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## Executive summary

### Mapping integration across the UK

The UK does not have a national integration strategy for migrants. The historical development of immigration law and ‘Race Relations’ policy have created a situation in which prominence in policy circles has been given to ‘minorities’. This has had the effect of inhibiting the development of policies around (new) migrant integration in the UK. The only strategy in place in for the integration of refugees. Furthermore, as a result of global (9/11) and domestic events (7/7), debates have instead focussed on strong borders to keep newcomers out, overtaking the promotion of good ‘race relations’. This led to a period dictated by multicultural and equalities policies, for already settled ‘minorities’. The views of the UK Government are (i) that the purpose of integration is creating the conditions for everyone, and not just ethnic minorities, to play a full part in national and local life, and (ii) that issues of integration should be dealt with at the local level, with Government only acting exceptionally.

Across the UK, experiences of integration vary significantly, in particular between the individual nations of the UK, because of differences in governance, political priorities, demography and local attitudes. The particular complexity of the relationship between ethnicity and migration in the UK, as well as the arrested development of a policy debate around migrant integration, has meant that the measurement and monitoring of migrant integration in the UK has not been a policy priority. This has resulted in a striking lack of available data on precisely the kind of detail required in order to assess and prioritise resource needs at the local level, in acknowledgement of the vast migratory waves of migrants who have settled in the UK since the mid-2000s.

Barriers to integration persist. Noted under ‘Barriers’, minorities and migrants experience high levels of discrimination (across public domains such as the labour market), and persisting perceptions that new migrants have impacted negatively, despite numerous publications to the contrary, on UK society. Inadequate English language skills – a key need - also detract from suitable integration, accessing employment, housing, healthcare, and participation in civil society. Notwithstanding these barriers, this report provides a rich picture of initiatives at the local level by LAs, civil society and migrant communities, collectively supporting the integration of migrants across the UK.

### 1. Legislation and policy instruments

**Patterns**

- Since the late 19th century, UK immigration and nationality legislation has evolved as a response to periodic surges of migration to the UK, typically seeking to restrict migrant numbers and manage their access to citizenship.

- People born in the British Empire and Commonwealth have been able to acquire British citizenship, while their children born in the have been granted *jus soli* citizenship. These communities have been termed ‘ethnic minorities’ and care has been taken to dissociate membership of an ethnic minority with migrant origin, since there is continued strong political opposition to immigration. Consequently, the concept of ‘second-generation’ is not used in the UK.
However, an important parallel theme underlying legislation has been to “robustly promote British values such as democracy, rule of law, equality of opportunity and treatment, freedom of speech and the rights of all men and women to live free from persecution of any kind” among migrants.

Data gaps

- Because of the ways in which data has been collected historically with the focus being on identifying trends within the settled minority communities, there is a significant lack of data distinguishing between settled ethnic minorities and new migrants.

- Ethnic monitoring of employment and public service delivery has only been introduced within the last 20 years and is still not comprehensive. Monitoring by migrant origin is not undertaken, because of practical difficulties and political resistance.

Main challenges

- The greater emphasis on ‘minorities’ rather than migrants has had the effect of inhibiting the development of policies around migrant integration in the UK.

- The debate has focused instead on border control issues on the one hand, and the promotion of good community and later social cohesion policy implementation, prompted by a difficult period of domestic unrest (‘referred to as ‘race’ riots) within the UK.

Drivers and barriers for the implementation of policies and legislation.

- Integration is viewed by the UK Government as being best achieved through changes to society not changes to the law. The emphasis of the UK Government is thus upon “mainstreaming” integration activity within the work of government departments.

- Regarding education policy, there is no set UK strategy, and responsibility rests with Local Education Authorities [LEAs] across the UK. However a national strategy is in place that focuses on the inclusion of non-English speakers into mainstream education and classrooms, with additional support being provided for them, via Ethnic Minority Achievement Grants [EMAG].

- Integration activities therefore mainly occur at the local level and are the responsibility of the devolved governments and local authorities. There were about 40 initiatives across England in December 2014.

- The UK Government has also moved away from integration activities targeted at specific groups, on the grounds that supporting the identity of separate communities undermines integration.

- England, Wales and Scotland all have specific strategies for the integration of refugees. No such strategy is currently in place in Northern Ireland however proposals to implement one have been made.

- One recent barrier to integration has been the UK Government’s campaign to encourage illegal immigrants to leave the UK. This campaign is seen to have had negative consequences for many people in the UK, including British citizens of minority ethnic background.
Increasingly hostile immigration policies have been introduced which have significantly impacted the ability of migrants to integrate in the UK. Changes have been made to provisions regarding employment such as requiring employers to apply for a licence in order to sponsor a Tier 2 (General) visa. This has resulted in restricted employment opportunities for migrants.

New housing provisions including landlord checks in the private sector and a habitual residence test for social housing have placed restrictions on migrants being able to choose where they live and therefore hindering their integration.

An income threshold of £18,600 has been implemented for those wishing to sponsor the settlement of a non-EEA partner. This figure is significantly higher than the minimum wage in the UK. Therefore many people will not meet the requirements and will not be able to sponsor their partners’ settlement.

2. Equal treatment and discrimination

Patterns

- There are many non-governmental organisations undertaking advocacy on behalf of migrants and ethnic minorities in the UK.
- There are numerous campaigns for the rights of migrants and ethnic minorities in the UK.

Data gaps

- There is no systematic collection of information on instances of discrimination against migrants. The most complete information is on cases of discrimination in employment on the basis of race or ethnic origin considered by Employment Tribunals.

Main challenges

- Despite the long history of anti-discrimination legislation, significant differentials exist between ethnic minorities and the majority white population on most dimensions of social, political and economic life.

Drivers and barriers for the implementation of policies and legislation.

- The UK has a strong anti-discrimination legal framework. There have been a series of Race Relations Acts and Amendment Acts since 1965. EU anti-discrimination Directives have been incorporated in UK law.
- Commissions have been established in both Great Britain and Northern Ireland to monitor and safeguard Human Rights.
- The Equality Act 2010 provides a single framework to protect against discrimination on a range of ‘protected characteristics’. Migrant status is not one of these.

3. Political and societal participation

Patterns

- Commonwealth migrants had more rights than those from other countries, e.g. to vote and obtain British citizenship.
- EU nationals can only vote in local and EU elections. Other migrants only have these rights if they obtain citizenship.

- The ability of foreigners to work in the UK is controlled by the work permit system. Under the Points Based System, only certain categories of worker (mainly skilled) may be recruited from outside the EU.

Data gaps

- Most information on political participation (e.g. electoral registration) contains no information on differentials by ethnic group, since this information is not collected. Country of birth is collected in the electoral registration process, but not routinely reported in statistics.

- There is no explicit statistical information on the incidence of discrimination against migrants.

- Lack of information on the ethnic composition of many professional organisations or voluntary bodies.

Main challenges

- Difficulty of measuring participation.

Drivers and barriers for the implementation of policies and legislation.

- Employment policy has sought to increase participation of migrants in the labour force. This has been enabled by anti-discrimination legislation.

4. **Social cohesion and intolerance**

Patterns

- One of the indicators of integration is mixed marriages/partnerships. One of the most rapidly growing sections of the population is people of mixed parentage. In England and Wales in 2011, 9% (or 2.3 million) of people who were living as part of a couple were in an inter-ethnic relationship.

- However, the incidence of mixed partnerships is much higher for the Black ethnic groups (especially Black-Caribbean people) and mixed partnerships are relatively rare for South Asian people.

Data gaps

- There are implicit measures of social cohesion published, but not for minority groups.

Main challenges

- There is a lack of official policies and actions promoting social cohesion.

Drivers and barriers for the implementation of policies and legislation.

- There is no national strategy for migrant integration.
• The Coalition government (2010-15) placed greater emphasis than the previous Labour government on devolved action, but has also dramatically cut the funding to local government.

1. Legal and policy instruments for migrant integration

1.1 Description of existing instruments and target groups

This section should present the overall state of play concerning national and, where applicable, regional legal and policy instruments focusing on how they address fundamental rights, core EU values and principles, as well as international legal standards and related EU law and policies, such as the Common Basic Principles and the Common Agenda on integration of migrants. Please complete the template in Annex 2. Please make sure the brief information you provide in the table includes the following aspects:

Does the national strategy on migrant integration contain a definition of integration? If so, please include it in the original language and full English translation.

There is a long history of immigration to the UK. One significant period was post WWII, when Britain implemented mass labour migration drives from its colonies and former colonies (known as the Windrush era), to compensate for the significantly depleted workforce resulting from the war. In time, the children and grandchildren of these immigrants slowly entered mainstream British life. Because of the strong links to the Empire and Commonwealth, and Britain’s traditional pattern of conferring *jus soli* citizenship by birth in the UK, and in particular popular resistance to non-white and ‘non-British’ populations, these (inter-generational as well as new arriving) communities through many decades have been discussed by policymakers and the public at large as being collectively of ‘ethnic minority’ status rather than ‘migrant’ status. The concept of ‘second-generation’ is not used in the UK (unlike the American dual matrix). Rather migrants, and especially their descendents, identify via census categories such as ‘black British’, ‘British Asian’, etc. There remains to this day no straightforward relationship between ethnicity and migration status in the UK; subsequent migratory wave arrivals are grouped in to this headline category. This lack of distinction is heavily reflected (as noted throughout this report) in official statistics and a range of policy measures which are geared towards the needs of, collectively, ethnic minorities.

It is important to provide this historical context, as immigrant presence was resisted and seen as a threat in

---

2 We note this in various locations across this report, in particular in the Annexes, especially where official statistics are being requested. An example of policy geared towards UK’s ‘ethnic minorities’ is the Ethnic Minority EMAG.
terms of the ‘negative impact’ of continued Black immigration on Britain’s towns and cities, especially after the ‘riots’ in Nottingham and Notting Hill in 1958. These ‘concerns’ resulted in the implementation of government policy placing a halt on immigration, as well as in support of other claims that the economy was saturated. These discussions and vitriolic public discourses, propelled - via a ‘race relations’ lens – legal instruments which were in effect controlling immigration. The Conservative government proposed a Bill, which eventually became the Commonwealth Immigrants Act 1962. This ongoing culture created the climate which led the way to viewing the ‘Other’ as non-white and non-British, and the rhetoric used, namely ‘ethnic minorities’ the Other[s], and ‘us’ – British white population, also entered the daily lexicon. It is not unrelated that the public has taken their lead from government positioning on this matter, and immigration has been a highly contentious issue for over 50 years, and continues to feature in the top three disputed political ‘problematics’ in every General Election. This year is no exception.3

A series of significant events, including the terrorist attacks of September 11 2001, (the northern English town riots of Oldham, Burnley and Bradford in 2001; and the London Bombings in 2007), saw the politicisation and criminalisation of specific ethnic groups, especially UK born Muslim youth. This has provided the framework within which policy has been fashioned, such as ‘community cohesion’. Another example is the Government’s ‘Prevent’ strategy.4

However, the emphasis on ‘minorities’ rather than migrants has had the effect of inhibiting the development of policies around migrant integration in the U K. The debate has focused instead on strong borders to keep newcomers out, on the one hand, and the promotion of good ‘race relations’ and, later, multicultural and equalities policies, for the ‘minorities’ within. The exceptional complexity of the relationship between ethnicity and migration in the UK, as well as the arrested development of a policy debate around migrant integration, has meant that the measurement and monitoring of migrant integration in the UK has not been a policy priority, and is in practice hampered by a striking lack of data.

---


A recent report\textsuperscript{5} by the Migration Observatory, underscores a range of current limitations identifying gaps in policy and especially noting the lack of systematic data on migrants and immigration \textit{per se}. This report also identifies that policy commentators are themselves confused by the interchanging use of terms such as 'integration', 'community cohesion', and 'social cohesion' when talking about these processes. \textsuperscript{6}

The UK does not have a national integration strategy for migrants. However, in 2012 the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), the department responsible for migrant integration, produced a paper, \textit{Creating the conditions for integration}\textsuperscript{7} which set out the approach to creating an integrated society in England. Although the approach laid out in the paper is targeted towards integration in England only, it is stated in the introduction that the issues raised have wider relevance across the UK.

The paper states that the meaning of integration is "creating the conditions for everyone to play a full part in national and local life". Whilst this is not a full definition the paper further identifies five key factors that contribute to integration: shared aspirations and values; mutual commitments and obligations; ability to realise one's potential in life; the opportunity to take part, be heard and make decisions in local and national life; and tackling intolerance and extremism.

The paper contains no programme of action and specifies that the issue of integration should be dealt with at the local level, with Government only acting exceptionally. The paper also states that integration requires changes to society not changes to the law\textsuperscript{8} and therefore emphasises the need for mainstreaming integration policy.

The DCLG was tasked with leading on integration, but the following Departments were also highlighted as playing a role.\textsuperscript{9}
- Home Office / UK Border Agency
- Department for Education (DfE)


On 3 December 2009 a community cohesion strategy, Getting On Together – a Community Cohesion Strategy for Wales\textsuperscript{10} was launched by the Welsh Assembly Government (WAG). Integration is described as one of the core components of community cohesion and that it “must happen to enable new residents and existing residents to adjust to one another”. However no definition of integration is provided with the strategy.

Similarly in May 2013 a good relations strategy entitled Together: Building a United Community\textsuperscript{11} for Northern Ireland was published. Integration is listed as one of the underpinning principles of the strategy. However, no definition of integration is provided. The strategy makes no specific reference to migrants but makes a number of references to ethnic minorities. For example, the strategy proposes that all children should have access to shared education programmes and that in order to be effective such programmes should encourage discussion on cultural diversity and “ensure that children from a minority ethnic background are included and integrated”.\textsuperscript{12}

The good relations strategy was launched to compliment the Racial Equality Strategy 2005-2010 (RES).\textsuperscript{13} The origin and development of the strategy came in part as a response to the rising incidents of violence and intimidation of minority ethnic people and migrant workers. The strategy highlights the importance of capacity building within minority and ethnic communities and that ethnic and minority people, “in particular recent arrivals to Northern Ireland”, may need to build a sense of community with people of similar background but this must be done alongside “integration and relationship building with the wider community.”\textsuperscript{14} No definition of integration is provided. The Consultation on Racial Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland 2014-2024\textsuperscript{15} has now been published by the Northern Ireland Executive for public consultation. The Consultation closed in October 2014.


and the strategy is currently being finalised. It is expected to be published shortly.

In the absence of a national UK policy framework on integration, there are integration policies relating only to one group, and this is for refugees. In 2000, a Refugee Integration Strategy was launched to help refugees (not asylum seekers) secure access to jobs, accommodation, welfare benefits, health, education and language services and to encourage community participation. An additional strategy was developed alongside, by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), specifically to target practical assistance to refugees seeking to enter the labour market. Neither of these strategies has been extended to other wider migrant populations.

England, Wales and Scotland all have integration strategies specifically targeted towards refugees. Northern Ireland has no such strategy; however in 2013 the Northern Ireland Strategic Migration Partnership published a proposal for one. The proposal has gathered support from civil society in recent years. In 2004 the Home Office issued Integration Matters: A Strategy for Refugee Integration for England. The strategy defines integration as “the process that takes place when refugees are empowered to achieve their full potential as members of British society, to contribute to the community, and to become fully able to exercise the rights and responsibilities that they share with other residents.”

Similarly in Wales the Refugee Inclusion Strategy was launched in 2008 with the aim of supporting and enabling refugees in building a life in Wales, a life in which they are able to make a full contribution to society. The Strategy makes a distinction between inclusion and integration and states that refugees will make their own choices as to the degree they wish to integrate and that integration occurs once an individual becomes an active member of society. The Strategy highlights that integration (and inclusion) is a two-way process and that “receiving communities” play an

16 UK, http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/policy-primers/integration#kp2
In December 2013 the Scottish Government published *New Scots: Integrating Refugees in Scotland’s Communities* which is a three year strategy for the integration of refugees in Scotland. The strategy aims to provide a framework for everyone that works with refugees in order to work in a co-ordinated way alongside the Scottish Government to help refugees rebuild their lives, access mainstream services, contribute to society and create social relations to support their integration. Whilst the strategy is specifically targeted towards refugees, in correspondence received from the Scottish Government’s Equality, Human Rights and Third Sector Division it was explained that the work taking place will benefit all ethnic minority communities and aims to improve “services across both reserved and devolved governments, gaps in provisions and the integration of all migrants in Scotland.” The correspondence also noted that the Division had been engaging with stakeholders regarding the Scottish Governments approach to race equality which focuses on employment, poverty and enterprise; representation in public and democratic life; strong, resilient communities and discrimination and hate crime. Through a consultative approach the Unit is aiming to co-produce a framework on race equality for Scotland by spring 2016. The Unit indicated that information about the consultation will be made publicly available soon.

### Are there specific references in the national strategy or relevant legal or policy instruments to fundamental rights in relation to migrants?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
of which is “people knowing their rights and responsibilities”. The strategy reiterates the WAG’s “plans to promote equality of opportunity and prevent discrimination by placing the promotion of equality, diversity and human rights at the centre of our work in policy making, service provision and employment”. The strategy also highlights the importance of developing active citizenship amongst children and young people and cites the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC). It also highlights the importance of competence in the host language as being important for individuals to be able to access their rights.

The Together: Building a United Community Strategy for Northern Ireland lists “rights” as one of its underpinning principles. There is no definition of the type of rights and no mention of rights specifically related to migrants. However, it does state that one of the overall aims of the strategy is to build safe communities “where each person’s rights are respected in a shared and cohesive community”. The Strategy makes specific reference to the CRC, the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, gender rights and cultural rights.

The Northern Ireland Strategic Migration Partnership (NISMP) work across the spheres of government in Northern Ireland and with other key stakeholders ensuring on behalf of new migrants, in order to facilitate their integration especially in the realm of making the most of their labour skills in order to support future economic growth. It provides a regional advisory, developmental and consultative function. This ensures that Northern Ireland’s needs and concerns in respect of immigration are recognised within the constraints of UK wide strategy. In its response (September 2014) to the Inquiry on Together: Building a United Community, the

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NISMP made four recommendations across four broad areas: 39

a) Moving beyond “Two Communities”: Making the strategy tie in with the vision of a diverse society. The TBUC strategy needs to examine issues of exclusion and discrimination in relation to migrants (as well as tackling sectarianism). Reference to some Section 75 40 groups (such as discrimination) are made in the executive summary but not given sufficient attention in the strategy. Programmes should target youth from migrant communities in their aims to promote integration.

b) Connections between the Racial Equality Strategy and Together: Building a United Community. More should be done to ensure the interconnectedness between the Racial Equality Strategy [RES] and TBUC, including improved representativeness of the Racial Equality Panel in Delivering Social Change and monitoring mechanisms of TBUC. Action should be directed from TBUC to ensure that the RES does not contradict the key priorities of TBUC, in particular the priority of cultural expression. The number of racist attacks has increased by more than 100% in spite of immigration figures levelling out. Any review of TBUC needs to incorporate anti-racism strategies across its initiatives.

c) Links between local government, good relations and community planning. Delivering Social Change and the commitments of TBUC should be channelled through local community mechanisms. This should include resource and capacity building for individuals from BME and migrant backgrounds. Without considering the needs of these groups in the development of shared and cohesive housing, tensions are likely to continue and racist attacks may continue to increase.

d) Measurement, process and indicators. NISMP submitted a response to the review of good relations indicators. It recommends that within each of the proposed indicators, data is disaggregated according to the ethnic background of respondents in order to more robustly assess the differential impact of interventions on various communities and thus better inform future related planning.

Which are the target groups of the national integration strategy? Please provide any definitions relevant or the

A response to the Inquiry on Together: Building a United Community, by the Northern Ireland Strategic Migration Partnership (NISMP), was made available in September

---


| Determination of the persons that are entitled to or beneficiaries of the relevant action plans and policy measures (e.g. ‘integration agreements’: who signs them and what do they contain). Please specify any residence requirements (e.g. which migrant and/or residence status counts or not for “legally residing third country nationals” that eventually would be covered by these policies) for persons to be considered members of the targeted groups. | 2014. It notes\textsuperscript{41}, “The strategy highlights diversity and integration as underpinning principles, and cultural expression as a priority area. However beyond the first few pages, the document appears to lose its focus on diversity and the definition of community seems to be limited to the two ‘traditional communities’ in Northern Ireland.” \textsuperscript{42} The NISMP suggests a need to take into account the wider definition of community and cultural identity, and not limit it to - Protestant or Catholic, British or Irish. In December 2014 a list of current government funded integration activities taking place in England was provided by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.\textsuperscript{43} The list details around 40 initiatives. However, migrants cannot benefit from all of them. The statement also suggested that integration activities should not be targeted at specific groups, “we have moved away from supporting separate communities’ identities (‘single group funding’) as it undermines integration. We promote British values including equality of all before the law and a belief in democracy”. The government has disseminated these integration activities via the use of infographics.\textsuperscript{44} An example of an integration activity targeted towards migrants is the English Language community-based programme, \textit{Creative English} run by FaithAction.\textsuperscript{45} The programme equips 1,200 people with practical English language skills that are specifically designed to empower beneficiaries in real life situations. In Scotland the \textit{Bridges Programmes},\textsuperscript{46} supports the social, educational and economic integration of refugees, asylum seekers, migrants, and anyone for whom English is a second language, living in Glasgow. 

\begin{itemize}
  \item In reference to the CBP 1\textsuperscript{47} \textit{Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all}
  \item The \textit{Creating the conditions} paper primarily places the responsibility of building integration at the local level emphasising that “from the public to the voluntary and
\end{itemize}


\textsuperscript{44} UK, Department of Communities and Local Government Flickr Account (2014) ‘Building stronger more united communities’ 2 May 2014, available at \url{www.flickr.com/photos/communitiesuk/13902166637/in/album-72157638505958763/}.


\textsuperscript{46} UK, Bridges Programmes (2014) ‘Welcome to the Bridges Programmes’, available at \url{www.bridgesprogrammes.org.uk/}.

| **immigrants and residents of Member States**: please specify if and how the majority population is explicitly targeted; distinguish, if possible, between policies or measures targeting the general population and specific target groups, such as public authorities, e.g. teachers, police, judiciary, etc.; outline the objectives of such policies and measures, and their duration. | **private sectors ... we all have a role to play in creating an integrated society"**.48

The Northern Ireland good relations strategy acknowledges "the reality that it is only through government, community groups, and individuals working together that a new and united community can truly be formed. It is only by working together that we will achieve our aspirations and bring our shared vision to a reality in people’s everyday lives."49

The Wales Community Cohesion Strategy50 was launched in 2009, and involves all 22 local authorities. The Strategy and the Action Plan were developed in partnership with public sector and third sector partners, with the aim of identifying an approach to support strong communities across Wales. The Strategy and Action Plan targets all people in Wales, and is not purely aimed at migrants. This Strategy focuses on those policy and service delivery areas that can have a significant impact on how well a community gets on together. These complement current policy concerns across the UK. They are:

- Housing
- Learning
- Communication
- Promoting Equality and Social Inclusion
- Preventing Violent Extremism and Strengthening Community Cohesion.

A 2-year long consultation51 evaluated this strategy and the findings were made available in 2013. Briefly, the outcomes were:

- Systems for monitoring cohesion were currently weak.
- Local authorities took the lead on promoting community cohesion at the local level and received an annual allocation from the Community Cohesion Fund to support these efforts.
- Some progress was made mainstreaming cohesion, but staff in some policy areas remained uncertain about the relevance of community cohesion to their work.
- Local Interventions and Impacts: The Community Cohesion Fund was allocated to the 22 local authorities in Wales and supported more than

---


600 local projects between 2009/10 and 2011/12.
- Ten case study projects were analysed, and examined under four broad topic areas (promoting responsiveness among service providers to cohesion priorities; promoting understanding between different groups, i.e. young and old people; integration support for newcomers to help them cope with their new life in Wales; and, managing tensions between different groups and resolving emerging conflicts).

1.2. Drivers & barriers in developing, implementing and assessing legal and policy instruments

Section 1.2. has been fully reorganised and augmented and is now laid out as follows: this box provides a broad policy overview. Sub-section 1.2.1 outlines briefly, as requested, the specific drivers determining the need for successful integration in the UK. These are supplemented with assessments of their implementation across the UK. Finally, sub-section 1.2.2. starts with a list of barriers, presented in the same order as under ‘Drivers’. There is supplemental discussion on a range of relevant and inter-connected issues on some of the above.

Despite there being no national integration framework for migrants in the UK, integration policies have been mainstreamed and can be identified in a number of key areas. Such policies, however, often do not explicitly mention migrants who are often considered under the category of “minority”. In doing so there is arguably room for migrant specific integration issues going unaddressed.

Immigration policy in the UK presents a number of barriers to migrant integration in the UK. The Immigration Act 2014 places a number of restrictions and checks on migrants’ access to services in areas key to integration such as housing and healthcare.

The three previous Great Britain equality commissions, the Commission for Racial Equality, the Disability Rights Commission and the Equal Opportunities Commission, were replaced by a single Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) in October 2007. The EHRC can support complainants in legal proceedings, has enforcement powers of its own, and also has powers to promote and encourage respect for equality of opportunity through research, public comments and other methods. There is a separate Equality Commission for Northern Ireland, which has similar functions (and in places, greater powers relating to positive action) to those of the EHRC. The EHRC commissions a wide range of research some of which

On the basis of material collected, including past research, studies, assessments, evaluation and contacts with the authorities, public officials and key actors for social inclusion and participation of migrants, outline the main drivers and barriers for social inclusion and integration policies in general. Please mention also any important differences at regional level. A more detailed outline of specific drivers and barriers for specific policy areas will be required in the following sections.
identifies drivers and barriers; and/or act as myth busting examples. Key examples are noted below.

- **Research report 19: The equality implications of being a migrant in Britain.** This study highlights a range of problematic areas and gives specific recommendations to tackle discrimination and human rights issues.

- **Research report 4: Social housing allocation and immigrant communities.** Widespread media reports had suggested that migrants receive priority in the allocation of social housing and in doing so displace non-migrants. This study dispelled myths surrounding migrant populations being favoured with social housing allocations. An analysis of social housing allocation policies showed no evidence that social housing allocation favours foreign migrants over UK citizens. However, the study revealed that there is a small amount of evidence which suggests that they may, unintentionally, discriminate against ethnic minority communities who may also have less understanding than white groups, of their housing rights and housing allocation. This demonstrates a barrier to some migrants accessing housing.

On 18 December 2014 the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government provided an update on their work on integration in a written statement to Parliament. The statement refers to the ‘Creating the conditions’ paper as containing the Government’s broad approach to integration and makes no reference to developing it or to developing a national integration strategy for the UK.

### 1.2.1. Drivers

The key drivers for successful integration policies, therefore factors that are considered to contribute positively in the design, development, implementation, assessment and accomplishment of policy goals and in strengthening social inclusion and participation of migrants and their descendants. For

At the UK level, key drivers for integration (bulleted below) fall broadly within the four main pillars of the Council of Europe Indicators for Integration; namely, Education; Economic Participation; Social Cohesion (including housing and healthcare); and, Citizenship. The key areas which, if in place, are seem to facilitate the effective integration of migrants in to the UK. These are:

1. Protection in law from discrimination

---


example, are these policies mainstreamed in other public policies, for example in employment, education, housing, etc. and how is this achieved?

2. Education - both children and adults (especially language proficiency)

3. Respect for family life and the right of family reunion

4. Full and equal participation in the labour market / access to housing, healthcare

5. Political participation - the right to take part in the processes that make the exercise of power accountable in society

6. A clear path to citizenship

7. Community and social cohesion

In spite of experiencing large-scale immigrant flows and settlement over the past half century, the UK does not have a formal integration strategy. In response to these migratory flows, political debates around integration have often been highly challenging and delivered via a rhetoric signalling both a fear of immigrants as well as a deep-seated indifference about immigration. This tone of hostility persists. In more recent times (1999-2009), net migration to the UK added 2 million people to the total population. Additionally, the unauthorized migrant population has been estimated at 618,000, or around 10 percent of the foreign-born population. The current landscape of migratory waves is infinitely different to that seen in the late 1990’s.

Inevitably, UK Academics and policymakers have aimed to establish what kinds of impacts significant and various migrations to the UK (lasting or otherwise, beneficial or not) have had on British society. The Migration Advisory Committee (MAC) is responsible for providing transparent, independent and evidence-based advice to the government on migration issues, and has commissioned a considerable amount of research on a range of migrant and integration related themes in recent years. One key study (Saggar, et al., 2011), examined the impacts of migration on social cohesion and integration. In their assessments of identity, integration, and cohesion, the authors have identified three main categories of integration: national

55 There have been integration programs in the UK in the past. For example, there were resettlement programs for Polish refugees in the 1940s that catered to hundreds of thousands of people. See Sword, et al (1989) The Formation of the Polish Community in Great Britain, 1939-1950: [The M.B. Grabowski Polish Migration Project Report].
58 UK, Migration Advisory Committee (MAC), available at: www.gov.uk/government/organisations/migration-advisory-committee/about#responsibilities.

The tensions that exist between cohesion / integration and other areas of public policy, such as immigration, indicate that the objectives to be achieved in one direction are by extension capable of being undermined in another. At the very least this means that proposed integration goals can be weakened and in some instances completely undermined. As will be seen in the next section, (under 1.2.2. Barriers), this is sometimes the case.

The Migration Observatory is a leading independent, authoritative, evidence-based think tank based at the University of Oxford. It provides impartial analysis of data and generates high quality research on international migration and public policy issues, on migration and migrants in the UK. It informs discourses both nationally and beyond and contributes balanced arguments to public and policy debates.

