on the West London experience and obstacles for local transferability. Key messages in applying this good practice are the importance of strategic leadership and multi-
agency policy-making, exchanging knowledge and understanding community needs, and resources and sustainability.

In order for local policy-makers and organisations working in West London to improve existing work or apply an integrated approach locally, the following concrete steps are recommended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategic Leadership &amp; Multi-Agency Policy-Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Strong strategic and political leadership from within statutory agencies e.g. working groups need to be led and supported by senior staff in local councils.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-term focus on policy-making, to address complex and deep-rooted social inclusion challenges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setting up expert working groups, round tables, and task forces, linked to existing statutory governance and decision-making structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff coordinating and giving administration support to these policy-groups, to ensure there is sufficient resource to implement any decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Involvement of a range of statutory agencies (housing, health, education, police, cohesion etc) and voluntary agencies, bringing different perspectives &amp; expertise, to negotiate joint and realistic solutions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Development of specific local policies, strategies and action plans across multiple sectors and agencies locally e.g. specific local policies on integration and inclusion of vulnerable BAMER communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using existing evidence of what works, for whom and in what circumstances e.g. research, evaluation and practice experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Capacity building, leadership training and support to organisations working with vulnerable groups, so they are better skilled to engage, influence and contribute to local policy-making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having specific departments or teams comprising multi-agency staff to work on social inclusion and integration e.g. as in Kavarna local government in Bulgaria.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exchanging Knowledge &amp; Understanding Community Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Developing tailored community engagement models between statutory services and specific communities e.g. New Arrivals task force &amp; Somali umbrella organisation in Harrow.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitating engagement of trusted, representative or elected community leaders from marginalised groups in existing LA participation structures e.g. councils, working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups, fora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training local authorities &amp; statutory organisations in needs of specific disadvantaged groups (e.g. GRT communities), effective working practices and cultural understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exchanging knowledge, experience &amp; best practice from organisations and NGOs already working with specific vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Networking and information sharing events, to enhance formal and informal networks between service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improving research, monitoring and data-collection to better understand community needs of certain vulnerable groups (ideally conducted with active involvement of communities themselves).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources and Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Sustainable or ring-fenced statutory funding to ensure integrated and multi-agency social inclusion policies can be effectively implemented in practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Multi-agency programming to avoid funding and service duplications, pooling of resources between agencies and neighbouring local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mainstreaming explicit work with certain vulnerable groups within existing statutory services e.g. Building work with Roma into existing funded employability initiatives such as the Work Programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Seeking innovative sources of funding for integrated multi-agency projects and programmes in local areas, to address identified gaps in need for vulnerable groups. e.g. EU, international and philanthropic funds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Effective capacity building to local voluntary organisations working with specific vulnerable groups to better access funding and generate sustainable income.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Good practice 2: Multidisciplinary working and holistic case-management

Multidisciplinary working is the application of an integrated policy approach to social inclusion in practice on the ground. As explained in the previous chapter, Roma communities experience multiple barriers and complex needs related to social exclusion. Problems related to their employability are often interconnected with wider issues such as lack of education, insecure housing, poor health and discrimination. Given this, on a practice level, working in multidisciplinary teams and/or adopting a tailored case-management approach will better meet the diverse needs of individuals and families. This chapter will explore how this practical application of the integrated approach happens.

4.1. What is the rationale for multi-disciplinary working?

As described in the previous chapter, the social inclusion and employability of the Roma requires combined efforts across a range of social policy fields – from employment, to health, housing and education. In practice, in order to effectively implement these integrated policies on the ground, there need to be combined efforts across multiple agencies, services and disciplinary teams at the frontline. So as well as joint-policy-making on a political level, there needs to be multi-disciplinary work with each individual.

Both in the literature reviewed and in the stakeholder interviews, a key good practice recommendation was the development of multi-agency teams. This includes individually tailored case-management to facilitate access to multiple services, and holistic work to support the needs of the wider family and community.

‘Unlike other new international arrivals, Roma come as whole families. Therefore, they are a complete “package” and that is also how services should treat them. The case of the Roma settling in England shows the real need for a truly holistic and multi-agency approach, where the needs of the child or adult are considered as relating to the overall wellbeing of the family’.

4.2. What does this approach entail?

Working in multi-disciplinary and multi-agency teams

• Having multi-disciplinary teams, including staff from education, employment, youth work, social work, therapeutic and health backgrounds can be effective in addressing the multiple barriers experienced by Roma.

Bulgarian Case-Study: Multi-agency multi-disciplinary practice - The CO.RE project

This is a Bulgarian-Italian project to improve multi-agency partnership working between government services, companies, and NGOs. It aims at reducing unemployment by

---


developing models for self-employment and entrepreneurship and recommendations for micro-financing and employment. It is funded by the EU’s PROGRESS Programme.

The project started with an assessment of unemployment needs in local areas, the accessibility of support programmes, and what companies are active in the labour market. A multi-agency Public Council is then set-up, comprising representatives of NGOs, local government and companies. Organisations in the council work collaboratively to identify and engage young unemployed people in the project, with a focus on disadvantaged groups. The Council develops shared criteria to select project participants, the key being to identify those who are really motivated. A small number of participants are chosen (5-8) and are given intensive support from existing programmes for 18 months. This involvement is accompanied by a parallel development of business plans and individual work combined with specific training modules. The model is called ‘Pathway to work’ and is developed individually for each participant based on their interests and abilities. The Public Council is a tool for sharing responsibility, ensuring sustainability and improving effectiveness of the programme.

- Multi-disciplinary teams allow flexibility and breadth in addressing the varied needs and barriers Roma experience to accessing employment - be that education, health or family caring responsibilities. For instance, one organisation in Bulgaria, that works with young Roma not in education, training or employment, ‘combines teaching and social work, to offer both social and educational support. We also have a case-management approach, where the needs of each child are researched; an individual plan of action is designed and then delivered’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

The benefit is that individual capacity and resilience is gradually built. This happens through supporting people in their wider circumstances. This makes people more able to learn new skills and access employment.

Individually tailored case-management support

- Alternatively, a case manager undertakes an assessment of an individual’s needs and acts as a mediator between different services. For example, education workers within the Traveller Education Support Service (TESS) and Ethnic Minority Achievement Services (EMAS) in the UK would often adopt this ‘multi-agency approach, cutting across all spheres of service provision (healthcare, social services, adult services, neighbourhood teams, youth offending teams, the police) and engaging as many service providers and agencies working with the Roma as possible’.  

- This involves a holistic assessment of an individual’s needs. These vary and can cover employability, skills, education and training, housing, health and other. The next step is facilitating a flexible and individually tailored package of support. For example, an organisation in Bulgaria found that having an ‘individual approach to people’s needs is important e.g. some may have difficulty with the Bulgarian language, so we would start with this; whereas others may need a different starting point’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

---

120 Ibid, p.10
The centre is based in the area of Vidin, in the northeast of Bulgaria. It is a very deprived part of the country, with a large population of Roma (6,000-7,000) and high numbers of street children. There are four long-term programmes at the centre: a) Social and educational support, mainly working with vulnerable children and adults, Roma street children, families with disabled children, parents or elderly people (over 65 years), who are alone and need social assistance; b) Youth leadership and volunteering with young people from both Roma and non-Roma backgrounds; c) Anti-discrimination work to improve the social integration of Roma; c) International work across neighbouring countries, such as an EU cross-border labour project to support migrating Roma.

The Free Youth Centre uses a multi-disciplinary approach that combines teaching and social work. The goal is to offer both educational and social support to vulnerable young Roma and street children. They have a multi-disciplinary team at the centre, comprising of teachers, social workers, a psychologist, a nurse, and volunteers. The aim is to provide holistic support to prevent children from dropping out of school. This includes supporting them with school work, providing extra education, family support, and with basic social needs (such as food, clothing and shower facilities). The centre is based in neighbourhoods. It works with 20-25 children and employs volunteers (some of which were previous Roma pupils at the centre). It also uses an individually tailored case-management approach: the team assesses the specific needs of each child and designs and delivers an individual action plan. For example, some Roma children may have difficulty with the Bulgarian language, so they would first be supported with this. Others may have a different main need, so the team will start from there. The centre uses interactive teaching methods and games with the young people. It also other employs other engaging activities such as sports. The purpose is to make the education experience very different from what it was in school. This helps to engage beneficiaries and to make the learning more enjoyable.

The organisation’s website is available here: http://www.fyc-vidin.org/english.html

Holistic work with the wider family or community

- An individual’s employability and inclusion needs are often interrelated with those of their family and wider communities. An example is caring responsibilities, which limit the candidates’ options to accept full time working hours. Another example is provided by an organisation in West London. They say that to support vulnerable young people from Roma or other BAMER communities, the work needs to be holistic: ‘we don’t just work with the child but also with the whole family set up and community; our work is contextual’ (UK Stakeholder). The benefits are that people’s wider circumstances, which are often the real cause behind difficulties presented by an individual, are also addressed. This is an effective approach, because the effects of difficult family dynamics, or problems in their community, often exacerbate an individual’s suffering and inability to move forward into employment, education or training.

4.3. How does it work?

As with the previous chapter below we will detail activities and success factors as examples of how this approach can be applied on the ground. The table below is
based on analysis of the interviews conducted both in Bulgaria and in West London.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Set-up practice forums to aid multi-agency communication on delivery</td>
<td>• Encouraging reflective practice, to learn from others to improve delivery or develop new</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and community needs.</td>
<td>ways of working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build informal networking between service providers e.g. events,</td>
<td>• Opportunities and resources for international networking and exchange of experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outreach and networking meetings.</td>
<td>• Build evaluation skills and capacity to embed a learning culture in staff and organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Conducting regular community needs assessments, monitoring and</td>
<td>• Work to develop common aims, values and a shared language between staff from different</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evaluation.</td>
<td>backgrounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Bring together multi-agency teams e.g. education, mental health, social</td>
<td>• Investing time to build team-work and relationships with wider partners e.g. referral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>work, employment, housing.</td>
<td>agencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Either in same geographical location, or a ‘central hub’ to refer</td>
<td>• Building a reflective culture in the team: clear roles, ways of communicating, organising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people to staff in different locations.</td>
<td>delivery, how to make best use of each other’s skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Putting in place supportive staff structures e.g. regular supervision</td>
<td>• Being open to new ideas and ways of working.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and reflective meetings, space for problem-solving.</td>
<td>• Try to understand, be open-minded and non-judgmental about a person’s circumstances and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Allowing flexibility in structures and ways of working to change and</td>
<td>context, and how they ended up in this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incorporate new elements.</td>
<td>• Develop joint assessments across services, and train staff to explore wider needs e.g.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Time allowed to develop trust with clients: responding in ways that</td>
<td>employment staff with health and family issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>convince them you understand their position and needs.</td>
<td>• Face-to-face home visits can be important to understand wider family and community issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Undertake holistic assessments of client’s needs, including across</td>
<td>• Direct contact with the ground.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employment, health, housing, education and family.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Assess needs in the wider family and community that are causing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barriers. Building networks and engagement in local communities already</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working with vulnerable groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work with community leaders in order to build trust.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4. Main results of the approach

Especially in the current financial climate, there is a lack of rigorous evaluation for multi-disciplinary practice. Partly this is due to policy makers concentrating the limited funding on direct service provision. However, this is also because an evaluation of this complex practice would not be cheap. A cost-effective solution emerging among independent research organisations is to provide evaluation support so that service providers evaluate themselves. However, the process of self-evaluation and collecting robust data by delivery teams themselves is very work-intensive. This is even more problematic for services that already have capacity issues linked to financial cuts.

Despite the lack of hard data, practitioners who work on the ground in Bulgaria and in West London have direct observations of the results of the approach. They include improved beneficiaries’ confidence, self-esteem, more positive self-image, and coming to terms with past difficulties. By paying attention to, and addressing people’s wider needs, interviewees stated that the practice can:

- improve client’s general wellbeing and happiness
- reduce emotional and behavioural problems
- change relationship patterns
- improve social interactions and performance, and
- help overcome isolation.

All of these factors are crucial to maintain aspirations and improve people’s ability to look for jobs, identify better prospects, improve presentation at job interviews and once in employment, to perform better, sustain employment and to progress.

4.5. Transferability of the approach: the West London experience, key obstacles and how they can be addressed

The West London experience

Multi-disciplinary practice and holistic case-management can be seen as effective practice in a number of projects and services in West London. This includes the NPWWL project which links frontline housing, mental health and adult social services with employment support. It can also be found in systemic approaches in mental health practice. The well-developed UK education and social services system with its routine practices of working with families share elements of this approach.

Of course, the different contexts and the different target groups can affect how the practice is implemented on the ground - some experiences that may work in one situation may not work in another. For example, if there are no trained practitioners in cultural awareness of the Roma, as is often the case in Bulgaria, the practice will not work. Similarly if practitioners do not know the particular culture
or community they are working with well, even though generally sensitive to cultural differences, they may fail. For example, we learned about cases in the UK child protection system, where Roma parents experienced difficulties. The court proceedings showed that staff did not understand the specific ways in which they look after their children. Despite these notes of caution, at their core, practices do share similarities in their effects across contexts. This is illustrated by the case studies below.

UK Case-Study: Supporting holistically young people - Pupil Parent Partnership (PPP)

The Pupil Parent Partnership (PPP) is an independent school. It works to support young people in West London who have specific difficulties. These are young people who have been excluded or dropped out of mainstream education, are in a lot of distress, displaying difficult behaviour, and are not engaging with any other services. It works with a diverse group of young people and families from a large range of different backgrounds. This includes Afro-Caribbean, Bangladeshi, Somali, Eastern European and a small number of Roma pupils. PPP also undertakes research to develop and refine its practice, and has been involved in a number of EU projects on the Roma.

The way PPP employs multi-disciplinary, holistic and systematic practice is an alternative to offering a disconnected range of interventions. Instead, the team brings together expertise in the fields of education, youth work and therapy. Central to this approach is understanding the huge complexity of responding to the multiple needs of vulnerable children and families: this includes being flexible, a team comprising practitioners from different disciplines, cultivating trusting relationships (based on psychological theories of attachment) to become a significant person for the individual, and providing support for staff.

PPP’s work always involves a therapeutic approach. It is often embedded within youth work or teaching practice: for example, staff are educators rather than counsellors as young people would not engage with clinicians, but they still apply a therapeutic approach. Every pupil has access to a therapist and key family worker, who has weekly one to one meetings with the young person and visits their family regularly. This key worker also supports them as an advocate when working with other organisations e.g. social services, courts, youth offending teams and CAMHS.

Working with the whole family set up and community is very important, including visiting parents in their own home territory (especially to reassure their children will not be taken away, which is a fear for many). PPP also recruits parents and ex-students to work as volunteers to help community engagement, offering them accredited courses. The exact nature of each intervention is tailored to the needs of each child and family. It involves in-depth understanding of specific cultural contexts: for example issues of gender, social position, culture and ethnicity, family dynamics, mental health, and an understanding of how migrant children grow up in the UK.

More information about PPP is available here: http://www.theppp.org.uk/about.asp
UK Case-Study: Holistic Approach of Roma Support Group - Example of Mental Health Advocacy Project

The Roma Support Group (RSG) is a leading charity in the UK working with Roma refugees and migrants, supporting over 860 Roma families across London. A central element to the RSG’s work is adopting a holistic approach to address the multiple inclusion needs within Roma communities. This approach includes:

- Advice and advocacy (e.g. welfare, debt, employability and housing issues);
- Providing education support (i.e. facilitating access to schools and adult training);
- Delivering health projects
- Social inclusion and community cohesion activities for the Roma and non-Roma children and young people in the areas of art, media and sport;
- Organising cultural events, workshops, seminars and publishing on Roma culture and issues; organising community information events

The holistic approach developed by the Roma Support Group also involves working simultaneously with individual, family and wider community needs. As explained in the Young Roma Advocacy Project, which works with young people at risk of dropping out of education: “You can’t only work with the young person or child – you have to take their parents and family with you. Without the family’s understanding and engagement it won’t work.” (Staff Member, Roma Support Group). An important example is in the Mental Health Advocacy Project (2008-11) that aimed to tackle the problem of ‘invisibility’ of Roma refugees and migrants in the UK’s mental health system. The project provided one-one advocacy to empower service users to access services and gain greater control over their lives. Key elements included:

- Holistic assessment of service users’ needs and providing tailored one-one case management support on different levels: non-intensive, moderate and intensive support
- A holistic approach to help people improve other aspects of their lives that are negatively affecting their mental health, e.g. housing, welfare, employment
- Facilitating and empowering people to access support from other projects and agencies: ‘to create a well-functioning net of support for families’
- Multi-agency networking and partnership building with other providers
- Supporting whole families with mental health problems
- Cultural awareness-raising on the Roma with health providers and staff


Key obstacles to transferability and how they can be addressed

Key obstacle 1: There is a risk that certain members of multi-disciplinary teams dominate.