The Observatory questions whether there is a role for public policy in relation to the experiences of migrants after arrival and, if so, what should the aims of policy be in terms of identifying integration, and what that actually entails. Should the goal be ‘integration’ and if so what does that mean? Should the primary focus be participation in the labour market (i.e. ready to enter the labour market with suitable – recognisable skills), or civic participation, or should it be addressing cultural practices that are deemed to be unacceptable? Should all migrants be the target of policy intervention or only certain groups? To the extent that this is a matter for public policy, is it primarily for central government or local authorities; and which policy levers they can use?

English language proficiency is a primary driver for successful integration. The ability to speak English is a fundamental aspect of wider integration and cohesion. Workers who speak English are less likely to be exploited, are more able to help themselves and each other if they do face problems, and can more easily do a job that matches their skills.\footnote{UK, Green, A.; Atfield, G.; Staniewicz, T.; Baldauf, B.; & Adam, D. (2014) Determinants of the Composition of the Workforce in Low-skilled Sectors of the UK Economy: Social Care and Retail Sectors, at page 96, available at: www.gov.uk/government/publications/low-skilled-sectors-of-the-uk-economy-social-care-and-retail-sectors.} This report underscores this need, and provides indicative evidence from the case studies that many migrant workers in the social care and retail sectors are increasingly integrated into the labour market, and in some cases are moving into better jobs, rather than being entrenched in separate migrant dense niches. It is clear that having adequate
English language skills is essential for integration to be accomplished. This was emphasised by those migrant workers with children who were being educated in the UK.

In 2011 the Government published a policy paper, *Opening doors, breaking barriers: a strategy for social mobility*. The strategy aims at improving social mobility which is identified as one of the five key factors in the *Creating the conditions* paper. The *Opening doors* paper aims to ensure that no one is prevented from fulfilling their potential by the circumstances of their birth. The *Opening doors* paper provides an example of the mainstreaming of migrant integration in the UK, as it is aimed at society as a whole. It also shows that the idea of mainstreaming integration was present even prior to the *Creating the conditions* paper. Although the *Opening doors* paper does not bind Government departments, it states that they should consider the impact of new policies on social mobility. It must also be noted that the strategy aims to improve social mobility across the UK but notes, without specifying which, that many of the actions contained within the strategy can only be applied in England. The strategy does not specify a target group. However, it does note that alongside other categories some ethnic groups are over-represented among the less well-off. It also highlights the importance of breaking the patterns of inequality between generations. It sets out a four stage life cycle approach: foundation years; school years; transitions; and adulthood. Strategies and programmes are identified at each stage to tackle inequalities in health, education and employment.

The Northern Ireland Executive has released the *Consultation on Racial Equality Strategy for Northern Ireland 2014-2024* for public consultation. The strategy makes particular reference to immigration and highlights the challenge posed to integration by a number of restrictions under immigration controls that result in some people having fewer entitlements than others. The strategy highlights a tension created by the Westminster government’s failure to take into account the different needs and concerns relating to immigration in Northern Ireland and other regions in the UK. It cites more favourable public views on immigration in Northern Ireland than are present in England.

In 2013 the Secretary of State for Education and the Minister of State for Schools published a policy, *Raising the achievement of disadvantaged children*. The policy

---


aims to tackle the inequalities faced by children from disadvantaged backgrounds in education so that their success is not determined by their social circumstances. Many of the policy instruments make reference to children with special educational needs (SEN) and those that are eligible for free school meals (FSM). Whilst this naturally will include migrant and minority children there is no specific mention of such categories.

However, in the impact assessment of *The Importance of Teaching: The Schools White Paper 2010* there is an acknowledgement that “like SEN and FSM children, children from certain ethnic backgrounds face an uphill struggle to succeed in terms of their educational attainment and longer term life chances”. It must be noted that the link between educational performance and ethnic minority background is not straightforward and naturally varies across different demographics with many other influences such as socio-economic factors playing a significant role in a child’s performance.

Since 2000, the UK has had educational policies based on inclusion. The duty for schools to work towards community cohesion and the creation of strong positive relations between people from different backgrounds, adds strength to the aims of inclusion (DFES, 2006); cohesion was mainstreamed when the Education and Inspections Act introduced a duty on schools to promote community cohesion.

The reformation of performance tables is laid out in *The Importance of Teaching* White Paper which aims at moving towards using formal external assessments to eliminate the systematic underrating by internal assessment which emerged as a problem in a 2011 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) report.

The 2011 *Raising the achievement* policy also introduced the Pupil premium fund. The fund gives schools additional funding to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils from reception (aged 4-5) to year 11 (aged 15-16). The fund has seen a dramatic increase from £625 million in 2011 to £2,545 million in 2015. The fund provides £1,320 per pupil between reception

---


and year 6 (10-11), £935 per pupil between year 7 (11-12) and year 11 and £1,900 per pupils who have been under local authority care or are care leavers. In July 2014 the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (Ofsted) inspection framework\(^71\) was amended to include the evaluation of the achievement of pupils eligible for the premium. Schools have the discretion to use the funds to best suit the needs of their pupils but have a duty to publish how they spend the premium. A *Teaching and Learning Toolkit*\(^72\) produced by the *Education Endowment Foundation* (EEF), an independent grant-making charity which aims to improve educational achievement for disadvantaged children, is available to provide guidance for schools. The Toolkit summarises a wide range of educational research on how to improve the attainment of disadvantaged pupils. The Toolkit makes reference to specific measures which adversely affect ethnic minority children such as setting (grouping pupils in classes by ability) or requiring pupils to repeat a year. In addition Ofsted published a review of effective uses of the premium, *The Pupil Premium: How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement.*\(^73\) The report sets out a number of case studies and promising practices, including a number of schools with high proportions of ethnic minority pupils and pupils with English as an additional language.

In 2011 the Department for Education published the findings from commissioned research.\(^74\) The aim of the research was to assess the effect on schools and local authorities of implementing the duty to promote community cohesion and the extent to which schools were aware of and were undertaking activities to contribute to the Government’s PREVENT strategy.\(^75\) The PREVENT strategy is one of the four elements of CONTEST,\(^76\) the government’s counter-terrorism strategy. It aims to stop people becoming involved in terrorist activity or supporting extremism, which can be a divisive counter to integration aims.

---


\(^73\) UK, Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (2013) *The Pupil Premium: How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement.*\(^73\) The report sets out a number of case studies and promising practices, including a number of schools with high proportions of ethnic minority pupils and pupils with English as an additional language.


In current public debates, there is an association made between increasing ethnic and religious diversity and the erosion of social cohesion. However, research has shown that age, class and where people live are far more important in shaping life chances than are ethnicity or religion and that the arrival of new migrant groups did not coincide with an increase in crime. The key to fostering ethnic integration is addressing poverty and economic disadvantage in the UK.

A study on the predictors of community cohesion found that one of the mechanisms linking (ethnic) diversity and cohesion is the presence of bridging relationships: inter-ethnic friendships increased social cohesion. It identified that social cohesion is reduced not by diversity but rather by economic disadvantage, at both the individual and community level. Being in employment is therefore a key driver for integration. Other findings included the fact that social cohesion is also influenced by various subjective beliefs such as self-identity, is lower where people perceive the allocation of social housing is unfair, and where people fear crime, and that formal volunteering increases social cohesion.

In order for migrants to integrate it is important that they are able to access the legal system in the same way persons who are born in the UK can. Access is often dictated by the ability to pay legal costs. Therefore, migrant access to legal aid can help integration particularly in relation to discrimination cases. Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO) identifies priority cases which have the greatest need for public funding. In 2014 the Lord Chancellor published The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2014 that, if enacted, would impose a residency test on the legal aid provided for in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of LASPO. The result of the order would mean that individuals that otherwise pass the legal aid “better than fifty-fifty chance of establishing a claim” test in cases which have the highest priority for legal assistance would be unable to receive assistance on the basis that they lack a sufficiently close connection with the country to whose

---

laws they are subject. A successful Judicial Review was brought to the High Court challenging the proposed provisions on the grounds that they are discriminatory. See Annex 9 for The Public Law Project, R (On the Application Of [a name is missing here??]) v The Secretary of State for Justice [double check the proper name of the case??] the Office of the Children’s Commissioner for details of the case.

In Scotland the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COLSA), the representative voice of Scottish local authorities, has a designated Migration, Population and Diversity (MPD) team.\textsuperscript{83} One of the MPD’s seven priorities is that legitimate migrants are better integrated into local communities.\textsuperscript{84} One function of the MPD team is the COLSA Strategic Migration Partnership (CSMP) who work in partnership with the Home Office, Scottish Government and other stakeholders with regards to policy issues relating to migration in Scotland and provide oversight of equality and human rights issues.\textsuperscript{85} In 2010 (and updated in 2011) the CSMP created a Policy Toolkit\textsuperscript{86} for local authorities which outlined the benefits that migration can bring to Scotland. Such benefits are; enhanced cultural diversity, filling skills gaps, contributing to the economy and address population concerns in the context of Scotland’s aging population.\textsuperscript{87}

In December 2013 with funding from the European Integration Fund COLSA established the Migrations Matters Scotland (MMS) project.\textsuperscript{88} The projects main aims are to: get a better understanding of integration needs, evaluate CSMP’s Policy Toolkit, establish a baseline of information in relation to migrant integration in Scotland, develop thematic briefings and policy resources to support integration and to widely disseminate the findings from the project.\textsuperscript{89} The project is due to be completed in June 2015.

Increasingly hostile immigration policies, particularly in regards to sponsoring visa’s for family members, create significant barriers to the integration of migrants in the UK. These will be outlined in the barriers section below. However the Supreme Court’s ruling in Quila and Bibi v Secretary of State for the Home Department\textsuperscript{90} is worth

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{83} UK, Migration Scotland, ‘About Us’, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/about}.
\item\textsuperscript{84} UK, Migration Scotland, ‘Our Priorities’, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/our-priorities/national-outcomes}.
\item\textsuperscript{85} UK, Migration Scotland, ‘About Us’, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/about}.
\item\textsuperscript{86} UK, COSLA Strategic Migration Partnership (2011) Policy Toolkit, September 2011, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/migration-matters-scotland/policy-toolkit}.
\item\textsuperscript{87} UK, COSLA Strategic Migration Partnership (2011) Policy Toolkit, September 2011, at page 5, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/migration-matters-scotland/policy-toolkit}.
\item\textsuperscript{88} UK, Migration Scotland, ‘Migration Matters Scotland: Project Background’, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/migration-matters-scotland/project-background}.
\item\textsuperscript{89} UK, Migration Scotland, ‘Migration Matters Scotland: Project Background’, available at: \url{www.migrationscotland.org.uk/migration-matters-scotland/project-background}.
\item\textsuperscript{90} UK, R (on the application of Quila and another) and (on the application of Bibi and another) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2011] UKSC 45, 12 October 2011, available at: \url{www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2011/45.html}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
noting. The ability to be joined by a spouse is a significant step in establishing a life in a new country and therefore being able to integrate. Changes made to the Immigration Rules in 2008 raised the minimum age of a spouse of sponsor wishing to obtain a visa for the purpose of settling in the UK from 18 to 21. The change was intended to prevent forced marriages; nevertheless young married migrants were restricted in establishing a family life in the UK. The Supreme Court held that the rule was an infringement of the rights conferred by Article 8 ECHR and the minimum age should return to being set at 18.

### 1.2.2. Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers, limitations, constraints or resistance faced in designing, developing and implementing such policies and measures, therefore factors that may hinder their effectiveness and influence negatively their outcomes. For example, budgetary limitations, or problems of coordination of governance levels, priority of interventions, lack of training or lack of mainstreaming of relevant policies, lack of action by competent actors or limited data about the interested population, could be factors that may function as obstacles or affect negatively the implementation of selected migrant integration measures.</th>
<th>Some identified barriers will to some extent be the ‘flip side’ of drivers, wherein these needs have failed to be met by either government initiatives, new policy, or inactivity at the regional and local levels, to either facilitate or improve integration routes for migrants in to UK society. Some, such as equitable access to the labour market will have crucial intersecting points of contact with, for instance, forms of (racial or other) discrimination or lack of language, qualification recognition, etc. which impede integration, (please see bullet no.6 below for an indicative list). The intersectionality of key needs, (such as housing, employment, racial discrimination, and the freedom to exercise cultural and/or ethnic belief systems), and, where support for these are not met by state mechanisms for existing minority groups in the UK, is very well documented. 91. Already noted is the British public’s established hostility to issues surrounding immigration. 92. For instance in 1999, fewer than 5 percent of respondents identified immigration or race relations as one of the most important issues facing the country; by December 2007 (and after 911, and the London bombings) this figure was 46 percent. Public opinion on integration informs us that slightly over half of the British public thinks that the integration of immigrants is “poor.” 93. As is seen next, the critical context to public opinion on integration is British hostility to immigration (both legal and illegal), and manifested in a variety of ways.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


Below we report on key areas (in the same order as noted under Section 1.2.1. Drivers), and identify obstacles currently in place preventing the integration for some groups of migrants):

1. **Protection in law from discrimination.** A clear barrier to immigrants being supported towards integration can be illustrated by government attempts for public engagement in support of its “Go home or face arrest” campaign\(^\text{94}\) to shame illegal immigrants to leave the UK. This campaign was seen to have had negative consequences for many people in the UK, including British citizens of minority ethnic background. In response in November 2014, a national NGO, Migrant Rights Network (MRN), launched a migrant manifesto as part of the 2015 pre-election campaign, called “Our Vote 2015”. The manifesto pulled together the views from many civil society organisations to call for a fair and equal immigration system, asking politicians to begin by making changes in six key areas.\(^\text{95}\) Another key project analysing the “Go Home” campaign also identified the negative impacts of government migration policy.\(^\text{96}\) It mapped the unfolding controversy of Home Office immigration campaigns, and explored the impacts on local communities and national debate of current publicity campaigns about migration by the UK Home Office.

A primary barrier noted above is of racial or other discrimination; but the intolerance and hostility generated in this case was a government driven initiative. A government campaign in 2013 used vans which drove around 6 highly ethnically diverse areas with large billboards on the side displaying what were deemed to be offensive slogans aimed at illegal immigrants. This exercise caught the attention of the national media, and was seen to exploit notions of fear and mistrust towards ethnic minorities. The Advertising Standards Authority [ASA] received 60 complaints from members of the public concerned that the advert was in breach of the UK advertising code because it was offensive and irresponsible. Many complainants stated that the slogans were, “reminiscent of slogans used by racist groups to attack immigrants in the past and could incite or exacerbate racial hatred and tensions in

multicultural communities". While the Government was within its rights to continue to enforce the immigration rules and promote voluntary departure schemes to those who had no right to be in the UK, this campaign – in the aggressive and misleading way in which it was orchestrated - has had lasting impacts on the communities targeted and for migrant organisations. Moreover, the government executed the featured campaign directly into the public sphere without any prior consultation with local communities.

This could be seen as having abrogated its primary responsibility to have ‘due regard’ to its duties under the Equality Act. In response to this, the charities, Amnesty, Refugee Action and Freedom from Torture published a letter in the Guardian. "The Home Office is bound by a positive duty under the Equality Act 2010 to eliminate discrimination, advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations. It is also responsible for assessing and determining the protection needs of the people who come to this country fleeing persecution. This campaign will generate hostility and intolerance in our communities, risks undermining the UK’s commitment to provide sanctuary under the Refugee Convention and should end now."

As a counterbalance to these various reactions, is the Attitudes to Migrants, Communication and Local Leadership Project (AMICALL) funded via the EIF and supported by the CoE, which comprised six EU partners (UK, Hungary, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, and Italy). The project sought to provide a platform for the sharing of good practice and the development of new strategies for the promotion of positive attitudes towards migrants and towards migrant integration at the local and regional level. It also sought to address the role of local and regional authorities (LRAs). One relevant UK outcome was that many LRAs had viewed face to face communication as much more effective than traditional media-based initiatives which were commonly viewed as either a public relations strategy or 'spin'. It was therefore concluded that in the future they would seek to operate with the media to mitigate these kinds of negative outcomes.

---

Negative perceptions of migrants (manifested as mistrust; racial discrimination; hate crimes). Romanian and Polish migrants in Northern Ireland continue to be targets of racism and hate crimes attacks, presumed to be because of sectarian issues (i.e. their Catholic faith). A NICEM report has identified that in the past year (2013-2014) Northern Ireland has become one of the worst spots for racist crimes and race hate-linked incidents in the UK, but the region is home to only 1% of all the non-EU/EEA migrants who have come into the UK.

2. **Education.** Lack of language skills and lack of access to ESOL classes. Studies in Scotland also report a number of barriers to employing migrants, thus impeding the integration process. These include language and UK-equivalent qualifications. In some areas of Scotland, employers report problems with accommodation which make it difficult for migrants to take up jobs and to settle. Use of agencies to recruit migrants is also reported by employers to add to the costs of their recruitment.

- Government reduction in resources for migrant children. Local authorities have lost specialist EAL advisers following government cuts, resulting in reduced resources for schools to deal with the number of bilingual pupils. A 2011 study undertaken by Institute of Education (IOE) at University College London (UCL) confirms this and has identified that bright children from migrant backgrounds are routinely placed in classes for low ability pupils because bilingualism is still wrongly associated with special educational needs. With regards to migrant children (EAL needs), there is some evidence to indicate that barriers are in place for bilingual children which prevent them from achieving their full potential. For the first time, the number of pupils who speak another language in the home exceeded 1.1million. The reduction in resources for EAL, etc. was

---


}

- A 2012 OECD report found that 80% of children of immigrant families were attending schools with high numbers of immigrant pupils and were highly likely to attend a school where large numbers of their peers speak a different language and/or have mothers with low levels of education. No updated data has been provided in either the 2013 and 2014 reports.

3. \textbf{Respect for family life and reunification.}

   Since 2012, the UK has occupied the second most stringent financial requirements of all major Western countries for those who wish to reunite with a non-European Economic Area (non-EEA) spouse or partner. In Impact Assessment HO0065, the UK Border Agency (UKBA) has estimated that 45% of British citizens and those persons settled in the UK would not be able to meet the Immigration Rules’ new minimum income threshold of £18,600 per annum. This translates into 45% of non-EEA nationals no longer being able to successfully apply to enter or remain in the UK as a spouse or partner. The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) produced figures indicating that of British citizens in employment, 61% of women and 47% of all British citizens in employment will not qualify to bring in a family member under the new changes. As a result, the new minimum income threshold of the Immigration Rules has now left British citizens with less favourable rights than EEA citizens who are exercising their treaty rights in the UK.

- In terms of social and emotional impact on families, research by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) has shown that every year a child spends in the country of origin, i.e. not in the UK and away from one of their parents, this has a particularly negative impact on their social integration as well as their assessment results and language abilities.\footnote{UK, Gherson (2012) ‘Second to none: Family Reunification in the United Kingdom’, 21 September 2012, available at: \url{www.gherson.com/news-articles/second-to-none-family-reunification-in-the-uk-3432/#sthash.2hcIH0Jj.dpuf}.}

4. \textbf{Participation in the labour market / Access to housing.} Analysis published by the Home Office in September 2014 found that employment rates for family migrants and students were lower than those that had come to
the UK with the intention of working. The lowest employment rates were found among refugees with only 47% in employed. Differences in employment rates for residents born abroad were acknowledged by the government as being likely to affect long term integration outcomes.

- Insufficient social housing availability, exacerbated by the public’s ongoing distrust of migrants per se. For instance, “perceptions that migrants displace British social housing applicants persist”. 105
- A recent study undertaken by the Migration Policy Institute (examining labour market integration in six EUMS, and funded under the European Commission’s DG for Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion) identified and confirmed a range of key barriers experienced by migrants across the UK, which impact on migrants’ effective UK integration across most public spheres (not just equitable labour market access). Including significant reductions in public funding impacting directly on migrants’ needs, in areas such as vocational training and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL). 106
- Employers have been expected to make up the above shortfall, but they may not be inclined to pay for such services. Preferring instead to recruit migrants in to low-skilled jobs.
- Studies have shown that migrants can be particularly vulnerable to exploitation by employers in the labour market with little or no English language skills, because they are often unaware of their rights under UK law. One study of Eastern European agency workers in Doncaster found that the majority of agency workers in the survey had no employment contract and were unaware of the terms and conditions of their employment. 107

5. **Political participation.** Operation Black Vote (OBV) is the major organisation in the UK seeking to promote the political status of Black and Minority Ethnic groups, and increase political participation, which it considers is under-represented. It therefore campaigns to increase


the representation of Black and Minority Ethnic people in the electoral system.\footnote{UK, Operation Black Vote, ‘What We Do’, available at: \url{www.obv.org.uk/what-we-do}}

6. **Clear path to citizenship.** The government has made citizenship acquisition more difficult for migrants in the UK, especially regarding the crucial need to have specific language skills.

- Over the past few years, there have been moves to escalate the use of powers to strip people of their British citizenship and withdraw British passports, particularly in respect of those who may be involved in fighting, extremist activity or terrorist training overseas.\footnote{UK, Melanie Gower (2015) Deprivation of British citizenship and withdrawal of passport facilities - Commons Library Standard Note [Home Affairs Section], 30 January 2015, available at: \url{www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/briefing-papers/SN06820/deprivation-of-british-citizenship-and-withdrawal-of-passport-facilities}.}
- Successive government approaches to ESOL have failed to meet demand adequately\footnote{UK, Paget, A. & Stevenson, N. (2014) “Making ESOL policy work better for migrants and wider society...” On Speaking Terms, 19 August 2014, available at: \url{www.demos.co.uk/files/On_speaking_termsweb.pdf?1408395571}.} Unlike Scotland and Wales, England lacks a national ESOL strategy. Therefore, ESOL in England is not functioning as well as it could. This lack of a national strategy for ESOL has contributed to a poor understanding of the scale of need and of the quality of provision, as well as a shortage of information for potential learners. A report published in January 2014 used a ‘freedom of information request’ to discover that government ESOL funding was reduced by 40% in the past five years, but there are large waiting lists around the country, which points to a paradox: an identifiable ESOL need and withdrawal of state support.\footnote{UK, The Scottish Government, publications available at: \url{http://www.gov.scot/Publications/2009/02/23154109/2}.}

A lack in formation and current data affects policy at the local levels to ensure pathways to citizenship. A review of available data on migrants, by the Scottish Government,\footnote{UK, Paget, A. & Stevenson, N. (2014) “Making ESOL policy work better for migrants and wider society...” On Speaking Terms, 19 August 2014, available at: \url{www.demos.co.uk/files/On_speaking_termsweb.pdf?1408395571}.} revealed substantial gaps in evidence relating to migration into Scotland, needed to implement policy. These are:

- Gaps in evidence
- There is a general need for improved data and information in areas including health, crime, education, children and social care. There is also a need for specific information in a number of areas to inform future policy in relation to

migration and integration. The report highlights a number of these:

- Barriers to migrants in accessing skilled work
- The extent of poor employment practices in relation to migrants
- Migrants' perspectives, experiences and intentions to settle or return
- Self-employed migrants
- Barriers to learning English
- Migrants' use of services and reasons for low take up
- Access to housing and issues of quality of housing
- Schools' role in supporting migrant children
- The experiences of children of migrants
- Hostility and abuse towards migrants
- Barriers and facilitators to community integration
- The involvement of migrants in criminal and civil law-breaking.

7. **Community and social cohesion.** The Social Integration Commission\(^{113}\) (SIC) was established in early 2014 for 12 months to undertake research and try to identify continuing cohesion problems in the UK. Via a series of reports SIC reported an overall lack of social integration, making it harder to address the various challenges that 21\(^{st}\) century Britain faces. These challenges include long-term unemployment, blocked opportunities, lowering of aspirations and ability to achieve potential, social isolation and a lack of community wellbeing. In particular, Report 2\(^{114}\) was a wake-up call to policymakers. It provided compelling evidence of the negative consequences and financial cost of poor integration for individuals and society. It outlined how social segregation limits solving key economic and social challenges in relation to employment, recruitment and career progression, and community health and wellbeing. Key findings also included that a lack of integration costs UK economy £6 billion, or approximately 0.5 per cent of GDP, each year.

There have been some consultations regarding accessing public services.\(^{115}\) In 2013 the Government implemented a public consultation on migrant access (and financial contribution by those deemed not eligible
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for free access) to the National Health Service (NHS). This was the result of concerns raised in the media that the current health system is overly generous to those who only have a temporary relationship with the UK. It has also recognised that the NHS struggles to identify and recover the cost of care from those not entitled to free treatment. The consultation aimed to identify:

- Whether the current qualifying residency test, for free NHS care, should be revised to reflect a permanent relationship with the UK;
- A proposal to introduce a new requirement for temporary non-EEA migrants to make an explicit contribution to the costs of their healthcare either by a levy or through health insurance;
- Whether the UK should continue to charge visitors and illegal migrants (including failed asylum seekers liable to removal, illegal entrants and people who have overstayed their visas) directly at the point of use for hospital treatment.

The Statement of Changes HC 1888\(^{116}\) closed Tier 1 Post Study Work (PSW) visas for non-EEA graduates as of 6 April 2012. The pre 2012 PSW Tier 1 visa route provided up to two years unlimited access to the labour market for all non-EEA persons who had graduated from a UK University. Such persons now have to apply for a Tier 2 or 5 visa, depending on the type of employment, which both require a sponsor, just as a non-EEA person who has not graduated in the UK would have to. On 24 February 2014 the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Migration (APPG on Migration) published a report\(^ {117}\) from an inquiry into the closure of the PSW route. The report found that on a number of occasion’s employers, and in particular small businesses, had either not applied for a Tier 2 licence, denied jobs or rescinded offers to non-EEA applicants to avoid having to do the associated procedural paperwork. Many smaller businesses also found it difficult to meet the minimum salary requirement for a Tier 2 visa which is £20,500\(^ {118}\).

Under s.22 of the Immigration Act 2014 a duty is placed on landlords to ensure that prospective tenants are not able to rent premises if disqualified due to their immigration status. A maximum fine of £3000 can be imposed by virtue of s.23 of the same Act. This means that landlords who are untrained in immigration matters could have negative effects on the integration of migrants in society. Landlords may profile potential tenants incorrectly or may be hesitant to rent to migrants for either fear of receiving a penalty notice or


to save on the additional administration of checking immigration status, as in some situations it may be necessary to contact the Home Office to check on an individual’s immigration status. The provision may also limit the areas in which migrants choose or are able to rent exacerbating segregation within communities.  

The possibility of discrimination is such that the Home Office and UK Visas and Immigration have issued a Code of Practice for landlords on how to avoid “unlawful discrimination when conducting ‘right to rent’ checks” pursuant to the obligation laid out in s.33 of the Act. The Code of Practice does recommend that landlords request documentation from all prospective tenants. However, it remains to see how this procedure will operate in practice. The “right to rent” checks are currently being undertaken under a pilot scheme in the West Midlands. The Pilot commenced on 1 December 2014 and is due to be reviewed in Spring 2015 with the Government then intending to roll it out to the rest of the country.  

Social housing is allocated in the UK by local authorities; the powers granted to local authorities in this regard are laid out in Part VI of the Housing Act 1996. Section 160A specifies the eligibility for social housing, under s.160A(3) persons subject to immigration control are not eligible unless that person is of a class prescribed by The Allocation of Housing and Homelessness (Eligibility) (England) Regulations 2006. Such persons are: persons with refugee status, persons with exceptional leave to remain with no condition against recourse to public funds or persons who have been granted leave to remain with no conditions or limitations and have been habitually resident for at least five years, have been granted leave to remain on the undertaking of a sponsor or if their sponsor is still alive. EEA nationals may have access to social housing if they have the “right to reside” in the UK, with the exception of such persons whose right to reside is an initial three month right by virtue of Regulation 13 of The Immigration (European Economic Area) Regulations 2006 or based on their job-seeker status. Part 7 of the Localism Act 2011  

---

provides local authorities with power to decide who qualifies for social housing in their local area.

In Wales the eligibility for social housing is governed by The Allocation of Housing (Wales) (Amendment) Regulations 2006. The Welsh Regulations allow eligibility for the same categories as the English provisions with regard to persons subject to immigration control but also allow for two further categories of persons. The two further categories eligible in Wales are citizens of countries that have ratified the Council of Europe Social Charter or the European Convention on Social and Medical Assistance and EEA nationals who do not have a right to reside. Persons from both categories must also be legally present and habitually resident in Wales. With regard to persons not subject to immigration control, including EEA nationals, the Regulations simply state that they must pass the habitually resident test.

In December 2013 the DCLG published statutory guidance on social housing allocation for local housing authorities in England entitled Providing social housing for local people. The guidance emphasises the Government’s view that, when exercising their powers under the Localism Act and deciding who qualifies for social housing, priority should be given to “applicants who can demonstrate a close association with their local area”. The guidance goes on to outline the Secretary of State’s support for local authorities who have introduced a residency requirement as part of their eligibility criteria and her encouragement for others to implement similar measures, with the suggestion that a reasonable period for a residency requirement would be at least 2 years. The guidance concludes by highlighting the power that local authorities have for prioritising local connection, dealing sensitively with lettings in rural villages by giving priority to those with a connection to the parish is provided as an example of when exercising this power would be useful.