In all working groups or staff teams, there are always power dynamics in which certain people or organisations can take over the leadership and influence the direction of work in a non-productive way. This can mean that other stakeholders’ perspectives are not sufficiently taken into account. For example, there is a risk in that community representatives do not have enough of a say compared to larger or statutory organisations. If certain professions dominate, for example psychiatrists or lawyers, this can lead to pathologisation or criminalisation of suffering. Linked to
this obstacle is the more general risk of resorting to simplifications when working on complex problems – this is the risk ‘to lose connection with reality because of trying to be holistic’, as one West London interviewee puts it.

The solutions to these potential challenges are to have a skilled facilitator to ensure different perspectives are being sufficiently taken into account. Another tip is to hold reflective meetings in which team members become more open to different ways of working and reflect on their own group dynamics.

Key obstacle 2: The approach cannot work in isolation.

This approach needs to work in conjunction with improving community participation in programme design and delivery. Multi-disciplinary practice and holistic case-management is very plausible and successful at the individual level. As a consequence many funders in the UK and Bulgaria have prioritised funding for such service delivery at the expense of funding for advocacy and community development. The latter, as we will see in the next chapter, is also crucial and ideally the two approaches should complement each other.

The solution to this problem is to ensure that policy makers are aware of the interconnectedness of multidisciplinary practice with developing participatory design and delivery (explored in Chapter 5). Ideally funders need to support both approaches, as without active community participation within multi-agency teams, the practice is unlikely to successfully reach and support disadvantaged groups.

4.6. Key messages and recommendations

The previous chapter explored the good practice of adopting an integrated approach to policy development on a strategic level across multiple agencies. This chapter has explored how this can be applied within service delivery, to address the diverse needs of vulnerable people. From the literature and stakeholder interviews, we found that multi-disciplinary working and holistic case-management is an important good practice for frontline services. This includes working in multi-disciplinary and multi-agency teams and individually tailored case-management. It is also crucial to work holistically with the wider family or community (not just with individuals), as their needs are often inextricably linked.

In order to improve existing work or adopt this practice, the key messages from this chapter for local policy-makers and services in West London are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working in Multi-Disciplinary and Multi-Agency Teams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Setting up teams with staff from varied backgrounds or from different agencies e.g. education, employment, youth work, social work, therapeutic and health backgrounds. This provides flexibility, breadth and a range of skills to address complex and multiple needs in individuals and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Having multi-disciplinary teams based in one geographic location or having a central ‘hub’ as the contact point that guides people to access staff based in different locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Individually Tailored Case-Management** | • Employing a team and partnership building approach in order to agree shared aims and communication styles  
• Either involving trusted community representatives, workers or NGO staff as employees within the teams, or building formal partnership arrangements for referrals  
• Supportive structures for staff working with vulnerable groups and complex needs e.g. supervision, space for team reflection, sharing of problems and solutions on difficult cases  
• A holistic assessment of an individual’s needs such as employability, skills, education and training, housing, health  
• A single case-manager acts as mediator between different existing services, providing regular contact and support in accessing provision e.g. as in the Traveller Education Support Services.  
• Having flexibility in the practice to enable the case-worker to develop an individually tailored package of support  
• Building non-judgmental relationships and trust with clients to improve understanding of their circumstances, context and needs, and help engage them in the service. This also improves the beneficiary’s confidence and self-esteem which is key for enhancing their employability.  
• Adopting a self-critical and reflexive approach within delivery teams to enable room for improvements in the practice  
• Either employing workers from trusted organisations, NGOs and community members already working with vulnerable groups, or undertaking intensive relationship building within communities  
• Face-to-face contact, outreach and relationship building in the geographic areas where groups are located, working through community leaders  
• Work with the whole family as the needs of parents, children and other family members are often interlinked.  
• Visiting families in their own homes can be important to build trust e.g. PPP work with young people with home-visits to engage parents. |
5. Good practice 3: Participatory design and delivery

A central theme from the findings is the importance of the active participation of Roma communities in social inclusion and employability initiatives. In this chapter we unpack what this means in everyday practice. We look at the rationale, practicalities, the results and transferability to West London and other vulnerable groups. All this is illustrated with examples of the experiences of the participants in the study.

5.1. What is the rationale for participation?

The principle of participation ‘nothing about us, without us’ is a central rationale in both literature and practice with the Roma community. This is articulated in the terms of reference for the EU Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-15:

‘Nothing about us, without us’: Roma participation will make or break the Decade. Roma representatives and civil society organizations are involved in every stage of the Decade. Roma shaped and defined the vision from the very outset … and identified policy priorities’.121

The active participation of the Roma is one of the ten Common Basic Principles of Roma Integration, as defined in EU policy. Community involvement in the design, development and delivery of social inclusion programmes is essential. It ensures that initiatives are appropriate, relevant and effective in addressing community needs:

‘The effectiveness of policies is enhanced with the involvement of Roma people at every stage in the process. Roma involvement must take place at both national and European levels through the input of expertise from Roma experts and civil servants, as well as by consultation with a range of stakeholders in the design, implementation and evaluation of policy initiatives.’122

Organisations already working directly with the Roma have in-depth knowledge of the communities. This includes barriers and integration needs, socio-cultural dynamics, methods of community engagement, and what practices are effective.123 Taking a participatory approach also empowers communities by enabling them to make decisions and act on improving their situation themselves.124 This is particularly important given that leading Romani authors have described how initiatives are often ‘top-down’ driven, in a context of an overall lack of self-representation in policy and research125. Similarly, the Roma community are often perceived as ‘hidden’ from public services and policy-making. For example, a number of interviewees reported that mainstream services find it difficult to access the community. Given this, for an inclusion or employability programme to be

---

successful, there has to be active community involvement: ‘You can’t change anything without support from inside the community. You need to involve people from the community in any project, including delivery within your own organisation’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

5.2. What does this approach entail?

Building Trust and Engagement of Community Leaders

• A first step in building community support and engagement is to connect and build relationships with community leaders or trusted NGOs. Engaging trusted leaders is important in order to access Roma communities: ‘it is not easy to access the community - you need a good entry point- usually somebody who is recognised as a leader and is trusted in the community’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

• In Bulgaria, each municipality (a structure of local authority) will know or have a list of Roma community leaders for this first approach. Identifying NGOs, community organisations or frontline-services (e.g. schools) that already work with Roma communities is an important initial activity:

‘Often NGOs and migrants associations are the first point of contact and support for migrants … they implement many informal integration programmes, provide for direct contact between local residents and migrants, and cooperate with different levels of government’126.

Outreach and Relationship Building

• It is important to undertake outreach and meet Roma communities directly in order to build relationships and engagement. An essential way is going to the geographic areas where communities are located, working through NGOs and community leaders.

• Personal contact and face-to-face communication is key to gaining trust: ‘An important element to gain their trust, is to work with them directly - to go within the community and do outreach campaigns. Meeting the communities where they are located with the help of NGOs and trusted community leaders. This type of personal contact and face-to-face communication is very important to gain the trust of the community.’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder)

• Working actively with the community to maintain their meaningful involvement throughout delivery. This can take the form of input into project design or seeking their feedback at different project stages.

• A key step is to facilitate effective communication channels and consultation activities. This can include better sharing of information about how communities can be involved in existing or new participation structures. This was a central finding of research conducted by the Roma Support Group in London:

‘One of the most frequent barriers to engagement identified ...was a lack of information...”We, Roma, would like to participate in every form of public life, including local and national politics, the governance of schools attended by our

---

Bulgarian Case-Study: Supporting grassroots organisations and Roma leaders – the C.E.G.A. Seeds Fund

Since the 1990s, C.E.G.A. has been building social and educational projects with the Roma in the most vulnerable areas in Bulgaria. These were developed following a participatory process with the active involvement of Roma communities themselves. This started by meetings with Roma community members and leaders in a local area. The essence of these meetings was a discussion of how problems can be solved and who can help. After this, the first step was to undertake participatory research, where local community initiative groups were trained and supported in research to make a full ‘snapshot’ of their area. This included analysing the population size and needs of local Roma families and children. Examples of the needs were availability of electricity, running water, sanitation and income. Thus, they created complex maps identifying areas of need.

The research was practically oriented and anthropological. It was conducted together with local representatives from Roma communities, because ‘regardless of how good a professional you are, there is always a distortion if you are not an insider’. It included gaining access and gradually immersing the research team in coffee shops, homes and local gathering places for participant observation and interviews. The next step was supporting local Roma groups to develop practices to address the identified needs. Next, participant researchers trained them to deliver this, alongside exchanging experience with other similar groups. Thus, the research was used to empower local Roma groups to take care of their own communities.

Projects started with small, funded initiatives to help participants gain confidence and see that a change is possible. Community workers were also given in-depth support by C.E.G.A as they were delivering projects. This included capacity building training, support in developing project ideas and proposals, regular monthly meetings and ad hoc problem solving. Over a five-year period, more than 120 groups have been supported this way. Some of them grew and developed into active organisations, but others later collapsed because of lack of funds or community members emigrating abroad. Many community workers later got employment in key local positions where they continue the work on the ideas that inspired them.

Roma involvement in design and delivery

• Involving Roma individuals in the design and delivery of programmes was key to providing community expertise, improving access to the community, and building community skills and capacity: ‘Effective participation of Roma in public affairs in general as well as in the design and implementation of policies on Roma inclusion, is a core principle’.128

---

Involvement of Roma community members in service delivery either as staff or volunteers also helps to promote role models in the community: ‘The best way to engage [Roma] is to involve them in the execution of tasks. For example our integration department is led by a Roma person’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

This also helps build trust and engagement with Roma communities, by enabling ‘community members to feel safe, to better understand what is expected of them, what they are entitled to, and it is also a visible sign of community acceptance’.129

An important feature was to build lasting skills in Roma communities so that people become self-sustaining after a programme ends. This includes management and advocacy skills, on one hand. On the other hand, it also covers professional skills in community development, youth work, health and social work and so on:

‘Roma inclusion doesn’t just mean eliminating barriers. It also means providing opportunities where people themselves become inspired and have the skills, confidence and tools to themselves become included – to get mainstream education or jobs’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

Bulgarian Case-Study: Roma involvement in design and delivery - Sofia Local Authority Public Council

In 1998, several Roma organisations in Sofia, the capital of Bulgaria, started working with the mayor to develop and design a Strategy and a Programme for Roma Integration. At the core of the initiative was the vision of shared decision making and control of delivery with Roma communities themselves. A Public Council was set up involving more than 20 Roma organisations to actively develop the programme. The process started by identifying problems in the community, followed by a discussion by the Council. The Council then offered an action plan to the mayor. In 2001 the programme was agreed and funded by the mayor, with the Council overseeing delivery and producing yearly reports. All substantive investments under the programme were put out to competitive tender. The Programme challenged existing conventions by developing an integrated programme covering a wide range of social issues, including, employment, education, housing, health, youth, sport and culture.

The first stage of delivery from 2001 - 2006 is characterised by the development of housing policies: for example 160 new housing sites were built, with the Council developing criteria for how accommodation would be distributed across the city. The Council also recruited Roma mediators to liaise with local communities and help collect utility bills, as unpaid bills were a major difficulty locally. This process was very effective and conflicts over housing and unpaid bills were significantly reduced (86% of payments were collected in this period). The key to this success was the direct contact with the ground and the needs of Roma communities. Since this practice has been terminated, conflicts over housing and unpaid bills have resurfaced once again. The Council developed an effective process for communities to communicate directly and discuss their needs with local authority policy makers, and create shared solutions. However, despite

---

the programme’s success, after 2006 during the second stage of delivery, funding for the Public Council were gradually reduced and eventually stopped in 2012.

More on the work of the Public Council is available here:
http://www.sofia.bg/en/display.asp?ime=STRATEGY_ROMA&title=STRATEGY%20ROMA%20IN%20SOFIA%202007%20%96%202013&pathtitle=%C0%EA%F2%F3%E0%EB%ED%E0%20%E8%ED%F4%EE%F0%EC%E0%F6%E8%FF

Roma empowerment through advocacy and political participation

Encouraging the active participation of minority communities in public and political life is a key activity recommended in best practice literature on integration\textsuperscript{130}.

- With the exception of a few cases in Eastern Europe, Roma political representation is rare and falls short of the community’s population size. As described in an EU research report, this means Roma tend to only play a consultative role in determining policy that affects them, rather than being key decision-makers: ‘political mobilisation, perhaps in the form of voter registration campaigns, is required if Roma are to acquire political visibility leading to representation, at least in some proportion to their numbers’.\textsuperscript{131}

- Roma empowerment and political participation involves identification of community opinion leaders. As a next step, efficient practitioners and policy makers should activate and support them to represent and defend the viewpoint of the local community on issues of housing, employment, health, education, discrimination, etc. For example, in London:

  ‘Roma beneficiaries perceive the Roma Support Group to be a vehicle for communication with mainstream society and its institutions … staff are often referred to as interpreters. Their role is to act as a bridge between Roma individuals, families or communities and mainstream society’.\textsuperscript{132}

Bulgarian Case-Study: Roma empowerment - INTEGRO Association

INTEGRO is an umbrella association comprising five Roma organisations, which aims to promote the views of professional and middle-class Roma in order to overcome prejudice. It also leads a network of over 30 community-based NGOs, called GORD (Civil Union Roma Movement)\textsuperscript{133}. INTEGRO seeks to emancipate the Roma community, to give them a voice and make them heard at the local level. Its activities involve building structures of active citizenship in Roma communities, and improving representation of Roma at all levels of government decision-making. It also provides training and financial assistance to Roma communities. The goal is to build their capacity, alongside awareness-raising to change public perceptions of the community. For example, the More than money project started in 2004, created a revolving fund for rural Roma communities to get interest-free loans to start-up small business and enterprises. Other projects include supporting Roma


\textsuperscript{133} ‘Gord’ is Bulgarian means ‘proud’.
youth to complete secondary education, including working with parents, local authorities, teachers and schools.

INTEGRO plays a central role in developing local and national policies. Its team speaks openly about discrimination, both conscious and unconscious, across a range of areas including education, employment and housing. For example, the association launched a five-year project called Strengthening the Roma Voice that sought to increase public participation of Roma as a way of tackling discrimination. Other work includes systematic research on the barriers experienced by Roma in order to challenge myths and stereotypes. In 2005-2006 INTEGRO provided an expert report to the government analysing the national Employment Plan, and its recommendation to use Roma community mediators was taken forward. Another key aim of INTEGRO is to shift perceptions away from seeing the Roma as poor, passive or excluded. Instead, they seek to promote a more positive representation: to highlight the achievements of Roma and to draw attention to the role and contributions of Roma leaders and professional people. Many professional and integrated Roma hide their ethnicity due to fear of discrimination, so part of INTEGRO’s objective is to challenge this trend. The association itself also employs Roma people and actively encourages their professional development.

More about INTEGRO is available here: http://www.integrobg.org/en/

Supporting Roma and BAMER organisations

• A central finding from interviews and the literature review was that statutory services are not sufficiently meeting the needs of certain vulnerable groups. There are a variety of reasons – services not being inclusive enough, services not meeting the actual needs on the ground because of lack of awareness of the specific barriers experienced by marginalised groups. This will be further explored in the remaining good practice, which looks at what would make mainstreaming services and programmes more inclusive. However given this situation, it is essential to build the capacity and improve support to Roma organisations (and those of other vulnerable BAMER groups). These organisations already have specialist skills and expertise in working with particularly vulnerable groups. With greater support, these agencies could play an active role in improving the development and delivery of social inclusion and employability initiatives.