In July 2011 the Home Office released a consultation paper setting out their proposals for the reform of family migration. It was stated in the paper that any reforms would be based on the principles of preventing and tackling abuse, promoting integration and reducing burdens on the taxpayer. The outcomes of the consultation influenced changes to the Immigration

Rules and on 11 June 2012 the Secretary of State for the Home Department issued a Statement of Intent on family migration. The Statement makes a number of references to how the changes to the Immigration Rules will help further the social integration of migrants in relation to private life and long term residence, financial requirements and knowledge of the English language and life in the UK.

In relation to sponsoring the settlement of a non-EEA partner the Statement of Changes in Immigration Rules HC 194 removed the previous financial requirement that parties had to demonstrate that they would maintain themselves adequately without recourse to public funds. The changes replaced the previous requirement with a minimum income requirement (MIR) for the sponsor. The income threshold to sponsor the settlement of a non-EEA partner is £18,600. A higher threshold of £22,400 is required for the settlement of a partner and a child (under the age of 18) and an additional £2,400 is required for each further child. Savings of over £16,000 can be taken into account to compensate for lower earners and a specific formula will be applied when deciding whether to grant entry and settlement to the partner. The changes also removed the provision of the previous ‘without recourse to public funds’ requirement that allowed any promised financial support from third parties to be taken into account. In 2012 some flexibility was given to the calculation procedure in Statement of Changes HC 628 to allow for example, proceeds of a property sale within the previous six months and also for non-salaried income to be taken into account. A Judicial Review of the threshold amount was brought in MM, R (On the Application Of) v The Secretary of State for the Home Department in 2013 which was later appealed in 2014. The Court of Appeal held that the threshold amount is not unlawful. It is believed the Claimants will appeal the decision in the Supreme Court. Further details of the case can be found in Annex 9.

In addition the Statement of Changes HC 194 increased the period of time a person without leave to remain (LTR) could apply for it under Article 8 ECHR from 14 to 20 years continuous residence. Persons under 18 years old who have had seven years’

---


continuous residence, are between the ages of 18-24 and have resided in the UK for over half of their life or persons residing in the UK for fewer than 20 years but have no ties to their country of origin can also apply for LTR on Article 8 grounds. It also abolished the provisions allowing immediate family resettlement when a British person has lived abroad with their partner.

### 1.2.3. Language learning and integration tests

Please provide information about:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main language learning support programmes and courses. Provide details about organisation of such programmes and actors implementing them, funding support, location, duration, frequency, numbers of beneficiaries, entitlements and limitations for accessing courses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) began as a grassroots movement providing courses for migrants, and is now a professional industry, with standards overseen by government and a specialised method of teaching and learning, backed by research, funding and various professional bodies. Government funded ESOL courses are mainly provided through further education (FE) colleges, adult community colleges and independent training providers. The Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) is the main government body responsible for ESOL, with funding administered via the Skills for Life programme by the Skills Funding Agency (SFA). In addition, a large number of initiatives around the country deliver ESOL via voluntary and community networks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants are able to take ESOL classes at different levels: entry 1, entry 2, entry 3, level 1 and level 2. The highest, level 2, is roughly equivalent to GCSE level, although there is debate around real equivalencies, descriptions and assessment of different levels of English between different benchmarking systems. For instance, there is a strong argument about adopting the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses in ESOL contribute to employability, community cohesion, overcoming racism, and improving health, housing, education and skills. Research for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation found a strong correlation between English language skills and positive attitudes to English people and low levels of reported discrimination.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successive government approaches to ESOL have failed to meet demand adequately136. Unlike Scotland and Wales, England lacks a national ESOL strategy. Therefore, ESOL in England is not functioning as well as it could. This lack of a national strategy for ESOL has contributed to a poor understanding of the scale of need and of the quality of provision, as well as a shortage of information for potential learners. A report published in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


January 2014 used a ‘freedom of information request’ to discover that government ESOL funding was reduced by 40% in the past five years, but there are large waiting lists around the country, which points to a paradox: an identifiable ESOL need and withdrawal of state support.\textsuperscript{137}

Furthermore, the funding system creates incentives, which disadvantage learners at both the lowest and the highest levels, while migrants in employment find it hard to access classes. Workplace-based ESOL has proven much more effective\textsuperscript{138} and offers a potential solution for this group. Current provision fails to take account of the wide range of learner’s needs, aspirations and circumstances. The Skills Funding Agency and individual FE colleges try hard to meet the needs of learners from unregulated and discretionary sources of funding, but this is not a sustainable solution.

Funding for the adult skills budget has been steadily decreasing, with implications for access to ESOL. The adult skills budget, which funds most ESOL, has decreased from around £2.8 billion in 2008, to £2.2 billion in 2014, and is forecast to drop to about £2 billion in 2015. ESOL funding on the main Skills for Life programme has declined from approximately £210 million in 2008 to £130 million in 2013. In a survey of ESOL providers, 66% attributed waiting lists to a lack of government funding.\textsuperscript{139}

Studies have shown that migrants can be particularly vulnerable to exploitation by employers in the labour market with little or no English language skills, because they are often unaware of their rights under UK law. One study of Eastern European agency workers in Doncaster found that the majority of agency workers in the survey had no employment contract and were unaware of the terms and conditions of their employment.\textsuperscript{140} A UK report into ESOL and the workplace concluded that ESOL helps migrant workers reduce their vulnerability to exploitation by improving their communication skills and therefore their awareness of their rights and responsibilities.\textsuperscript{141}


In November 2010 the Government announced in a Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (BIS) document *Further Education New Horizons – Investing in Skills for Sustainable Growth* that funding for ESOL would be cut from September 2011. In the government document, it was stated that “[w]e will focus public funds for ESOL on active jobseekers (JSA or ESA WRAG) by fully funding formal training where English language skills form a barrier to finding work. Public funding will not be available for ESOL in the workplace, subject to conditions it will be co-funded for those who are settled here”. Skills Funding Agency guidance was that the changes should apply to new learners only.

| Adult learner (aged 19+ years) participation on ESOL courses, and the percentage of all age ESOL participation by gender, 2007-08 to 2009-10. |
|------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                  | 2007-08          | 2008-09          | 2009-10 (Near Final Data) |
| ESOL participation (19+) | 203200          | 197100          | 187000           |
| Female ESOL participation (16+) | 66.2%          | 66.4%          | 66%              |
| Male ESOL participation (16+) | 33.8%          | 33.6%          | 34%              |

Scotland

Adult ESOL literacy learners - those who have little or no literacy in their own mother-tongue or in English, and whose spoken English may range from basic to fluent - are eligible for free ESOL with literacy courses. These are funded under adult literacy and numeracy streams.

In 2002, the Scottish Government convened the Scottish Refugee Integration Forum to support a strategy for the integration of refugees and asylum seekers into Scotland’s communities. It created a positive impact. Implementation of the strategy is currently in place, and will continue up until 2017. Education Scotland leads on the education strand of the strategy.

---


strategy, and is responsible for Scottish policy relating to ESOL. It is tasked with:

• Helping achievement of English language skills for refugees and asylum seekers
• Increasing access to appropriate education opportunities for refugees and asylum seekers
• Supporting refugees and asylum seekers to use their pre-existing qualifications
• Enabling refugees and asylum seekers to contribute fully to Scottish life through promoting linguistic diversity.

Wales
Wales has a detailed ESOL strategy\textsuperscript{146}, which contributes to the delivery of a number of key priorities set out in the Programme for Government, and to a range of specific Welsh Government policies, including the Strategic Equality Plan, the Refugee Inclusion Strategy, and a Community Cohesion Strategy – Getting on together for Wales. The Welsh Government is committed to providing public funding to support the delivery of ESOL classes for all up to the level of functionality. This has been determined via the engagement of multiple agencies, within an operating framework where Wales is seen as an inclusive, multicultural and multi-faith country. ESOL is the provision for learners whose first language is not English or Welsh. The provision of ESOL as an element of Lifelong Learning is the responsibility of the Welsh Government. However, the UK Government has responsibility for immigration / citizenship policy which impacts on the provision of ESOL in Wales.

ESOL is essential for integration and enables learners to function independently, advance onto further learning opportunities or work and it supports greater community cohesion. There are clear links between English-language disadvantage and social exclusion and deprivation. A 2013 study into poverty and ethnicity in Wales found that English language skills influence, “access to services, people’s confidence, their ability to help their children to flourish in school and their social networks”.\textsuperscript{147}

Since October 2013, all applicants for settlement and naturalisation to the UK are required to pass the Life in the UK Test (detailed below) and present an English language speaking and listening qualification at a minimum of B1 (Entry 3) level of the CEFR for Languages, unless exempt. The 1999 Immigration and Asylum Act implemented a policy of dispersal across the


UK and there are currently four cluster areas in Wales: Cardiff, Newport, Wrexham and Swansea. Demand for ESOL is greatest in these areas. Studies have been undertaken to determine how many hours it takes to learn English through ESOL. In some instances the time may be extensive. Such considerations are important when determining provision and measuring performance.\(^{148}\)

Applying to become a citizen of the UK is considered an especially important decision and commitment. There is an implicit agreement to accept the responsibilities which go with citizenship and to respect the laws, values and traditions of the UK. It is therefore expected as part of this responsibility that prospective citizens are able to communicate with the wider community and are thus equipped to play a part in community life.\(^{149}\)

A person is considered as qualifying in this regard, by:

1. Taking and passing the Life in the UK test (please see following box); and either
2. a. have a speaking and listening qualification in English at B1 CEFR or higher, or an equivalent level qualification; or
   b. have obtained an academic qualification deemed by UK NARIC\(^{150}\) to meet the recognised standard of a Bachelor’s or Master’s degree or PhD in the United Kingdom and (i) UK NARIC has confirmed that the qualification was taught or researched in English or (ii) the qualification was taught or researched in the UK or a majority English speaking country other than Canada; OR
   c. If they are a national of a majority English-speaking country.

Language tests required for migrants to access residence or other legal status affecting equal treatment and access to rights. Please provide information about their content and character, level of knowledge required, numbers of participants, and rates of success/failure

INFO IN NEXT QUESTION

---


\(^{150}\) UK NARIC is the UK’s National Agency responsible for providing information and opinions on academic qualifications from across the world.
Some qualifications on the Home Office’s list expire after 2 years.

### Integration Tests

The *Life in the UK Test* takes 45 minutes to complete 24 questions about British traditions and customs. Applicants must achieve 75% mark or higher in order to pass this test. It is available to be booked online to be taken at the nearest of 60 [nationally available in England, Scotland and Wales] test centres and costs £50. There are very stringent rules in place governing protocol to ensure that the person who booked the test is the person sitting the exam. In the event of failure, the applicant must wait 7 days before taking the test again; however, they may take the test as many times as needed, and will have to [re]book and pay the full amount each successive time.

The UK Integration test contains sections on:
- The process of becoming a citizen or permanent resident
- The values and principles of the UK
- Traditions and culture from around the UK
- The events and people that have shaped the UK’s history
- The government and the law
- Getting involved in your community

The numbers undertaking the *Life in the UK* test were 183,562 in 2010, 180,834 in 2011, 151,856 in 2012 and 131,608 in 2013 (January to October). The pass rates were 73.4% (2010), 77.1% (2011), 85.2% (2012) and 78.3% (2013). The success rate was steadily increasing until early 2013 (reaching a peak of 88.1% in February 2013), since when it has declined (to 69.8% in October 2013). These statistics were provided by the UK Borders Agency in response to a Freedom of Information request.

In 2012, 2% of naturalization applications were rejected because of “insufficient knowledge of English and Knowledge of Life in the United Kingdom (KOL)”. The numbers rejected on these grounds were 382 in 2010, 143 in 2011, 103 in 2012 and 62 in 2013.

### Mother tongue learning programmes for children of migrants

It is considered that parental involvement in the education of their children is important to children’s success at school, a series of measures have been implemented across the EU by EUMS. There are essentially three main targeted areas to maximise the

---


In some Member States top-level education authorities are responsible for publications in the child’s mother tongue. The situation in the UK is that in Northern Ireland, a multilingual website [in more than 10 languages] for newcomers and their parents has been set up by the five Education and Library Boards in cooperation with each other. Whereas for the rest of the UK, Local Education Authorities [LEAs] or school authorities are solely responsible for delivering different language literatures for parents’ in their mother tongue, with some providing up to 11 different languages.

Guidance by the Department for Education [DFE] provides clear and practical advice on how LEAs and schools can accommodate the various learning needs via the Ethnic Minority Achievement Grant (EMAG).

There are exceptions to this, in various cases and in particular when no central or local recommendations exist on the use of interpreters, the schools must bear the cost of such services. In the case of the UK (England), a bilingual member of the school learning support staff undertakes this responsibility as a form of ‘volunteering’. This is based on government recommended advice that schools have a reception policy for newly-arrived pupils who do not have English as their mother tongue, appoint a mentor responsible for welcoming all new pupils, and also that Induction mentors are often learning support assistants. In Northern Ireland, the inclusion and diversity service provides training and support for schools to establish induction procedures for newly arrived pupils including those for who English is an additional language. Scotland also operates as a common practice to use resource persons to communicate with migrant families.

This may be seen as an approach to a good practice in the absence of funding provision, and where the particular members are fluent in the same language needs.

---


158 eacea.ec.europa.eu/education/eurydice/documents/thematic.../101EN.pdf

159 www.loc.gov/...native-education/education-non-native-language-speakin...
In Northern Ireland the inclusion and diversity service provides a range of tailored language services for newcomers whose children do not speak English as their first language, from pre-school to post-primary and anti-bullying toolkits. They also provide translation services.\(^\text{160}\)

Please provide insights about key issues, debates, challenges or problems related to the implementation of the above measures and policies. The findings should be substantiated through existing assessments, research or studies and case law (use template in Annex 9).

Studies have shown that migrants can be particularly vulnerable to exploitation by employers in the labour market with little or no English language skills, because they are often unaware of their rights under UK law. One study of Eastern European agency workers in Doncaster found that the majority of agency workers in the survey had no employment contract and were unaware of the terms and conditions of their employment.\(^\text{161}\) A UK report into ESOL and the workplace concluded that ESOL helps migrant workers reduce their vulnerability to exploitation by improving their communication skills and therefore their awareness of their rights and responsibilities.\(^\text{162}\)

### 1.2.4. Monitoring and assessment – Use of indicators

In this section please outline monitoring and evaluation procedures applied by public authorities at national and regional level, as applicable, for migrant integration. In particular, please present any indicators used for the monitoring, assessment and review of integration policies in the areas of political and social participation, social cohesion, and intolerance, inclusive and welcoming society. Please make sure to report here the link of such indicators with fundamental rights and the way their use reflects to the review of such policies.

Narrative for this section not yet ready, but general statistical indicators have been inserted (Annex 4)

No official monitoring of the situation of migrants and ethnic minorities is undertaken. The monitoring of migration is only undertaken via the International Passenger Survey, a sample survey of no more than 8 thousand people per year, which is used by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) in producing quarterly migration estimates.\(^\text{163}\) The ONS publishes labour market statistics which identify employment and unemployment for migrants and ethnic minorities. The Ethnic Minority Employment Task Force (EMETF) created by the National Employment Panel (NEP) formerly monitored the differential in the employment rate between white and ethnic minority people with the aim of promoting policies to increase ethnic minority employment. The EMETF was closed down by the Coalition Government.\(^\text{164}\) The Ethnic Minority Employment Stakeholder Group (EMESG) now “advises government on actions it might take to make sure ethnic minorities don't face disproportionate barriers to

---


\(^{161}\) UK, D, Sporton. (2013), "They control my life": the role of local recruitment agencies in East European migration to the UK, *Population, Space and Place* 19(5), pp 443–58.


\(^{163}\) See: [http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmpubadm/writev/migration/m10.htm](http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm201213/cmselect/cmpubadm/writev/migration/m10.htm) for criticisms of this approach by the City of Westminster Council.

achievement in the labour market”\textsuperscript{165} This body has a less proactive role than the EMETF.

The indicators presented in Annex 4 are as follows:

- Employment rate for people born outside the UK October-December 2014.
- Change in employment rate for people born outside the UK between 2013 and 2014 for the October-December quarter.
- Employment rate for people with non-UK nationality October-December 2014.
- Change in employment rate for people with non-UK nationality between 2013 and 2014 for the October-December quarter.
- Unemployment rate for ethnic minorities July-September 2014.
- Ethnic minority/white unemployment rate differential July-September 2014.

These indicators all refer to the labour market theme. All are presented for the UK as a whole, using the most recent data available (at March 2015). They were chosen because access to employment can be seen as a key measure of successful integration in this aspect of social and economic life, and because they are available for ethnic minorities, people born outside the UK and for people with non-UK nationality. The employment rate is the percentage of the population of working age who are in employment, while the unemployment rate is the percentage of economically active people who are unemployed. The more socially excluded a population sub-group, the lower the employment rate and the higher the unemployment rate. Change in the employment rate is a measure of changing access to employment. Employment and unemployment rates are compared for white people and ethnic minorities and for UK-born and non-UK born people. Where these values are positive relative to the ‘native’ category, the ‘migrant/minority’ is relatively disadvantaged, and negative values indicate a better employment performance.

Provide full wording and translation in English of each indicator used per area and dimension covered as well as its full definition, legal basis, rationale, and link with fundamental rights or EU law (use table in the Annex 4). General statistical indicators have been inserted.

Please provide data and evidence about the adoption of related Zaragoza indicators, especially in the dimensions of active

The “Zaragoza” indicators outlined in the MPI report referred to are not readily available in the UK. It has been noted earlier in this report that because of the UK’s history, emphasis has been placed on measuring the relative situation of “ethnic minorities”, rather than

citizenship and welcoming society. Please consult the publication *Using EU Indicators of Immigrant Integration* (ESN, MPG) and report more detailed and updated specific descriptions and mapping of indicators used in the Member States.

migrants and monitoring exercises ask individuals for their ethnic group, not their migrant status. The 2011 Census of Population marked a change of direction in including more questions on migration and citizenship. This and the Labour Force Survey are the main sources of these indicators. In the employment domain, the employment and labour market participation rates for migrants and non-citizens are published quarterly by the Office for National Statistics. However, data on the “active citizenship” and “welcoming society” domains is limited to the ONS annual estimates of the population born outside the UK and with non-UK citizenship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2.5. Funding integration policies (EIF, ERF, EMIF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please provide information about the distribution of funds for integration of migrants, as well as their social inclusion and participation. In particular, provide specific breakdown of funding per general area of integration policies – with particular focus on active citizenship, participation, welcoming society, social cohesion – in the last year and for the period 2010-2014 if available. (Use the table in the Annex 5).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data on total spend in Annex 5. Spending is not disaggregated by theme in Home Office reports.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Home Office administers these funds in the UK. The web page concerning these funds provides links to the original documents outlining planned expenditure when these funds started plus lists of projects funded.(^{166}) Total funding is detailed in Annex 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The majority of funds under the European Refugee Fund (£16.7 million between 2010 and 2013 out of £31.8 million) was allocated to departments of the Home Office. This was mainly for the Gateway Protection Programme. A further £5.36 million was granted to the North West Gateway Resettlement Partnership in 2011 and £1.8 million was granted in 2011 to the Yorkshire &amp; Humberside Gateway Protection Programme. Horton Housing Association received £255 thousand in 2010 and 2012 for its &quot;HOSTS – Housing, Orientation and Support of Torture Survivors&quot; project. Islington Council received £350 thousand in each of 2009 and 2010 for ESOL projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A list of projects funded under the Migrant Integration Fund is provided. There is little information from the project title about the activities undertaken or the themes they fell into. Most titles emphasise “integration” or “welcome”, but many explicitly mention ESOL or English leaning. The funding provided to such projects was as follows: 2009=£172,637.91; 2010=£343,147.07; 2011=£1,251,504.76; 2012=£921,576.45; 2013=£2,190,905.23.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Promoting equal treatment and non-discrimination

2.1. The implementation of anti-discrimination legislation and equal treatment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Briefly provide information on the following:</th>
<th>While there is no integration strategy for migrants, the UK has a strong anti-discrimination legal framework, and there are many campaigns supporting the rights of migrants and equitable access to public life across the UK. There is also a tradition in the UK for independent [non-government funded] organisations undertaking advocacy for migrants. Listed below are key organisations which pursue migrant rights. Listed below are currently run key outreach and awareness training campaigns.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outreach and awareness raising campaigns, training schemes, etc. undertaken by national or regional public authorities (including national equality bodies) targeting migrants and their descendants on the national anti-discrimination legal framework.</td>
<td>England:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Movement Against Xenophobia [MAX] has started a poster campaign, 'Celebrate, don't vilify'. MAX intends to portray immigrants and their contribution to Britain in a positive light. This is in direct response to the Conservative and Labour parties which stated that if they are elected in the 2015 General Election, they intend to further reduce the level of immigration into the UK.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• AboutHumanRights is an excellent online resource for all people (with sections for immigrants) on a wide range of topics which explain peoples’ rights and signpost which organisations they can go for further information. Broad areas covered are: Work, Life &amp; Health; Information &amp; Privacy; Lifestyle; Human Rights; Law &amp; Enforcement; The Law Explained; right to protest/demonstrate. This is run by trained legal experts, who will answers questions online via the discussion pages.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • The Challenge, UK’s leading charity for building a more integrated society, operates a number of projects. Step Forward, brings | 167 UK, the Movement Against Xenophobia was created by the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI). Available at: [www.noxenophobia.org/](http://www.noxenophobia.org/).
together new school leavers from all backgrounds, providing them with one year’s professional work experience and skills training. It is a 12-month project, and has been in place for several years; 150 young people will take part in 2015. All participants build a professional and peer network across sectors and gain training in highly transferable skills and character development. They also build experience and knowledge in their chosen field.

Northern Ireland:

1. The Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities (NICEM)’s Equality and Diversity Training\(^\text{172}\) has been established to tackle the growth of racist based attitudes and opinions, as well as to address issues of racism and prejudice in Northern Ireland. The anti-racist training seeks to counter racism, create self-sustaining structures of anti-racism activity and cross community participation, promote inter-ethnic participation, provides awareness of the value of cultural diversity and of the dangers of social exclusion. NICEM provides tailor-made Equality and Diversity Training for the following organisations:

- Statutory bodies
- Voluntary sector
- Community groups
- Trade Unions
- Schools and educational establishments
- Youth groups
- Political parties
- Private sector
- Business sector
- Religious groups

2. The Belfast Migrant Centre\(^\text{173}\) is a consortium of UNISON, the Irish Congress of Trade Unions and NICEM under the Welcome House Project. The overall aim is to tackle racism and eliminate barriers against new and settled migrant communities in Northern Ireland. The Centre recently developed a new integrated approach to tackling racism and awareness-raising on migrants through a successful project called ‘Belonging’.\(^\text{174}\) The Belonging project aims to develop empathy, within the community, towards migrants in Northern Ireland by telling the stories of individual migrants through a variety of channels. They aim to celebrate diversity while

---

simultaneously highlighting shared similarities. The aims are (i) to encourage the general public to identify with migrants on a human-to-human level rather than through a “’them and us’” mentality; (ii) to create more cohesive communities through the workshops and learning to be shared at the roundtable by facilitating the engagement of local communities with migrant communities in a safe and energetic environment; (iii) To foster an environment of understanding migrant communities throughout Northern Ireland.

3. The fourth edition of Your Rights in Northern Ireland, a Guide for Migrant Workers, was translated in 2012 in a wide range of languages serving many migrant groups’ needs, and is available online. The new edition of the guide was produced by Law Centre (NI) and the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission. It is available online on Law Centre (NI)’s website, on the Human Rights Commission website and at NI Direct in: English, Polish, Bulgarian, Chinese, Latvian, Lithuanian, Brazilian Portuguese, Romanian, Russian and Slovak. A paper copy of the guide is available in Polish. This (the fourth) edition, updates and gathers together in one, more user-friendly, guide the three different guides that made up past editions. The cost of translation and publication was funded by Belfast City Council, Northern Ireland Strategic Migration Partnership and OFMDFM.175

Scotland.

1. Young Scot is the national youth information and citizenship charity, providing young people (11-26) with a mixture of information, ideas and incentives to help them become confident, informed and active citizens, such as help with the Citizenship Test.176 It operates a free 24-hr legal advice on all rights and issues (including racism) affecting this age group. It provides a comprehensive range of racism-related information177, as well as a hyperlink to Childline’s page on racism.

2. Positive Action In Scotland [PAIH] is a Scottish wide, black and minority ethnic led charity working with communities, housing providers, voluntary organisations, providing a wide range of services [outreach surgeries and drop-ins; helping new migrants; housing

---

/ homelessness projects], as well as human rights and anti-racism campaigns.¹⁷⁸

3. West of Scotland regional Equality Council [WSREC]’s Minority Ethnic Employment & Training Support [MEETS] project [running until March 2018] will be working to deliver an employment and training project which will support people from minority ethnic communities to enhance their prospects within the world of work by targeting people who are economically inactive, with a particular focus on Roma community members, asylum seekers, refugees and minority ethnic individuals who are disabled. The project aims to work strategically with a range of partners to support the pathways of target beneficiaries through provision of training, work placement and advisory services. A key aspect of the approach will be to ensure that beneficiaries gain the skills, knowledge and confidence to respond to appropriate opportunities within a supportive, inclusive environment.¹⁷⁹

Wales

The Including Families Project works with asylum, refugee and migrant families, communities and professionals to protect and safeguard children in these vulnerable families. The project aims to raise awareness and understanding of the importance of safeguarding children, through helping families to be better integrated into communities in Wales. This includes promoting positive parenting methods to improve parenting and communication within families, and keeping children safe and secure in their home environment.¹⁸⁰

England:

1. Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI) is an independent national charity (not government funded) with substantial UK-wide recognition which campaigns for justice in immigration, nationality and refugee law and policy.

2. Movement Against Xenophobia [MAX] is a new campaign aimed at countering the pejorative anti-immigrant discourse of mainstream politics in the UK. It will follow all related debates, including the run-up to the General Election 2015.

3. *Divided Families Campaign* is underpinned by research which explores the impact of the Family Migration Rules on families with children, with a specific focus on the effect of the minimum income requirement.

4. *Adult Dependent Relatives*. The family immigration rules of July 2012 have had a significant effect on thousands of UK and non-EEA families. Many families have been detrimentally affected by the new adult dependent rules (‘ADR Rules’), are unable to look after their aging parents in the UK and are faced with uprooting their lives in the UK to move back to their country of origin in order to care for them. JCWI has secured funding from The Strategic Legal Fund, to carry out pre-litigation research into the impact these rules are having on families. In particular to assess the detriment to children.

**Scotland**

1. *Young Scot* is the national youth information and citizenship charity, providing young people (11-26) with a mixture of information, ideas and incentives to help them become confident, informed and active citizens. It operates free 24-hr legal advice on all rights and issues (including racism) affecting this age group. It provides a comprehensive range of racism-related information, as well as a hyperlink to Childline’s page on racism.

2. *Positive Action In Scotland* [PAIH] is a Scottish wide, black and minority ethnic led charity working with communities, housing providers, voluntary organisations, providing a wide range of services [outreach surgeries and drop-ins; helping new migrants; housing / homelessness projects], as well as human rights and anti-racism campaigns.

**Wales**

1. *Race Council Cymru* (RCC) is an overarching umbrella body established in Wales to bring together key organisations which work to combat prejudice, race discrimination, harassment, victimisation, abuse and violence. It undertook exploratory research on the needs and experiences of people from black and minority ethnic (BME) backgrounds living in Wales, and collected baseline information against which to identify the key priorities for promoting good race relations in the Welsh context. The ethnic minority population of Wales is small but growing. The research identified the extent to which racism and discrimination are issues which affect the many and varied BME communities living across Wales. It looked at: housing,
employment, education and policing; and included information about the experiences of living in neighbourhoods and communities in Wales.

Northern Ireland [NI]

1. The **BELONG Programme** is a cross-sectoral, inter-agency family support programme. Its primary aim is to promote a sense of belonging for black & minority ethnic (BME) children throughout NI communities. The planned outcomes are: to increase cultural confidence and competence; increased participation in schools and to reduce bullying and racial bullying.

2. **Northern Ireland Council for Ethnic Minorities** (NICEM). The initial idea for NICEM developed from the linkage and working relationship between the Chinese, Indian and the Traveling communities, which together with the Committee on the Administration of Justice (CAJ), have been the forefront in campaigning for the race relations legislation in Northern Ireland since 1991.

Evidence through polls, surveys, academic research, etc. on the awareness of migrants and/or their descendants concerning the right to equal treatment. Please indicate differences between ethnic/ migrant groups, living in different geographic areas, gender and age, as well as trends in time.

The most up-to-date information is from the 2010-11 Home Office Citizenship Survey for England and Wales.\(^{181}\) This revealed that 73.1% of people reported that they had the right to fair and equal treatment. The percentages for households with the following ethnic composition are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic composition</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>6044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>3257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Black or Black British</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>1237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Mixed race</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Chinese</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other ethnic group</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not all the same ethnic group</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>1197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>12467</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most people from ethnic minorities had greater awareness than white people, but households of mixed ethnicity had lowest awareness.\(^{182}\)

Evidence of complaints lodged by migrants and/or their The main source of data is the Tribunals Service. Unfortunately, employment tribunal data on race

---


\(^{182}\) UK, UK Data Service, Data available at: [http://nesstar.esds.ac.uk/webview/index.jsp](http://nesstar.esds.ac.uk/webview/index.jsp).
| Tools, measures and positive initiatives aiming at facilitating reporting incidents of discrimination – e.g. translation facilities to report and submit complaints in multiple languages – and tackling under-reporting and low rights-awareness. | Citizens Advice Bureau [CAB] is a charity servicing the needs of communities across the UK, via 140 locations and extensive volunteer staff. It provides wide-ranging and region-specific advice (as this differs from one to another). Depending on which region, services are offered in a wide range of languages, including BSL (British Sign Language). CAB provides clear details on how and to who to report any form of discrimination incident, and how to do so when reporting the identified authorities, in particular the police. It also provides tools for submitting complaints, awareness raising, and instructions on how to take action when an incident of discrimination is believed to have taken place. |
| In particular, provide information about any legal protection on grounds of nationality, which is not covered by the EU anti-discrimination Directives, but is a prohibited ground in several Member States. Please explain how unequal treatment on the basis of nationality is treated and provide exemplary cases, if any. Please provide information on the relevant practice and case law (use template in Annex 9) | NICEM’s Equality and Diversity Training has been established to tackle the growth of racist based attitudes and opinions, as well as to address issues of racism and prejudice in Northern Ireland. The training aims to counter racism, create self-sustaining structures of anti-racism activity and cross community participation, awareness, promote inter-ethnic participation and provide awareness of the value of cultural diversity and of the dangers of social exclusion.183 |

---


Section 19 of the Act defines indirect discrimination as applying a provision, criterion or practice which is discriminatory in relation to a relevant protected characteristic which would put that person or persons that share that protected characteristic at a disadvantage and that it cannot be shown it is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. Therefore, employers have to ensure they did not have any recruitment provisions, criteria or practices in place which would indirectly discriminate against applicants on the basis of their nationality or ethnic or national origins.

Moreover s.159(1) of the Act requires that employers take positive action in recruitment and promotion for persons who the employer reasonably thinks suffer a disadvantage connected to the protected characteristic they possess or that participation of persons of a certain protected characteristic is low in the respective field. Under s.159(3) the positive action to be taken would be to treat a person with a protected characteristic more favourably than persons who do not, as long as they are equal in qualification. Such action must also be a proportionate means of overcoming the disadvantage or low participation identified by the employer by virtue of s.159(1).

Section 29 of the Act prohibits discrimination, harassment and victimisation in the provision of services on the basis of one of the protected characteristics. However, Paragraph 17 of Schedule 3 to the Act provides an exception to s.29. By virtue of para 17, s.29 does not apply to relevant persons acting under the Immigration Acts and Special Immigration Appeals Commission Act 1997 with regards to “nationality” and “ethnic or national origins”.

Paragraph 1 of Schedule 23 provides a general exception to Parts 3 (services and public functions), 4 (premises), Part 5 (work) and Part 6 (Education) of the Act and allows for discrimination based on a person’s nationality, place of ordinary residence, or length of time out of or in (including specific areas of) the UK. Such conduct is permitted only when carrying out acts authorised by law, Ministerial arrangements or Ministerial conditions.

Section 29(6) of the Equality Act 2010 makes it unlawful to discriminate against a person on the grounds of nationality and ethnic and national origins, along with other characteristics protected by the Act, when exercising a public function, public authorities

---

accessing law enforcement and judiciary services. In particular please clarify whether and when the latter are considered and treated, or not, as services available to the public, therefore falling within the scope of the directives and the jurisdiction of Equality Bodies.\textsuperscript{185} include the police.\textsuperscript{187} However an exception to s.29(6) is made by Schedule 3 Paragraph 3 for judicial functions.\textsuperscript{188} The Explanatory Notes of the Act clarify what is meant by judicial function, they provide the following example; "A decision of a judge on the merits of a case would be within the exceptions in this Schedule. An administrative decision of court staff, about which contractor to use to carry out maintenance jobs or which supplier to use when ordering stationery would not be."\textsuperscript{189} This exception means that a migrant would be unable to submit a complaint on the basis that a judge had discriminated against them whilst carrying out their judicial functions. A complaint of this nature could however, be submitted against a police officer who acted in a discriminatory way whilst exercising their public function.

Please provide statistical data about numbers of discrimination cases/complaints submitted to competent bodies (Equality Bodies, Administrative Courts), as well as about their outcomes \textbf{(use the tables in the Annex 8)}

\section*{2.2. Implementation of equal treatment of various permit holders}

Please summarize briefly in this section any key issues affecting the implementation of equal treatment of permit holders, as defined by the following EU legislation; these could be, for example, practical issues and bottlenecks, administrative delays, coordination and cooperation of public authorities, etc.

Please substantiate findings, as far as possible, through formal evaluations, as well as research or studies and case law \textbf{(use template in Annex 9)}. Please bear in mind that no assessment of the \textit{legal transposition} process is required. In regard to the five categories below, please provide \textbf{statistical data} issued in 2014 or valid on 31.12.14. \textbf{(use annex 3)}

\subsection*{2.2.1. Long Term Residence (LTR) status holders (Art.11 of the Directive 2003/109/EC)}

The UK maintains a unique position to EU immigration law and the Common European Asylum System; it is not bound by, nor chooses to participate in, any provisions of the Schengen \textit{acquis}. Under Protocol 19 to the TEU and TFEU, the UK is able to opt in to such provisions at its own discretion.

The UK has not chosen to opt into Directive 2003/109/EC.

2.2.2. **Single-permit procedure** permit holders (Art.12 and 13 of the Directive 2011/98/EU)
The UK has not chosen to opt into Directive 2011/98/EU.

2.2.3. **Blue card** holders (Art.14 and 12 of the Directive 2009/50/EC)
The UK has not chosen to opt into Directive 2009/50/EC.

2.2.4. **Family reunification permit holders** (specifically in terms of access to labour market - Art. 14 of Directive 2003/86/EC)
The UK has not chosen to opt into Directive 2003/86/EC.

2.2.5. **Beneficiaries of international protection long term residence status holders**
The UK has not chosen to opt into Directive 2003/109/EC.

2.3. **Key developments and trends**

Please include in this section key developments in the area of equal treatment and anti-discrimination that concern only migrants and/or their descendants. Key developments may be new legislation or policies, abolition, update, improvement or reform of existing ones, as well as important case law, court, equality body or administrative cases, that have had or may have an impact on the implementation of the anti-discrimination legislation and equal treatment policies that related to the rights of migrants and/or their descendants. Such developments may also affect the actual situation on the ground, including public debates and perceptions among the native population and migrants. The House of Lords Select Committee, *The EU Committee*, has repeatedly communicated to the Government their support for the opt-in of the Long Term Residence Directive and the Family Reunification Directive. The Committee welcomed the substantial content of the Single Permit Directive but did not express a view as to the UK’s opt-in to the directive. Similarly the Committee considered the Blue Card Directive but again did not express an opinion with regard to the UK’s opt-in. Under the UK’s immigration system, persons from outside the EEA or Switzerland who have been offered a skilled job or a job on the shortage occupation list must apply for a Tier 2 (General) visa. A Tier 2 visa allows the recipient to stay for a maximum of five years and 14 days or, if it is shorter, the period of employment provided for in the certificate of sponsorship. The minimum salary requirement for a Tier 2 visa is £20,500. Tier 2 visa holders are able to study, conduct voluntary work and be accompanied by family members as long as they are a dependant and the visa holder is able to support them whilst in the UK. In order to prove a dependant will be supported whilst in the UK, the visa holder must demonstrate that they have had at least £2,205 (£630 to support the dependant and £945 to support the visa holder) in their bank account for a minimum of 90 days. Tier 2 visa holders are not permitted to own shares greater than 10% in their employer’s company, have access to public funds or to

---


apply for a second job prior to commencing work for their sponsor.

Long-term residence is dealt with in the UK by a system that allows an individual from outside the EEA or Switzerland who has been legally and continuously resident for 10 years to apply to settle in the UK. The continuous residence requirement will not be fulfilled if the applicant has, during the 10 year period, left the UK for a period exceeding 180 days in any given year or 540 days in total. All applicants must pass the Life in the UK test and prove sufficient English language skills.

A series of public discussions on developments which are set to (further) inhibit migrants’ rights have produced a variety of responses (some from a key national NGO organisation), as follows:

1. Changes to the ways in which banks process new accounts, will affect newcomers to the UK.¹⁹⁴ New rules for banks and building societies became applicable on the 12 December 2014, so it is too early to still to assess the affect these changes will have on migrants. The Home Office now requires these institutions to check the immigration status of anyone opening a current account in relation to which the applicant is a signatory or is identified as a beneficiary. This also extends to occasions when a person is added as an account holder or a signatory or identified beneficiary in relation to an existing current account. Migrants’ Rights Network [MRN] comments that, “This is a hideous extension of the business of surveillance and monitoring of migrant communities. The large numbers of people of migrant background who are active in the small business sector are likely to find that gaining access to banking and financial services are seriously set back as local banks set about tracking down evidence from a Home Office which still receives very poor marks in terms of responding in a timely fashion to queries concerning its records of immigration status.”

2. MRN run a discussion piece about government changes in the way newcomers are to be processed to assess eligibility.¹⁹⁵ MRN raised concerns that draconian approaches targeting refugees have been mainstreamed, and aggressive bureaucratic measures are now also seen to target migrants, extending a hostile environment to migrants more generally. In order to demonstrate that they have resided in


the UK in accordance with EEA Regulations, an application process has to be commenced. In short, this new system replaced a straightforward application process; with a highly complex and lengthy application form, 120 pages?? [is 120 correct number? Should it be 12 or 20??] in length and one has to be filled in for each member of a family.

3. UN Anti-Racism Day - March 2014.\textsuperscript{196} Strong anti-racists strands of public opinion have been established in the UK over the past several decades, as evidenced on this occasion, The event was commemorated by a mass demonstration in London’s Trafalgar Square. People from all walks of life: civil society leaders, Parliamentarians, Trade Unionists, Community leaders, Faith representatives, campaigners LGBT communities and students came together in the biggest anti-racist demonstration of the year, drawing 10,000 attendees including high profile persons in public office, supporting the event and the message to stamp out anti-racist sentiment.

The Modern Slavery Act 2015\textsuperscript{197}

An important step has been made by the Modern Slavery Act 2015. The aim of the Act is to protect some people who are victims of modern slavery from prosecution for crimes they are forced to commit while under the control of their exploiters. This includes migration-related crimes such as identity document fraud, and crimes commonly involving trafficked labour, such as cannabis production. Smaller steps forward were also made in the area of victims’ legal rights - Section 8 of the Act requires a court to at least consider ordering compensation for a victim, following a conviction of slavery or trafficking. The Act also extends legal aid to victims of forced labour, slavery and servitude, where it was previously only available to trafficking victims.

The passing of this law has generated much discussion. As it has only recently been passed, any real difference the law will make for actual and possible victims of severe exploitation remains to be seen. There are, however, some areas in which the new law has potential to improve the situation of exploited and vulnerable workers (such as those migrants who are domestic workers with tied accommodation; migrants recruited form outside the UK with promised work), who through lack of language skills or a familiarity of UK regulatory

\textsuperscript{196} UK, Stand Up To Racism and Fascism, available at: www.standuptoracism.org.uk/2015/03/high-profile-figures-show-support-for-un-anti-racism-day-demonstration-against-racism-islamophobia-anti-semitism-and-fascism/.

frameworks\textsuperscript{198}, have little understanding of any redress mechanisms available to them. Immediately of benefit, however, is the recognition of the need to prevent further deterioration of sub-standard conditions, that bind them in positions of forced labour (withholding the passport – if they have one), and/or withholding their wages. This definition also turns attention towards personal circumstances that may lead someone to be particularly vulnerable to exploitation. Such circumstances expressly include the victims’ family relationships and mental or physical illness, but also have the potential to include the victims’ immigration status – a common source of vulnerability to forced labour.\textsuperscript{199}

Some concerns have been raised in public discourses, on the amendment to the Act tying the migrant workers to the same employer. A Government aim to control immigration, has been to remove a visa system which was shown to work well and replace it with one that has been condemned as enslaving domestic workers to their employers, by organisations such as Kalayaan\textsuperscript{200} (a human rights group). Furthermore, in a Kalayaan Briefing, Professor Bridget Anderson\textsuperscript{201}, Deputy Director Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford has said of the amendment;

\begin{quote}
It is the tying to their employers which effectively invisibilises migrant domestic workers. To then put the onus on the workers to present themselves to the authorities that at the same time threaten them with illegality is perverse. It seems that the government is only able to see domestic workers as abject victims, as objects, and the solution to their problems envisaged as a combination of rescue and prosecution. Key to the solution to abusive employers is to empower domestic workers and enable them to take their lives into their own hands.
\end{quote}

Furthermore, a legal expert\textsuperscript{202} on exploited migrant workers underscored the above debates regarding the limitations of the Modern Slavery Act with regard to redress mechanisms for exploited and vulnerable

\begin{footnotes}
\item[	extsuperscript{198}] UK, Migration Advisory Committee (2014) Migrants in low-skilled work: The growth of EU and non-EU labour in low-skilled jobs and its impact on the UK, July 2014
\item[	extsuperscript{202}] Caroline Robinson, Policy Director of the organisation, Focus on Labour Exploitation (FLEX), website: www.labourexploitation.org Quotation taken verbatim from telephone and email exchanges (23/04/2015 & 28/04/2015). She has given written permission for her name & organisation to be used, if deemed of use by the FRA.
\end{footnotes}
migrants, informing that their organisation’s main concerns were as follows.

The Immigration Act, Modern Slavery Act and Deregulation Act should be considered together when considering the impact of legal instruments on the rights of migrants and integration more broadly. Such consideration should include the focus of the trafficking definition in the Modern Slavery Act 2015 on travel, the hostile environment for migrants created through the Immigration Act 2014, and the removal in the Deregulation Act 2015, of certain protections to self-employed workers. Each of these measures has the potential to impact migrants' access to fundamental rights in the UK.

### 3. Participation of migrants and their descendants in society

#### 3.1. Political rights at national level

##### 3.1.1. Citizenship acquisition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path to citizenship for foreign born third country nationals (the so-called ‘1st generation’)</th>
<th>Path to citizenship for country-born (so-called ‘2nd generation’) and country-grown migrant children (so-called ‘1.5 generation’).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In this section please provide information about the specific requirements and criteria for citizenship acquisition, if any, that relate to the applicants active participation in society, genuine links or bond to the society or the country, schooling period or other ‘socialization’ requirements.</td>
<td>Applicants for naturalisation are expected to demonstrate English language ability and knowledge of life in the UK before being granted settlement. This can be done either by completing an ESOL course and demonstrating progression from one level to the next, or taking the ‘Life in the UK’ test(^{203}), aimed at ESOL 3 and above. Applicants have 45 minutes to answer 24 questions about British traditions and customs. The current ‘Life in the UK’ publication for citizenship tests includes a wide range of information around every day needs, employment, law and signposting for sources of further help and information.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

The outcome, published in 2012, reflects government positioning with respect to managing (controlling) migration. Some examples of key changes are:

[i] Proposal Consultation Question: Introduce a minimum income requirement for sponsoring a non-EEA national spouse or partner to come to or remain in the UK under the family migration route.

Government response: We will make this change. We will introduce a minimum income requirement of £18,600 for sponsoring a non-EEA spouse or partner, with higher amounts for non-EEA children under the age of 18. For sponsoring a non-EEA spouse/partner and one child, the requirement will be £22,400, with an additional £2,400 for each additional child sponsored before the migrant spouse or partner qualifies for settlement.

[ii] Proposal Consultation Question: Increase the probationary period before settlement for Points Based System dependants from 2 years to 5 years. Only time spent in the UK on a route to settlement would count towards the 5 year probationary period.

Government response: We will make this change. Spouses and partners of migrants under the Points Based System will be required to complete a 5 year probationary period in line with other routes to settlement. They must be in a relationship in the UK with the PBS main applicant for 5 years. Only time spent in the UK on a route to settlement will count towards the 5 year probationary period.

[iii] Proposal Consultation Question: Require adult dependants (aged under 65) under the points based system to understand everyday English before being granted settlement in the UK.

Government response: We will make this change. From Autumn 2013 all applicants for settlement will be required to pass the Life in the UK Test and provide an English language qualification in speaking and listening at B1 level or above of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages when applying for settlement. There will be provision for exemptions in certain specified circumstances.

[iv] Proposal Consultation Question: Prevent family visitors switching into the family route as a dependant relative while in the UK.

Government response: We will make this change. Those in the UK as a visitor will not be able to apply for settlement in the UK as a dependent relative. They will need to apply for a visa from overseas in order to...

---


enter into the family route. Those here on a visit visa must leave at the end of it.

[v] Proposal Consultation Question: It will continue to be important that those staying permanently in the UK have an understanding not just of English language, but also of British life and of the values and principles which underlie British society. These aspects are currently covered by the Life in the UK test or through the Citizenship materials used within the ESOL courses. We will be reviewing this approach and considering whether the integration process would be assisted by changes to the current testing regime.

[vi] Government response: Changes to the testing regime will be introduced to ensure that applicants demonstrate their understanding of both English language and of the principles and values underlying British life. From October 2013 all applicants for settlement will be required to demonstrate an ability to speak and understand English at an intermediate level (B1 level or above of the Common European Framework of Reference for languages) and to take the Life in the UK test.

Civil society responses to it were varied. For instance, the cross party, non-party membership organisation Liberty, were concerned that, “Sections 1-7 of the Consultation … include plans to introduce many more obstacles to settlement for all applicants, whether their relationship is accepted as genuine or not, including more onerous English language requirements, longer probationary periods and higher financial hurdles.”

Children born in the UK after 1 January 1983 are automatically British citizens if one parent was a British citizen or settled in the UK at the time of their birth. Children born in the UK after 1 January 1983 whose parents did not satisfy these conditions at the time of their birth but have become citizens since then can apply to become British citizens, as long as they do so before they are 18. UK-born children whose parents were not UK citizens can apply for citizenship if their first ten years were in the UK and if they spent no more than 90 days per annum outside the UK.

In 2013, 20,484 male and 19,713 female children aged under 16 were granted citizenship (this was close to the annual average since 2009). 207

---


Over the past few years, there have been moves to escalate the use of powers to strip people of their British citizenship and withdraw British passports, particularly in respect of those who may be involved in fighting, extremist activity or terrorist training overseas.\textsuperscript{208}

Under section 40 of the \textit{British Nationality Act 1981}\textsuperscript{209} (as amended), an order to deprive a person of their British citizenship can be made if the Home Secretary is satisfied that:

- It would be conducive to the public good to deprive the person of their British citizenship status and to do so would not render them stateless; or
- The person obtained their citizenship status through naturalisation, and it would be conducive to the public good to deprive them of their status because they have engaged in conduct “seriously prejudicial” to the UK’s vital interests, and the Home Secretary has reasonable grounds to believe that they could acquire another nationality; or
- The person acquired their citizenship status through naturalisation or registration, and it was obtained by means of fraud, false representation or concealment of any material fact.

In the second and third scenarios, a person may be deprived of their British citizenship even if this would leave them stateless. “Conducive to the public good” means depriving in the public interest on the grounds of involvement in terrorism, espionage, serious organised crime, war crimes or unacceptable behaviours.

The power to deprive a naturalised person of their citizenship status and leave them vulnerable to statelessness due to “seriously prejudicial” conduct derives from s.66 of the Immigration Act 2014, which came into effect on 28 July 2014. The Home Secretary also has powers to issue, withdraw and refuse to issue British passports under the Royal Prerogative (an executive power which does not require legislation). The \textit{Counter-Terrorism and Security Bill of 2014-15}\textsuperscript{210} seeks to strengthen powers to seize passports and exclude British nationals from the UK (without extending citizenship deprivation powers). The Bill


Key commentators have questioned how this controversial power would be applied, and whether it undermines the UK’s international obligations. The relation between citizenship and ideals of cohesion, integration and equality, remains unclear. More particularly the aims of citizenship policy are not well defined, in stark contrast to immigration policy. Nevertheless there have been considerable changes to the processes of acquiring formal citizenship, including the introduction of a number of tests. These ostensibly promote citizenship and a sense of belonging, but there is also some evidence that they are making citizenship acquisition more difficult, particularly for certain groups. It seems that a number of, often competing, ideas about what citizenship is and why it should be valued are being brought to bear on acquisition processes. These formal processes are not necessarily able to accommodate all these ideas.

The breaking of the association between settlement and citizenship represents a fundamental break with past practice by attempting to draw a ‘bright line’ between those who have citizenship and those who do not. The sharpening differentiation between citizens and non-citizens is occurring at a time of ‘super-diversity’, when migrants from many different countries are moving to the UK for very different reasons and lengths of stay. They argue that this makes a more flexible approach more desirable, and there is a risk of creating an ever increasing number of people with extremely limited rights. The question of the relation between formal citizenship and Britishness, between belonging to the state and belonging to ‘the community’ is set to continue as a result of such uncertainties.

| Key developments and trends | In October 2013 the Supreme Court ruled on the case of Secretary of State for the Home Department (Appellant) v Al-Jedda (Respondent). The Court held that material consideration of the Secretary of State |

---


cases – here only a simple reference to the case name is required) or new provisions and reforms.

for the Home Department when making the assessment of whether an order would make an individual stateless should be whether at the time of the order the person holds another nationality.

In March 2015 the Supreme Court ruled on the case of Pham (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent), 215 despite the appeal being dismissed with regard to the facts of the case, the Court did clarify that when making the assessment as to whether an individual would be left stateless the Home Secretary must take into account the practice of the government of the individual’s state of origin and not merely the text of the provisions regarding nationality in the law of the respective state. See Annex 9 for details of the case.

In March 2015 the Supreme Court ruled on the case of Pham (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent), 215 despite the appeal being dismissed with regard to the facts of the case, the Court did clarify that when making the assessment as to whether an individual would be left stateless the Home Secretary must take into account the practice of the government of the individual’s state of origin and not merely the text of the provisions regarding nationality in the law of the respective state. See Annex 9 for details of the case.

Please indicate key and/or milestone dates – e.g. of major reforms - regarding citizenship acquisition for migrants and/or their descendants.

In 2013 reforms to the ‘Life in the UK Test’ were announced by the then Minister of State for Immigration, Mark Harper. The new test and accompanying handbook now focuses on “British culture, history and traditions as well as the events and people who have helped make Britain a great place to live”. 216 The test no longer contains questions on the more practical aspects of life in the UK, such as public transport, banking and applying for jobs. These have been replaced with questions on the “values and principles at the heart of being British”. The changes were said to be made in line with ongoing reforms to the immigration system with the overall goal of reducing net migration to the UK which implies that the test was being changed in order to make it harder to pass. The new test has been dubbed as impractical, inconsistent and trivial in a report 217 by Dr Thom Brooks of Durham University. The report also criticised the handbook for not giving clear information about how the questions would be formatted, how many correct answers are required to pass and the distribution of questions between chapters. 218

The major reform in recent years regarding citizenship regards the deprivation of citizenship rather than the acquisition of it. The Secretary of State for the Home Department (SSHD) had existing powers under s.40 the British Nationality Act 1981 219 to deprive an individual of their citizenship if they have either obtained it by fraud, false representation or concealment of a material fact or where the SSHD is satisfied that doing so is conducive to the public good.

---


and where that individual would not be rendered stateless as a result. Section 66 of the Immigration Act 2014 amended the 1981 to allow for, in certain circumstances, the SSHD to deprive a person of their citizenship regardless of whether they will be rendered stateless or not. The SSHD can do so if the individual acquired their citizenship through naturalisation and conducted themselves in a manner seriously prejudicial to the vital interests of the UK. The SSHD must also have reasonable grounds to believe that the person is able, under the law of a country or territory outside the UK, to become a national of such a country or territory. In making the assessment as to the conduct of the individual the SSHD may take into account the manner in which a person conducted themselves prior to the coming into force of the 2014 Act. A decision made under this provision was challenged in the case of Pham (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) which is further outlined in Annex 9.

Section 65 of the 2014 Act allows for persons born before 1 July 2006 to a British father but whose parents were unmarried.

| Naturalisation rate - % of migrants that have been naturalized compared to migrant stock and to general population – listing the most numerous groups on the basis of their previous nationality, by gender and age-group if available. Please provide the latest available data. The most recent data provided by Eurostat concern the year 2012. | Grants of Citizenship

| All grants, 2013 | 207,989 |
| Naturalisation based on residence | 113,339 |
| Naturalisation based on marriage | 46,301 |
| Registration of minor children related to a British citizen or on a discretionary basis | 44,275 |
| Registration on other grounds | 4,074 |
| % on basis of residence | 54.5 |
| % on basis of marriage | 22.3 |
| % grants to minors | 21.3 |
| % grants for other reasons | 2.0 |

The latest figures for the number of people in the UK born in each country of the world and of each nationality (derived from the Annual Population

---


Survey) are for the calendar year 2013, published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS) on 28 August 2014. The total population of the UK in 2013 was 62.566 million. Of this, 7.78 million (12.4%) had been born outside the UK, with 2.67 million (4.3%) born elsewhere in the EU28 and 5.1 million (8.2%) born outside the EU. The percentage of the usually resident population born outside the UK was 13.6% in England, 6.8% in Scotland, 6.6% in Northern Ireland and 5.4% in Wales. The number of people with non-British nationality was 4.9 million (7.8%), of whom 2.5 million (4%) had a non-UK EU28 nationality and 2.39 million (3.8%) had non-EU nationality. The percentage of the population who were non-UK nationals was 8.4% in England, 5.4% in Northern Ireland, 5.1% in Scotland and 3.4% in Wales.

India was the most common non-UK country of birth in 2013, with 734,000 usual residents of the UK born in India (1.2%), followed by Poland (679,000 or 1.1%), Pakistan (579,000 or 0.8%), the Republic of Ireland (376,000 or 0.6%) and Germany (297,000 or 0.5%). Polish is the most common non-British nationality in 2013, with 726,000 (1.2%) usual residents of the UK having Polish nationality. The next largest are India (330,000, 0.5%), the Republic of Ireland (329,000, 0.5%), Pakistan (193,000, 0.3%) and Lithuania (156,000, 0.2%). Less than half (46.9%) of people born outside the EU have non-EU nationality, but 93.8% of those born elsewhere in the EU have non-UK nationality. In 2013, 3.2 million people born abroad had British nationality. Just over half (56.4%) of Indian-born people had British nationality, but only 4.6% of those born in Poland had British nationality.

The number of non-UK born usual residents of the UK increased by 2.5 million between 2004 and 2013. The number of people born in India increased by 232,000 over the same period. The number born in the A8 countries increased from 167,000 to 689,000 between 2004 and 2008, while the number of people born in the AQ2 countries was 180,000 in 2013. The number of UK usual residents with Polish nationality increased by 657,000 between 2004 and 2013.

Numbers of naturalisations and citizenship acquisitions in the last 2 years (in 2013 and in 2014) by mode of acquisition, by gender and age-group if available, and for the 10 most numerous groups on the basis of their previous nationality Please provide the latest available statistics - (please use the relevant table in the Annex 6)

3.1.2. National elections voting rights - turnout

Third county nationals are allowed in exceptional cases to vote in national elections. In this section please provide the

We will not be able to fully update the FRA with the planned 2015 General Election information on candidates until September. The UCL Parliamentary Candidates UK project is creating a database of

---

specific requirements and criteria for participation of citizens of migrant background (and third country nationals in the very few cases where this is foreseen) in national elections, as well as any available data on their voting turnout. Please specify any differences in different geographic areas or by type of national level voting circumstances (e.g. parliament, referendum, president of the republic etc.). In addition to official data and also if such data are not available, make reference to any relevant quantitative or qualitative academic research concerning the exercise of the right to vote and related drivers and barriers.

A key national NGO organisation, the Migrants Rights Network\textsuperscript{230} promotes the integration of migrants via a range of initiatives across the UK. One is to promote a greater representation of migrants in the field of politics. Part of its remit is to:

- Strengthening local voices at national level.

---

\textsuperscript{227} UK, University College London Parliamentary Candidates UK Project, ‘Data Download’, available at: \url{http://parliamentarycandidates.org/data/data-download/}.

\textsuperscript{228} UK, The Electoral Commission, ‘Who is eligible to vote at a UK general election?’, available at: \url{www.electoralcommission.org.uk/faq/voting-and-registration/who-is-eligible-to-vote-at-a-uk-general-election/}.


\textsuperscript{230} UK, Migrants’ Rights Network, ‘Who are we’, available at: \url{www.migrantsrights.org.uk/about}. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Party</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Indian</th>
<th>Pakis</th>
<th>Banglad</th>
<th>Canib</th>
<th>African</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lib-Dem</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (unweighted)</td>
<td>2805</td>
<td>2787</td>
<td>587</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N of voters</td>
<td>2125</td>
<td>1768</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>298</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
encouraging the exercise of the right to vote.

- Raise awareness among government and those in the public sphere about migrant interests and needs so that they can be involved in debates about migration.

MRN’s work has identified that top 20 constituencies in London are where the migrant vote could be decisive in the marginal seats in the 2015 General Election. MRN has a campaign which engages with a wide range of migrant communities and enables them to participate in politics, by attending Hustings (meetings at which candidates in an election address potential voters). One such example was a trip organised as part of a wide-ranging programme of work that aims to get British Somalis to register to vote in the run-up to the 2015 General Election.

The website AboutHumanRights provides a range of information for migrants (and other groups in need of specialised advice). It is manned by solicitors, and also offers an online facility where any question on a range of topics which will be answered quite swiftly. These provide signposting needs to other services or also explain aspects of the law in relation to human rights.