• Support grassroots organisations can cover building capacity in applying procedures and strategies to communicate with local authorities and building organisational capacity. The latter can include improvement of management, finance and fundraising skills, along with staff training on both strategic and delivery levels. ‘Supporting Roma NGOs to strengthen their organisational, networking and capacity building structures e.g. identify policy impacts, strengthen implementation, access and use of EU funds effectively’. 134

• Sustainable and better statutory funding for Roma, BAMER or specialist organisations was a key theme from both stakeholder interviews and literature. This also includes improved support for voluntary organisations in accessing EU and non-governmental funding streams. As described in research by Equality in an interview with a manager in the Traveller Education Support Service (TESS):

‘If her service was not able to continue supporting the Roma … there would be no capacity anywhere else to take up the work … with repercussions both within schools, and the Roma communities, and also in terms of community cohesion.’

5.3. How does it work?

In this section we explore examples of activities needed to implement a participatory approach. Applying this good practice in everyday work is often patchy or remains superficial. That is why it is important to make sure that not only the framework and activities, but also the circumstances are in place to allow proper working of the practice. If this does not happen, the superficial presence of community members can become a way of legitimizing the existing status quo without really changing the disadvantaged position of the community and its members. The table below is based on the findings of our interviews with both practitioners in West London and in Bulgaria and to a lesser extent on the literature. At the core of this good practice is finding a common ground in our shared humanity and the need for respect and recognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Design initiatives based on community ideas, with co-ownership of policies and programmes.</td>
<td>• Set-up dedicated community engagement structures, to meet and negotiate with stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build community capacity to actively contribute or lead design and delivery of programmes, and negotiate their needs.</td>
<td>• Build skills in policy development, leadership, management, finance, strategic planning, team-building, HR and organisational development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build community skills and confidence, to enable them to address issues themselves.</td>
<td>• Be aware that inclusion does not just mean eliminating barriers, but also improving skills and opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Try to inspire, engage and empower communities, so they are themselves the active drivers of any change.</td>
<td>• Empowering key individuals can trigger a chain reaction and help motivate other community members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourage role models within communities.</td>
<td>• Engage community representatives and leaders that are trusted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Facilitate and support individuals to become community spokespeople.</td>
<td>• Build skills in communication, political negotiation and advocacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual support &amp; training of community leaders e.g. degrees, project writing, fundraising</td>
<td>• Explore funding streams that support community development, leadership and capacity building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Help communities build networks to achieve greater visibility and political participation.</td>
<td>• Establish forums, networking and awareness raising events, to speak to stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Actively involve communities in any project, including delivery within your own organisation.</td>
<td>• Be clear that you don’t want to change a community’s culture - that integration does not mean assimilation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recruit community members as employees or volunteers.</td>
<td>• Can help create community ownership and engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Outreach and immersion in local communities, in the geographical areas where they are located</td>
<td>• Build trust and in-depth understanding of a community e.g. culture, difficulties and aspirations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Regularly consult and have discussions with local communities.</td>
<td>• Ensure participation is meaningful and ongoing, throughout project delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Engage in cultural understanding e.g. respect and be aware of both differences and similarities.</td>
<td>• Premise that human beings are equal and fundamentally similar, despite differences and nuances.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.4. Main results of the approach

It is notoriously difficult to measure participation and empowerment. Successful Roma and other representatives of disadvantaged groups often hide these parts of their identity due to a justified fear of stigmatization and marginalisation. Nevertheless, as with the achievements of the previously described good practices, we were able to learn from our informants both in Bulgaria and in West London. They emphasized the success in developing people who are able to represent their culture and their communities and to communicate messages from the mainstream to their fellow people. Even more importantly, they are able to defend their rights and the rights of the group they represent, to identify needs in the community and to negotiate support for meeting these needs. In addition, they are able to understand cultural specifics which are difficult to comprehend for the outsider. They can also translate these specifics into the language of the majority – not the linguistic but the commonsense language which guides and directs power dynamics.

We were also able to observe the effects of empowerment through the contacts with Roma and other activists who belong to disadvantaged communities. The encounter with them was very enriching and enlightening for us. These members of the community were invaluable in helping us to understand why the approaches
we identified are a good practice and why sometimes they do not work as intended. The case vignettes in this chapter all show success of the practice.

5.5. Transferability of the approach: the West London experience, key obstacles and how they can be addressed

Many members of disadvantaged groups want to belong to mainstream society. However, they do not want to be assimilated. This applies to people from different ethnicities and cultures, but also to people with various disabilities and other differences. It is no surprise that the approach is applied in West London to various degrees. The core of this good practice does not originate in Bulgaria. It is a basic principle of empowerment policies that can be replicated everywhere in advanced democracies, accounting for local specifics.

We found a lot of expertise in this area in West London. Also recent developments initiated by the Council of Europe are further promoting this approach UK wide. The Council’s Roma Mediation Programme has responded to the French expulsions of Romanian and Bulgarian Roma in August 2010 and started the implementation of the Roma mediation programme (ROMED) in the UK. This is a project launched in December 2012 involving Roma groups from all nationalities, thus preparing 27 mediators to work with the local authorities.

The case vignette below illustrates this good practice with existing activities in West London with regard to empowering Gypsy, Roma and Travellers.

**UK Case-Study: Roma involvement in design and delivery - GRTAS (Ealing)**

The Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Achievement Service (GRTAS) is part of the Ealing Education Service. It is funded by Ealing Local Authority and through additional funding, notably from the BIG Lottery. GRTAS works with all GRT communities but the majority of the beneficiaries are Irish and Occupational Travellers (including second and third generation travellers who have settled locally). There is a long history of Irish Travellers passing through Ealing as it is situated on a traditional migratory route. The key activities of the service are: supporting educational access and achievement (in nursery, primary, secondary school and lifelong learning); facilitating dialogue with education professionals; helping with employment for 14-19 year olds (including business and communication skills); human rights promotion and community empowerment; information, advice and guidance; youth work; and family support.

Recent projects include collaboration with *People of the Road Ltd.* (POTR) to set up a Travellers’ social enterprise that will promote human rights, community empowerment, arts and music. This project illustrates GRTAS’s guiding participatory principles of involving communities in the whole process of designing and delivering projects. The long-term aim is that Travellers become their own spokespeople and advocates, who negotiate with service providers and lobby for what they want and need.

Key to GRTAS’ success is ensuring real consultation with GRT communities, and building trust to gain their views and opinions in order to inform policy. With this group the written word is not as valued as oral communication, so it is important to bring stakeholders together regularly to discuss services and delivery. Similarly, a key lesson in engaging
beneficiaries is that members of the community are part of service delivery. For example, employment training on beauty and skin care was delivered by a young beautician from the community. Her sensitivity to local needs inspired GRTAS’s team to base educational work on empowering community members to become educational workers visiting schools. Furthermore, the team encourages people from the GRT community to come and make the office their own space, with meeting rooms available where they can organise their own meetings with schools or other services.

GRTAS’s statistics shows that GRT people face the greatest difficulties in dealing with services who are not sensitive to their particular needs, such as unemployment (especially among young men) and human rights violations. However, despite their work, GRTAS feel that the situation for GRT communities is deteriorating. The negative publicity around the Dale Farm eviction, and the Channel 4 Programme ‘My Big Fat Gypsy Wedding’, has been very damaging. As a result their work on empowerment is more difficult, as GRT people keep a very low profile and are no longer willing to engage. The effect on children is particularly significant and has led to decreased school attendance, due to fears of discrimination and bullying from other children.

More about the service is available here: http://www.ealingtravellers.com/

The approach of participatory design and delivery is not only relevant to Roma or wider GRT communities as the next vignette shows. On the contrary, it can also be applied broadly to a range of target groups and communities. Providing opportunities for participatory design and delivery, can also involve bringing together different vulnerable groups, and facilitating them to support each other.

**UK Case-Study: Participatory Design and Delivery – We Are 1 (Hounslow)**

WeAre1 is a charity to support disabled people from all ages, genders and ethnicities. The name of the organisation captures the managers’ vision of collaborative community working. The organisation was founded by people with personal experience of disability. They were not satisfied with the tendency to have separate services for people with multiple vulnerabilities, so they set up an alternative model.

The organisation is very new and started work in 2012. It offers courses and activities that cover diverse areas such as learning, physical activities and care, with 40-45 people per day using their services. In the area of employment, they deliver practical training such as developing CVs and job applications, internet access and use, specialised training and courses, and volunteering. The most important part of their work is engaging in dialogue people in order to identify the best ways to address their needs. Services at present include: building confidence, developing self-awareness, managing anger, and improving wellbeing (training in relaxation techniques, advice on dietary requirements, and smoking cessation). This is combined with building practical skills, such as improving finances, navigating the new benefit reforms, and using transport.

The philosophy behind the organisation is: to approach everyone as individuals, to encourage people to be themselves, to support each other and embrace people for who they are - regardless of their disability, colour, gender, age, or position in society. The most successful projects they deliver are:

- Social networking: disabled people and their carers are invited to the
organisation, they can see each other in a different light, interacting in a different environment.

- Dancing and music therapy: including for people in wheelchairs who find it liberating to do things they are not expected to do and to challenge social expectations
- Computer training: it applies the latest developments in technology to be inclusive to people with disabilities.

WeAre1 has a participatory approach where members are regularly asked for suggestions for events and activities (2-3 times a month). A daily de-briefing also takes place with volunteers running the services. In the short term this approach helps people to become more independent and confident to be themselves. In the longer term, the main benefit is for volunteers who gain experience in a supportive work-based environment. Staff encourage their further professional development, for example going to college or volunteering in other organisations. A key lesson for the organisation is that a lot of the problems faced by vulnerable groups are caused by fears in a society that does not accept or understand difference. Excluded people need to feel safe, understood, listened to and heard: ‘If we don’t address people as human beings we will not reach them. Every person is an aspiration waiting to become truth.’

More about the organisation is available here: [http://www.weare1.org.uk/](http://www.weare1.org.uk/)

Users’ involvement in design and delivery can also be linked to a wider approach of empowering the whole community to take a lead in delivery. This is illustrated by the next case vignette.

**UK Case-study: Community-led delivery - Roma Support Group**

The Roma Support Group (RSG) has been working across London with Eastern European Roma, asylum-seekers, refugees and migrants since 1998. The organisation is led and driven by the Roma community - community members are involved in organisational management and every aspect of service delivery: ‘Springing from the Roma people’s need to be heard on their own terms through cultural contribution and self-representation’.[136] Active community empowerment and participation is a core underlying principle of the RSG. It is a process where Roma beneficiaries are empowered to participate in the development and implementation of the organisation’s projects, activities and advocacy. This may take the form of taking up a role as Trustees, volunteers or staff members, or serving as role models for their peer group and the whole Roma community.

The chair of the organisation is a Roma. Roma are also half of the management committee, and a substantive proportion of staff and volunteers. In addition, the organisation holds regular community consultations. They take the form of community events, focus groups, steering group meetings and interviews. This helps to create a sense of ownership among the community for the organisation. ‘One of the greatest achievements of the RSG is its ability to establish and maintain a trust-based relationship with the Roma refugee and migrant community in London’ (Ibid). The Roma Support Group undertook research on Improving Engagement with the Roma Community for the London Civic Forum (2010). There, they developed best practice models for community engagement including:

- Consultation: involvement in community consultation events to ascertain community needs and develop suitable plans of action

---

• Community Representation: election by other members on the basis of ability to voice the community’s concerns, alongside skills in leadership and strategic planning
• Engagement: elected representatives engage and mobilise their communities to set up grassroots activities to implement action plans.
• Creating a Framework: using an appropriate framework for the community work to operate from (e.g. voluntary group, charity, social enterprise, public organisation).
• Establishing partnerships: with statutory and voluntary agencies to advance Roma issues and the needs of the Roma community locally.
• Empowerment process: providing practical and sustainable support in many different areas of need, with emphasis on training and mentoring.
• Gathering evidence and recommendations: Roma community members are involved in running services, gathering evidence on the effectiveness of these services, and writing recommendations for improving public service delivery.
• Engaging with decision makers: Roma representatives, equipped with their evidence and recommendations, engage with policy and decision makers on a local and national level.


Key obstacles to transferability and how they can be addressed

Key obstacle 1: This approach is particularly vulnerable to the negative effects of a discriminatory environment.

It is very hard to build activists’ resilience to prejudice, mocking, discrimination, degrading treatment and violations of their basic human rights and those of their family. As a consequence, well-educated and integrated representatives of disadvantaged groups hide their ethnic origin or disability, keep a low profile, or migrate to neighbourhoods, towns and countries that are more inclusive. A huge amount of empowering work can thus be lost for the community, even though there is still benefit of improving individual and familial circumstances. The only solution to this obstacle is a consistent, systematic work with the immediate surrounding, the community and institutions. This may take the form of awareness raising, breaking myths, promoting the culture’s achievements and work with the media.

Key obstacle 2: Hidden, unacknowledged discrimination can be particularly destructive as it undermines resilience and inner strength from within.

This includes not open acts of hostility, but also the ways in which strengths, values, traditions, culture and other coping mechanisms are not acknowledged. ‘There is nothing more damaging than the lack of respect and recognition’, as one West London stakeholder says. This can be reflected in policy trends characterised by attempts to diminish difference and provide standardised solutions. The effective work to address this obstacle should target the individuals within the mainstream population. There is a need to work with values to promote respect for differences (as opposed to trying to eliminate them) starting at an early age e.g. in
schools and children’s centres. At policy level, it is more difficult to address this challenge. A solution is to encourage media, academics and other civil society structures to engage directly with policy makers. Thus, they will generate a public debate to identify strategies to address hidden discrimination.

Other solutions are seen in an adequate legislative framework around volunteering. It can regulate voluntary work and provide decent remuneration in an encouraging manner. This will provide incentives to both the volunteers and the hosting organisations. Not least, both practitioners and policy makers need to be made aware that working against hidden discrimination is a time-consuming process. However, it is essential to the successful implementation of social inclusion programmes with disadvantaged communities.

5.6. Key messages and recommendations

The active participation and involvement of vulnerable communities themselves, was highlighted as a central good practice by the stakeholders interviewed and in the literature. This chapter explored key activities within this practice. This includes building trust and engagement of community leaders, outreach and relationship building, involving disadvantaged communities in the design and delivery of social inclusion programmes, empowerment through advocacy and political participation, and supporting specialist grassroots organisations working with vulnerable populations.

In order for policy-makers and organisations working in West London to improve existing work or apply a participatory approach locally, the following concrete steps are recommended.