Operation Black Vote (OBV) is the major organisation in the UK seeking to promote the political status of Black and Minority Ethnic groups. It campaigns to increase the representation of Black and Minority Ethnic people in the electoral system. There are four strands to its work:

1. Political education: raising awareness and understanding of democratic and civic society through citizenship projects.
2. Political participation: Improving engagement with civic society through local and national voter registration and other civic participation campaigns.
3. Political representation: Increasing political representation of black and minority ethnic communities, through encouraging engagement; undertaking mentoring schemes and lobbying political parties and civic institutions on the benefits of representative bodies.

---


234 UK, About Human Rights, ‘Ask Our Experts…’, available at: [www.abouthumanrights.co.uk/AskOurExpertsCategory.html](http://www.abouthumanrights.co.uk/AskOurExpertsCategory.html).


OBV runs a range of programmes (e.g. MP, magistrate and councillor ‘shadowing’ schemes) designed to give people from Black and Minority Ethnic backgrounds the experience to campaign successfully for these roles and to undertake them.\(^{236}\)

### 3.1.3. National level election – representation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The number of <strong>candidates</strong> with migrant background (where available, specify own or parent’s country of birth) at the latest national level elections (specify date).</th>
<th>There were 131 candidates from ethnic minorities for the three main parties - Conservative, Labour and Liberal Democrat parties across Great Britain at the 2010 General Election.(^{237}) There is only limited availability of information at this stage more will be released in September (please see note above). We do however have some limited information to submit now, from a House of Commons briefing Paper(^{238}) issued a few days ago (18(^{th}) May). On page 10 it notes, “There is a record 42 black and minority-ethnic MPs in the House of Commons, a rise on the 27 BME MPs of 2010.”(^{239})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic minority electoral representation</strong>(^{240}):</td>
<td>House of Commons: The first ethnic minority MP was Dadabhai Naoroji, a British Indian elected in 1892, serving as Liberal member for Finsbury Central until 1895. Prior to the 2015 General Election, there were 27 serving ethnic minority MPs, the longest-serving being Diane Abbot and Keith Vaz, both Labour MPs elected in 1987. There are 11 Conservative and 16 Labour serving ethnic minority MPs. The most common ethnic group is Pakistani or British Pakistani (8), followed by those of African heritage or mixed white and African heritage (7) and Indian or British Indian or (5). A further 3 are East African Asians and only 2 are of Caribbean heritage. The Labour Party has 53 candidates in the 2015 General Election of Black and Minority Ethnic heritage.(^{241})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


House of Lords: The first ethnic minority member of the House of Lords was Satyendra Prasanno Sinha (1st Baron Sinha) a British Indian Liberal Party peer from 1919 to 1928 (when he died). There are currently 53 ethnic minority peers, 15 of which are Labour, 12 Conservative, 8 Liberal and 18 Crossbenchers (4 who had previously been Labour and 2 Conservative). There are 17 of Indian or British Indian and 7 of Pakistani heritage.

European Parliament: Following the 2014 elections, there were 7 ethnic minority MEPs, 4 Conservative, 2 Labour and 1 UKIP. Of these, 3 are British Pakistani. The first was Mark Hendrick, a British Somalian who was Labour MEP for Central Lancashire between 1994 and 1999.

London Assembly: There are 5 ethnic minority assembly members, two of whom are British Indian. Of these, 4 are Labour and 1 Conservative.

Devolved parliaments: There are two ethnic minority members of the Welsh Assembly, two ethnic minority members of the Scottish Parliament (both Pakistani), and one ethnic minority member of the Northern Ireland Assembly (Hong Kong Chinese).

Ethnic minority representation in public life

**Police**

There were 6,537 FTE minority ethnic officers in the 43 English and Welsh police forces as of March 2013, 5.0% of total strength. The forces with the highest representation are the Metropolitan Police, with 10.5% minority ethnic officers, the West Midlands (8.3%), British Transport Police (7.5%) and Leicestershire (7.1%).

Despite the improvement in their overall representation in the ranks of the police, minority ethnic officers remain under-represented in the highest ranks, with only 3.3% of officers at Chief Inspector or above being from an ethnic minority, compared with 5.2% of Constables, the lowest rank.

**Judicial Statistics**

The 2013 figures from the Judiciary of England and Wales show that 4.8% of the total judicial workforces are of ethnic minority backgrounds. However, the figures differ between grades. The most ethnic diverse grade at 7.6% of the workforce is Deputy District Judges for Magistrate Courts. Some less diverse judicial workforces such as Masters, Registrars and District judges have a 0% BME population.

---

Armed forces
7.1% of the total service men and women in the regular forces are from ethnic minority backgrounds. However, only 2.4% of the officer ranks come from ethnic minorities, compared to 8.1% of other ranks.

National Health Service
The latest figures from the NHS staff census show that 41% of hospital and community service doctors are from ethnic minorities, although the proportion falls to 31% for the highest staff grade of consultant. Likewise 20% of all qualified nursing, midwifery and health visiting staff are from ethnic minorities, but only 6% of nurse consultants and 7% of matrons are from ethnic minorities.

National Fire and Rescue Service
Operational figures from the fire and rescue authorities in England show that in 2012, the proportion of ethnic minority staff was 3.8%; up from 3.2% in 2007. The total number of uniformed staff from ethnic minority backgrounds had increased from 1,200 in 2007, to 1,400 in 2012.

Ministerial Appointments
Statistics by the Commissioner for Public Appointments show that in 2012/13 5.5% of appointments were given to those from ethnic minority background. This figure has decreased from the previous year of 2011/12 where 7.2% of appointments were given to people from an ethnic minority.

3.2. Political rights at regional/local level

Regional/Local elections voting rights – turnout

Commonwealth citizens have the right to vote in all UK elections, including parliamentary elections. EU citizens can only vote in local government and EU parliament elections. Other foreign nationals do not have the right to vote. 244

To be eligible to stand as a local councillor, a candidate needs to be at least 18 years old and a British, Commonwealth, Irish or EU citizen. In addition to this, at least one of the following requirements also apply: being registered to vote in the area; renting or owning land or premises in the area for the whole of the last 12 months; have a main job in the area during the last 12 months; have lived in the area for the whole of the

| Key and/or milestone dates regarding the voting and/or election rights for migrants and/or their descendants at regional/local level | The 1992 Maastricht Treaty imposed reciprocity inside the European Union concerning voting rights in local elections; this already existed for the European elections. It was ratified in the UK in November 1993. The 1918 Representation of the People Act gave the right to vote to all British subjects. The right of Commonwealth citizens to vote in General Elections derives from this. |
| Please indicate any programmes or information campaigns aiming at informing citizens of migrant background about their political rights and encouraging the exercise of the right to vote. | The Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JWCI) undertakes much policy work and information campaigns. It works with organisations and individuals, to try to affect change in law and policy in its campaigning work. This work is collaborative and informed by JCWI’s casework experience and policy output; in this way it combines ongoing legal work with campaigning. Vote you are home! Campaign. The aims are: to increase voter education and turnout and to eliminate voter participation barriers amongst EU and Non-EU citizens in Northern Ireland. Northern Ireland political candidates were asked 3 questions (on value that (Polish) migrants contribute to Northern Irish society; the 4 freedoms and the UK’s membership of the EU; and racially motivated attacks on Polish against migrant). |
| In addition to official data and also if such data are not available, make reference to any relevant quantitative or qualitative academic research concerning the exercise of the right to vote and related drivers and barriers. | The Ethnic Minority British Election Study (BES) following the 2010 General Election found that 78% of ethnic minority people were registered to vote at the sampled address although the proportion was significantly lower among Black Africans (59%). In comparison, 90% of White British sampled in the main BES (90%) were registered. Black-Africans were least likely to be eligible to vote, but there was also some ignorance about right to vote in people with Commonwealth citizenship. Amongst those registered, |

---

turnout rates for ethnic minorities were similar to those for white people.  

3.2.2. Regional/local level election – representation

| The number of candidates that were third country nationals and/or with migrant background at the latest regional/local level elections (specify date) | There is no elected tier of regional government, and hence no regional elections in the UK – there are only UK, devolved administration and local government elections. The only systematic information on the ethnic and national background of local politicians is from periodic surveys, reported below.

The Elections Centre at Plymouth University has undertaken eight surveys of local election candidates, the latest being undertaken in 2013. The report states that it is a national survey, but does not state which countries of the UK are covered. Some of the questions imply that Wales was included. The 2013 survey provides data about the types of people that seek election to local councils, their motives for standing and their activities during the election campaign. A total of 9,950 candidates were contacted and combining the numbers that responded online and by post the survey produced 1,989 usable replies. This is a response rate of 20%. “Virtually all (98%) candidates that stood in 2013 describe their ethnic origin as white”. The ethnic breakdown of candidates was: White British 95%, White Irish 1.1% and Other White 2.1%. The percentage of candidates who were from ethnic minorities by party was: Conservative (1.5%), Labour (2.3%), Liberal Democrat (1.0%), Green (2.5%), UKIP (2.2%), Other minor and Independent (6.9%), All (2.2%).

The number and % of elected representatives with migrant background at regional/local level (e.g. municipalities, regions, prefectures etc.) | In England, the Local Government Association 2013 Census of Councillors in England is the most recent source of information on the ethnicity of local government councillors.  

The gender profile, ethnic origin, disability status and caring responsibilities of local government councillors have changed very little between 2001 and 2013. In 2013, 67.3 per cent of councillors were male (compared with 70.7 per cent in 2001) and 96 per cent were of white ethnic origin (97.3 per cent). In 2010,  

---

96.3 per cent of councillors were white and 3.7 per cent were from other ethnic backgrounds. In 2008, these figures were 96.6 per cent and 3.4 per cent respectively. All of the councillors from the Green Party and the UK Independence Party were white. Of the main political parties, the Conservatives had the smallest proportion of representatives who were from other ethnic backgrounds (1.5 per cent), followed by the Liberal Democrats (2.3 per cent). The Labour Party had the highest proportion of representatives from other ethnic backgrounds (9.2 per cent). These figures were similar to those reported in 2010. A greater proportion of councillors in London boroughs were from minority ethnic backgrounds (15.7 per cent) than was the case in England as a whole. Councillors in the North East and South West were most likely to be white (100.0 per cent and 99.2 per cent respectively) than in any other region. The ethnic breakdown of councillors was broadly similar in all regions of England except London, where 84.3 per cent of councillors were white and 15.7 per cent were from other ethnic backgrounds.

London:
10 per cent of London’s MPs, 15 per cent of London’s councillors and 16 per cent of Assembly members are from black, Asian and ethnic minority (BAME) communities.254

Birmingham
Around 40% of councillors are from ethnic minorities.255

Scotland
After the 2012 council election, across Scotland’s 32 councils, there were only 17 ethnic minority councillors elected from the 1,223 seats available, or 1.4% of the total. None are black (i.e. of African or African-Caribbean descent), and few occupy seats outside west central Scotland. There are only 2 ethnic minority Members of the Scottish Parliament, 1.5% of the total, both of whom are Asian. 256

In Glasgow, which is the country’s most ethnically diverse city, there are now eight Asian councillors. Six are from Labour, two SNP; none are Chinese or black.

Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>The number of ethnic minority Welsh Assembly Members after each election was: 2 in 1999, 1 in 2003, 0 in 2007 and 0 in 2011.257</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The most recent information on the ethnicity of local government councillors is for 2004258. In 2004, 99.2% of councillors who responded to the National Census of Local Authority Councillors were white and 0.8% were from an ethnic minority background. Within this, 0.3% of councillors were from a Mixed background, 0.3% from an Asian background and 0.2% from a Black background. In 2001, 1% of councillors were from an ethnic minority background. This survey has not been repeated since 2004. Ethnic minority councillors have a shorter average length of service than White councillors, and more do additional work – 100 per cent were school governors. The Welsh Assembly Government has worked with Operation Black Vote to increase awareness and understanding of its activities amongst ethnic minority communities, but currently there are no ethnic minority Assembly Members.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>The Assembly elections of both 2007 and 2011 yielded only 1 ethnic minority Assembly Member.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No information is available on the ethnic background of local government councillors found for Scotland and Northern Ireland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those who were elected or appointed to a high public office (e.g. mayor, vice mayor etc.) by end of 2014.</td>
<td>Mayoral elections are a recent innovation in the UK. Only 5 mayoral elections were held in 2014, with one successful candidate (Lutfur Rahman in Tower Hamlets, a Bangladeshi) from an ethnic minority. However Rahman has since been disqualified as a result of electoral malpractice (vote-rigging, seeking spiritual influence through local imams and wrongly branding his Labour rival a racist).260 Operation Black Vote provides profiles of some ethnic minority politicians and campaigners. 261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Please identify related limitations and challenges or public debates, as well as relevant research, studies and assessments.

The main debates are around perceived under-representation of ethnic minority politicians. See the activities of Operation Black Vote aimed at increasing the number of ethnic minority people in political roles (e.g. by councillor shadowing schemes and mentoring).262

The Centre for Population Change [CPC], undertook research on Polish migrants in Scotland, which looked at their voting behaviours and engagement in the Scottish independence referendum.263 Key findings were:

- Despite Poles having the right to participate and vote in both sub-national elections in the UK and national elections in Poland, most of those asked vote in one or the other, not both
- 84% of those surveyed stated that they would participate in the 18 September 2014 referendum
- The uncertainty of Scotland and the UK’s future membership of the EU and Polish migrants’ residence rights in a potentially independent Scotland were significant issues for all participants
- The majority of survey participants indicated that the outcome of the referendum will not have an impact on their settlement plans.

The NISMP organises the Policy Seminar Series - Migration in Post-Accession Northern Ireland, featuring academics, practitioners, and politicians to encourage dialogue and debate across public, academic and voluntary sectors and generate questions for future research. In May 2014, it ran, "We ARE the Electorate!: Engaging Migrants and BME groups in the political system."264

This seminar aimed to challenge the perception that ‘newcomer’ and BME communities are not active members of political constituencies. It examined how BME and migrant groups participate in the political process in Northern Ireland, their relationships with political parties, public consultations and elected representatives. It features presentations on the newly formed BME parliament, the role of representative agencies in political integration. The seminar ended with an open discussion and debate with the panel, on how to translate voter registration and political interest into full political incorporation – exploring issues with politics in a divided society and the language of ‘two communities’ in NI political culture.


### 3.3. Consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.3.1. Consultative bodies at national/regional/local level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultative bodies</strong> are meant to provide a link between the government and immigrant communities, a forum for dialogue, an opportunity for the community to express their opinions on issues affecting them and a way to encourage integration into the community. Some consultative bodies are focused solely on integration policy, while others work on a wide range of issues including those related to all ethnic minorities (including those resident in the UK), and diversity issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there any migrants’ consultative bodies in place at national / regional/local level foreseen and/or operational in practice? Since when and on which legal basis (please provide reference). Please specify whether migrants' consultative/advisory/representative bodies are established by law or other type of normative regulation, policy or practice.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Consultative body</strong></th>
<th><strong>Description</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reference</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>The Migration Advisory Committee (MAC) was established in 2007; it is an independent, non-statutory, non-time limited, non-departmental public body that advises the government on migration issues, and is sponsored by the Home Office. It is not established by law.</td>
<td><a href="#">1</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>Wales Strategic Migration Partnership (WSMP) is funded by Welsh Government (Inclusion Grant) and the Home Office (Enabling Grant) and is based at the Welsh Local Government Association. It is not established by law.</td>
<td><a href="#">2</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>COSLA (the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) is the representative voice of Scottish local authorities. COSLA's Migration, Population and Diversity team has responsibility for policy issues relating to migration to Scotland in all its forms (including asylum seekers and refugees), human trafficking, population and demographic change, and also provides oversight of equality and human rights issues. It is not established by law.</td>
<td><a href="#">3</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Ireland</td>
<td>Northern Ireland Strategic Migration Partnership (NISM) is a multi-agency, cross-party and cross-departmental body working to reflect the regionally specific needs of Northern Ireland in the development and implementation of UK immigration policy. It is not established by law. NISM is an independent body made up of relevant stakeholders. It is hosted by its stakeholders.</td>
<td><a href="#">4</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**References:**


 lead partner, Northern Ireland Local Government Agency (NILGA), and is funded by the UK Border Agency.

The non-governmental Equality and Diversity Forum, an umbrella group of the main civil-society organisations working on issues surrounding migrant inclusion and integration, has started to work in this area. It has a wide range of member organisations, as well as many observer organisations.

What is the mandate of the body – duration and procedures? In particular specify if and by which modalities these bodies are competent to participate in consultations only on migration or integration issues or if they participate also in consultations on other issues? How do these bodies work in practice?

[1] England – The MAC is responsible for providing transparent, independent and evidence-based advice to the government on migration issues. Reports cover issues including:
• the impacts of immigration
• the limits on immigration under the points based system
• skills shortages within occupations
MAC is made up of a chair and 5 other independent economists, who have been appointed under rules relating to public appointments laid down by the Office of the Commissioner for Public Appointments (OCPA). Additionally, the Commission for Employment and Skills and the Home Office are represented on the committee. Its remit is to undertake consultations on migrant-related issues.

[2] Wales - WMP is a partnership organisation aimed at providing an enabling function and a strategic leadership, independent, advisory and consultative body on migration in Wales. This allows sharing of expertise, diverse range of views and vital information minimising adverse impacts and maximising the benefits of migration. Broadly, WSMP’s role is to:
• Enable strategic and political oversight on asylum, refugee and economic migration issues in Wales
• Ensure positive local delivery and promotion of community cohesion.
• Monitor migration impacts and trends, and raise awareness of issues, risks and opportunities with the regional/national area to inform policy.
• Respond to national consultations.
• Contribute to the development and implementation of local and national migration policy.
• Work with local delivery partners designing/overseeing delivery of services meet migrants’ needs.

[3] Scotland - COSLA Strategic Migration Partnership (CSMP) is a function of the Migration, Population and Diversity team. It works with partners from across the public, private and voluntary sector as a means of ensuring that Scotland is a welcoming place for new

---


270 UK, Migration Advisory Committee (MAC), available at: [https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/migration-advisory-committee/about#responsibilities](https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/migration-advisory-committee/about#responsibilities).

migrants. Key partners include Scottish local authorities, the Home Office, the Scottish Government and a host of other stakeholders with an interest in migration issues in Scotland. It follows a range of strategic objectives. Key examples are (full list can be accessed here)²⁷².

1. To develop a tripartite approach to migration, working between local government, Scottish Government and UK Border Agency.
2. To develop an evidence base on the impact of migration in order to enhance the public policy response to migration in Scotland.

[4] Northern Ireland- THE NISMP's²⁷³ remit:
The NISMP works across spheres of government, private and voluntary sectors in the region to ensure that Northern Ireland is a welcoming place for migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, and supports the retention and integration of people in a way which meets skills and labour requirements to support future economic growth. The Partnership tries to ensure that Northern Ireland's needs and concerns with regards to immigration are recognised within the constraints of a UK-wide strategy. It plays a strategic leadership, advisory, and co-ordination role for migration in the region.

Frequency of convening of the body/ies/meetings with competent public authorities. What is foreseen and how is it implemented in practice?
This type of information is not made available to the public by all bodies. Any new developments are made publicly available via website or social media outlets. COSLA [Scotland] provides some details on its website.²⁷⁴

Role in relation to other public or private bodies. Is there a statutory role of coordination and cooperation with other public or private stakeholders foreseen? How is this implemented in practice?
Regional Strategic Migration Partnerships were originally established to deal specifically with asylum issues, RSMPs now take on the full remit of migration. There are 12 regional strategic migration partnerships across England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. These partnerships address the concerns of each locality, working with communities, local government, service providers and voluntary and community organisations to ensure that the specific needs of those areas relating to migration are met. Each partnership is different in its make-up, staff team, funding streams and programme of work. Regional Migration Partnerships across the UK have been involved in:
Dissemination and interpretation of Home Office news and information as part of monthly newsletters on migration issues which includes:
1) ‘Myth-buster’ leaflets dispelling popular myths about migration and migrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation in decision-making (consultative, observer status, voting right etc.). Are such bodies competent to participate in decision-making at national/regional/local level in regard to the design, implementation, assessment and/or review of integration-specific, migration or other policies of general interest? Are such bodies and/or their representatives participating in any way to allocation, distribution, monitoring, evaluation or management of funding social inclusion and integration policies, measures and programmes at national level?</th>
<th>The Community Life Survey for 2013-14 found that two-fifths (40%) of people from ethnic minority groups reported that they felt able to influence decisions affecting their local area, compared with a third (33%) of White people. The reason for this difference is probably because of the spatial concentration of the ethnic minority population, ethnic minorities having more involvement with bodies representing their interests and their relatively greater influence in a small geographical area. The white majority do not feel an equivalent close connection to “communities” or “community leaders” and are probably more likely to interact with the state on an individual basis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the modalities for representation and participation of migrants, e.g. elections, designation etc.? What is foreseen and how is it implemented in practice?</td>
<td>This will be completed with data from the upcoming General Election in May. As noted above, under Section 3.1.2., we will not be able to update the FRA with planned 2015 General Election information on candidates until September. The UCL Parliamentary Candidates UK project is...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

creating a database of candidates with information on their characteristics including detailed ethnicity. Unfortunately, they don’t plan to make their data available until later this year.\(^{276}\)

No separate provision is made in the political system for migrants or ethnic minorities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On which criterion are migrant groups represented (migrant status, foreign-born, foreign nationality etc.)? What is foreseen and how is it implemented in practice?</th>
<th>Periodically “community leaders” and prominent minority organisations (e.g. the Muslim Council of Britain(^{277})) are consulted by government over particular issues – e.g. the development of the PREVENT strategy(^{278}).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

See evaluation sheet - this section is mainly still under research. There will also be new data available after this year’s General Election in May. Some information has been supplied. Please see new comment above.

Race Card is published by Runnymede\(^{279}\), the UK’s leading race equality think tank. Runnymede is increasingly creating spaces where individuals can feel empowered to tackle racial inequality. Race Card is the continuation of Runnymede’s Bulletin magazine, which has been an authoritative analysis of race relations in the UK over the past 45 years. It is produced by a mixture of journalists, bloggers, politicians and academics, who provide a nuanced view on race in the UK. Runnymede’s Race and Elections report, \(^{280}\) Race and Elections: How the Ethnic Minority Vote Could Decide the Next Prime Minister, examines black and minority ethnic (BME) voting patterns in past and present elections. \(^{281}\)

A 2015 BBC/Comres poll of Muslims in Britain found that only 55% felt that the Muslim Council of Britain represented their views. \(^{282}\)

---


### 3.4 Participation in trade-unions and professional association

In this section based on available data, research, surveys, studies, etc. please provide information about:

**Membership and participation of migrant workers in workers’ unions and craft associations:**

See evaluation sheet. Information was sought from the Trades Union Congress (TUC)\(^{283}\) in order to complete this section. Everyone working in the UK has the right to join a trades union.\(^{284}\) However, some practical barriers limit this opportunity for migrants. Statistics of trade union membership by non-British workers are presented below.

Many migrants work in sectors which are under represented by trade unions, such as food processing, hospitality and cleaning. An increase in precarious job creation in the UK has added to this trend. Many migrant workers in such sectors are from the EU. Additionally A8 and A2 migrant employment is more concentrated in towns and villages where there is a weaker trade union presence than in municipal centres. This can mean that many migrant workers in rural areas are unaware of their options or simply do not know how to access them. This is often exacerbated by poor public transport connections between rural areas and larger cities. An additional problem for workers in these sectors is that employees often segregate workers by language group limiting their opportunities to organise collectively. Additional language often creates a barrier for migrant workers of different backgrounds being able to communicate with one another, the TUC has created *Working in the UK - a guide to your rights*\(^{285}\) which is available in 13 languages to try and eliminate this problem.

Another practical limitation to migrants joining trade unions is the often temporary nature of their employment which may deter them from joining a union particularly if they do know how long they will be employed for.

Financial cuts made by the current government have also created practical limitations to migrant access to trade unions. In 2010 the Union Modernisation Fund (UMF)\(^{286}\) was terminated. From its establishment in...

---


2004 up to its termination in 2010 the UMF the fund provided financial assistance to trade unions for innovative projects which aimed at speeding up union adaption to a changing labour market. Examples of migrant facing projects funded by the UMF are Unite’s Migrant Workers Support Unit and Unison’s Migrant Worker Participation Project. 2010 also saw cuts in funding to Jobcentres and the Citizens Advice Bureaux for distributing information on how to join a trade union. Already isolated by location and language the absence of this information makes it even harder for migrant’s to engage with unions.

Do workers’ associations encourage and support membership and participation of migrant workers? E.g. through information and raising awareness initiatives in more languages, translation and language support services etc.

A research study funded by the Leverhulme Trust287 into trade union engagement with migrant workers concluded that “the trade union movement has had some success in engaging with migrant workers in the workplace, through organising and learning strategies, and has also engaged in campaigns around promoting the rights and position of BME workers within trade unions and in the workplace”.288 However, the authors point out that: “outlining the role of unions in enhancing the economic and social conditions of immigrant communities is difficult because many established activities tend to affect individuals within the constituency represented, irrespective of their social background.” (p5).

What is the rate of participation (figures and % of association members, figures and % of migrant professionals as members, or descriptive data if statistical data is not available) of migrant workers in the most representative workers’ unions and associations? Please specify the geographic and workforce range/type of associations (referring to national, regional, local and to the range of workers represented and degree of association).

Trades union membership289

About 27% of UK born employees were members of a trade union in 2012, compared with 19% for non-UK born employees. The proportion of employees who were trade union members was highest in Black or Black British ethnic group at around 28% in 2012, compared with 26% for all employees. The Chinese and Other Ethnic group had the lowest proportion of union members at just 17% in 2012. Higher proportions of female employees belonged to a trade union than males for all ethnic groups, with the exception of Chinese and Other. The largest difference was within the Asian or Asian British ethnic group. In 2012, the proportion of female Asian employees who belonged to a trade union was around 24%, compared with around 15% for male employees (these estimates are derived from the UK Labour Force Survey – the report cited is the only place where these estimates are published).

Trade union density by personal, work and job characteristics, 2012 (% of each group, not seasonally adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>All</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All employees</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Asian British</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or Black British</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese or other ethnic group</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK, British</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of Birth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Migrant workers can be representatives of trade unions and workers’ or craft associations. Though no quantitative information is available, there are numerous examples, such as Bill Morris. Born in Jamaica, he was General Secretary of the Transport and General Workers' Union from 1992 to 2003, and the first black leader of a British trade union. 290

The UCU is one of the organisations backing a new poster campaign aimed at countering anti-immigrant rhetoric that can be found in some parts of the media and political debate in the run-up291 to the 2015 General Election. A series of posters was rolled out leading up to the general election on billboards throughout the country and at national rail stations and in London tube stations. The posters featured 15 immigrants from different parts of the country with varied occupations and nationalities. The posters all carried the message 'I am an Immigrant' and had a simple line outlining their contribution to British society. The posters included mental health nurses,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there differences between associations for high and low skill workers, different industries and trades, and/or different geographic area of country of origin, citizenship or birth or gender?</td>
<td>Part 7 of the Equality Act 2010 prohibits discrimination on a number of grounds, including nationality, with regards to the application to and membership of an association. An association is defined by s.107 as &quot;an association of persons – (a) which has at least 25 members, and (b) admission to membership of which is regulated by the association’s rules and involves a process&quot;. Associations must not have less favourable conditions for membership. For example, they cannot charge a higher membership rate for persons that share a protected characteristic, nor can they refuse membership on such grounds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and participation of migrant entrepreneurs and expert professionals to professional and scientific associations:</td>
<td>Are there any legal or practical limitations or barriers for the membership of migrant workers in professional, employer and scientific associations (such as medical, engineer, bar associations)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do professional associations encourage and support membership and participation of migrant professionals? E.g. through information and raising awareness initiatives in more languages, translation and language support services etc.</td>
<td>Getting involved in UCU - a course for black members new to activism? This course is aimed at new black activists and members who are keen to get involved with their branch and the wider union. The course will also contain a CPD (continuing professional development) session around leadership and mentoring. In UCU the word black is used in a political sense to describe people who self-identify as belonging to a visible minority (more usually from an Asian or African heritage) with a shared experience or understanding of discrimination. This new one day course is specifically designed for UCU black members who are interested in becoming more involved with UCU. The course will also include a leadership CPD session. This course will cover: · Issues and positive solutions - becoming active in UCU locally · Leadership and mentoring a professional development session · UCU campaigns, how new members can get involved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the rate of participation and membership (figures and % of association members, figures and % of migrant professionals as members, or descriptive data if statistical data is not available) of migrant professionals in the</td>
<td>These questions cannot be answered from published information. The only source of information on trade union membership is the Labour Force Survey. This does not ask the name of the union or association of which the individual is a member. Bespoke analysis of individual responses to the survey would enable patterns for workers of different skill levels from</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### 3.5. Participation in social, cultural and public life

In this section based on available data, research, studies, etc. provide information about the membership and participation of migrants and their descendants in media, cultural organisations and public life:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there any legal or practical limitations or barriers for the membership of migrants in professional associations related to the media, sports and culture?</td>
<td>Section 195(5) of the Equality Act 2010 provides a general exception permitting the restriction of participation in competitive sports based on an individual’s nationality, place of birth or length of time that an individual has resided in a particular area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On 23 March 2015 the Chairman of The Football Association (the FA) announced that they had received approval from the Home Office for fundamental reforms to work permit regulations. A minimum percentage of matches played for their country within the previous two years will be enforced; the percentage will vary depending on the ranking of that country. The changes aim at ensuring that only the “most talented” non-EEA national players will be eligible for permits. It is estimated by the FA that 33% of players granted visas over the last 5 years would not be eligible under the new system.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


With regards to other professional associations Part 7 of the Equality Act 2010 applies and professional associations must not discriminate against a person on the grounds of their nationality or ethnic or national origins.

Do media, sports, culture professional associations encourage and support membership and participation of third country nationals as members? E.g. through information and raising awareness initiatives in more languages, translation and language support services etc.

Show the Red Card\(^{295}\) is a campaign that uses top footballers to educate against racism, and targets all kinds of discrimination. It provides case studies, school resources, teachers’ guides.

Kick It Out\(^{296}\), football’s equality and inclusion organisation, launched a consultation in April 2015 seeking opinions on racial discrimination at grassroots level. The consultation will provide players, coaches, referees and parents with the opportunity to offer their thoughts on discrimination and its impact on individuals and teams across the amateur game. Its purpose is because the organisation acknowledges the important role played by grassroots figureheads, supporters and activists across the country in their local communities. The consultation will also look to find out how Kick It Out can engage further with players, coaches, referees, parents, clubs, leagues and County Football Associations.

The ethnicity of members is not routinely collected by professional associations, despite the Equality and Human Rights Commission publishing a report in 2010 on the benefits of diversity monitoring.\(^{297}\) An example of a professional body which is active in monitoring the diversity of its membership is the Institute of Physics (IOP) Diversity Committee\(^{298}\) Unfortunately, its reports and activities on diversity mainly focus on gender and make no mention of ethnicity.

What is the rate of participation in the most representative professional associations? (figures and % of association members, figures and % of migrant professionals as members, or descriptive data if statistical data is not available).

In 2007, the Guardian newspaper produced a list of the 30 most influential or powerful people from ethnic minorities in the media, business and the arts.\(^{299}\)

Are migrants elected as representatives of professional associations related to the

One example is Arts Development UK, a professional association for people working in arts and cultural

---

\(^{295}\) UK. Show Racism the Red Card, *Show Racism the Red Card*, available at: [www.srtrc.org/home](http://www.srtrc.org/home).


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>media, sports and culture? Please provide figures if available, and report the related legal or practical limitations or barriers, eventually faced.</td>
<td>development in England and Wales. It presents the names of trustees, but no indication of their ethnicity or gender. Members can be individuals or representatives of local authorities. The Arts Council of England publishes Diversity Statistics on the composition of its staff. Figures for 2013 show that women form 63.7%, LGBT groups form 9.5% and ethnic minorities 12.6% of employees. However, the ethnic minority share of the workforce was higher in 2008 at 15.4%. The share of ethnic minorities in those leaving the organisation in 2013 was higher than their share of the workforce. No information on any barriers to minorities is presented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a visible or notable presence (or absence) of migrants and their descendants as media professionals?</td>
<td>A 2014 BBC news story reported that “around 6% of people working in the media industry as a whole are from ethnic minorities as opposed to 14% in the UK population as a whole.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are migrants and/or their descendants present, visible and actively participating in public? (E.g. in public events, TV and electronic media, cultural events). Please substantiate on the basis of existing data or contacts with relevant authorities, actors and stakeholders, making sure to cover a wide spectrum and obtain as much as possible objective information.</td>
<td>The 2013-14 Community Life Survey found that 51% of ethnic minority and 57% of white people had engaged in any civic engagement or formal volunteering during the previous year. 20% of ethnic minority and 32% of white people had engaged in civic participation, during the previous year. In both groups, 41% had engaged in voluntary activity. People from ethnic minorities were slightly less likely (72%) than white people (76%) to have talked to neighbours in the last month.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there legal or practical limitations for the media, culture or other type of public events by migrants and/or their descendants? (E.g. are there national language requirements for TV or radio stations, bureaucratic and representation requirements, etc.).</td>
<td>Schedule 3 Paragraph 31 to the 2010 Act provides an exception to the prohibition of discrimination, harassment and victimisation in the provision of services on the basis of one of the protected characteristics: provision of services in s.29 of the 2010 Act with regard to television, radio and on-line broadcasting distribution. The exception does not extend to the provision of an electronic communications network, services or associated facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there positive measures for promoting or restrictions/barrers to the operation of migrant and ethnic minority (owned, operated,</td>
<td>There are no provisions for this.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| directed or audience specific media? | The BBC aims to reflect the diversity of the UK in its output and among its workforce. Other media organisations also have diversity policies (e.g. the Guardian). Channel 4 imposes diversity targets which if not met affect executives’ bonuses. Protests about the low representation of ethnic minorities point out that the media industry is largely based in London, where the ethnic minority share of the population is much higher than the UK average, and hence the disparity in representation is greater. However, producers of media content have to balance this with the much lower percentage of ethnic minorities in the rest of the country. |

| Are there practical measures encouraging and promoting the visibility, voice and public presence of migrants and/or their descendants in the media, culture or other type of public events? (E.g. are there programmes and information provided by the media in other than the country official language, and migrants’ languages, quotas for journalists and public programmes reflecting the diversity in society etc.?) | |

### 3.5.1 Diversity in the public sector

In this section based on available data, research, studies, etc. please provide information about recruitment of migrants and their descendants in the public sector:

| Please describe how legal provisions allow or prevent the recruitment of third country nationals in the public sector. Please indicate specific areas, requirements, quotas if any, upward mobility and promotion limitations if any, as well as if and how these provisions are applied in practice. | There is a general statutory prohibition on the employment of aliens in the Civil Service. An alien is any person who is not a British or Commonwealth citizen, a British protected person or a citizen of the Republic of Ireland. The details of the employment policy are available on the Civil Service website. An aliens certificate can be issued allowing a candidate to be given a conditional (nationality) appointment provided that the normal recruitment procedures for the grade are followed and the candidate is eligible in respect of age, health, character, knowledge and ability. In all cases, a certificate is only valid for a period of five years (renewable). In addition, EU, EEA, Swiss and certain Turkish nationals (certain family members who acquire free movement rights irrespective of their nationality) are eligible for employment in all non-reserved posts in the Civil Service. In England, the Education (Specified Work and Registration) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended by the Education (School Teachers) (Qualifications and Specified Work) (Miscellaneous Amendments) (England) Regulations 2012 set out |

---

the conditions under which overseas-trained teachers are allowed to carry out specified work (teach pupils). Teachers qualified in a country outside of the UK are allowed to teach in state maintained schools and non-maintained special schools in England without qualified teacher status (QTS) for up to four years. Teachers who qualified in Canada, Australia, New Zealand and the United States of America may apply for QTS without further training or assessment in England. Teachers from overseas may also be required to satisfy UK Visa and Immigration requirements. Third country nationals may teach in state maintained schools and non-maintained special schools in England as unqualified teachers for four calendar years (the “four year rule”). It applies to teachers who qualified in countries outside of the EEA and Switzerland except for teachers who qualified in Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States of America. To continue to teach in England after four years, they must become qualified teachers and satisfy visa rules. From 1 April 2012 qualified teachers from Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the USA can apply to the National College for Teaching and Leadership for QTS without undertaking further training or assessment in England. If they are awarded QTS, they are exempt from the four year rule.311

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate if citizens of migrant descent can also be affected by limitation – e.g. on the basis of their ethnic origin or migrant background or naturalisation - in public sector recruitment, for example in education, law enforcement, judiciary, etc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As citizens of migrant descent will fall under the protected category of race defined under s.9(1)(c) of the Equality Act 2010 as including national or ethnic origins, they are afforded the same protection as third country nationals as outlined above.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please indicate proportion of recruitment (% on the total of posts for this category or service) for the interested categories of third country nationals, if any.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority representation in professional associations, etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Civil Service**312

In the UK Home Civil Service as a whole, total employment was 439,940 at 31 March 2014. Ethnicity was known for 348,150 employees (79.1%), of whom 312,970 were white and 35,180 (10.1%) were from ethnic minorities.

Ethnic minority representation in some government departments is well above the average. For example, in the departments and agencies of the Ministry of Justice, the ethnic minority share is typically over 15%. In smaller departments, this share rises to over

---


| | a quarter and the highest share is for the Office of the Public Guardian, in which 43.4% of the 400 employees with known ethnicity are from ethnic minorities. In contrast, the number of ethnic minority employees in the Scottish and Welsh government departments is around 2-3% (no information is presented for the Northern Ireland government).

Employment in the Civil Service has been falling under the Coalition government (in place since May 2010) and declined by 2% between 2013 and 2014. Even so, people are still being recruited, but in March 2014 entrants (28,890) are outnumbered by leavers (36,590). However, ethnic minorities still form 15.8% of the 18,150 entrants with known ethnicity and only 8.4% of the 27,010 leavers with known ethnicity. The largest flows are for the Ministry of Defence, in which of the 1,000 entrants with known ethnicity, 5.8% were from ethnic minorities and of the 3,550 leavers with known ethnicity, 3.3% were from ethnic minorities, indicating an increase in the ethnic minority share of employment in a period of employment decline.

Ethnic minorities are most strongly represented in the more junior grades. At March 2014, 11.6% of employees at Executive Officer responsibility level and 10.4% at Administrative responsibility level were from an ethnic minority. In comparison, 7.3% of those at the Senior Civil Service level were from an ethnic minority, an increase of 2.6 percentage points from March 2013.

| | Please indicate any affirmative action and positive action **either** for third country nationals **or** citizens with a migrant background, if any, e.g. quotas, reserved posts for people of migrant background etc. as well as promising practices in this area. Please provide information specifically for law enforcement, judiciary, and education.

| | Under s.149 of the Equality Act 2010 public authorities, in the exercise of their functions, must have due regard to the need to eliminate any discrimination, harassment or victimisation prohibited by the Act and advance equality for opportunity for persons with a protected characteristic.

Section 149(3)(a) stipulates that public authorities need to remove or minimise disadvantages suffered by persons in connection with a protected characteristic that they possess. On 10 September 2011 The Equality Act 2010 (Specific Duties) Regulations 2011\(^{313}\) came into force which requires the public authorities, listed within its Schedules, to publish information to demonstrate their compliance with s.149. The information published must include all information in relation to their employees (excluding authorities with less than 150 employees) and any other persons affected by its policies and practices who share a protected characteristic. The published information should be updated at intervals no greater than one year.

---

Public authorities must also publish one or more objectives that are specific and measurable. Objectives should have the aim of achieving the elimination of discrimination, harassment or victimisation prohibited under the Act, advance equality of opportunity for people who share a protected characteristic or foster good relations between persons who share a protected characteristic and those that do not. Objectives must be updated at intervals no greater than four years since their last publication. Publications must be made publicly available. Guidance for public authorities published alongside the Regulations offers advice on what needs to be published in order for a public authority to be in compliance with the Equality Duty. The Guidance explains that there is no prescribed format and it is up to each authority to decide itself what information it publishes. The size of the organisation should influence the type of information it publishes and should also guide the number of equality objectives to set. The Guidance also highlights that the duty does not mean authorities have to publish equality schemes, action plans or impact assessments.

Section 158 of the Act provides a general public sector equality duty to take positive action. Positive action should take place when a person reasonably believes persons with a protected characteristic would suffer a disadvantage, or such persons due to their protected characteristic have needs that are different from those that do not or that activity by persons of a certain protected characteristic are disproportionately low.

3.6. Political activity – active citizenship

Membership and participation of migrants in migrant and/or diaspora organisations and associations:

Are there any legal or practical limitations or barriers for the self-organisation membership of migrants in migrant and or diaspora associations and organisations?

Part 7 of the Equality Act 2010 prohibits discrimination on a number of grounds, including nationality, with regards to the application to and membership of an association. An association is define by s.107 as “an association of persons – (a) which has at least 25 members, and (b) admission to membership of which is regulated by the association’s rules and involves a process.

Schedule 16 of the Act provides an exception in that membership or benefit of an association can be restricted to persons who share a protected characteristic, with the exception of colour, allowing for specific migrant groups to form associations and organisations to protect and further their rights and to celebrate their shared characteristic.

Are there notable cases of active migrant and/or diaspora associations and organisations? Please indicate the most known, active or representative ones on the basis of existing data about membership – please include size/numbers of members - and through contacts with competent actors and stakeholders. Please specify their character and eventual differences, including aspects concerning their religious, culture or geographic scope.

One of the earliest migrant organisations in the UK is the Indian Workers Association\textsuperscript{315}, first established in 1938 in Coventry with branches established where Punjabi populations were concentrated including Wolverhampton, Southall, and Birmingham. The local branches combined to form a national organisation in 1958. It represented industrial workers (predominantly Sikh, but all Indians were able to join), campaigned against discrimination and had a socialist ethos.\textsuperscript{316} Though it still exists, its activities are now much reduced.

Southall Black Sisters is a campaigning organisation for women from ethnic minority and migrant groups.\textsuperscript{317} It was established in 1979, and is still actively campaigning, most recently against the Coalition government’s efforts to ‘persuade’ illegal migrants to leave the country.

Please provide any data on the participation of migrants and their descendants in the most representative migrant and/or diaspora organisations and associations? (figures and % of migrants and/or persons with the specific ethnic or other background as members, or descriptive data if statistical data is not available).

Migrant or minority organisations are usually established and led by members of the community they represent and draw their members predominantly from those communities. As such, they do usually do not document the ethnicity of their members. An example is the Federation of Poles in Great Britain.\textsuperscript{318}

Are such associations and organisations encouraged and/or supported financially or in other means (e.g. offices) by the national, regional or local authorities? Is there in place a mechanism linking such associations at national level? (e.g. network of migrant associations.

Northern Ireland’s Belfast City Council has a major programme which aims to build positive relations and tackle sectarianism and racism, funded by the European Regional Development Fund under the Peace III\textsuperscript{319} programme.

In Northern Ireland, the Minority Ethnic Development Fund (MEDF) provides support for voluntary and community organisations working with minority ethnic people and groups. Funded by the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister, it aims to assist minority ethnic and local community organisations to promote good relations between people of different ethnic backgrounds. Levels of funding are quite limited, with voluntary organisations receiving the smallest grants.\textsuperscript{320}

\textsuperscript{315} UK, Open University, ‘Indian Workers Association’, available at: www.open.ac.uk/researchprojects/makingbritain/content/indian-workers-association.
One scheme funded via this programme, and supporting migrant associations is the Migrant and Minority Ethnic Project.\textsuperscript{321} The scheme aims to:

- Improve co-operation between agencies in Belfast on issues facing migrant and minority ethnic communities.
- Raise awareness within the council of issues facing migrant and minority ethnic communities.
- Encourage community-led initiatives which build understanding between new and host communities.
- Help migrant and minority ethnic communities to settle in Belfast.
- Support settled communities in adapting to change in their areas.
- Develop and deliver training programmes which promote a better understanding of issues relating to diversity and migration into Northern Ireland both within and outside the council.

In 2010 London Councils decided to scale back its London-wide grants scheme by returning most funding to boroughs, where they will be able to spend it as they see fit, it will not be ring-fenced. One of the affected funding streams was for the provision of advice for BME, migrant and refugee communities. This means that no London borough can guarantee that they will not reduce funding for the voluntary sector (many of whom serve minority communities), as a result of cuts to local government funding.\textsuperscript{322}

Islington London Council works in partnership with the Islington Refugee Forum (IRF) and Refugee and Migrant Community Organisations (RMCOs) across the borough to ensure that its services are improving outcomes for those residents. RMCOs work with, support and represent residents from refugee and migrant communities. The Council’s new 2015 statement of strategic intent replaces the council’s 2010 Refugee Integration Strategy and Refugee and Migrant Action Plan (RMAP). Refugees and migrants living in the borough have contributed to its design.\textsuperscript{323}

The strategic plan is directed to providing problem free integration for its minority population. It provides details on the kinds of interventions and financial support is available in order to do so.

Membership and participation of migrants in civil society organisations and voluntary work:

| Are there any legal or practical limitations or barriers for the | Part 7 of the Equality Act 2010 prohibits discrimination on a number of grounds, including nationality, with regards to the application to and membership of an |


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>membership of migrants in civil society organisations?</td>
<td>An association is defined by s.107 as “an association of persons – (a) which has at least 25 members, and (b) admission to membership of which is regulated by the association's rules and involves a process.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do civil society organisations encourage and support membership and participation of migrants and/or their descendants? E.g. through information and raising awareness initiatives in more languages, translation and language support services etc.</td>
<td>Examples of organisations attempting to attract black and ethnic minority involvement include the National Parks and National Trust in England and Wales, who have run information campaigns attempting to persuade BME people that the countryside is not exclusively white. The Environment Agency is attempting to encourage black people to become involved in angling. However, some such as the Women’s Institute are making no particular effort, assuming that as the organisation becomes less rural-focussed, the number of members from minority groups will increase. The Coventry Migrant and refugee Centre [CRMC] meets the needs of refugees and migrants (new and established) to help them settle into Coventry, supporting their integration and encouraging them to contribute fully to the life of the City. The CRMC helps them with their paperwork / applications, and with any medical and welfare issues; it helps them to find a permanent place to live and to integrate into the community by providing English and computing lessons, and by helping them to find meaningful and appropriate work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please provide any data on the participation and membership of migrants and their descendants in the most representative civil society organisations? (figures or % of organisation members, % of migrants and/or with migrant background as members, or descriptive data if statistical data is not available).</td>
<td>Statistics on Civil Society organisations are provide by the National Council for Voluntary Organisations. See their Almanac. However, it is difficult to find information on ethnicity or nationality in this resource.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership and participation of migrants in political parties:</td>
<td>In addition to the previously identified provisions of the Equality Act 2010 that cover equal treatment of persons with protected characteristics with regard to association, the Act provides additional special provisions for political parties under s.104. A political party is a party that is registered in the Great Britain register. Section 104 allows positive action to be taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Notes:**


325 UK, Women’s Institute, ‘The WI is still largely white middle class, is anything being done to attract women of different ethnicities?’, available at: [www.thewi.org.uk/faqs/the-wi-is-still-largely-white-middle-class,-is-anything-being-done-to-attract-women-of-different-ethnicities](http://www.thewi.org.uk/faqs/the-wi-is-still-largely-white-middle-class,-is-anything-being-done-to-attract-women-of-different-ethnicities).


by political parties when selecting candidates for elections. Positive actions must be proportionate to the purpose of reducing inequality in the party’s representation with regard to persons of protected characteristics. By virtue of subsection 6 and 7 selection arrangements cannot be limited to only persons of a specific characteristic with the exception of the characteristic of sex. Therefore, as stated in Explanatory Notes 335-338 to the Act a party can have for example women only shortlists, ensuring a woman is elected but could not have a shortlist based on a person’s race and thus nationality or ethnic or national origin. If persons of a particular race are underrepresented in a political party, the proportionate positive action to take would be to reserve a specific number of places on the shortlist for such persons.

Do political parties encourage and support membership and participation of migrants and/or their descendants in their activities? E.g. through information and raising awareness initiatives in more languages, translation and language support services etc.

Lord Ashcroft, author of, Degrees of separation Ethnic minority voters and the Conservative Party, explained why at the 2010 general election, only 16% of ethnic minority voters supported the Conservatives. The Conservatives also seem to have very few MPs or spokesmen from ethnic minorities, and this is often evidenced that the party was not engaged in their communities. The book looks at the gulf between ethnic and religious minorities and the Conservative Party. Based on a unique 10,000 sample poll and extensive research among voters from black African, black Caribbean, Hindu, Muslim and Sikh backgrounds, the study sheds new light on one of the Conservative Party’s biggest and most longstanding challenges.

Please provide any data on the participation and membership of migrants and their descendants in the political parties, initiatives and movements? (figures or % of party members, % of migrants and/or with migrant background as members, or descriptive data if statistical data is not available)

An internet survey of party members in 2008 found that 6.2% of all party members were from ethnic minorities, with 5.7% of Labour Party members from ethnic minorities, compared with 6.1% of Conservative Party members and 1.2% of Liberal Democrat Party members.

Are migrants elected as representatives of political parties, initiatives and movements? Please provide figures if available, and report the related legal or practical limitations or barriers, eventually faced.

The 2015 General Election saw a record number of MPs from Black and Minority Ethnic groups elected (42). The Labour Party “is committed to increasing the representation of women and under-represented groups in Parliament and at every level of politics”. Turning to the Conservatives, an article by Sunder Katwala of British Future claimed that “most of the

---


progress in the last decade [in increasing ethnic minority MPs] has been among the Conservatives.”

The Liberal Democrat Party “is committed to increasing diversity throughout the party, and encouraging those from a diverse range of backgrounds to represent the Liberal Democrats at all levels”. The total number of selected LibDem candidates for the 2015 General Election identifying as Black, Asian or Ethnic Minority (BAME) was 54 (9%).

3.7. Civic and citizenship education

The participation of migrants and their descendants (with a distinct linguistic, cultural background) in education:

The Schools Workforce Census collects data on the ethnicity of teachers in England. No information is collected on nationality. Teachers categorised as “White-Other” are predominantly of White-European origin, presumably recent migrants. Teachers of non-white ethnicity accounted for 6.7% of all those for whom an ethnicity was recorded. Ethnicity was recorded for 95.4% of all teachers.

Ethnicity of teaching workforce in publicly-funded schools in England, November 2012

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White - British</td>
<td>41,572</td>
<td>88.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White - Irish</td>
<td>7,605</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other white background</td>
<td>15,522</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Black African</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White and Asian</td>
<td>1,222</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other mixed background</td>
<td>1,640</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>7,401</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>3,847</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1,572</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other Asian Background</td>
<td>2,205</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>4,494</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black - African</td>
<td>3,131</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Any other Black background</td>
<td>1,048</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any other ethnic group</td>
<td>2,401</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity details provided</td>
<td>470,100</td>
<td>100.0 (95.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information not yet obtained</td>
<td>19,284</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>492,874</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are there any particular gender issues?**

In November 2012 women accounted for 73.3% of the (full-time equivalent) teacher workforce in publicly-funded schools in England. There are no statistics on migrants in teaching, as migrant status is not one of the questions in the Schools Workforce Census. However in relation to ethnic minorities, men were more likely to be in senior positions: 6.1% were heads and 10.9% deputy heads. For women, these figures were 3.8% and 7.4%, respectively. 335 There is no further published breakdown by ethnic group.

**Are parents of migrant background actively participating in the school life?**

No systematic national information found

**Are there extracurricular activities involving and engaging with children and parents of migrant background and/or focussing on civic and citizenship education?**

Please see number five under, Promising Practices, Learning Unlimited.

Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF)337 provides various kinds of extracurricular support to a very wide range of migrant groups. MRCF has a membership structure with 40 organisations currently enrolled. Of these 30 are groups, which primarily service particular ethnic groups, such as Somalis, Bosnians, Ukrainians, Chinese, Ethiopians, Moroccans, Vietnamese, Sudanese and Eritreans. Seven describe themselves as ‘women’ or ‘mothers’ groups. Two are constructed around the needs and contributions of elders, and three are youth organisations. MRCF was established in 1993 in response to the needs of migrant and refugee communities in northwest London. Settled economic migrants as well as newly arrived refugees struggled in their attempts to access health and welfare services, employment and education, legal advice, and housing. They formed

---

336 For more information about involving the community in the school life and vice versa please refer also to the findings of the SIRIUS Network http://www.sirius-migrationeducation.org /
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community organisations to share their knowledge and skills and to support each other, but this presented them with the additional challenges of meeting the requirements of charitable law and working within a competitive voluntary sector. In the true spirit of partnership and self-help, diverse communities overcame their differences and joined forces in order to empower themselves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are there provisions for bilingual education? If yes, is it supported by trained teachers and curriculum provisions and dedicated school manuals and books?</td>
<td>In Wales and Scotland, a minority of schools teach in Welsh or Gaelic (native languages of these countries) as first language. There has been recent growth of bilingual education in England, the Bilingual Immersion Education Network (BIEN) is a network for schools, policy makers, parents, researchers and other interested parties to network around the topic of bilingual immersion education in the UK. It has created a directory which lists 30 state and independent schools and projects that use bilingual immersion in the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence of school segregation and/or policies of separate/distinct schooling of migrants?</td>
<td>No evidence of this found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there evidence of modifying school curricula and teaching materials can be modified to reflect the diversity of the school population? Is the teacher regular curricula/training dealing with specific reference to immigrants or ethnic minorities and respect/promotion of diversity?</td>
<td>Some reference to this had been made above, under Section 1.2.3 &amp; 2.1. The National Association for Language Development in the Curriculum (NALDIC), a registered charity dedicated to promoting the effective teaching, learning and achievement of bilingual pupils in schools. NALDIC, partnered with The Bell Foundation, together funded the pilot of a new training programme for teachers to benefit English as an additional language (EAL) learners in the East of England. This aims to support the development and delivery of two training programmes for teachers and teaching staff working with primary school children who require support learning EAL. It is tailored to meet the needs at the local level reflecting the importance of the diversity of nationalities in different localities. British Council funded a study in to the efficacy of EAL teaching. The study revealed the following. Provision of support for children who speak English as an Additional Language (EAL) in UK primary schools is geographically variable, due in part to a lack of centralisation of funding and resources, which is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>caused by EAL not being a National Curriculum subject. A deficit of training means that teachers tended to ‘wing it’, rather than offer an innovative approach to the education of bilingual children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The British Council’s work with migrants in the UK provides access to high-quality materials and training for learners and teachers of English, with an emphasis on developing language skills, skills for life and work, and a growing understanding of UK life and culture. The wide range of topics and contexts provide a rich array of perspectives from teachers and learners on language issues in migration and integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are all students – not only of migrant background – targeted and/involved by civic education and activities related to migrant integration at schools?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some reference to this had been made above, under Section 1.2.3 &amp; 2.1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research at the University of Cambridge: An exploratory study looking at the needs of migrant children and their schools within and beyond the classroom. The study is exploring the contribution that schools make in addressing the linguistic and non-linguistic needs of EAL pupils, and is uncovering the links between language development, achievement and social integration at classroom level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The implementation of specific measures and initiatives aiming at (the following possible practices on the left is an indicative and non-exhaustive list):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Please use the following as indicative list of possible practices to report on:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the way civic and citizenship education reflect diversity in society through curricular and extracurricular activities. Are there specific programmes helping young people to learn how to live in a society with people from different cultures and religions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please see Section 1; sub-section 1.2.3; Section 2; Section 3.2.2.; Section 3.3.1.; Section 3.4.; Section 3.5.; Section 4.1; and, under Promising Practices [the latter are still being compiled]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the way formal curriculum subjects, e.g. literature, history, etc. promote mutual understanding, respect for ethnic and religious diversity and the common democratic and pluralist values?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitating equal opportunities in education for children with migrant background?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


Facilitating the involvement, participation and support of parents with migrant background in the educational system and in the school activities?

Providing language learning support to students of migrant background?

Improving attendance and reducing drop-out of students with migrant background?

Improving school and teachers’ capacity to embrace, build on and/or manage diversity?

In particular, please specify if there are promising practices, including affirmative action / positive action practices designed to tackle structural inequalities

Other...

3.8. Drivers, barriers for the implementation, monitoring and assessment of legislation & policy measures

Previous paragraphs indicated in detail aspects about the actual implementation of participation policies, normative framework and measures. In this section briefly summarize the most important drivers, positive factors and the barriers, resistance or negative factors that have been identified regarding the design, implementation, monitoring and assessment of policy measures and normative framework for the political and social participation of migrants and their descendants. Please base the analysis on governmental and non-governmental reports, as well as research and studies.

The CBPs and the EU Framework for Integration provide a clear starting point in setting out the needs for migrants’ full participation in society. EU policy on integration has had limited appeal in the UK; though there has been no shortage of successive governments’ willingness to accept EU integration funds (for language tuition and civil society projects). The agreement by all EUMS on CBPs in 2004 was followed by a rather soft programme of activity which largely focused on sharing good practice, including an integration website (included are some cities with initiatives from the UK). The EU’s most significant intervention has perhaps been the Directives on discrimination in 2000. In the Equality Acts of 2006 and 2010, UK policy moved ahead of the requirements of EU law, not least in establishing a duty on public bodies to advance equality of opportunity and foster good relations (which came into force in 2011). Yet in its pre-2010 form an existing duty to promote racial equality scarcely impacted on migrants and refugees.

so marginal are they in practice to the equality agenda.

The lack of national agreement on the goals of public policy towards migrants living in the UK, has resulted in a series of ongoing problematic areas, some of which have several points of contact. There is no standardised understanding of the terminology (cohesion, inclusion, and integration are used interchangeably in public and policy circles; and policy drivers are, on the whole, not distinctively set out). There remains little momentum to promote consultations involving key migrant organisations in devising the strategy (nationally), or to resolve contradictions in policy that hinder rather than promote participation. Without any strategic framework it is possible for key areas of policy relevant to marginal groups, such as equality and the ‘Big Society’, the shift to localism and reform of the NHS, to move forward without any thought to their potential significance in tackling the exclusion of those who have come to the UK from abroad.

In combination with this, the following concerns point towards a more restrictive climate in which the integration of migrants can reasonably be pursued, within a global recession landscape. The reduction in funding across the public sector (in key integration areas such as ESOL, and vocational training); the increasing onus on migrants to demonstrate their willingness to integrate (through attendance in programmes and tests such as ‘Life in the UK’, for those seeking permanent residence and Citizenship); the expectation that employers will now demand “job ready workers”346; and the ongoing almost xenophobic hostility played out in public discourse which conflate issues of immigration (immigration policy and public perception – the ‘Go Home’ campaign), illegal immigrants; and those who reside legitimately in the UK. Additionally, while data is regularly collected on ethnic minorities, there remains limited data on migrants to inform policy and service provision. Nor are the outcomes of policy intervention relating to migrants routinely monitored.