<p>| Building Trust &amp; Engagement of Community Leaders | • Identify and build relationships with community leaders, trusted NGOs or front-line services already working with vulnerable groups, as an entry point to access hard-to-reach communities. |
|                                               | • Build capacity and skills in community leaders and organisations to help their engagement with local policy-makers and services e.g. management, advocacy and leadership skills. |
| Outreach &amp; Relationship Building               | • Undertaking outreach to meet communities directly in the geographic areas that they are located, working through trusted community leaders and NGOs. |
|                                               | • Personal contact and face-to-face communication is key to gaining trust of communities. |
|                                               | • Building meaningful relationships with communities is often a lengthy process that requires considerable time and energy. |
| Roma involvement in Design &amp; Delivery          | • Involving communities themselves in programme and service design helps ensure initiatives are appropriate, relevant and effective in addressing community needs. |
|                                               | • Recruiting trusted community representatives to give expert advice on policy and service design. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roma empowerment through advocacy &amp; political participation</strong></th>
<th><strong>Supporting Roma &amp; BAMER organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Work with local organisations to identify community opinion leaders, activating and supporting them to represent the viewpoint of excluded groups such as the Roma.</td>
<td>• Supporting community NGOs to build organisational and staff capacity to aid engagement with local authorities and mainstream services e.g. communication strategies, management, networking skills, finance, policy and advocacy, fundraising skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve sharing of information about how communities can be involved in existing or new participation structures.</td>
<td>• Ensuring there is sustainable funding for frontline organisations working with marginalised and under-served groups such as the Roma e.g. statutory funding and support in accessing EU &amp; other funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult with voluntary organisations about how to improve political participation and voter registration of excluded groups.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work to increase representation of ethnic and other marginalised groups in local government and political parties e.g. through positive recruitment measures for council staff, policy-makers, stakeholder, elected council members etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Undertaking research and assessments of community needs, ideally involving communities themselves as researchers.** |
| • Setting up multi-agency task forces, councils or working groups, with statutory and community representatives, to jointly plan realistic solutions to address evidenced needs. |
| • Work actively with communities to maintain meaningful involvement throughout delivery e.g. seeking feedback at different project stages. |
| • Undertake meaningful consultation activities ideally delivered by communities themselves, and create clear communication channels e.g. regular meetings, designated contacts, sharing draft plans, agreed methods of communication (phone, meetings or email). |
| • Employ community members in mainstream service delivery as staff or volunteers, to help community engagement and as role models e.g. community development, youth work, health and social work. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Supporting Roma &amp; BAMER organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting community NGOs to build organisational and staff capacity to aid engagement with local authorities and mainstream services e.g. communication strategies, management, networking skills, finance, policy and advocacy, fundraising skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Undertaking research and assessments of community needs, ideally involving communities themselves as researchers.** |
| • Setting up multi-agency task forces, councils or working groups, with statutory and community representatives, to jointly plan realistic solutions to address evidenced needs. |
| • Work actively with communities to maintain meaningful involvement throughout delivery e.g. seeking feedback at different project stages. |
| • Undertake meaningful consultation activities ideally delivered by communities themselves, and create clear communication channels e.g. regular meetings, designated contacts, sharing draft plans, agreed methods of communication (phone, meetings or email). |
| • Employ community members in mainstream service delivery as staff or volunteers, to help community engagement and as role models e.g. community development, youth work, health and social work. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Roma empowerment through advocacy &amp; political participation</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Work with local organisations to identify community opinion leaders, activating and supporting them to represent the viewpoint of excluded groups such as the Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve sharing of information about how communities can be involved in existing or new participation structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Consult with voluntary organisations about how to improve political participation and voter registration of excluded groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Work to increase representation of ethnic and other marginalised groups in local government and political parties e.g. through positive recruitment measures for council staff, policy-makers, stakeholder, elected council members etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Supporting Roma &amp; BAMER organisations</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Supporting community NGOs to build organisational and staff capacity to aid engagement with local authorities and mainstream services e.g. communication strategies, management, networking skills, finance, policy and advocacy, fundraising skills.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Undertaking research and assessments of community needs, ideally involving communities themselves as researchers.** |
| • Setting up multi-agency task forces, councils or working groups, with statutory and community representatives, to jointly plan realistic solutions to address evidenced needs. |
| • Work actively with communities to maintain meaningful involvement throughout delivery e.g. seeking feedback at different project stages. |
| • Undertake meaningful consultation activities ideally delivered by communities themselves, and create clear communication channels e.g. regular meetings, designated contacts, sharing draft plans, agreed methods of communication (phone, meetings or email). |
| • Employ community members in mainstream service delivery as staff or volunteers, to help community engagement and as role models e.g. community development, youth work, health and social work. |
6. Good practice 4: Combining mainstreaming with a targeted approach

There is a need for a careful balance between delivering mainstream programmes for a wide range of vulnerable groups, and targeted work with specific ethnic communities with particular vulnerabilities. To enable this process, there needs to be better ethnic monitoring and data collection on excluded groups. Policy makers and practitioners should also invest in efforts to raise awareness of these communities. In order to mainstream the social inclusion of Roma and other vulnerable BAMER groups at a practice level, changes will need to be implemented within organisations. This includes staff training, anti-discrimination work and improving cultural understanding and awareness of these communities.

6.1. What is the rationale for combining mainstreaming with targeting?

There is an on-going debate in social inclusion literature and practice about how to best address the needs of minorities: whether to adopt a general approach (targeting all groups) or a specific approach (that targets particular communities only). The advantages of adopting a mainstream approach are that this can aid local community cohesion and reduce prejudice and inter-community tension. An example can be negative beliefs that certain ethnic groups are being prioritised for council housing or receive special benefits. However, given the specific barriers that are experienced by particular ethnic communities, a targeted approach is often necessary to effectively address these needs:

‘General programmes can promote immigrant integration as an integral part of activities that are geared towards society as a whole. At the same time, there are specific needs that will demand additional and targeted measures’.137

EU-level policy on Roma inclusion tackles this debate by recommending a balanced approach of ‘explicit but not exclusive targeting’. This is recommended in both EU literature on the Roma specifically and minority integration more widely, such as in the series of EC Handbooks on Integration.138 Under this approach, mainstream policies and programmes are targeted at vulnerable groups more widely, but elements of these initiatives have an explicit focus on particular communities. This is particularly useful in areas populated by other ethnic minorities or socio-economically deprived groups. However, in areas with large Roma populations, it may still be appropriate to have more targeted initiatives in place on a temporary or permanent basis.139 Finding an appropriate balance between general and targeted measures should be a key decision in programme design, in consultation with community stakeholders.140

---

138 Ibid.
‘Explicit but not exclusive targeting of the Roma is essential for inclusion policy initiatives. It implies focusing on Roma people as a target group but not to the exclusion of other people who share similar socio-economic circumstances. This approach does not separate Roma-focused interventions from broader policy initiatives. In addition, where relevant, consideration must be given to the likely impact of broader policies and decisions on the social inclusion of Roma people’.141

To effectively build the social inclusion of marginalised groups this way, organisations need to explore activities that would make their service delivery more accessible and inclusive to these groups. As well as redesigning programmes, in some cases, this also involves adapting existing organisational cultures and structures. This includes improving awareness of the needs of specific groups, tailoring services to better address these needs, training staff, introducing measures to increase organisational employee diversity, and culture change initiatives to adapt the goals and identities of organisations. As explained in the best practice literature, the rationale is that:

‘Much interaction between immigrants and non-immigrants takes place in mainstream organisations and their openness encourages immigrants to actively take part in the life of these organisations and thus in society … Opening up mainstream institutions and organisations is not an automatic process; rather it needs the continuous and active support of stakeholders at all levels’.142

Improving inter-cultural understanding and awareness is also an important element in making mainstream services more accessible.143 As described in the Common Basic Principles on Roma Integration, one of the key resources in the area, this is a two-way process of mutual understanding. In this process mainstream providers are equipped with better tools and competencies to understand Roma culture. At the same time, Roma are provided with better awareness and skills to understand and access mainstream services.144

Another key issue to be addressed is discrimination: according to stakeholders interviewed, one of the most significant barriers to Roma inclusion and employability in Bulgaria are hostile social attitudes towards this community.145 As described by one stakeholder:

‘The major challenge is the negative and hostile attitudes towards the Roma in mainstream Bulgarian society. From my own experiences as a Roma this prejudice affects social attitudes through all spheres of life, from the playground, to the market, to work, to employment, to health. Most Roma have dark skin so immediately you are seen as Roma’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

While equality and anti-discrimination measures are comparatively much stronger in the UK, research indicates that prejudice and discrimination towards the Roma and wider GRT communities remain a persistent issue in this country, too.146

6.2. What does this approach entail?

Mainstream programmes with explicit but not exclusive targeting

• Mainstream programmes targeting a wide range of vulnerable groups can be less divisive and are better for encouraging positive community relations. For example, by focusing on open groups such as ‘disadvantaged neighbourhoods’, or ‘people excluded from the labour market’147. As explained by one stakeholder:

  By giving funding only to Roma young people (e.g. extra tuition for Roma pupils) you create segregation and this is embarrassing for the Roma kids themselves. It is preferable and less segregating to fund mainstream programmes where disadvantaged young people are working together’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

• However explicitly targeted approaches need to be also incorporated within mainstream practices. This is needed in order to effectively reach and address the particular barriers experienced by certain marginalised groups. This is especially true in situations where their needs are not currently being met by mainstream services.148

  ‘There is a danger of slippage [in mainstream programmes] – those organisations that regularly work with the Roma will focus on those young people, whereas those that don’t won’t reach out to Roma pupils. We have to encourage organisations to work with those that are most in need not just the easiest to engage’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

• Explicit but not exclusive targeting requires a review of major policies and practices at different government levels. This is important in order to ensure that services are adequately reaching diverse social groups that are currently under-represented:

  ‘Policy-makers, service providers and non-governmental organisations active in a wide range of fields need to look critically at their own activities. To what extent do programmes recognise, respond to, and plan for immigrant’s particular needs and circumstances? Can processes and structures be adapted to improve accessibility?’149

• Given the multi-dimensional inclusion needs of Roma across a range of social policy fields, mainstreaming using an explicit but not exclusive approach, will help address the diverse and structural nature of their social exclusion.150


147 Ibid


Bulgarian Case-Study: Matching the right candidates with the employers’ needs - Bridge with Business Programme

Bridge with Businesses is a programme that works with Roma young people run by Open Society Foundation Sofia. The programme has been running since 2010, funded by the America for Bulgaria Foundation. Its main objective is to identify opportunities in the labour market at leading companies in Bulgaria. Then it places Roma young people in internships, with the long-term aim that they are offered employment. The programme provides:

• Carefully selected Roma interns and assesses their employment and skills needs;
• Intensive tailored and individual training for the candidates over a long period;
• Mediation with the companies;
• Matching individuals with placements;
• A business counsellor to support candidates through the placement.

A key success factor is that they are filling a niche in supporting talented Roma who need help in selling their skills to employers. Another key element is to invite the partnering companies to give presentations to future interns and to ask previous interns to talk about their experiences and give advice. Business mentors to the young people give tailored and individual support before and during their work placement. The mentors are directly from the employment sectors mentees are trying to access. This is coupled with lengthy and specific training to prepare young people for each placement. This training includes soft-skills such as communication, time and project management, interview presentation skills, body language, and building self-esteem.

Placing young people in internships is a two-fold process that requires careful matching, so that the companies and individuals fit with each other’s profile and expectations (especially if the placement is to lead to a future job contract). Developing partnerships with a wide range of stakeholders and employers is crucial. Hence, partners include NGOs, local and national government and private sector companies. In the first year of delivery the team undertook intensive work to promote the programme and develop and sustain good contacts with leading employers.

However, there is variation in how businesses respond to the idea of Roma internships, and it can be hard to convince some employers to give them a chance. International companies are often more open as they are used to having a multi-cultural workforce, whereas within Bulgarian companies, stereotypes around the Roma often persists and frightens them. In these cases, considerably more time and energy is required to negotiate placements, including numerous face-face meetings.

Organisational change and staff training

• Improving organisational awareness of the specific needs of marginalised groups is a key principle. This includes close collaboration with specialist organisations to better understand community needs and accessibility barriers: ‘Undertaking community needs assessments to review whether existing services are adequately meeting all parts of the population’.\(^{151}\)

---

• Contracting specialist NGOs already working with hard-to-reach communities such as the Roma as expert advisors on service design. This could also include delivering training workshops for front-line staff to improve skills in working with specific communities:

‘Cooperation between mainstream organisations and NGOs is very important – relationships can be complementary or competitive, coordinated or duplicating and so organisational bridges need to be built. NGOs have knowledge and expertise of the target groups mainstream organisations wish to reach, and can become trainers or advisors for mainstream providers’.  

• Promoting a diverse workforce and volunteering opportunities for vulnerable groups within mainstream organisations is another crucial ingredient of this good practice. As one Bulgarian stakeholder says, ‘[t]he municipality [staff] delivers this project themselves instead of using special companies … we have a department here for gardening… and now we have 30 Roma people working in this department’. This will help build staff skills in community engagement and help make mainstream provision more accessible. As the leading UK organisation Equality writes in one of their reports:

‘There is an urgent need for more Roma specific health visitors and education workers recruited for, and if possible from the community … employing and training Roma staff as teaching assistants, outreach workers, home and school liaison workers’. 

Bulgarian Case-Study: Working with teachers - Step by Step Programme Foundation

The Step by Step Programme Foundation is an educational NGO. It specialises in pedagogical work with Roma children aged 0-10 years, teachers, schools and parents. The programme develops a range of projects for education of vulnerable children starting from work with infants and toddlers and going through preschool, primary school (including special schools) up to secondary education. Their work covers projects such as:

• Teachers for Multilingual/Multi-ethnic Europe Project;
• Access to Education and Training for Roma Representatives to Work in Public Administration and Police Structures;
• Roma Education Initiative, Promoting Access to Quality Education and Desegregation of Roma Project;
• Reducing Risk of prostitution & Trafficking of Economically Disadvantaged Children ;
• Creating Caring and Responsible Classroom Project.

The organisation’s aim is to ensure that the child is at the centre of policies and programmes in Bulgaria. A key example of their practice is the on-line training of teachers using the Moodle learning environment, funded by the Ministry of Education. There are three main themes to the training: individualisation of the teaching process, participation of the family and inter-cultural education. The methodological pack consists of seven training modules, two manuals on the use of Moodle and a monitoring component. This is a fully
electronically delivered training, which ensures unlimited access to the learning environment, in the participants’ own time and pace.

More about the organisation can be found here: [http://www.stepbystep-bg.org](http://www.stepbystep-bg.org)

**Cultural awareness and challenging discrimination**

- This aspect includes awareness raising activities, e.g. events, relationship building with organisations, training on anti-discrimination, and public campaigns to encourage greater understanding of Roma issues and promote inclusion initiatives. For example, one Bulgarian stake holder explains that a key success factor was relationship building:

> ‘The programme [to support Roma into employment] has also become very recognisable within the public. In the first year of implementation we really tried to promote the programme and develop and sustain good contacts’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

- Cultural activities are an important method to develop better understanding about communities. They also promote the positive contributions BAMER groups bring locally. Not least, they facilitate contact between different ethnic communities to improve community cohesion:

> ‘Funding local art and cultural programmes can enhance community cohesion (i.e. Roma culture workshops in schools, oral history projects, Roma music & dance classes for all local residents, music programmes for young people). Promoting an understanding of Roma culture and celebrating Gypsy, Roma, Traveller History Month by Local Authorities, schools, libraries, theatres, galleries, museums, media agencies’. \(^{154}\)

- In order to improve cultural awareness, social inclusion and employability programmes need to develop intensive partnership working and networking. This should include a wide range of potential employers and mainstream organisations. This also includes mainstream organisations undertaking outreach with NGOs and Roma communities to improve community knowledge of the available mainstream services: ‘NGOs can act as intermediaries and help change perceptions that service providers and users have of each other’. \(^{155}\)

- An important aspect of improving cultural understanding is building better knowledge and awareness of the diversity within target groups. This is particularly relevant in the case of the Roma, an extremely diverse collection of different communities and groups:

> ‘Diversity within the Romani communities is, as with all communities, complex and multi-dimensional and involves differences of language and dialect, history, culture, religion, social class, educational and occupational status’. \(^{156}\)

---

\(^{154}\) Ibid.


\(^{156}\) Ibid. p.28.

An important component of this good practice is to recognise strengths and skills within communities. This goes hand in hand with adopting a more flexible and innovative approach to acknowledging employability skills and experiences: Roma and vulnerable groups may not have formal qualifications but they often have valuable skills to be utilised if service providers and employers have the creativity to uncover them. For example, in the Roma community this can include unique craft and building skills, teaching, music, arts and linguistic skills. This would mean ‘considering Roma not as a problem, but as an artistic, cultural, and social capital, whose cultural heritage and artistic excellence will contribute significantly to the cultural development of each borough’.

Engaging Roma as volunteers (for example young people and school pupils) in mainstream inclusion projects, can also be a useful tool to promote cultural understanding: ‘Employing Roma mediators in local councils to build bridges of understanding between local governments and Roma community members’ is a must.

Employment discrimination against the Roma, wider GRT communities and other BAMER groups remains a persistent issue throughout Europe. ‘Employment discrimination against Roma is endemic – job vacancies are not open to Roma … employers even tell Roma that they are not being hired because they are ‘Gypsies’’. European best practice literature recommends that alongside robust anti-discrimination and equality frameworks there needs to be effective implementation mechanisms in organisations. They include positive recruitment measures to tackle the causes of under-representation of certain groups in employment.

More targeted work needs to take place with organisations and employers that have more negative perceptions towards groups. This work takes the form of face-to-face meetings, relationship building and negotiation. As described in a job brokerage project in Bulgaria, international employers tended to be more open to employing diverse workforces, however local employers were often reluctant: ‘There is variation in how [potential employers] respond. Some are very open to the idea of Roma placements but some are not…where we have to put in more effort to negotiate placements – the stereotypes around the Roma frighten them’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder).

The work of funders is a key condition for developing an inclusive environment. By analysing the context and the needs to establish their priorities, they provide guidance and direction to local organisations. The next case vignette illustrates this.

---
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Bulgarian Case-Study: Participation in policy making through funding - America for Bulgaria Foundation

America for Bulgaria Foundation (ABF) is a grant making organisation in Bulgaria. There are six funding streams. The stream on economically disadvantaged groups (defined as people in poverty) supports a wide range of programmes. Its strategic focus is on early education, preventing school drop-out and connecting people with employment. In Bulgaria, this work is based on their analysis that the majority of impoverished persons are pensioners or ethnic minorities (and particularly the Roma). Strategically, the foundation decided to focus its efforts on young Roma people. However, they do not restrict their support to organisations working just with the Roma – ‘in fact’, our interviewee says, ‘it is more successful to employ an integrated approach and to work with Roma and non-Roma people together’. For example, the ABF has learned that many Roma organisations preferred not to provide funding only for Roma young people (e.g. extra tutorials for Roma pupils).