This all notwithstanding, and in the absence of a national UK strategy, this report has identified various positive aspects geared towards integrating migrants. Much has and is being done at regional and local levels, not least within the voluntary and community

sector, providing advice, support, targeted services and access to social networks. For instance, current works-in-progress, alliances, and various other efforts at the local level (such as ENAR, and the Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum [MRCF]) (see Annex 7, Promising Practices for this and other examples of progress at the local level), help towards improving the delivery of services to migrant communities. This also enables a process to foster the participation of migrants in democratic processes at the local level and therefore help them become invested in driving the work of local government and public services to further integration measures in a sustainable way.

Empirical measures used to assess identity, integration, and cohesion consist of three categories: national identity (Britishness or measures of whether someone feels more or less English, Scottish, Welsh, or Irish); integration outcomes (this refers to the performance of immigrants, usually set against the national average, in various spheres such as employment and education and is probably the definition closest to ‘immigrant integration’ as understood by scholars in comparative analysis of immigrant integration); and cohesion, usually at the local or neighbourhood level. Cohesion at the local level may be termed neighbourhood cohesion, or in the UK, interchangeably as community cohesion or social cohesion. The integration challenges created by the earlier [historical] waves gave rise to a specific ‘race-relations’ driven policy framework that focused on race/ethnicity and skin colour to the exclusion of other factors [which was also applied to those post-WWII white European Voluntary Workers]. The policy of managing ethnic diversity, and not immigration, has driven the UK integration agenda, and has held back long-term integration.

The focus of immigrant integration policies shifted away from a race-relations model, and there are a series of developing policy areas which led to this shift: refugee integration policy, community cohesion from 2001 to 2010, a strong and broad emphasis on equality, counter-terrorism (CT) policy, mainstream policies with some targeting of immigrant groups embedded within them, and citizenship policy. The

349 UK, Kay, D. & Miles, R. (1992) Refugees or Migrant Workers?: European Volunteer Workers in Britain, 1946-51 (Critical Studies in Racism & Migration). Routledge, London. This scheme marked the intervention of the state into the organisation of the domestic labour market, reinforcing divisions between the Outsider and the British.
most salient facets mentioned earlier in the report will be dealt with next.

The previous (Coalition) government (2010-15) has been supportive of refugees and did implement asylum reforms (e.g. to reduce the number of families in the detention estate). The Strategic Upgrade of National Refugee Integration Services [SUNRISE], was a project at the heart of Integration Matters, and was piloted in five UK cities; comprehensive employment and other support were provided immediately after refugee status was granted. The government rolled out its services nationally after a positive evaluation. This was known as the Refugee Integration and Employment Services [RIES] and offered 12 months of employment service support to those eligible. In September 2011, RIES ceased to operate due to severe governments cuts to public-sector services. Since then there has been no government statutory funding to support refugee integration in the UK.

Research has uncovered that the removal of the RIES intensive transitional support system to refugees immediately after they received refugee status, has led to destitution level situational experience for some, and highlighted child safety concerns. At the national level, the Refugee Integration Strategy was never extended to family or labour migrants, international students or EU citizens who can equally face challenges in securing jobs and decent accommodation, and can be exploited or face hostility because of their country of origin or immigration status. Yet there remains no debate on whether it is appropriate to exclude whole categories of people in this way from the limited strategy that exists.

These policies are associated with a government response to the 2001 riots in the northern towns of Oldham, Burnley, and Bradford. The outcome was in the form of a series of reports, including the main government enquiry, led by Ted Cantle (now known as the Cantle Report). The key findings (of parallel lives and the resulting segregation of Asian and white communities) recommended new community cohesion policies, aimed at bringing those (segregated) communities together. Community cohesion policies

followed. These policies included initiatives such as summer youth programs, school-twinning projects, and ethnically mixed housing policies — all largely undertaken at a local level. Austerity and other global drivers have seen much of this funding reduced. Both Wales and Northern Ireland also operate their respective cohesion programmes. Cohesion policy has been embedded in education policy. This notwithstanding, these cohesion policies were implemented to target second generation ethnic minorities, and not new migrants. This underscores that, as noted elsewhere throughout this report, integration is rarely about new immigrants only.

The point to stress here is the interconnectedness of these above noted mechanisms, such as ESOL and vocational training, and how they drive social cohesion at the local level. These mechanisms do not operate in isolation. Trade unions are an area where migrants have been helped with integration needs. They have provided a range of structured support to migrant workers by providing advice (such as housing) and campaigning for their rights in the labour market. Participants at ESOL classes have been encouraged to join unions, to provide collective support for their needs, and many have done so. As noted above, ongoing developments in immigration policy also present significant barriers to new migrants’ access to labour market opportunities. Policymakers have in recent years significantly slashed public funding for vocational training and English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) classes, these measures have limited personal development and developing native language proficiently, especially for the low-skilled, and those with limited literacy and education — such as refugees. These categories will remain amongst the most disadvantaged in the labour force.

3.9. Use of funding instruments (EIF, ERF, EMIF)

Please provide briefly information and documented insights about the allocation

Majority of funding under the European Refugee Fund is devoted to the various Gateway Programmes and no further detail of their activities is provided. Below is a
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and distribution of funds aimed at supporting political and social participation, and active citizenship measures for migrants and/or their descendants.

List of the projects funded by the European Integration Fund in 2013 (excluding the grants made to the Home Office and British Council).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Project name</th>
<th>EIF funding - project granted up to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accent on Training Ltd</td>
<td>UNITING COMMUNITIES</td>
<td>€ 284,840.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business in the Community</td>
<td>Mosaic Primary School Mentoring Plus</td>
<td>€ 276,904.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The British Red Cross</td>
<td>Third Country National Orientation and Integration</td>
<td>€ 387,348.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bromley by Bow Centre</td>
<td>ESOL – Bridges into the Community</td>
<td>€ 286,462.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSGS College</td>
<td>Removing Barriers to Integration (RBI)</td>
<td>€ 275,263.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College Nottingham</td>
<td>Greetings UK</td>
<td>€ 291,124.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City College Nottingham</td>
<td>Join Up UK</td>
<td>€ 539,126.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention of Scottish Local Authorities (COSLA)</td>
<td>Migration Matters Scotland</td>
<td>€ 305,713.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eaves Housing for Women Limited</td>
<td>Settling In</td>
<td>€ 212,194.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East London Advanced Technology Training</td>
<td>The Welcome Club</td>
<td>€ 428,310.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith Regen Foundation</td>
<td>U R Britain</td>
<td>€ 281,980.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater London Authority</td>
<td>English – Key to Integration in London</td>
<td>€ 2,121,945.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groundwork London</td>
<td>Active Citizens – 205 Flags</td>
<td>€ 477,180.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax Opportunities Trust</td>
<td>Integrated Calderdale</td>
<td>€ 287,597.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hugh Baird College</td>
<td>Women’s Community Integration and Participation Initiative – Get Involved</td>
<td>€ 407,280.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

360 UK. Exchange rate of 1.41 euros per pound on 27/5/2015.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation Name</th>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ILC Manchester (T/A Manchester International College)</td>
<td>Mum’s Club</td>
<td>€ 282,924.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspire Futures</td>
<td>Inspiring Integration</td>
<td>€ 304,699.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ipswich CSV Media Clubhouse</td>
<td>The Evolution Project</td>
<td>€ 456,395.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Islington Council</td>
<td>The Islington Bridge - Welcome To The Borough</td>
<td>€ 543,473.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karmand Community Centre</td>
<td>English for Integration</td>
<td>€ 262,824.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Unlimited</td>
<td>Active Citizenship and English (ACE)</td>
<td>€ 1,006,922.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI ComputSolutions</td>
<td>Integrate Plus</td>
<td>€ 425,420.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newry &amp; Mourne District Council</td>
<td>Europa Diversa</td>
<td>€ 259,190.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Refugee Centre</td>
<td>Active Integration</td>
<td>€ 296,653.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth &amp; Kinross Association of Voluntary Service Ltd</td>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>€ 143,898.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QED Foundation Limited (T/A QED UK)</td>
<td>Living in Britain (Northern Punjab Province)</td>
<td>€ 359,471.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QED Foundation Limited (T/A QED UK)</td>
<td>Living in Britain</td>
<td>€ 410,811.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Royal Borough of Kingston</td>
<td>Empower and Inspire</td>
<td>€ 339,702.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salford City College</td>
<td>Live and Learn in Salford</td>
<td>€ 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YWCA England &amp; Wales (Platform 51)</td>
<td>Women’s Interactive Citizenship</td>
<td>€ 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Education Association (WEA) South Wales</td>
<td>English Learning Integration Society (E.L.I.S)</td>
<td>€ 5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In particular provide a breakdown of funding for the relevant actions and measures by area (political participation, social participation and membership, indicating the source of funding (EIF, ERF, national, regional, other funding source) by **using the Annex 5**
### 3.10. Key legal and policy developments, and relevant case law

In this section, please provide information about developments regarding the above legal and policy instruments concerning participation (political, consultation, membership and association, active citizenship and civic education), including any new legislative or policy initiatives in the framework of migrant integration in the country. Key developments may be new legislation or policies, abolition, update, improvement or reform of existing ones, as well as important case law, court, equality body or administrative cases, that have had or may have an impact on the implementation of legal and policy instruments and on the actual situation on the ground, including public debates and perceptions among the native population and migrants. (Use template in Annex 9).

Since coming into force the *Equality Act 2010* has had few developments, none of which affect these areas. One example of a change to the Act can be seen in the Government’s introduction of the *Enterprise and Regulatory Reform Act (ERRA)*[^361] in 2013. The ERRA puts in place provisions that support their goal of achieving strong, sustainable and balanced economic and business growth. It also made a number of changes to the Equality Act in order to reduce burdens on business[^362]. The ERRA repealed the provision that makes employers responsible for third parties harassing employees[^363]. In the context of migrants and the increased hostility towards them this leaves many individuals vulnerable in the work place and creates a barrier to their integration.

The *Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA)*[^364] gives greater effect to the most of rights set out in the ECHR to all persons in the UK regardless of immigration status or citizenship. This includes the prohibition of discrimination laid out in Article 14 ECHR and can therefore be used by migrants to challenge discriminatory acts of public bodies. The Act means that it is easier to challenge breaches of these rights at the national level. In May 2015 the Conservative Party won a majority in the general election and has subsequently formed the new government. During their election campaign the Conservative Party stated that they would restore “common sense to human rights”[^365] and published their proposals[^366] for changing Britain’s human rights laws. They put forward their proposals for change which include distances themselves from the HRA and labelling it the “Labour’s Human Rights Act”[^367] and claiming that it undermines the role of UK courts in deciding on human rights issues in this country and the sovereignty of Parliament, and democratic accountability to the public.


claims that the HRA goes far beyond the UK’s obligations under the Convention. They outlined that at the centre of their plan for change is to bring into force a “British Bill of Rights and Responsibilities” and repeal the HRA. These plans have however been put on hold with no Bill announced by the Queen during her speech delivered to Parliament on 27 May 2015. It is likely that this is because the Government knows it will face substantial opposition not least from within their own party.

This has now sparked major debate across the country and faces opposition from other parties, civil society and the legal sphere. The Scottish National Party (SNP), who now holds the second largest number of seats in the House of Commons, issued a statement confirming their commitment to opposing the repeal of the HRA.

Additionally the Conservative Party have stated that they will move forward with their pre election promise to hold a referendum on leaving the European Union. The originally pledged to hold the referendum by the end of 2017 but have now indicated it could take place in 2016. The potential exit from the EU has created uncertainty among the EEA migrant community in the UK. In a blog post an immigration solicitor noted the increase in EU nationals enquiring about becoming British.

---


4. Social cohesion and community relations

4.1. Social cohesion policies

The concept of community cohesion is officially recognised as having been established in the UK following a number of riots and disturbances in England in 2001. A report was commissioned as a result, which is now commonly referred to as the Cantle Report, and is titled, Community Cohesion: The Report of The Independent Review Team.\textsuperscript{377} The outcome was to propose a new policy framework, based on the findings, which considered the wider dimensions of community relations nationally, having identified the existence of parallel lives of minority and majority communities, living exclusively to one another.

A distinct change in approach towards community cohesion can be seen after the 2010 general election and the establishment of coalition government of the Conservative and Liberal Democrat parties.\textsuperscript{378} Prior to 2010 the UK had a labour government since 1997 who had a clear approach to community cohesion with initiatives such as the Cohesion Delivery Framework.\textsuperscript{379} In May 2010 the coalition government launched a policy paper on Building a Big Society\textsuperscript{380} which communicated their “driving ambition: to put more power and opportunity into people's hands” to achieve an overall fairer society. The paper stated that every government department and citizen has a responsibility towards building a “big society”.\textsuperscript{381} The policy received criticism and accusations were made that the intention behind it was to make cuts to public sector funding and jobs.\textsuperscript{382} Despite distancing the role of politicians in enhancing social and community cohesion the policy effectively re-emphasised its importance.\textsuperscript{383}

---


In 2011 the coalition government published the updated *Prevent Strategy*[^384]. *Prevent* is one part CONTEST[^385], the Government’s four pronged approach to tackling terrorism. The strategy has an unwelcome focus on the Muslim community, many of who are migrants.

The closest to any coalition government policy on cohesion is the earlier cited *Creating the conditions for integration*[^386] paper for England. However, it does not make reference to social or community cohesion. It has been observed that the change in terminology from the pre 2010 “cohesion” to the post “integration” was a way for the new coalition government to distance themselves from the previous labour government and avoid them receiving any credit for the policies.[^387]

Are there any specific measures in place to strengthen social cohesion? Please refer to promising practices and examples of challenges. Use the template for promising practices in Annex 7 highlighting the most important and/or successful.

There have been at least three formal national definitions of the concept, each building upon the other over the six year period from 2002 to 2008. All refer to the need for: strong and positive relationships between people from different backgrounds; tackling inequalities; and, developing a positive climate of opinion to support diversity. There are also quite a number of local definitions, all of which draw upon the 3 formal definitions but tend to add a local context for their respective implementations. In Wales the Welsh Government maintains a cohesion strategy and programme[^388]. In Northern Ireland[^389], cohesion work has developed under the ‘shared future’ programme. The level of activities overall in England have been reduced by Government expenditure cuts; as of December 2014 a list of funded projects was issued, some at the local level.[^390]

James Laurence and Anthony Heath’s research (2008)[^391] on the predictors of social cohesion provided the key empirical foundation for policies implemented by the DCLG from 2008 onwards. They found that ethnic diversity did not undermine community cohesion, but that in fact one of the mechanisms linking diversity and cohesion is the presence of bridging relationships:

inter-ethnic friendships increased social cohesion. They identified that social cohesion is reduced not by diversity but rather by economic disadvantage, at both the individual and community level. These policies in turn impacted the practices of local authorities in a variety of domains, including the allocation of social housing and the funding of community projects.

The Social Integration Commission (SIC) was established in early 2014 for 12 months, in order to try to consolidate the debate around social integration between people of different ages, ethnicities and social economic groups in Britain; to assess the impact of social division on the UK economy and society; and, to make practical and affordable recommendations across key policy areas. It was financed by The Challenge (the UK’s leading integration charity) and British Gas. During this time, SIC produced a series of reports (three phases – 2 interim, and 1 final). The Commission has now completed its objectives, and nothing further is planned at present. The findings from the first two led to a series of recommendations to strengthen social cohesion and move towards greater integration across different groups in society.

Report 1: revealed that levels of integration have not kept pace with the growing diversity of the British population, it highlighted that a lack of integration is an issue for all groups, with White groups lacking sustained social networks as those other ethnicities. The key finding was that the most significant forms of social segregation is that between people from different income backgrounds.

A lack of social integration presents a huge challenge, as it is likely to make it harder to address the various challenges that 21st century Britain faces. These challenges include long-term unemployment, blocked opportunities aspiring and achieving potential, social isolation and a lack of community wellbeing.

Report 2: This was a wake-up call to policymakers, as it providing powerful evidence of the negative consequences and financial cost of poor integration for individuals and society. It outlined how social segregation limits solving key economic and social challenges in relation to employment, recruitment and career progression, and community health and wellbeing. Key findings also included that a lack of integration costs UK economy £6 billion, or approximately 0.5 per cent of GDP, each year.

The present Coalition Government in England, unlike Wales, has failed to heed the ‘wake-up call’ message.

---

and has concentrated on Prevent\textsuperscript{395} and its security. The earlier noted Ministerial Statement, outlining the greatly reduced planned integration projects, is a case in point.

Report 3: The report, launched in March 2015, makes a series of practical recommendations to promote a more integrated and socially cohesive society. The SIC also identified two specific areas where urgent and immediate action is required to boost social mixing.

- First, the Commission calls on the DfE to only approve applications for new faith schools when the petitioners have a clear plan for pupils to meet and mix with children from different faith backgrounds and communities. Additionally, the report states that the DfE should investigate requiring all schools to devise a social mixing strategy.
- Second, the SIC calls on all local authorities to ban the installation of ‘poor doors’ and ‘rich gates’ in their areas. Along with calling on the DCLG to introduce a requirement for councils to consider whether proposed major developments would allow people from different backgrounds to meet and mix and to reject planning applications which do not pass this test.

In response to the Social Integration Commission’s final report and recommendations therein, Ted Cantle and Paul Thomas raised their concerns about ongoing challenges regarding addressing social cohesion needs. Namely that there existed too few proposals to improve community cohesion, and a real shortage of education programmes to help people to come to terms with plurality and diversity. They suggested the following\textsuperscript{396}: “There are few signs of any actual anti-extremist education taking place. Our concern is that the Prevent focus on identifying young people viewed as vulnerable to radicalisation is taking attention away from the need to promote the prevention of extremism through educational approaches that build individual and collective youth resilience that not only just teach the principles of democratic citizenship but actually put it into practice.”

- Are there indicators used by authorities to assess, monitor and support social cohesion policies? E.g. social distance, social interaction, intergroup relations, etc. Please provide available relevant data, figures and findings, if any, and present them briefly in the relevant table of the Annex (4). DONE

- Please outline available research, studies, and surveys about the sense of belonging and identification of migrants and/or their descendants with Research findings by the Social Integration Commission in its report, \textit{How Integrated in Modern Britain}\textsuperscript{397}, revealed particularly high levels of segregation among the under-17s in Britain. Those under 17 years old in Britain have on average less than half (47\%) the


| Diverse types of local, regional and national identities. Please summarise briefly key findings and any differentiations by nationality or ethnic origin, gender, age and geographic area. | Number of social interactions with people from other ethnicities than would be expected if their relationships reflected the ethnic make-up of their communities. The research also revealed that individuals currently aged between 18 and 34 are the most ethnically integrated. This age group have on average two thirds (65%) the number of social interactions with people from different ethnic backgrounds than would be expected if ethnicity was irrelevant. The research further demonstrates that ethnic segregation becomes more widespread again for older age groups. Those aged between 35 and 54 years old have on average just 44% of the number of social interactions with people from other ethnicities than would be expected if ethnicity was irrelevant. |

Research funded by the Runnymede trust, examined whether a school system with faith schools can also promote equality and cohesion. England currently has a system that includes faith-based schools which reflect the diversity of religion and belief in England. The key findings and recommendations from the research aim to clarify the role of faith schools in the system. They are: end selection on the basis of faith; involve children in discussions about how they are educated; included religious education as part of the core national curriculum; ensure faith schools serve the most disadvantaged; faith schools must value all young people; and that faith should continue to play and important role in our education system. |

| Please indicate legal measures and case law affecting social cohesion and community relations, for example the banning of specific religious or ethnic dress, such as the ‘burqa’ | There are no legal measures in the UK banning religious dress. One case involving the wearing of the niqaab whilst giving evidence as a defendant during a criminal trial in the Crown Court has however imposed some limitations on when a defendant may and may not cover their face during trial. For more details of the case see R v (D) R (Judgment of H.H. Judge Peter Murphy in relation to wearing of niqaab by defendant during proceedings in Crown Court) in Annex 9. |

| Does the action plan or strategy on integration and inclusion of migrants and their descendants address combating racism, xenophobia and intolerance? Are there specific integration/inclusion actions related to racism and intolerance for education and/or for young people? If yes, how are such actions | As mentioned above (under Section 1), there is no UK action plan. However, the Equality and Human Rights Commission is a statutory body which operates as an independent body to protect and promote equality and human rights in Great Britain. It aims to encourage equality and diversity, eliminate unlawful discrimination, and promote and protect human rights. The Commission monitors and provides information on equality legislation on age, disability, gender reassignment, marriage and civil partnership, pregnancy and maternity, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation. It encourages compliance with the |

---


linked to general integration and/or social inclusion and/or cohesion policy? Please provide information on implementation and impact of such plans and refer to any assessment of their impact?

Human Rights Act 1998 and is accredited by the UN as an ‘A status’ National Human Rights Institution.

There is no action plan as noted above, but there are initiatives which are linked to general integration and social cohesion; given their nature, they may not always be impact assessed.

The Northern Ireland Department of Education (DENI) established the Taskforce  on Traveller Education on 15th September 2008 (finalised and signed in 2010). The aim of the Taskforce is to assist the Department of Education (DE) develop an action plan on Traveller education. Improving the educational achievement of Travellers is a significant factor in reducing inequalities and encouraging their full inclusion in society, reducing racism and intolerance. The Taskforce is cross-sectoral and includes members of the Traveller Community, representatives from a range of non-government organisations, as well as government Departments and public bodies from all of Ireland. The DE works towards raising the attendance and achievement level of Traveller children to a par with other children (including other minority ethnic groups). Every School a Good School: a Policy for School Improvement specifically mentions Travellers as one of the groups that require a particular focus to close the gap in achievement. Under Chapter 10: Recommendations, subsection 10.9,

Inclusion:

- Consistent regional anti-racism training and high quality learning materials which reflect Traveller culture and heritage should be available to school Governors and school leaders and as part of Initial Teacher Education and the Continuing Professional Development of teaching and non-teaching staff.

The Taskforce has an expectation that these principles will be met in ten years.

The Nation Union of Teachers (NUT), the largest teachers union, provides a range of awareness tools, actions and campaigns for teachers and schools regarding racism, anti-Semitism and Islamophobia, and intolerance generally.

Trust for London is the largest UK independent funder tackling poverty and inequality in the capital. It was established in 1891, and nowadays makes grants

---


totalling £7 million a year, supporting around 400 voluntary and community organisations in London at any one time. The Trust’s for London’s Preventing Racist Violence Special Initiative was launched in January 2007. The initiative was set up in response to findings from a report by the Runnymede Trust: Preventing Racist Violence – Work with Actual and Potential Perpetrators. This report highlighted the fact that, although young people (and especially young men) are predominantly the perpetrators of incidents of racist violence, almost all work in this field over recent decades has concentrated on the response to such incidents, and virtually no targeted work has been undertaken with young people specifically on the prevention of racist violence. This resulted in a three year project involving three organisations to help develop preventive approaches to racist behaviours and incidents. These three were specifically selected because they were all in areas where economic and demographic change has established disturbing social patterns, resulting in changes in the dynamics of inter-ethnic relations. Each organisation operated in a different setting, engaging with a wide range of stakeholders - schools; colleges; community spaces; sporting/ football organisations.

Findings and recommendations resulted (full list here), examples are, for:

**Practitioners**: Raising awareness around identity issues, and challenging racist attitudes and stereotypes, can help to prevent involvement in racist violence, especially in deprived areas experiencing rapid demographic change.

**Policy makers**: A multi-agency approach is essential, including the involvement of community groups, and links to other relevant agendas, such as personal and social development, anti-social behaviour, and community cohesion.

**Funders**: Evaluation of the effectiveness of the interventions should be an integral part of project and programme design.

Please provide information about state and non-state responses via positive measures, campaigns, partnerships involving migrants and communities. Please provide information only about those actions that focus on learning unlimited is a social enterprise. [Its extensive range of support auctioning sustainable integration in the UK is detailed under promising practices.] Its position is that learning is an empowering tool. This organisation has across the specialisms of literacy, language, numeracy, family learning and learning unlimited is a social enterprise. [Its extensive range of support auctioning sustainable integration in the UK is detailed under promising practices.] Its position is that learning is an empowering tool. This organisation has across the specialisms of literacy, language, numeracy, family learning and

---


migrants and on prevention and promotion of peaceful living together and integration as mutual accommodation combating racism and intolerance. Please outline any assessment about their impact and identify any relevant promising practice. (Use the template for promising practices in Annex 7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teacher education. It provides considerable resources to newcomers to the UK recognising the different needs due to culture, faith, gender, etc. A wide range of projects<strong>⁴⁰⁸</strong> have been implemented over the years (impact assessment undertaken), with useful materials in Welcome to the UK project toolkit and flash cards, which can be used in ESOL classes. Workshops are continuously being run, which are supported by a range of key stakeholders. For instance, the British Council presented the latest resources available on the ESOL Nexus website to help learners to develop the English language skills they may need to interact effectively in the UK, in a range of different settings.</th>
<th>SET commissioned the polling organisation Populus to explore the issues of English identity, faith and race. The Fear and HOPE survey gives a snapshot of current attitudes in society today. It explores the level of fear, hate and hope. With 5,054 respondents and 91 questions it is one of the largest and most comprehensive surveys into attitude, identity and extremism in the UK to date. On one level it is not promising. It concludes that there is not a progressive majority in society and it reveals that there is a deep resentment to immigration (which, we note under ‘Barriers’, government campaigns such as ‘Go Home’ capitalised on), as well as scepticism towards multiculturalism. There is a widespread fear of the ‘Other’, particularly Muslims, and there is an appetite for a new right-wing political party that has none of the fascist trappings of the British National Party or the violence of the English Defence League. The findings suggests that because there is a clear correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
between economic pessimism and negative views to immigration, the situation is likely to get worse over the next few years. Some key findings are:

- There is a clear correlation between economic pessimism and negative attitudes towards immigration. The more pessimistic people are about their own economic situation and their prospects for the future the more hostile their attitudes are to new and old immigrants.
- While more likely to consider ethnicity and religion to be important to their identity than nationality, Black and Asian minority groups share many other groups’ opinions on a range of issues, including the national and personal impact of immigration.

Positive findings:

- 60% of respondents thought that positive approaches – community organising, education, and using celebrities and key communal movers and shakers – were the best way to defeat extremism in communities.
- There is a real appetite for a positive campaigning organisation that opposes political extremism through bringing communities together. Over two-thirds of the population would either ‘definitely’ or ‘probably’ support such a group.

---

### 4.2. Combatting racism and intolerance

Are there any policy measures, initiatives and practices to accommodate for ethnic or religious differences, for example in regard to sharing public space, such as swimming pools at local level?

Identify any promising practices encouraging social interaction and contacts of people of different backgrounds at local level (use the template for promising practices in annex 7).

Since there is no integration framework, there are no policies on, for instance, allowing shared space such as swimming pools, at the local level. Local facilities offer some timetabling for Muslim women, and/or women only times. But access to public facilities is open to all members of society, and no special provisions are generally necessary.

Churches Together in Britain and Ireland (CTBI) have joined with the Joint Public Issues team to Counter political extremism. Christians, along with people from other faith communities and beyond, have been very concerned by the growing presence of extremist parties in local elections and their threat to community cohesion. They have issued a guidance note, *Countering far right political parties, extremist groups and racist politics*, on how to field any problems encountered.

---

410 UK, Searchlight Educational Trust, ‘Fear and HOPE survey: Executive Summary’, available at:  


Please also see the ENAR toolkit, under Promising Practices, No.7.

Please indicate concrete measures, initiatives or programmes targeting migrants and/or descendants aiming at building trust in public institutions, especially at local level. E.g. campaigns, opening doors and reaching out to citizens, social centres, informal collective bodies, cultural events etc.

Please provide notable examples of promising practice (use the template for promising practices in annex 7).

There have been some consultations regarding accessing public services. In 2013 the Government implemented a public consultation on migrant access (and financial contribution by those deemed not eligible for free access) to the NHS. This was as the result of concerns raised in the media that the current health system is overly generous to those who have only a temporary relationship with the UK. The consultation has also recognised that the NHS struggles to identify and recover the cost of care from those not entitled to free treatment. It was determined to modify who should be charged in the future, via:

- Whether the current qualifying residency test, for free NHS care, should be revised to reflect a permanent relationship with the UK;
- A proposal to introduce a new requirement for temporary non-EEA migrants to make an explicit contribution to the costs of their healthcare either by a levy or health insurance;
- Whether the UK should continue to charge visitors and illegal migrants (including failed asylum seekers liable to removal, illegal entrants and people who have overstayed their visas) directly at the point of use for hospital treatment.

Are there any specific ethical or other guidelines or rules concerning the language used by media or journalists, when writing about migrants and/or their descendants? In this case please provide briefly information about actual application of such rules and challenges.

There are no specific rules or guidelines for migrants in the realm of media. Appropriate coverage falls under normal ethical requirements.