They do so because this can reinforces segregation and is embarrassing for the Roma children themselves. It is preferable and less segregating to fund mainstream programmes where young people are working together. The draw-back is that there can be a danger of slippage – those organisations that regularly work with the Roma may focus on those young people, whereas those that do not may not reach out to Roma pupils. The goal is ‘to encourage organisations to work with those that are most in need not just with those that are the easiest to engage.’

A lesson learnt is that everyone wants the same things in life - a job to support their family, good health and so on. Working from the starting point of what makes us similar, rather than different, is important. Projects that give specific skills and individually tailored goals are also crucial. These goals can be a high school certificate, a driving license or welding qualification: ‘education is key, as without an 8th grade school diploma, most jobs are not open to people in Bulgaria’. Particularly for adults who find it embarrassing going back to school, working towards specific goals and relevant skills are important to engage them, so that people become self-sufficient beyond the end of a programme.

However, the most challenging aspect of AFB’s work on Roma integration is trying to connect people with jobs. Even if the Roma person has a high-school or even graduate diploma, they often lack the soft-skills that are needed to integrate into work-places. It is also hard to convince businesses to give them a chance. So not only do Roma lack the necessary skills, they are also trying to enter a skeptical environment. It is very important to be aware of the challenges and not to have unrealistic expectations. Trying to improve Roma integration is long term work - there are no quick fixes and change is a hard and long process.

More information about the foundation is available here: [www.americaforbulgaria.org](http://www.americaforbulgaria.org)

Grant making organisations do not necessarily limit their contribution to funding only, they can themselves carry out and commission research and work to raise awareness. The next case vignette is an illustration of how this is done in Bulgaria at present.
Bulgarian Case-Study: Using research and raising awareness to create an inclusive environment - Open Society Institute Sofia (OSI)

Open Society Institute Sofia was established in the early 1990s to contribute to promoting democracy in the Bulgarian society. Its Roma programme is one of its most long-standing streams, implementing a range of initiatives. It is funded through the Open Society Foundations, as well as the World Bank and the EU. The OSI conducts a large amount of research on the Roma, including the regular sociological survey (called Openbus) in Bulgaria targeted at the mainstream population which includes questions on Roma issues. OSI is well known for its research publications that dismantle myths and stereotypes about Roma through providing evidence on the reality of their lives. The OSI also runs operational programmes on the Roma that combine anti-discrimination, job placement (discussed above) and scholarship programmes to enable Roma students to take up professional roles in mainstream society. For example, the Roma Health Scholarship programme for medical students has been very successful because there is a huge demand and skills-shortage in Bulgaria for all types of medical staff. Training Roma as doctors in this public-facing profession is also a way of tackling prejudices within Bulgarian society.

The major challenge to the work of the OSI is the negative and hostile attitude towards the Roma in mainstream Bulgarian society. This prejudice affects social attitudes through all spheres of life - from the playground, to the market, to work, to employment, to health. To promote social and political inclusion of Bulgaria’s Roma minority, the OSI assists Roma in advocating for themselves and their communities and works to eliminate institutional racism and negative stereotypes in Bulgarian society. The foundation also helps create alternative images of Roma in local and national media. Another priority is to increase Roma engagement in public affairs.

More information about the organisation is available here: www.osf.bg

6.3. How does it work?

This chapter paid special attention to the activities and circumstances needed to successfully implement an explicit but not exclusive mainstreaming approach in the area of employment. The section is based on the rich data from interviews with stakeholders from both West London and Bulgaria. The section on how the good practice works is particularly important, as this is a relatively new policy approach. Similarly, as with the other good practices, experience shows that it is very difficult to achieve success when the implementation is patchy and when the context is challenging. Below are the core elements that need to be in place for this good practice to work.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Critical success factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Review mainstream policies and programmes to ensure they are tailored to specific groups.</td>
<td>• Involves community stakeholders to review accessibility of mainstream programmes for vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Try to ensure organisations work with those most in need, not just the easiest to engage.</td>
<td>• Clear and explicit direction from decision makers that the focus is to target vulnerable groups, such as the Roma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Be realistic about aims &amp; outcomes of programmes e.g. significant change takes long-term &amp; consistent work.</td>
<td>• Effective monitoring and evaluation of past programmes, and feedback from practitioners to develop realistic aims.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Develop realistic project ideas that match economic and employer demands.</td>
<td>• Research whether there is a market for project ideas e.g. jobs in certain sectors or community craft products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Set practical objectives, so in a set period beneficiaries can really see measurable and tangible outcomes.</td>
<td>• E.g. gaining concrete skills, qualifications or certificates, work or volunteer placements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt explicit but not exclusive targeting, to target the most vulnerable but also mainstream.</td>
<td>• So specific needs of certain groups are being addressed, but without enflaming prejudice or hostility from others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Fund programmes, or community cohesion work to bring different disadvantaged groups together.</td>
<td>• Work from the starting point of what makes people similar: cross-cultural activities such as sports, arts and crafts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve mainstream practice and organisations through cultural awareness training.</td>
<td>• Encourage organisations to better understand and work with different cultures, traditions and values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employ community mediators and mentors in mainstream organisations, to engage and link with certain groups.</td>
<td>• To improve delivery and also the confidence of communities to engage with mainstream services &amp; feel less isolated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• In-depth community engagement to build honest, transparent and consistent relationships with groups.</td>
<td>• Allow time to build trust with local communities, and understand their difficult circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Have well-prepared and tailored information to beneficiaries.</td>
<td>• Pilot information in different communities to test its accessibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tailored training for staff in mainstream organisations, in working with specific vulnerable groups.</td>
<td>• Help drive change within organisation to better reach and improve ways of working with certain vulnerable groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Positive recruitment measures in organisations to train and increase representation from certain groups.</td>
<td>• Employing under-represented groups such as the Roma in public-facing roles can help tackle social prejudice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activities

• Ensure training matching employers’ needs and job opportunities.

• Improve and introduce better ethnic monitoring systems, to better assess local needs and reach of services.

Critical success factors

• Undertake research on employers’ needs and job shortages in local areas.

• Consult with under-represented communities such as Roma, about how to improve research and ethnic monitoring.

### 6.4. Main results of the approach

This good practice is better supported by evidence than the other models we identified. It is comparatively easy to see its components working – people either get a job or they do not. We have included the available data in the case vignettes: the presented results are impressive. However, despite this, wider circumstances in people’s lives can prevent job placements or relationships with potential employees do not work as planned. These can happen even in the most inclusive environments and with the most suitable candidates. Therefore, both job seekers and practitioners need to be equipped with patience and strategies to learn from negative experiences.

An emerging hypothesis is that negative outcomes are due to a lack of connection between the activities delivered within this model and the other three good practices presented in this paper. It is difficult to make this practice work if it is not underpinned by an integrated policy approach, if it is not implemented in practice through multi-disciplinary working, and if there is not active community participation. The reason is that successful employment and careers are a product of interwoven life factors. It is not enough to provide technical skills, vocational qualifications and techniques for job seeking, even if they are tailored.

Measuring how many people remain in employment long-term is more difficult and does not happen often. This is now changing in the UK with increasing funding that targets sustained employment outcomes. However, programmes still often do not follow up their candidates beyond the time the individual beneficiary has been supported into work, or at best measure results after three or six months only. For example, our interviewees observed that beneficiaries often struggle to stay in employment if support is not linked to an integrated approach and does not employ holistic case management.

There are a number of organisations in Bulgaria that support the implementation of this approach in the area of employment, such as Free Youth Centre, INTEGRO Association and leading Business Centres as the one in Nova Zagora. As they all work with the Employment Agency, below is the presentation of its work and results. They would have not been possible without the non-governmental organisations that make the direct link with communities on the ground.
Bulgarian Case-Study: Mainstreaming combined with targeting - The Employment Agency

The Employment Agency is an executive agency at the Ministry of Labour and Social Policy. It supports the labour market through its territorial structures – the Employment Bureaus, which aim to improve employment and reduce joblessness in local areas. The Bureaus work with all possible categories of job seekers and employers.

In order to increase the suitability for employment and training of Roma and to improve their access to the labour market, the agency implements a range of activities, which includes motivational work for job seeking; career advice; enrolment in training to improve literacy and vocational qualifications; and providing employment in the framework of programmes and supportive measures. A key activity is support to entrepreneurship, via motivational work and enrolment in training modules. The Employment Bureaus deliver programmes that aim at developing skills for project development and management to support entrepreneurship: up to November 2012, 124 individuals have participated. 8,341 unemployed individuals from a Roma background have been enrolled in activities aiming at increasing the suitability for employment and obtaining a qualification. 8,461 unemployed have received employment in the framework of various programmes and measures, including Development of Human Resources Operational Programme.

A key initiative is the Activating Inactive Individuals Programme. The aim is to work with inactive and disenchanted individuals, who in Bulgaria are mostly from the Roma community. The Agency appointed mediators, people with a Roma background, who do motivational work. They help them register and support them to use the mediating services of the Employment Bureaus. To date, within the 68 Bureaus across Bulgaria, there were 82 Roma mediators, with 55 of them are women, and 22 have a higher education.

Also important is the organisation and implementation of specialised Job Fairs. They aim to support the employment of the Roma by ensuring direct contact with employers. Jobs Fairs have been held since 2006. There were 2 Job Fairs in 2012 with 57 individuals starting a job through participating. The key lesson, as our interviewee puts it, is that:

‘in order to engage the Roma community, one ought to seek support and engagement of prominent community leaders, Roma intellectuals, mediators, NGO, media – in other words “Roma for the Roma”. The implementation of activities and the various initiatives related to Roma integration have to be carried out in close cooperation with informal leaders and Roma local organisations’.

An alternative to the Employment Bureaus are the Business Centres which develop excellent practices in all aspects of employment support and work well with minorities. Examples of their practices have been set out separately in Practitioners’ Briefing No 5 on Supported Entrepreneurship.

6.5. Transferability of the approach: the West London experience, key obstacles and how they can be addressed?

The West London experience

This good practice on combining mainstreaming with a targeted approach, already works in West London through a range of projects and services. Examples include
local authorities’ services in the framework of the NPWWL project, Jobcentre Plus and the voluntary sector organisations such as WeAre1. One of our informants described the importance of not separating mainstream delivery and targeted services:

‘Barriers are there if you put barriers in place. We are all born in different circumstances. Life is based on money and power, but there are people who don’t have voice and there is an interest to keep them there, [this is the only difference]. We all have aspirations and dreams, people don’t choose to go down the road – they want to change [like anybody else]’. (West London Stakeholder)

The approach is transferable as long as there are conditions for it to be grounded and as long as services are really accessible. ‘When you help six members of a specific community, at least six members of other communities, including mainstream, will benefit’ – this is how another West London interviewee illustrated the transferability of the approach to other groups. This is so because the mechanisms through which it works, for example focus on soft skills or using interactive techniques, can lead to success for many people, not only those from disadvantaged groups. However, the actual implementation should be combined with a cultural sensitivity and awareness of the tailored needs of different group: ‘Identities are defused, you can be an Irish and a Traveller; however you are more Traveller than an Irish, that is you share more characteristics in common with European nomadic cultures than with Irish nationals’ (West London stakeholder).

Interviewees in Bulgaria pointed out that the practice may actually work better in West London than in Bulgaria, as many see London as a more inclusive environment. In the lack of comparative studies of employers in Bulgaria and West London, this optimistic prognosis about transferability of the approach has to be approached with caution. It is possible that employers have rather negative attitudes in the UK, too163.

Another factor to consider is that, in order to work well, the practice needs a context characterised by a large number and variety of job opportunities. This is usually facilitated by large employers. In this sense the West London context may be very appropriate which is confirmed by the instances in which the practice is employed. It is also important that the providers of the service have access to a large number of candidates. This makes local authorities and national welfare bodies very appropriate service providers in this good practice. The next case vignette illustrates these points.

**UK Case-Study: Tailoring to employers’ needs to match them with the right candidates - ESF Heathrow Academy (Hillingdon)**

The Heathrow Academy project provides sector based training and job brokerage into vacancies at Heathrow Airport. Currently funded by London Councils ESF and

---

Heathrow Airport Ltd (previously known as BAA), with delivery led by Outsource Training, the project targets economically inactive and unemployed residents in Hillingdon, Hounslow and Ealing. There are around 76,000 jobs available at the airport at any given time, and Heathrow Academy provides a high quality, free employment service to the employers on the site. Between 2009-11 Heathrow Academy supported 530 people into jobs (well exceeding the target of 400) and achieved high job retention rates, which can be challenging with candidates who have been economically inactive. Key factors for its success are:

- Employers are heavily involved in identifying the skills needs and shaping the training given to participants;

- The project has a very clear process for screening, training and matching the best candidates to the steady flow of vacancies that could be compared with a production line;

- Heathrow Academy has established itself as a trusted source of high quality candidates for jobs, despite skills needs or barriers to work these candidates might have when joining the project.

Mainstreaming, whilst tailoring to the needs of disadvantaged groups, requires careful data collection. This is particularly difficult when working with more hidden groups such as the Roma. The case vignette below presents a rare example of what is needed to apply rigorous data collection.

**UK Case-Study: Good practice in data collection - National Pupil Database and School Census**

This survey developed by the Department of Education is unique in the European Union in that it collects data on Roma pupils disaggregated by ethnicity. This survey can present local authorities with a valuable instrument in ascertaining the size and needs of Roma communities in their areas.\(^{164}\) There are still challenges with this tool, in that it only collects data on children not adults, many Roma young people may have dropped out of education, and there are barriers for Roma in ascribing their ethnicity due to fears of discrimination. However, the School Census remains the most accurate source of official statistics on the Roma to date, and could is a useful resource for local authorities, especially if used to developed further local population surveys to map ethnic communities living in local areas: ‘The collection of high quality data on Roma would enable local authorities to really know the actual size of their Roma communities, and devise and implement programmes which respond to their assessed needs’.\(^{165}\)

Despite specific details that differ between disadvantaged groups, key principles and techniques of this good practice can be applied to a variety of vulnerable groups. At the same time, the same principles and techniques can also improve the work with members of the mainstream population. Thus, the model can help all

---


disadvantaged groups universally whilst members of the mainstream population also benefit. Working with a wide group of people in need can result in greater social cohesion. An illustration of how this can be done is provided by the next case vignette.

**UK Case-Study: Working with mainstream and with disadvantaged communities together - Urban Youth Network (Hounslow)**

The Urban Youth Network works with young BAME people, with a focus on Somali youth, to encourage them to get involved in sport, especially football. The organisation also delivers mentoring, providing role models to BAME girls and boys who may not have a father figure in their lives. The football sessions improve confidence, reduce isolation, increase integration and tackle problems such as the risk of engaging in anti-social behaviour. The mentoring targets those most at risk and to work on their future in terms of education, employment, and physical and mental health. In turn, by engaging the mainstream community and other ethnic groups, the sports sessions help to show the real face of Somali youth and tackle their negative image in the society, for example the media portrayal of Somalis as terrorists. The Urban Youth Network also works to show positive examples of Somali culture such as the success of Somali competitors at the Olympics, and works with parents to help them understand the importance of building relationships with their children’s schools.

Over 100 young people have accessed the mentoring scheme in the last year. Success is owed to the careful approach to engagement: identifying places in the community where they can engage young people and follow up through sports sessions and discussion of issues raised by the young people. The other key to success is that the mentoring team ensure that young people have ownership of the programme and are involved in shaping what opportunities are on offer.

The key lesson from their work is that it is essential to gain the trust of the community to enable positive engagement, delivering consistently and not over-promising. It is also crucial to support the young people through celebrating their successes, providing them with meaningful role models and fighting stigma.

A variation of the approach can be employed to combine work with users from a variety of disadvantaged backgrounds and provide them with services that are different from the mainstream. Such an example is presented below:

**UK Case-Study: Combining work with different disadvantaged groups - Action Acton (West London-wide)**

Action Acton is based in Ealing but currently expanding to other parts of West London. It works with disadvantaged individuals, including long term unemployed and economically inactive. The organisation delivers a diverse range of employment and business support projects which tackle a wide range of barriers to employment such as language and ICT skills needs, lack of qualifications, childcare and carer issues and lack of soft skills such as communication or attitude. Projects include:

- Delivering a sub-contract of the Work programme in West London;
• the “Jobs not knives changes lives” project which helps 15-19 year olds involved in youth violence and group offending to exit this lifestyle through stimulating debate, challenging negative stereotypes and attitudes and supporting them to secure employment, training and education;

• Providing free ESOL tuition and support on literacy, numeracy, ICT and Citizenship which includes work to help enable third country nationals to integrate into UK society through the European Integration Fund;

• Projects supporting young people, particularly those not in employment, education or training (or at risk of), young offenders and young people leaving care;

• The Doughnut Factory managed workspace for SMEs and social enterprises.

For more information: [http://www.actionacton.com/](http://www.actionacton.com/)

It is important to keep in mind that this good practice works best in combination with the other good practices presented here. These practices should use the principles of an integrated policy approach, participatory design and be employed in multi-disciplinary teams applying holistic case management. An example of how this can be done is presented below.

**UK Case Study: Combining mainstreaming with targeting, an integrated approach, multi-disciplinary practice and participatory delivery - FAST Programme (UK-wide example)**

Families and Schools Together (FAST) is a parenting programme delivered by Save the Children and Middlesex University which encourages schools to work with the families of pupils aged 4-6 years. FAST teams work with families to increase children’s respect for their parents and strengthen parent-child attachment; build parent friendship networks; increase parent involvement in schools and communities and providing mechanisms of self-support. Such activities to enhance the social environment strengthen the child’s resilience and reduce maladaptive behaviours, increase social capital in communities and empower small groups of families.

Parent engagement rates at schools show that if the family comes once, 80% will return for 5-6 of the 8 sessions, regardless of school location. A key to the project’s success is ensuring teams are representative of the ethnic make-up of the schools, and involve parent partners from these communities. The initiative is also deliverable in other countries through the setting up of Cultural Adaptation Teams comprising representatives of different cultures.

This is the only parenting programme that works by building social capital. The activities are designed in such a way that parents do not only learn how to be better parents through experiential learning, but they also gradually come to know better their neighbours and local resources. By strengthening the personal links between parents from different communities, it helps fight stigma and works for greater inclusivity. The installed follow up monthly meetings at schools for two years often continue spontaneously even longer. These meetings provide parents with the opportunity to explore and work together on the issues that are important to them. They also help parents to feel more confident when using the available support at schools, community services and local authorities. Often this
Includes issues of employment and unemployment. Examples of this spontaneously emerging support include sharing tips from experience about looking for a job, applying for a job, going to interviews, maintaining the private life/work balance and dealing with problems at work as well as at home.

For more information: http://www.savethechildren.org.uk/about-us/where-we-work/united-kingdom/fast

Initiatives to create inclusive environments are widely applied in the UK context, including West London. Higher and further education institutions routinely apply this good practice and traditionally develop intensive research in this area. Local voluntary organisations and activist groups also employ the approach, often in innovative ways and to a range of disadvantaged groups. Where the practice expands to employers, there are a range of policy and legislative mechanisms to ensure an inclusive and tolerant environment. Concrete practices to enforce them constantly evolve. Examples from West London work with the Roma community are detailed below.

**UK- Case Study: Awareness-Raising and Training - Roma Support Group**

The Roma Support Group (RSG) is a London-based charity that works to improve the social inclusion and employability of Roma refugees and migrants. It also seeks to improve understanding of Roma culture, heritage and current circumstances in the UK, through information events and publications for the public and mainstream services. A key barrier to employability for the Roma is the lack of awareness of this community within mainstream services. For example, employment advisors and job brokers need to take a more flexible and innovative approach when assessing the skills and experiences of Roma people. Often mainstream staff assess skills using more rigid frameworks and criteria, stressing the importance of formal education and work experience. Roma people often lack formal qualifications, however they do have valuable and employable skills if service providers and employers have the creativity to uncover them. This includes unique craft, construction and building, teaching, linguistic, social care, music and arts skills. ‘Roma have many skills but these are not formally defined and so are often overlooked – for example as craftsmen and artisans, teachers and translators’ (Staff Member, Roma Support Group).

An important aspect of this approach is to recognise the skills and strengths within communities, and having the vision to see someone’s potential employability. This is particularly important as due to past negative experiences, Roma can have low self-esteem and confidence. Employment advisors need to build trusting relationships with Roma clients, be culturally aware, and probe to uncover people’s hidden skills and talents. Individual examples from the RSG’s job brokerage work include:

- Skilled metal workers and craftsmen: such as the case of a man who had unique skills in church bell repair. There is significant UK shortage in these traditional trades, so the man has since been employed by churches and as a trainer of other apprentices.
- Education and youth work: within Roma communities there are traditional oral teaching methods that are very effective in engaging young people. As in the case of a man skilled in karate, who was then supported by the RSG to establish a youth group for marginalised young people at risk of dropping out of education.
• Linguists and translators: Many Roma refugees and migrants are multi-lingual speaking fluent Romanes, Eastern European languages and English. The Romanes language has a large number of dialects, so community members can act as translators for mainstream organisations in areas with high Roma or Eastern European populations.

• Musicians and artists: for example, the RSG has supported musicians to become freelance teachers, service providers to schools, or successful musical groups (e.g. the group Romani Rad and work with the Great Union Orchestra).

A key aim of the Roma Support Group is to provide cultural awareness training for statutory organisations and staff. This includes running workshops and training for practitioners in cultural and ethnic diversity. This targets practitioners working within Roma communities, with ethnic and family structures, and on cultural taboos. The training covers leadership mechanisms, understanding of social inclusion barriers, best practice in improving Roma inclusion and employability, and how to engage effectively with Roma clients and communities. The RSG is currently being funded by the Department for Education to build its capacity and to further develop its activities in organisational training for statutory and voluntary services.

There is a subtle difference between cultural awareness raising and working with discrimination – these are two complementing approaches with a slightly different focus. The next case vignette is an example of what working with discrimination means.

**UK Case-Study: Working with discrimination - GRT Achievement Service (GRTAS)**

There is a lot of hidden, unacknowledged discrimination towards GRT communities in the UK. It is expressed in a lack of recognition for the European nomadic tradition as an ancient culture with its strengths and a lot of rejection and cultural misunderstanding. In the current economic climate, there is a risk that discrimination against minority groups such as GRT communities will be heightened. The Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Achievement Service (GRTAS) offers tailored cultural awareness training to frontline staff and organisations which come into contact with nomadic persons/communities and ongoing support as a liaison service as and when required.

Some years ago, the team worked on a multi-media exhibition promoting positive images of Gypsy, Roma and Traveller people entitled ‘Travellers Tales’. The idea was to give individual Travellers creative opportunities to express those aspects of their life and culture which they feel are most important to convey to members of the public and to tackle external representations from romantic misconceptions to abject racism. Another more recent example of this work was in 2010 when the GRTAS collaborated with a large group of Travellers of Irish heritage, various professional writers, directors, actors and musicians in re-writing the story of the opera ‘Carmen’. This was then then in performed at the Royal Albert Hall, in the contemporary words and scenarios of the Irish Travellers who participated.

There is also a lot of work at the individual level. For example, the GRTAS team supported a young Irish traveller singer, who performed the songs of his family, passed down the generations orally. The team supported him to make a recording and tour music venues. He has achieved significant recognition in the world of folk music as a singer of songs thought to have been lost, including coverage in the national press and on BBC Radio 4.
Key obstacles to transferability and how they can be addressed

Key obstacle 1: Insufficient ethnic monitoring and data collection.

The Roma community (and other BAMER groups such as wider GRT communities) often remain 'hidden' in national and local policy and research. They are rarely included in surveys, ethnic monitoring and other forms of data collection. Or as in the case of the UK’s 2011 census, the ethnic categories used are not appropriate in capturing this population: ‘The census doesn’t ask the right question. It is Gypsy and Irish Traveller but for Roma from Eastern Europe the term gypsy is discriminatory’ (UK Stakeholder). This label can re-enforce the feelings of inferiority and exclusion of members of these communities. As a result they would not identify themselves with this group, but will be also affected psychologically - in terms of self-esteem or trust in services who use this term. This lack of adequate tools has a significant impact on effective policy and programming to address Roma social inclusion:

‘The lack of reliable data and information regarding Roma populations in Europe, from a demographic, social and economic point of view, represents a substantial barrier for policy elaboration, programming and policy impact assessment … It limits the overall vision of the socio-conditions of the Roma’.166

Anti-discrimination and cultural awareness activities also need to take place to ensure that the identity of marginalised groups is recognised in the mainstream society. Many Roma do not declare their ethnicity on official monitoring forms (such as in the UK school survey) due to fears of discrimination and experience a sense of stigma in openly promoting their Roma identity and culture.167

Lack of adequate data collection is a common issue for national and local governments, and mainstream services, which means they are often unaware of sizable Roma populations living locally:

‘Data on the Roma is not collected efficiently even by those local authorities whose work can serve as a model of good practice. The collection of high quality data on Roma would enable local authorities to really know the actual size of their Roma communities, and devise and implement programmes which respond to their assessed needs’.168

A solution to this problem is further research into what are the appropriate categories and questions on disadvantaged groups, such as the ethnic categories used in the UK School Census. It is also important to consider who formulates these categories and questions and how. They need to be developed by expert panels to determine anti-discriminatory practice. The issue is also well analysed in the available literature but findings are not synthesised. Good research practice would be to carry out periodic reviews of established this way categories and questions. This would ensure that consistent and non-discriminatory monitoring

168 Ibid, p.11.
practices are in place. This will enable routine research to guide adequate actions on social inclusion generally, and with regard to employment support in particular.

Key obstacle 2: Large employment support organisations are very suited to apply the approach, but they can be disconnected from the reality on the ground and do not sufficiently connect marginalised groups.

The approach works better if large employment organisations and welfare to work providers cooperate with grassroots level groups. They also need to cooperate with any organisations which have direct access to the experiences and lives of disadvantaged groups. For example, we encountered a range of practices both in Bulgaria and in West London, related to job placement and supported internships. They use this approach to recruit, encourage, motivate and support candidates. Such cooperation can be encouraged by targeted funding of joint projects as well as by policy frameworks in this spirit.

Key obstacle 3: Disenchantment of workless people.

Our informants in West London report that there is an intuitive assumption among members of the public that people without a job should take any opportunity to work. However, this is not necessarily true. As discussed earlier, there are many complex factors in people’s lives which get in the way. This includes care responsibilities, mental health issues, transport connections to remote areas, open discrimination and negative attitudes to their communities. This can be addressed by combining the practice of mainstreaming whilst targeting with a multi-disciplinary approach. Thus, organisations can address the whole range of social and psychological barriers - as the case studies in this chapter have demonstrated.

Key obstacle 4: EU funding streams at present are hard to access by grassroots organisations.

Both in Bulgaria and West London, programmes that combine mainstreaming with a targeted approach, are mainly delivered by large consortia in EU funding streams. Accessing these funds can be difficult for smaller grassroots organisations, as it often requires match funding, larger staff capacity and a complex funding process. The risk is that reliance on such funding brings obstacles to utilising the expertise of grassroots organisations in regard to needs on the ground and successful approaches. These are, however, exactly the organisations who know how to motivate and engage people from vulnerable groups. EU funding bodies are aware of the problem and the ESF draft Regulation proposes to extend the use of simplified cost options, including by making their use obligatory for smaller operations. These provisions will reduce the administrative burden on beneficiaries and managing authorities, strengthen the results orientation of the ESF and will contribute to reducing error rates.169

A solution is that larger organisations and consortia looking to apply for EU funding, should look to partner with specialist grassroots organisations, and actively involve them in project design and delivery.

---

Key obstacle 5: Resorting to the provision of mainstream services as an easy solution to avoid working with complex realities.

While mainstream models of provision can relieve the symptoms of social inclusion, without targeted work it will not adequately improve the access, development and sustainability in employment for disadvantaged groups: ‘courses for literacy, language and qualification are interesting for the teachers but not for the learners’ (Bulgarian Stakeholder). This can be alleviated, and even prevented, by focusing services to deliver appropriate support to develop sustainable soft skills and to build psychological resilience. This requires the involvement of specialist professionals who can train candidates in communication skills, presentation at interviews and of documents to name just a few. There is also a need to employ mentors that are linked to different employment sectors, who can provide careful guidance for people in how to navigate employment opportunities and their requirements. Psychologists and psychotherapists can help deal with the consequences of stigma, past traumas and discrimination. Thus the potential employees will develop a positive image of themselves, will become more assertive and will be able to give up unsuccessful behavioural patterns and beliefs.

Key obstacle 6: The practice of mediators can be undermined by under-utilisation that leads to de-skilling.

If there is no institutional buy-in and understanding of the community mediators’ role, they can slip into the role of administrators and technical assistants. This has been observed by some informants in Bulgaria. Mediators can be employed on an ‘if and when needed’ basis. Alternatively, they can be tasked with developing an overall policy within the organisation. This will avoid under-utilisation and the tendency of institutions to attempt utilising them as technical assistants.

Mediators in the area of employment and other areas are seen as ‘successful’ in their ways of engaging and supporting the Roma. However, the existing programmes are too small to address the scope of the problem, according to our informants in Bulgaria. Including pro-active responsibilities as well responsibilities to build networks of voluntary ‘helpers’ will make good use of mediators’ time.

Key obstacle 7: Funding shortages result in short term programmes.

Programmes based on this model are often between six months and one year long. This is not enough time for the required job seekers’ to learn new skills, change behaviours and attitudes, nor for the employers’ organisational culture change. Even longer time is needed for employers to embrace and incorporate a more inclusive culture. Each project, programme and policy needs to emerge from previous steps and to build on their achievements. This requires developing mechanisms and spaces for institutional memory and learning: improved evaluation and monitoring, efficient organisation of documentation, team forums for learning from experience, systems for update and hand over. These spaces need to follow the trajectory of the individuals involved in the initiatives, including routine monitoring and regular evaluation to ground subsequent actions.
Key obstacle 8: Lack of motivation to create an inclusive employment environment.

As one of our interviewees says, ‘if *people and organisations are not motivated [that is, if there is no buy-in], if there is hypocrisy, populism, and lies, then the approach does not work’ (Bulgarian stakeholder). There needs to be a carefully balanced package of encouragements and sanctions in place. This may include positive discrimination until a critical mass of disadvantaged people in a certain workplace is achieved. As a result, staff already employment from disadvantaged backgrounds can contribute and even lead to culture change and greater acceptance. A softer approach is stimulating work placements in which organisations can see the advantages of individuals whose skills are matched to their needs. Such placements can lead to a longer term and permanent employment.

6.6. Key messages and recommendations

This chapter has explored the need for a careful balance between delivering mainstream programmes for a wide range of vulnerable groups and targeted work with specific ethnic communities. It emphasised the importance of ‘explicit but not exclusive targeting’ and of improving ethnic monitoring and data collection on excluded communities. This is necessary to ascertain the population size and needs of marginalised groups as they are currently underserved in mainstream initiatives and services. As a result, programmes can be designed or adjusted to improve accessibility and better meet their needs. In order to do this at a practical level, there is a need of changes and adjustments within organisations. This includes staff training, organisational culture change, alongside cultural awareness raising and anti-discrimination work to improve understanding of these groups.

The key messages from this chapter for local policy-makers and services in West London, to improve existing work or adopt this practice are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mainstream programmes with explicit but not exclusive targeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Mainstream programmes that target a range of vulnerable groups (rather than particular ethnic groups) can help community cohesion &amp; anti-discrimination e.g. some Bulgarian programmes only targeting Roma have fuelled local community tension &amp; discrimination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• However, there are specific barriers experienced by particular ethnic groups such as the Roma, so targeted work is often essential to effectively address needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopting ‘explicit but not exclusive targeting’ within mainstream programmes and policies, where elements of wider initiatives have an explicit focus on targeting excluded communities like the Roma e.g. Work Programme, early years, families with complex needs etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Review major mainstream policies, programmes and services at different levels (e.g. sub-regional, local authority, policy areas &amp;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisational change and staff training</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Build collaborations with specialist organisations working with certain groups (e.g. Roma or other BAMER groups), to build understanding of community needs and accessibility barriers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employ specialist organisations or NGOs as expert advisors on service design to tailor and adjust services to better engage and address needs of specific groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training workshops for frontline-staff, delivered by community representatives or specialist organisations e.g. diversity within communities, ethnic and family structures, cultural practices, leadership, social inclusion barriers and best practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Promote a more diverse workforce through positive recruitment measures, and employ community members within delivery teams e.g. as health visitors, education workers, community mediators, home and school liaison workers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Cultural awareness and challenging discrimination</strong></th>
<th><strong>Organisational change and staff training</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Undertaking awareness raising activities to build understanding of needs of certain groups such as the Roma and solutions to improve support e.g. events, networking &amp; relationship building with organisations, training on anti-discrimination and campaigns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural awareness activities to promote the positive contributions of Roma and other BAMER groups e.g. local art and cultural programmes, workshops in schools, oral history projects, Roma music &amp; dance programmes, promoting GRT History month.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Adopt more flexible and innovative ways of recognising employability skills and experiences of excluded groups e.g. uncovering strengths and skills and less focus on formal qualifications or experiences.

- Awareness-raising activities within excluded communities, ideally via trusted organisations, to build understanding of mainstream services and support available.

- Recognition and build understanding of the diversity and differences within ethnic groups such as the Roma.

- Engage community members as volunteers e.g. young Roma people in mainstream inclusion projects.

- Ensure there are robust anti-discrimination and equality policies in organisations.

- In social inclusion and employability initiatives, undertake targeted work with organisations and employers with more negative perceptions towards Roma and wider GRT communities e.g. face-to-face meetings, relationship building and negotiation.
Annex 1: Study methodology

This research paper on social inclusion through employment is part of this strand of the project’s activities. Cooperating with Creating Effective Grass Roots Alternatives (C.E.G.A) Foundation in Bulgaria we have been analysing the barriers to integration faced by the Roma community in Bulgaria and measures to support them into education, employment and other aspects of society. We reviewed the similarities with other disadvantaged groups, especially Gypsy/Traveller communities and growing Roma population in West London, both of which are still to a large degree socially excluded from many mainstream services. The objective was to study the experience in Bulgaria and to explore what the practices and policies we encountered can tell us more generally about social inclusion through employment with other vulnerable groups.

Methodological approach to the research paper

In order to achieve the aim and objectives of the study, the overall methodology for the study was based on a ‘realist synthesis review’ approach. Research in a complex landscape like social inclusion can be challenging for three reasons: the potentially vast and rapidly evolving body of evidence that needs to be collected and assessed; the variability of the evidence in terms of relevance and quality; the problem of ‘attribution’, establishing ‘what works’ in environments that are highly contextualised and in the case of practice that is new and often emergent in nature. This was particularly pertinent to this research study, where the task was to review the complex and evolving layers of policy and practice surrounding Roma inclusion in Bulgaria, linking this to wider developments and policy frameworks in the EU, and ensuring any findings are relevant and transferable to UK policy and practice. Thus the research and its findings are a rare opportunity to dig deeper into what constitutes a good practice in social inclusion through employment and how it works in everyday practice.

Applying traditional systematic reviews in this type of field – using for example the ‘Jadad scale’ to measure robustness of data and reviewing randomised control trials – would not have worked for this study. The nature of the social interventions are too complex, too embedded in rapidly evolving contexts and very few randomised control trials are sophisticated or subtle enough to handle this level of complexity and so are rarely used in these types of social inclusion activities.

Therefore, we considered the realist review method, developed by Ray Pawson, as more suitable as it takes evolving policy and practice contexts into consideration, by exploring how something is supposed to work (its underlying rationale), and evidence of what works for which people, in what circumstances,
and how. The realist review maps the direction and journey of a policy or practice, with a particular focus on how ‘context’ influences any change, and how other factors such as changing structures, partnership and staff interactions, affect that journey. Exploring the particular contexts and circumstances in which certain practices work well, and who these work well for, given the diversity of Roma communities and other excluded groups, is essential to ensure research findings on best practice are transferable to local UK services, and other organisations in Bulgaria and Europe.

The project methodology followed the main steps in carrying out a realist synthesis review:

• Mapping the key ‘theoretical drivers’/ approaches, actors and activities that shape policy and practice surrounding Roma inclusion in Bulgaria. (Re-mapping the Field);

• Searching the field for ‘evidence’, including ‘grey’ literature. This was followed by applying quality criteria to the material identified, based on relevance and rigour and extracting data from the final shortlist of material to uncover evidence in support or contradiction of the approaches identified (Literature and Policy Review);

• Telephone interviews with West London actors to get a feel of the context and to find out about the work evolving there and how it may or may not link with the work in Bulgaria;

• Synthesising and analysing the results to re-assess the original ‘map’ of the field, and to produce conclusions and best practice recommendations on ‘what works, for whom under what circumstances’ (Writing Up and Feedback from Participants).

Triangulation was applied in the process of analysis as it allows for the synthesis of evidence from different sources and research activities, in order to arrive at rigorous and balanced conclusions. In particular, a key aim of triangulation is to capture and reflect the ‘voice’ of different stakeholders in order to identify and understand their different positions and perspectives. Triangulation is essential in a realist review approach for the following reasons. First, it allows for the capture of complex contextual data. Second, it avoids relying on ‘expert’ knowledge and evidence (for example that derived solely from peer-reviewed journals rather than on-the-ground practice experiences) and third, it provides a means to consider ideologies, values and power relations between different actors. Triangulation supports generalizability and transferability of findings in a situation like this domain, where, as noted above, the evidence base is uneven and lacks ‘robustness’. It increases the ‘robustness’ and transferability of findings through cross-checking of data derived from different sources and from different actors thus helping to boost the internal validity of the research.173

Limitations

In our efforts to apply the method of realist synthesis rigorously, however, we came across the following data and evidence limitations.

When discussing and examining relevant policies, programmes and projects in Bulgaria we found that monitoring and evaluation were neglected historically due to limited resources (though the situation is now changing). At the same time, there is also lack of valorisation of research in the UK in the areas studied and due to limited resources monitoring and evaluation is not consistently applied, either. Consequently, this paper is more based on ‘soft’ evidence as revealed to us through the small window provided by our research methodology. Where relevant statistical data was available we embedded it in the case vignettes.

Both in the UK and in Bulgaria we found that often policies tackling employment of disadvantaged groups are based on evidence and data from demographic information, such as national Census, benefit status, number of claimants, and labour market data. As purposeful research to inform policy making processes is rarely done, and when services are commissioned only basic monitoring is implemented, data on effects of programmes are not easily available. As one UK informant puts it, ‘some don’t deliver, just money gone’.

According to our informants, with a few exceptions, the government and service providers in Bulgaria do not routinely collect ethnic monitoring data, which makes it difficult to target specific programs at the Roma, or evaluate who they are reaching. Most programmes are mainstream, but without collecting monitoring information it is not known which percentage of Roma and other minorities are beneficiaries. There is a trend in the UK to cut this statistical information gathering in recent years as well. These may have prevented us from identifying mainstream providers whose practices may be working for disadvantaged groups and does not allow us to generalise with confidence. Generally, such a task is in any case very ambitious, so we do not claim to provide an exhaustive list of practices.
Annex 2: Further reading

This is a list of valuable further reading indicating the relevance of the sources to the topic of social inclusion through employment.

**Bulgarian Policy & Research**

**Legend** (1=extremely relevant, 2=relevant, 3=not relevant to social inclusion through employment but very helpful, 4= not relevant to social inclusion through employment but very helpful)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT &amp; EU REPORTS ON EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Bulgarian national website: [http://www.eufunds.bg/en](http://www.eufunds.bg/en) |
- An Impact Assessment took place of the largest labour market programme- *From social Assistance to Employment FSAE* in 2005, p4 (however this is not available on the web). |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2007. BG. Operational Programme ‘Regional development 2007-2013’</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="">file:///P:\DoingWork\Work\Ealing%20Council%20Research%20Paper%20Roma%20in%20Bulgaria\Document%20review%20mapping\BG%20documents\OPRD_29August_FINAL_Revised.pdf%5b1%5d.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2002. EC. Joint Assessment of Employment Priorities in Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="Joint%20assess%20employment%20priorities%20Bulgaria_en%5b1%5d.pdf">Joint assessment of employment priorities bulgaria_en[1].pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bulgaria: The European Social Fund in Bulgaria, 2007-2013:</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="">file:///P:\DoingWork\Work\Ealing%20Council%20Research%20Paper%20Roma%20in%20Bulgaria\Document%20review%20mapping\BG%20documents\Employment%20in%20Bulgaria%202007-2013_ESF_%5b1%5d.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bulgaria and the European Social Fund Country Profile:</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="">file:///P:\DoingWork\Work\Ealing%20Council%20Research%20Paper%20Roma%20in%20Bulgaria\Document%20review%20mapping\BG%20documents\esf_country_profile_bulgaria_en%5b1%5d.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GOVERNMENT &amp; EU REPORTS ON ROMA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Findings on discrimination in the following member states: Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary Poland, Romania, Slovakia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NGO REPORTS**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2007. ERRC. The Glass Box- Exclusion of the Roma from Employment. <a href="http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/media/02/14/m00000214.pdf">http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/media/02/14/m00000214.pdf</a> includes Bulgaria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2009. ERRC. The Economic Crisis Closes in on Bulgarian Roma. <a href="http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/media/04/15/m00000415.pdf">http://www.errc.org/cms/upload/media/04/15/m00000415.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bulgarian Initiatives & Programmes:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>EU COHESION POLICY 2007-2013</strong>: (Cohesion Fund)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>EU COHESION POLICY 2007-2013: (Cohesion Fund)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>- list of programmes funded: [<a href="http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prorhn/search.cfm?gv_pay=BG&amp;gv_reg=ALL&amp;gv_obj=ALL&amp;gv_the=ALL&amp;lan=EN&amp;gv_per=2">http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/country/prorhn/search.cfm?gv_pay=BG&amp;gv_reg=ALL&amp;gv_obj=ALL&amp;gv_the=ALL&amp;lan=EN&amp;gv_per=2</a>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>EU STRUCTURAL FUNDS</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.eufunds.bg/en">http://www.eufunds.bg/en</a>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFERENCE FRAMEWORK & OPERATIONAL PROGRAMMES:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>NATIONAL STRATEGIC REFERENCE FRAMEWORK &amp; OPERATIONAL PROGRAMMES:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td>- National Strategic Reference Framework Bulgaria: [NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013 - very last_ENG.pdf] [1].pdf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There are seven Operational Programmes in Bulgaria to manage the EU structural funds from the ESF, Cohesion Fund and European Regional Development Fund:

1. Transport

2. Environment

3. Human Resources Development (*key programme related to employment*)

4. Development of the Competitiveness of the Bulgarian Economy (*relevant to employment esp. enterprises*)

5. Administrative Capacity (*Priority Human Resources Management* covers capacity building of civil society in policy formation - check to see if any relevance).

6. Regional Development (covers urban development incl. housing integration & disparities between social groups).

7. Technical Assistance

---

1. BG 0204.01: Urbanisation and social development of areas with disadvantaged minority Populations __NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013_-_very_last_ENG.pdf [1].pdf

2. BG 2004/006-070.05.01: Ethnic minorities labour market integration __NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013_-_very_last_ENG.pdf [1].pdf

3. BG 2004/016-711.01.03, BG 2005/017-353.01.03 & BG 2006/018-343.01.02: Improvement of the situation and inclusion of the disadvantaged ethnic minorities with a special focus on Roma (in three phases) __NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013_-_very_last_ENG.pdf [1].pdf

3. BG 2003/004-937.01.03: Educational and medical integration of vulnerable minority groups with a special focus on Roma __NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013_-_very_last_ENG.pdf [1].pdf

3. BG 2004/016-919.01.01: Restructuring of pilot multi-profile hospitals and developing of emergency medical care with a view to improve access to healthcare for vulnerable group of people with a special focus on Roma __NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013_-_very_last_ENG.pdf [1].pdf
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EUROPEAN SOCIAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are 54 projects funded under the ESF Bulgaria: For a full list of Projects see here: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/result2.cfm">http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/result2.cfm</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some projects that explicitly explore access to employment- except:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- INTEGROMA: development and integration project in Dobrich for young Roma in the field of sciences, arts and sports, with involvement of parents and teachers. Delivered by Dobrich Municipality. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14288&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2">http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14288&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tailored Solutions for Disadvantaged Young People: children in care are trained by a social enterprise in tailoring skills. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=466&amp;langId=en&amp;featuresId=302&amp;furtherFeatures=yes">http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=466&amp;langId=en&amp;featuresId=302&amp;furtherFeatures=yes</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Making School Life a Central attraction: project to reduce number of early school leavers, many of which are from the Roma community. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=466&amp;langId=en&amp;featuresId=303&amp;furtherFeatures=yes">http://ec.europa.eu/esf/main.jsp?catId=466&amp;langId=en&amp;featuresId=303&amp;furtherFeatures=yes</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- A Social Enterprise promotes jobs for all: <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14288&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2">http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14288&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Community cohesion, cultural understanding and anti-discrimination projects funded under the ESF: e.g.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Intercultural education- a key to interethnic tolerance and understanding <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14289&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2">http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14289&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Together We Can <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14295&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2">http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14295&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- All Hands together <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14298&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2">http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14298&amp;project_lang=en&amp;rp=2</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A number of educational projects funded under the ESF related to the Roma:

- Gradual desegregation of separate schools for Roma children in town of Pazardzhik: Delivered by Roma Community Center – Pazardzhik

- Integration of Roma children through improvement of the access to quality education. Delivered by Municipality of Blagoevgrad.

- Providing access to vocational education for Roma families involved in agricultural activities: Delivered by the Earth Foundation.

- Integration of Roma children into the educational system in the City of Varna:
  [http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14329&project_lang=en&rp=2](http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14329&project_lang=en&rp=2)

- Supporting the process of integration and setting up modern conditions for development of pupils from the Roma minority in the Municipality of Aytos.

- School Network for Integration:
  [http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14340&project_lang=en&rp=2](http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14340&project_lang=en&rp=2)

**EUROPEAN AGRICULTURAL FUND FOR RURAL DEVELOPMENT:**

National Strategy Plan for Rural Development, includes objectives on raising the skills level and knowledge of the labour force.


- see [NSRF_Bulgaria_2007-2013_-_very_last_ENG.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/social/esf_projects/project.cfm?id=14357&project_lang=en&rp=2)

**WORLD BANK**

2 Series of three Social Sectors Institutional Reform (SIR) Development Policy Loans, designed to support Bulgaria to meet accession (DPL I) and post-accession (DPL II and III) challenges – to support the adoption and implementation of policies to increase employment (2008-2011).

- The Japanese Government also contributed to the loans.


5 Programmatic Adjustment Loan (PAL 1-3): Series of 3 loans from the World Bank (co-financed by the Japanese Government) from 2002-2005 to improve growth, including investing in human capital and strengthening social programmes.


**United Nations Development Programme**

1 UNDP activities in Bulgaria focus on the following areas:

- **Social Inclusion and Local Economic Development for Poverty Reduction**
- **Democratic Governance for Equitable Local and Regional Development**
- **Energy and Environment Conservation for Sustainable Development**
- **Information Technology for Development**
- **Response to the HIV/AIDS Threat**

There are also cross-cutting themes of human rights and gender equality: [http://www.undp.bg/focus_areas.php?id=242](http://www.undp.bg/focus_areas.php?id=242)


| 1  | Thematic Fund Agreement for the Reform Fund linked to the Inclusion of Roma and other Vulnerable Groups. [Bulgarian-Swiss Cooperation Programme Roma Thematic Fund.pdf](http://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/ourwork/capacitybuilding/projects_and_initiatives/local_service_deliverybulgaria.html) |
| 3  | **BULGARIAN-SWISS COOPERATION PROGRAMME**  
| 1  | **ROMA INCLUSION DECADE INIATITIVE** |
| 1  | **Roma Education Fund (REF):**  
REF Scholarship Fund: supports Roma at tertiary level in university in 12 EU member states incl. Bulgaria:  
- [http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/programmes/ref-scholarship-programme](http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/programmes/ref-scholarship-programme)  
- Project Support Programme  
- A Good Start  
- Reimbursable Grant Programme |
- Communication and Cross Country Learning Programme
- Policy development and Capacity Building Programme

A range of projects are funded in Bulgaria- for a full list see [http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/publications/ref_annual_2011_singlepages.pdf](http://www.romaeducationfund.hu/sites/default/files/publications/ref_annual_2011_singlepages.pdf) e.g.

- BU 154 After school, Foundation for Regional, Development “ROMA-1995”– Plovdiv
- BU 156, Step by step together for better education of Romani children, New Horizons Association

### BULGARIAN GOVERNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>URL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### EEA GRANTS & NORWAY GRANTS (ICELAND, LIECHTENSTEIN & NORWAY)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Iceland, Liechtenstien and Norway provide grants to the 12 newest EU member states. The current programme runs from 2009-2014. Includes a priority on ‘improving the situation for vulnerable groups, including the Roma’: <a href="http://www.eeagrants.org/id/39.0%20">http://www.eeagrants.org/id/39.0%20</a> – full list of programmes are here: <a href="http://www.eeagrants.org/asset/4797/1/4797_1.pdf">http://www.eeagrants.org/asset/4797/1/4797_1.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant projects include:
United Kingdom
UK Policy & Research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>GOVERNMENT REPORTS ON ROMA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Integration Strategy from CLG: devolved strategy for integration to LAs: focusing on 5 themes 1) social mobility (most linked to employment policy) 2) participation, 3) responsibility, 4) common ground, and 5) tackling extremism. <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/2092103.pdf">http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/communities/pdf/2092103.pdf</a> CLG tends to have policy &amp; research on wider issues such as migration and integration, rather than on the Roma specifically:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DfE have been relatively active on the Roma, particularly around educational needs of Roma children in schools. They have a policy focus on gypsy, roma and traveller achievement <a href="http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/inclusionandlearnersupport/mea/improvingachievement/a0012528/gypsy-roma-and-traveller-achievement">http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/inclusionandlearnersupport/mea/improvingachievement/a0012528/gypsy-roma-and-traveller-achievement</a> (education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More recently CLG has also focused on managing anti-social behaviour e.g. 2010. Guidance on managing anti-social behaviour related to Gypsies and Travellers. <a href="http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/housing/anti-socialbehaviourguide">http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/housing/anti-socialbehaviourguide</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**WIDER GOVERNMENT POLICIES ON EMPLOYMENT & SOCIAL**
## INCLUSION OF EXCLUDED GROUPS

1. **Work Programme (DWP):** Major new payment for results welfare to work programme that launched in July 2011. Along with the Universal Credit Benefit Reforms it is central to the new welfare reform. [http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/the-work-programme.pdf](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/the-work-programme.pdf)


1. **Institute for Strategic Dialogue has been funded to research outcome measures for successful integration.** [http://www.strategicdialogue.org](http://www.strategicdialogue.org)

2. **Youth Contract DfE & DWP:** to tackle NEETs, youth unemployment and education & skills for young people. [http://www.dwp.gov.uk/youth-contract](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/youth-contract)


2. **New Child Poverty Strategy:** focus on early intervention in families to prevent cycles of deprivation, arguing that reducing poverty by fiscal means is not the only answer. [https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/CM%208061](https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/standard/publicationDetail/Page1/CM%208061)


## NGO REPORTS ON ROMA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011. Ryder et al. A Big or Divided Society: Final Recommendations and Report of the Panel Review into the Coalition Government Policy on Gypsies and Travellers.</td>
<td><a href="">file:///P:\DoingWork\Work\Ealing%20Council\20Research%20Paper%20Roma%20in%20Bulgaria\Document%20review%20mapping\UK%20documents\big_or_divided_society-%20Panel%20Review%20on%20Coalition%20GRT%20policy%5b1%5d.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NGO REPORTS ON EMPLOYMENT**

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All change! : Romani studies through Romani eyes (ed. T. Acton)</td>
<td>Hatfield : University of Hertfordshire Press, 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Vertovec, S. 2006 <em>The Emergence of Super-diversity in Britain</em>. Oxford: COMPAS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Sumption, M. and Somerville, W. 2009 The UK’s new Europeans: Progress and challenges five years after accession, Equality and Human Rights Commission Policy report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Markova, E. and Black, R. 2007 East European immigration and community cohesion, University of Sussex and Josef Rowntree Foundation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acton, T. 2004 'Modernity, Culture and &quot;Gypsies&quot;: Is there a Meta-Scientific Method to Understand the Representation of Gypsies? And do the Dutch Really Exist?' in N.Saul &amp; S.Tebbutt The Role of the Romanies (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press) 2004</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UK Initiatives & Programmes:**

**GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES WITH GRT COMMUNITIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 (good practice examples)</th>
<th>- The Scottish Traveller Education Programme (STEP): <a href="http://www.scottishtravellered.net/">http://www.scottishtravellered.net/</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>DfE: Gypsy, Roma and Traveller Achievement:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The DfE has previously done a number of research studies &amp; initiatives around improving GRT education however there are no projects funded currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/inclusionandlearnersup">http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/inclusionandlearnersup</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOVERNMENT PROGRAMMES ON EMPLOYMENT &amp; SOCIAL INCLUSION OF EXCLUDED GROUPS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> DWP Work Programme:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> National Apprenticeships Service (NAS):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> DfE: English as Another Language (EAL) programme: for pupils from minority backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/inclusionandlearnersupport/eal">http://www.education.gov.uk/schools/pupilsupport/inclusionandlearnersupport/eal</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Youth Contract DfE &amp; DWP: to tackle NEETs, youth unemployment and education &amp; skills for young people.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> Troubled Families Programme CLG: to tackle intergenerational worklessness and the root causes of difficulties for the most vulnerable families in the UK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> BIS: Skills for Sustainable Growth.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EU PROGRAMMES IN THE UK:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> European Social Fund:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- About ESF:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Operational Programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> National Reform Programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2012. Europe 2020: UK National Reform Programme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> ROMED Programme in the UK (COE &amp; EC): Intercultural Mediation for Roma:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="http://coe-romed.org">http://coe-romed.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ACERT is the UK National Focal Point for the ROMED programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NGO PROGRAMMES

4 - Travellers Aid Trust Website [http://travellersaidtrust.org](http://travellersaidtrust.org)

**EU Policies & Research:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>EU EMPLOYMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**EU ROMA INCLUSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th>EU ROMA INCLUSION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

128
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Youth in Action and the Roma Community. <a href="http://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1799/Booklet%20Youth%20in%20Action%20and%20the%20Roma%20Community.pdf">http://www.salto-youth.net/downloads/4-17-1799/Booklet%20Youth%20in%20Action%20and%20the%20Roma%20Community.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Council of Europe main website on GRT: <a href="http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/romatravellers/default_en.asp">http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/romatravellers/default_en.asp</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>European Platform on Roma Inclusion that was set-up in 2008. <a href="http://ec.europa.eu/justice/events/roma-platform-2012-extra/background.html">http://ec.europa.eu/justice/events/roma-platform-2012-extra/background.html</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|    | 3 | Population estimates 2010 on Roma in EU countries:  
http://www.coe.int/t/dg3/romatravellers/Source/documents/stats.xls       |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>NGO REPORTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/Employment%20Resources/Em    |
|    |    | powerment-through-Employment-Brief-20120918.pdf                        |
http://www.romadecade.org/files/downloads/Employment%20Resources/Ro    |
|    |    | maFinancialInclusion.FinalLayout.3.19.20.pdf                           |
|    | 2  | European Network Against Racism (ENAR). 2007. EC. Report on Social Int    |
|    |    |egration of Ethnic Minorities and their Full Participation in the Labour |
|    |    | Market (2007)                                                           |
|    |    | **ACADEMIC**                                                           |
|    | 3  | Roma/ Gypsies in Europe- The Quitessence of Intercultural Education, by Arthur Ivats R.  
http://www.grtleeds.co.uk/information/downloads/UNESCOForReal.doc      |
## Annex 3. Map of relevant organisations

This is not an exhaustive list nor the list is indicative of a good practice necessarily. It is intended to facilitate communication and cooperation on the topic of social inclusion through employment.

### Republic of Bulgaria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNMENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Directorate Demographic and Family Policy and Equal Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Main Directorate European Funds, International Programmes and Projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directorate Policy of the Labour Market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directorate Social Protection and Social Inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directorate Standard of Life and Social Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Directorate Free Movement of Persons, Migration and Integration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


| State Agency for Refugees with the Council of Ministers. |
National Council for Cooperation on Ethnic and Integration Issues
http://www.nccedi.government.bg/index.php

NGOs

- **CEGA Foundation, Sofia** [http://www.cega.bg/]

- **Open Society Foundation, Roma Programme**
  [http://www.osf.bg/?cy=10&lang=2&a0i=222667&a0m=read&action=4&proj_id=15&program=5]

- **Good Mother Women’s Roma Society, Vardun**
  Contact person: Nevena Madjarova, email: vardun@abv.bg

- **Amelipe Centre for Inter-ethnic Dialogue and Tolerance, Veliko Tarnovo**
  [http://amalipe.com/]

- **Development and support to Roma women and children, Lom**

- **Free Youth Centre Vidin, Vidin**
  http://www.fyc-vidin.org/english.html

- **Drom Dromendar Newspaper**
  http://www.ric-bg.info/dd_en.htm

- **Interethnic Initiative for Human Rights**

- **Association “Alternativa-BS”**
  [http://www.alt-bs.hit.bg]

- **Foundation CARE International – Bulgaria**
  http://www.ecip-bg.org/

- **Caritas Bulgaria**
  http://www.caritas-bg.org/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Contact Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**ROMA COMMUNITY CENTRES**

- **Association "Future for Roma People", Dupnitsa**, 4 Solun Street, tel. 0701/50412  
  [bmm_vasko@abv.bg](bmm_vasko@abv.bg)  Emilia Mihaylova – Director

  [romanybacht@hotmail.com](mailto:romanybacht@hotmail.com)  Zhivka Ivanova - Director

- **Roma Community Center - Valchedram "Roma Bureau – Montana" Foundation**, Valchedram, 30 Saedinenie Street, tel. 09744/3261  
  [roburomontana@abv.bg](roburomontana@abv.bg)  Ilari Dunin  
  – Director

- **Roma Community Center - Yambol Foundation "Integration and Development of Minorities"**, Yambol, 4A Tsar Ivan Shishman, tel. 046/664661, 664979  
  [firm@mail.bg](firm@mail.bg)  Ivan Georgiev – Director

  [ethnocultural@abv.bg](ethnocultural@abv.bg)  Adela Stoyanova – Director

- **Roma Community Center – Plovdiv, Stolipinovo**  
  Regional Development Foundation "Roma-Plovdiv", Plovdiv, 12 Malina Street, tel. 032/622 322, fax 032/653678  
  [frdroma@abv.bg](frdroma@abv.bg)  Anton Karagyozev – Director

- **Roma Community Center – Sliven, Roma Youth Organization**, Sliven, 34 G Tsar
Osvoboditel Street, tel. 044/62 37 56 stela_rmo@slivenbg.net Stela Kostova – Director

Roma Community Center – Pazardzhik, Foundation for Multi-Ethnic Cooperation
"Napredak" - Pazardzhik
Pazardzhik, 9 Buzludzha Street, tel: 034/448502, 8 29 07 NAPREDAK2002@yahoo.com
Plamen Tsankov – Director

Roma Community Center – Varna, Association "Obnovlenie" Varna, 11 Dibich Zabalkanski Street, 052/444 388, fax 052/501 035 office@obnovlenie.org, www.obnovlenie.org Ridvan Sali - Director

Roma Community Center – Burgas, Union of Roma people in need "Nadezhda" – Burgas, Burgas, 19 Valko Pushkov Street, tel. 056/84 27 59 dzingo@abv.bg Zheko Shishkov – Director

Roma Community Center - Burgas
Union of Roma people in need "Nadezhda" – Burgas, Burgas, 19 Valko Pushkov Street, tel. 056/84 27 59
dzingo@abv.bg Zheko Shishkov – Director

West London Organisations

STRATEGIC LONDON-WIDE ORGANISATIONS

- Skills Funding Agency http://skillsfundingagency.bis.gov.uk


- Greater London Authority http://www.london.gov.uk

- London Councils http://www.londoncouncils.gov.uk


- London Skills and Employment Board http://www.london.gov.uk/lseb

SUB-REGIONAL LONDON PARTNERSHIPS

West London Alliance http://www.westlondonalliance.org

West London Housing Partnership http://www.westlondonhousing.org.uk

North London Strategic Alliance http://www.nlsa.org.uk
Central London Forward: [http://www.centrallondonforward.gov.uk](http://www.centrallondonforward.gov.uk)

South London Partnership: [http://www.southlondonpartnership.co.uk/home.aspx](http://www.southlondonpartnership.co.uk/home.aspx)


Haringey LA Traveller Gypsy and Roma Education Team [http://www.haringey.gov.uk/index/children-families/education/services_for_pupils/travellerseducation.htm](http://www.haringey.gov.uk/index/children-families/education/services_for_pupils/travellerseducation.htm)

WEST LONDON BOROUGH ORGANISATIONS

Local Authorities:

- Ealing
- Brent
- Harrow
- Hammersmith & Fulham Hillingdon
- Hounslow

Local Strategic Partnerships, Thematic groups/ Key teams:

- Ealing Skills and Employment Group [http://www.ealing.gov.uk/info/200142/regeneration/20/employment_and_skills/3](http://www.ealing.gov.uk/info/200142/regeneration/20/employment_and_skills/3)
- Brent Employer Partnership [http://www.brent.gov.uk/partners.nsf/Pages/LBB-6#The_Employer_Partnership](http://www.brent.gov.uk/partners.nsf/Pages/LBB-6#The_Employer_Partnership)

**Other Fora and Partnerships:** see [West London Documents\DWP West London data of cpa-w-london-multiple.xls](http://www.westlondondocuments.dwp.gov.uk/DWP%20West%20London%20data%20of%20cpa-w-london-multiple.xls)

**Brent:**

- Brent 2 Work Provider Forum [http://www.brent.gov.uk/brentin2work.nsf/Pages/LBB-1](http://www.brent.gov.uk/brentin2work.nsf/Pages/LBB-1)
- South Kilburn Employment & skills group [http://www.skpartnership.net/employment-and-skills1.html](http://www.skpartnership.net/employment-and-skills1.html)

**Hammersmith & Fulham:**

- Work Matters Strategy Board
- Education Business Partnership Employers’ Steering Group
- H&F Training & employment Network

**Harrow:**

- Harrow Recession Busting Group
- The Harrow provider Forum
- The Harrow Financial Inclusion Forum

**Hillingdon:**

- HELP (Housing Employment LINK Project) & Local Housing Partnership
- Joint Strategic Needs Assessment

**Hounslow:**

- Economic Forum

**Voluntary Sector Provision:** [West London Documents\DWP West London data of cpa-w-london-multiple.xls](http://www.westlondondocuments.dwp.gov.uk/DWP%20West%20London%20data%20of%20cpa-w-london-multiple.xls)
Brent:
- Brent in2 Work, Language 2 Work, BrAVA (Brent Volunteer Centre), LEAP, Brent Mencap's Employment Service, Brent Mind, Brent Refugee Forum, B.HUG, Careers Development Group, New Challenge

Hammersmith and Fulham:
- Tendis, SPEAR, H&F CAB, Fulham Legal Advice Centre, Third Age Foundation, H&F Credit Union

Hounslow:
- Leaders Project

Work Programme:

Prime Contractors in West London:
- Ingeus UK Ltd
- Maximus Employment Ltd
- Reed Partnership

Subcontractors in West London:
- There are 76 providers in West London, comprising a mix of voluntary and private sector. Most voluntary sector organisations tend to be social enterprises or larger VCS organisations rather than grass-roots community organisations.
- Full list is here: [http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/wp-supply-chains.xls](http://www.dwp.gov.uk/docs/wp-supply-chains.xls)

**WEST LONDON ORGANISATIONS WORKING WITH GRT COMMUNITIES:**

Roma Support Group: NGO dealing with advocacy and consultancy issues for the Roma population; a community organisation working with East European Roma refugees and migrants since 1998. [www.romasupportgroup.org.uk](http://www.romasupportgroup.org.uk)

Ealing Travellers, GRT Project. Traveller Community: Widening Participation and Lifting Barriers to Inclusion, and is funded by the BIG Lottery fund. [http://www.ealingtravellers.com/A96C9/Home.aspx](http://www.ealingtravellers.com/A96C9/Home.aspx)

East European Advice Centre [http://www.eeac.org.uk/](http://www.eeac.org.uk/)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nalId=Ta9OGeqBCc4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gypsy Roma Traveller History Month London <a href="http://www.grthmlondon.org.uk">http://www.grthmlondon.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>