4.3. Mixed marriages

Mixed marriages is often used as an index for social distance and integration or, even, assimilation. Mixed (citizenship) marriages are defined as those where one of the spouses has foreign citizenship and the other has national citizenship (including registered partnerships, common-law marriages). Please indicate legal

The Immigration Act 2014 enforced stricter rules for detecting sham marriages. Section 55(2) of the Act defines a sham marriage as follows: when either or both party is not a relevant national (a British citizen, a EEA or a Swiss national) and there is no genuine relationship between the parties and either or both parties enter into the marriage for the purpose of avoiding the provisions of UK immigration law or rules or to obtain a right conferred by those laws or rules. Section 55 extends the duty to report suspicious marriages originally provided for in s.24 of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 so that it now

---

limitations, if any, for marriages between nationals and foreigners, e.g. for asylum seekers, third country nationals, etc. Do these limitations result in practical barriers?

imposes a duty on registration officials to report suspected sham marriages before and after a marriage is registered. The additional duty conferred under the 2014 Act to report suspicious marriages before a marriage or civil partnership notice is taken could result in barriers to marriage for migrants.

Under the Asylum and Immigration (Treatment of Claimants, etc.) Act 2004 and the Civil Partnership Act 2004 notice to register must be given to a Designated Register Office in person in England and Wales and either in person or by post in Scotland and Northern Ireland.

The Secretary of State will decide whether to investigate a marriage that has been reported as suspicious unless they are under the category of exempt persons under s.49 of the Immigration Act 2014. Exempt persons are those that are not a relevant national (as detailed above) or do not hold the appropriate immigration status or relevant visa in respect of the proposed marriage or civil partnership. Persons with the appropriate immigration status are those that have a right to permanent residence in the UK, those exempt from immigration control or those that are settled in the UK. Section 62 of the 2014 Act extends the notice period from 15 to 28 days which can be extended under s.50(7) to 70 days should the Secretary of State have reasonable grounds to suspect the marriage is a sham in order to carry out an investigation. Schedule 6 to the Act provides registration officers in England and Wales the power to share information and/or documents with the Home Office if they suspect an immigration offence has been committed.

In 2011 a provision, then contained in Paragraph 227 of the Immigration Rules, that prohibited the settlement of foreign spouses or civil partners unless both parties were over the age of 21 was challenged in the Supreme Court. In R (Quila and another) v Sec of State for the Home Department\textsuperscript{414} the Court found the provision to be an unlawful infringement of the rights contained in Article 8 ECHR as the efficacy of achieving the legitimate aim of preventing forced marriage was thought by the Court to be highly questionable.

Are there any official or non-official data and information on mixed marriages (between nationals and people with another citizenship)? Please provide % proportions on the total number of marriages in a

The decennial Census of Population is the best source of information on mixed partnerships (encompassing marriage, civil partnership and other cohabiting relationships). The Office for National Statistics has published information for England and Wales in 2011.\textsuperscript{415}


given period, as well as data – where available - about ages, country of origin/birth of migrant spouses.

The total household population aged 16 and over was 44.5 million, of whom 25.7 million people (58%) were in a relationship living as part of a couple, who were married, in a civil partnership or cohabiting. Overall, 9% (or 2.3 million) of people who were living as part of a couple were in an inter-ethnic relationship. The corresponding percentage for 2001 was 7%.

People of mixed parentage or with multiple ethnic heritage were most likely to have a partner from another ethnic group (85%), with 91% of people of mixed White and Black-Caribbean heritage having a partnership which was ethnically mixed. The White Irish (71%), Other Black (62%) and Gypsy or Irish Travellers ethnic groups (50%) were the next most likely to be in an inter-ethnic relationship. A quarter of Chinese people in partnerships had a partner from a different ethnic group, but this percentage was nearly twice as high for women (39%) than for men (20%). In most other ethnic groups, women were less likely than men to have a partner from a different ethnic group. At the other extreme, only 4% of White British, 7% of Bangladeshi, 9% of Pakistani and 12% of Indian people in partnerships had a partner from a different ethnic group. Overall, 40% of inter-ethnic partnerships included someone who was White British, with the most common being between Other White and White British (16%), with the largest number of mixed partnerships involving white people and a minority ethnic group involved people of Black-Caribbean heritage. The proportion of people in inter-ethnic relationships decreased most between 2001 and 2011 for the Other White ethnic group (from 54% to 39%), because this ethnic group grew most between 2001 and 2011.

People who were married (or in a civil partnership) were less likely to be in an inter-ethnic relationship than people who were co-habiting (8% compared with 12%). Mixed partnerships were most common for people in the 25 to 49 age range (12% for both men and women).

7% of dependent children lived in a household with an inter-ethnic relationship, but Pakistani (3%), Indian (3%) and Bangladeshi (2%) dependent children were least likely to live in such a household.

The percentage of people living in households containing partnerships only involving people from the same ethnic group was 87.6% in England and Wales, 98.4% in Northern Ireland and 83.8% in Scotland (where white people were split into the White Scottish, White British, White Irish and Other White ethnic groups).
### Annex 2: National and regional level action plans on integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National / regional level (specify region)</th>
<th>Year of the first edition and Year of latest update (e.g. First edition: 2004, Most recent update: 2011)</th>
<th>Responsible ministry – public authority – reference details (URL – links)</th>
<th>Target groups identify migrant and refugee groups as beneficiaries (e.g. on the basis of their residence status)</th>
<th>Main aims, actions and activities foreseen in the focus areas – link to fundamental rights (provide both key dimensions and specific actions and aims of the policy instruments in each focus area (use a different row for each focus area if needed))</th>
<th>Targeting general population? Yes/No – explanatory comments where needed</th>
<th>Insert here definition of integration (in EN) if any. Alternative: Indicate the core aim/objective of the NAP related to social inclusion and/or integration of migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional instrument for England. Creating the conditions for integration.</td>
<td>First edition 2012. No updates from first edition to present.</td>
<td>The Department for Communities and Local Government is the leading responsible ministry. Responsibility is also delegated to the following ministries in the instrument: • Home Office / UK Border Agency • Department for Education (DfE) • Department for Business,</td>
<td>The instrument does not target any one group.</td>
<td>The paper does not specify any programme for achieving integration and instead emphasises the need for action to be taken at the local level and amongst communities. The overall aim of the paper is to create an integrated society, build</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>No full definition of integration is given. The instrument states that the meaning of integration: “creating the conditions for everyone to play a full part in national and local life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>First edition</td>
<td>Targeting</td>
<td>Definition of integration</td>
<td>Reconcile with diversity and good relations?</td>
<td>Definition of integration provided?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>First edition</td>
<td>Author(s)</td>
<td>Target Group</td>
<td>Strategy Aim</td>
<td>Definition Provided?</td>
<td>No definition of integration provided.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration Matters: A Strategy for Refugee Integration</td>
<td>First edition 2004</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>The instrument targets refugees.</td>
<td>The strategy aims at enabling the swift integration of refugees by mainstreaming the support provided for refugees and ensure access to the same services that UK nationals have.</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
<td>The strategy defines integration as the process that takes place when refugees are empowered to achieve their full potential as members of British society, to contribute to the community, and to become fully able to exercise the rights and responsibilities that they share with other residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Edition</td>
<td>Author</td>
<td>Instrument</td>
<td>Strategy Aims</td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Inclusion Strategy (Wales)</td>
<td>First edition 2012</td>
<td>Welsh Assembly Government</td>
<td>The instrument targets refugees.</td>
<td>The strategy aims at supporting and enabling refugees in building a new life and empowering them to make a full contribution to society.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The strategy defines integration as taking place when individual refugees become active members of society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Scots: Integrating Refugees in Scotland’s Communities</td>
<td>First edition 2013</td>
<td>Scottish Government</td>
<td>The instrument targets refugees. ( Whilst the strategy is specifically targeted towards refugees, in correspondence received from the Scottish Government’s Equality, Human Rights and Third Sector Division it was explained that the work taking place will benefit all ethnic minority communities )</td>
<td>The strategy aims to provide a framework for everyone that works with refugees in order to work in a coordinated way alongside the Scottish Government to help refugees rebuild their lives, access mainstream services, contribute to society and create social relations to support their integration.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The strategy defines integration as a two-way process that involves positive change in both the individuals and the host communities and which leads to cohesive, multi-cultural communities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 4: Indicators monitoring migrant integration - social inclusion/cohesion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Legal frame / policy target</th>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Periodicity</th>
<th>Reference / Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>UK: Non-UK born/UK-born employment rate differential October-December 2014. -4.1</td>
<td>Defined as the percentage of economically active non-UK born people aged 16 to 64 who were unemployed minus the percentage of economically active UK born people aged 16 to 64 who were unemployed.</td>
<td>ditto</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-353568">http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-353568</a> Thematic area: Labour market</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nationality October-December 2014. 69.8</td>
<td>Published in ONS (2015) Labour Market Statistics, March 2015 (Table EMP06)</td>
<td>tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-353568 Thematic area: Labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UK: Unemployment rate for ethnic minorities July-September 2014. 5.7</td>
<td>Defined as the percentage of economically active ethnic minority people aged 16 to 64 who were unemployed</td>
<td>Source: UK Labour Force Survey. Published in ONS (2015) Labour Market Statistics, March 2015 (Table A09)</td>
<td>Quarterly <a href="http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-353568">http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/publications/re-reference-tables.html?edition=tcm%3A77-353568</a> Thematic area: Labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK: Ethnic minority/white unemployment rate differential July-September 2014. 5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defined as the unemployment rate for ethnic minority people aged 16 to 64 minus the unemployment rate for white people aged 16 to 64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 5: Use of funding instruments

Table 1 - European Integration Fund (EIF)
NB No breakdown by thematic area available

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>European Integration Fund (EIF) - TOTAL</th>
<th>Own funds</th>
<th>Funds distribution / Thematic areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Social Cohesion / social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>£3,181,697.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>£3,667,327.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>£7,589,195.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>£13,289,696.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>£15,593,492.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The EIF helps fund integration projects for third-country nationals shortly after their arrival (but not for asylum seekers or people granted international protection), “Match-funding” is provided – i.e. 50% of the cost of larger projects and 75% of the cost of smaller projects. Organisations are expected to find the remaining cost from other sources or by subsidising the project themselves.

Value in euros (at 1.41 euros/pound): 2009=€ 4,500,925.20, 2010=€ 5,187,912.05, 2011=€ 10,735,904.00, 2012=€ 18,800,003.53, 2013=€ 22,059,022.31

* Please indicate if Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund is used for 2014
Table 2 - European Refugee Fund (ERF) aiming at integration of beneficiaries of international protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>European Refugee Fund (ERF) TOTAL</th>
<th>Own funds (national/regional)</th>
<th>Funds distribution / Thematic areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Particip</td>
<td>Social Cohesion / Social inclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>£5,046,043.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>£895,994.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>£14,617,157.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>£6,272,281.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>£4,059,775.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Please indicate if Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund is used for 2014


N.B. The European Refugee Fund (ERF) focuses on projects aimed at asylum-seekers and persons granted international protection. Much of it is used to fund the Gateway Protection Programme, which is concerned with resettling “Quota” refugees. Between 2004 and 2012, 4622 refugees were resettled, the largest national groups being Iraqis (1116) and DRC Congolese (1038). Most resettlement was in the North West and Yorkshire and Humberside regions.416

## Annex 7: Promising practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Education [No.1]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Title (original language) | i) The Pupil Premium: How schools are spending the funding successfully to maximise achievement  
| | ii) Update Title- Pupil Premium: An Update |
| Title (EN) | |
| Organisation (original language) | |
| Organisation (EN) | UK, Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills (2013) |
| Government / Civil society | Government |
| Funding body | Department for Education [DfE] |
| | Toolkit: http://educationendowmentfoundation.org.uk/toolkit/ |
| Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist | In April 2011, the DfE introduced a fund of £625 million to give schools £400 per year for each child who:  
| | • was registered as eligible for free school meals  
| | • had been looked after for 6 months or longer  
<p>| From April 2012, pupil premium funding was extended to children eligible for free school meals at any point in the past 6 years. For the 2015 to 2016 financial year, funding for the pupil premium has increased to £2.55 billion. |
| Type of initiative | The pupil premium is additional funding for publicly funded schools in England to raise the attainment of disadvantaged pupils and close the gap between them and their peers. The Education Endowment Foundation has produced a teaching and learning toolkit to help teachers and schools effectively use the pupil premium to support disadvantaged pupils. |
| Main target group | School children: Years 6 – 11 [secondary school level] |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</th>
<th>England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</td>
<td>Assesments on how effective the spending has been to benefit disadvantaged children in schools indicate that the pupil premium is making a difference in many schools. Overall, school leaders are spending pupil premium funding more effectively, tracking the progress of eligible pupils more closely, and reporting outcomes more precisely than before. There are encouraging signs from inspection that the concerted efforts of good leaders and teachers are helping to increase outcomes for pupils eligible for the pupil premium. However, it will take time to establish whether this increased focus will lead to a narrowing in the attainment gap between those eligible for the pupil premium and other pupils. The government is spending significant amounts of public money on this group of pupils. Schools will receive around £2.5 billion through pupil premium funding in the financial year 2014–15. This means that an average sized secondary school with average numbers of pupils eligible for free school meals will receive an additional amount of funding in the region of £200,000. This is the equivalent of five full-time teachers. Ofsted’s increased focus on this issue in all inspections is making a difference. Each report now includes a commentary on the attainment and progress of pupils who are eligible for the pupil premium and evaluates how this compares with other pupils. Headteachers know that their schools will not receive a positive judgement unless they demonstrate that they are focused on improving outcomes for pupils eligible for the pupil premium. We mention this initiative as it is likely to benefit many migrant children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</td>
<td>All of it, provided that enough funding is available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</td>
<td>This initiative requires a substantial revenue injection in order to sustain it across England, so it might not be sustainable in the long term due to funding cuts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</td>
<td>The Ofsted Update report (July 2014), provides an update on the progress schools have made in using their pupil premium funding to raise achievement for pupils eligible for free school meals. It is based on evidence from 151 inspections carried out between January and December 2013, text review of 1,600 school inspection reports published between</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?

This initiative requires a substantial revenue injection in order to sustain it across England. Other EUMS may not consider this a priority in the same way, especially where inclusion of school children is already incorporated (in a similar or some other way), within a national integration framework.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice is transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?

The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) regulates and inspects to achieve excellence in the care of children and young people, and in education and skills for learners of all ages. It does so via the support of several key agencies. It regulates and inspects childcare and children's social care, and inspects the Children and Family Court Advisory and Support Service (Cafcass), schools, colleges, initial teacher training, work-based learning and skills training, adult and community learning, and education and training in prisons and other secure establishments. It assesses council children's services, and inspects services for looked after children, safeguarding and child protection.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.

In 151 reports analysed between January and December 2013, there was an association noted between the overall effectiveness of the school and the impact of the pupil premium. Routinely, good and outstanding schools demonstrate unwavering commitment to closing the attainment gap. They target interventions with much scrutiny, and have robust tracking systems in place to establish what is making a difference and what is not.

Ofsted revised their inspection framework in July 2014. As a result, school inspections report on the attainment and progress of disadvantaged pupils who attract the pupil premium.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Employment [No.2]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>The Co-operative Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>The Co-operative Farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government / Civil society</strong></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body</strong></td>
<td>Own funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</strong></td>
<td>Around 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of initiative</strong></td>
<td>Workplace practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main target group</strong></td>
<td><strong>Migrant workers/Employment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</strong></td>
<td>National</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</strong></td>
<td>The Co-operative currently farms around 50,000 acres of land in England and Scotland. It owns three packhouses for potatoes, broccoli and strawberries. The business requires a large amount of additional labour during the harvest periods on its fruit farms, which it recruits from Europe and a significant proportion of the workforce within its potato packhouses are also of foreign nationality. A graduate from The Co-operative Group’s Leadership Programme was tasked to look at how it could improve the management of migrant workers on its farms and packhouses, helping the business understand what difficulties the workers face in the workplace and what more could be done to support them. From this the following actions were identified:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• ESOL: English lessons are available for all permanent staff at two sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Translators: Every site that has a significant foreign workforce has employees who earn an additional payment each month for providing a translation service for work related matters. External translation support is used for meetings that are confidential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Translation of documents: Health and Safety signs, induction documents and policy and procedure documents are translated into several languages. The annual employee engagement survey is translated into all the languages spoken in the packhouses so everyone has an equal say.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Welfare Officer: In Perthshire, a returning student is employed as a welfare officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</td>
<td>Language training and information provision. Better information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</td>
<td>These actions have achieved benefits for the business:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A number of foreign workers have been promoted to Line Supervisors and Managers at the packhouses and fruit farms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• An ever increasing number of returnees for the summer harvests reduces recruitment and training costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low turnover rates within its packhouses enabling development of the workforce and promotion from within.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</td>
<td>The impact can be measured by comparing labour turnover rates over time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</td>
<td>Most of these actions are management good practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</td>
<td>In Perthshire, a returning student is employed as a welfare officer. Many of the students are young, working away from home for the first time, so the welfare officer supports them with personal issues, such as finding a doctor or the nearest post office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.</td>
<td>No information available.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thematic area** | Employment [3]  
---|---  
**Title (original language)** | Genesis Breads |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title (EN)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description (max. 1000 chars)**

Genesis Breads is a family owned craft bakery. Established in 1968, it has listings with major multiples and independents in the UK, Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland. Genesis Breads employs a large number of highly skilled migrant workers and it undertakes various activities to assist with their integration into the workforce. This includes simple activities from translating all signage and notice boards to ensuring all employees’ full skill sets are identified and fully utilised, benefitting both the employee’s own development as well as the business.

They appointed a Polish migrant worker to the HR department to develop advice and guidance for employees relating to their wages and contributions, vital information for new migrant workers. This progressed to helping translate various policies, documents and contracts for employees. This person is now an official liaison officer for all Polish employees and is the first point of contact, including completing inductions for new employees. Her work helps to engage non-English speaking employees and allows the company to promote the strong company ethos more effectively.
Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)

Migrant worker liaison officer

Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)

The policy has benefits for the company in terms of:

- Continually decreasing levels of employee turnover, especially in production areas which traditionally have higher staff turnover levels
- Increased loyalty from employees and improved motivation and employee engagement
- Improved support for managers which has decreased time spent on resolving issues
- Improved line manager communication

Allowed the business to grow smoothly while technical standards from new customers like M&S were introduced

Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact

The impact can be measured by comparing labour turnover rates over time.

Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?

It provides benefits for the employer

Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.

The migrant liaison officer is a Polish migrant worker.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.

No information available.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Social Integration &amp; Inclusion [No.4]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>The establishment of a policy forum on refugee, asylum and migrant issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>West Midlands Strategic Migration Partnership (WMSMP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Migrant Consultative body (Gov)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>UK Border Agency of the UK Home Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (incl. url, where available)</td>
<td><a href="http://www.ilo.org/dyn/migpractice/migmain.showPractice?p_lang=en&amp;p_practice_id=64">http://www.ilo.org/dyn/migpractice/migmain.showPractice?p_lang=en&amp;p_practice_id=64</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
<td>2007 – ongoing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
<td>Its mandate is to coordinate and advocate on behalf of these populations, to include the accommodation, support and social integration of refugees, asylum-seekers and recently arrived migrants. Through its work, the forum also gathers and monitors data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve the living conditions of migrant workers who experience overcrowding, exploitation, lack of legal advice and accommodation issues;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve support available to migrant children in schools especially in rural areas, as well as parental understanding of admissions, appeals, absenteeism and other procedures to enable migrant children to reach their full potential;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To support and develop the capacity of Primary Care Trust Asylum Leads and other relevant health networks in the region;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve the employment conditions of, and opportunities for, progression for migrant workers in the region. Further, to dispel myths about displacement caused by migrant workers and communicate the benefit of up-skilling this group to local employers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To improve the opportunities for migrants to access English language training, ideally through working with their employers and local ESOL providers. In addition, to improve the information, advice and guidance available to migrants about education and training opportunities, enabling them to make better and more informed decisions; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To respond positively to issues of community cohesion and tensions in areas where there are significant new migrant populations. In addition, to work with the media to challenge common misconceptions concerning new migrants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
<td>WMSMP's target beneficiaries include key voluntary and community organizations across the region with a focus on asylum, refugee or migration issues; asylum seekers;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate level of implementation:</strong> Local/Regional/National</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlands region of the UK. The key partners of WMSMP are: the UK Border Agency; the Government Office of the Regions; local authority departments across the region; statutory service providers such as health, education and the police; voluntary and community sector organisations; refugee and migrant community organisations and support agencies; accommodation providers within the private, public and voluntary sectors; the business sector; trade unions; Citizens Advice Bureau; Jobcentre Plus; the Department of Health and the Regional Learning and Skills Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WMSMP is funded by the UK Home Office and develops biennial strategic business plans. It also undertakes work and supports projects and organizations that receive funding from other sources. WMSMP is the principal regional policy forum on refugee, asylum and migrant issues. It was established as a result of the Immigration and Asylum Act 1999 to coordinate activities regarding the dispersal, accommodation and support of asylum seekers and the integration and social inclusion of refugees. In 2007, WMSMP was asked by the Home Office to include new migrants in its remit. The WMSMP Secretariat seeks to work in partnership to gather regional data and monitor and evaluate the impact of policies and influence policy decisions; promote the inclusion of asylum-seekers, refugees and new migrants through a multi-agency approach; identify and seek to address gaps in resources and service provision; ensure relevant organisations are aware of the needs of asylum-seekers, unsuccessful asylum-seekers, new refugees and migrants; and partner with local, regional and national bodies including government departments to deliver on specific initiatives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The impact of WMSMP's work goes beyond the duration of particular initiatives: regional networks are established amongst and between migrants and organizations working on migration issues and there is improved awareness and understanding of migration issues within these organizations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to 'one off activities')</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A benefit of WMSMP is the development of relationships and partnerships between different agencies in the region, enhancing cooperation and information sharing at a regional level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Integration [No.5]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>Welcome to the UK [i]; ACE [Active Citizenship and English] [ii]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>Welcome to the UK [i]; LLU+ at London South Bank University (Year 1) then Learning Unlimited ( Years 2 &amp;3) ACE [Active Citizenship and English] [ii]Learning Unlimited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>European Integration Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reference (incl. url, where available) | [http://www.learningunlimited.co/projects/previous-projects/wttuk](http://www.learningunlimited.co/projects/previous-projects/wttuk)  
[http://www.learningunlimited.co/projects/ace](http://www.learningunlimited.co/projects/ace)  
| Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist | [i] WUK: July 2010 – June 2013  
| Type of initiative | Supporting and facilitating language learning, integration, active citizenship and access to UK society via range of taught skills, including ESOL |
| Main target group | [i] WUK:  
Strand 1 UK based – non EU national migrant women in a category leading to settlement in the UK  
Strand 2 Bangladeshi based (pre-departure) – Bangladeshi women in a category leading to settlement in the UK (i.e. spouse or family reunion visas)  
[ii] ACE: UK based – non EU national migrant women in a category leading to settlement in the UK |
| Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National | [i] WUK: London, UK and Sylhet, Bangladesh  
[ii] ACE: London, UK |
| Brief description (max. 1000 chars) | [i] WUK:  
Welcome to the UK (WUK) was an innovative three-year project which supported the integration of non-EU migrant women in the UK. The project had two main strands:  
  a. Free, accredited, ESOL programmes for non-EU national women settling in the UK comprising:  
     - contextualised language learning |
- thematic events providing opportunities for women to engage with key local agencies and services (e.g. 999, Staying safe at home, citizenship, progression)
- trips and visits (e.g. the Houses of Parliament, local libraries and markets, museums, parks, the seaside etc).
- support from trained volunteer befrienders

b. Free pre-departure bi-lingual topic-based 'Preparing for life in the UK' workshops in Bangladesh delivered by local teachers of English working with volunteers from the UK

WUK also provided:

- recruitment, training and support for volunteers - befrienders in the UK and British Bangladeshi women supporting the PLUK workshops in Bangladesh
- free capacity building workshop for other providers working with the target group in the UK and Bangladesh
- free capacity building’ Teaching Basic literacy to ESOL learners’ short courses for ESOL practitioners working with the target group
- an annual dissemination event (x 3)
- the production and distribution of free toolkits; Welcome to the UK, Preparing for life in the UK, Setting up and running a volunteer befriender programme

[ii] ACE provides

Free, accredited, ESOL programmes for non-EU national women settling in the UK comprising:

- contextualised language learning
- thematic events providing opportunities for women to engage with key local agencies and services (e.g. Staying safe at home, citizenship, Talking Politics, progression) – some of these organised by learners themselves
- trips and visits (e.g. the Houses of Parliament, local libraries and markets, museums, parks, etc.
- support of trained volunteer befrienders
- volunteering opportunities for learners
- free workshops and short courses, e.g. bread-making, cake decorating, CV writing, interview skills, basic literacy, yoga, zumba, life in the UK, exam preparation

ACE has also provided:
- recruitment, training and support for volunteer befrienders
- free capacity building workshop for other providers working with the target group in the UK
- free capacity building ‘Teaching Basic literacy to ESOL learners’ short courses for ESOL practitioners working with the target group
- an annual dissemination event (x 2)

the production of *Literacy for Active Citizenship* easy readers for adults who are beginner readers in English with free downloadable supporting activities

The support and training offered to the non-EU migrants on both of these projects goes beyond simple English language skills. Each project has included a range of effective and empowering elements which support the target group in developing the knowledge, skills and confidence to fell part of life in the UK, and take an active part in life in the UK. They have also been able to develop a wide range of additional skills, meet numerous local and national agencies and key stakeholders, build friendships, and get support to deal with everyday challenges, such as travelling on public transport and accessing public services.

Learning Unlimited is one of two organisations (the other being QED in Bradford) which has successfully delivered pre-departure projects in non-EU settings. The impact and transferability of these projects as been recognised in a number of ways:

- The Welcome to the UK project hosted a visit by the Director General for Home Affairs (Brussels) in 2011.
- In 2012 and 2013 project staff took part in and made presentations at pre-departure conferences in Brussels.
- In September 2014, project staff made a presentation at the Headstart conference on pre-departure practice ([http://www.headstartproject.eu/](http://www.headstartproject.eu/)) and have been invited to attend the final conference in Vienna May 2015.
- In 2015 the ACE project has been short-listed for a prestigious ELTons award in the Local Innovation category.
- Feedback from CPD and capacity building training programmes clearly demonstrate the impact and value for participants: ‘the best conference of my life’ (ACE dissemination event Year 1).
| Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’) | The project has benefits to both migrants and UK society in terms of:
- Learners and volunteers develop valuable skills, knowledge and confidence which support their progression
- Training and support for partner organisations in recognising and responding to the needs of migrant women in innovative ways
- The production of toolkits, readers and resources
- Free CPD, capacity building short courses and dissemination events have shared approaches/good practice, locally, nationally, within the EU and in Bangladesh
- Lessons learned from each project are used to inform the design and delivery of subsequent projects |
|---|---|
| Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact | Non-EU migrant women are able to improve their knowledge of British culture and language, as well as develop cross-cultural friendships. Since July 2010, the project has enrolled 96 non-EU migrant women in the UK. This includes 37 women who have achieved English language accreditations in the first year. From the start of the project, 6 volunteers in the UK and 26 teachers in Bangladesh have been recruited in an effort to increase the capacity of pre-departure English teaching. This has resulted in 96 Bangladeshi women attending English classes in preparation for their departure to the UK.

The Bangladeshi teachers in turn benefit from training, capacity building support, and the opportunity to be directly involved in the delivery of the project workshops. During the first two years of this project, 120 teachers benefitted from training and capacity building support in the UK. |
| Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States? | See above comment on dissemination on pre-departure conference |
| Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice. | A wide range of match-funding and delivery parents have been involved in different years/aspects of each project: Blackfriars Settlement (voluntary sector organisations), BRAC (International charity), the British Council, Greenwich Community College, London Borough of Southwark, London South Bank University, Morley College, St Giles International, UCL Institute of Education (NRDC), UK Bangladesh Education Trust (charity based in Bangladesh), Working Men’s College. |
Each project has an advisory group comprising match funding and delivery partners, learners, volunteers, funders, project delivery staff and external experts.

Each project has a rigorous on-going approach to review and evaluation involving all stakeholders. Recommendations are used to inform year on year improvements.

An impact assessment report is produced each year.

The Welcome to the UK project also had an external evaluation carried out.

The ACER project has included training and support for volunteer befrienders (Led by the UCL Institute of Education) in practitioner research methods and the befrienders are researching the approaches and impact of befriending.

Learner and volunteers in the UK and Bangladesh were involved in a participatory video project on each year of the Welcome to the UK project. These videos also provide powerful evidence of the impact of the projects.

**Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.**

[i] WUK: an annual internal led impact assessment informed by all stakeholders + external evaluation

[ii] ACE: an annual internal led impact assessment informed by all stakeholders + practitioner research undertaken by volunteer befrienders and supported/led by the UCL IoE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Integration (projects, campaigns, including migrants’ political participation initiatives) [No.6]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Title (original language) | The UK’s leading migrants’ voter registration campaign project  
www.votebooster.org/register/theforum |
<p>| Title (EN) | |
| Organisation (original language) | The Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum [MRCF]. Known also as the ‘Forum’ |
| Organisation (EN) | |
| Government / Civil society | Civil society - charity |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding body [amount]</th>
<th>This charity is funded by a wide range of organisations, including AB Charitable Trust; Barrow Cadbury Trust; and the European Commission. For a full list of funders, see: <a href="http://migrantforum.org.uk/about-4/">http://migrantforum.org.uk/about-4/</a></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference (incl. url, where available)</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
<td>MRCF was established in 1993 -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
<td>Several, see below. But in particular also: A series of special meetings and trainings organised with policy makers as a part of the 'Engage to Change' programme, an initiative which encourages migrants to engage directly with politicians and policy-makers at Forum organised meetings and events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
<td>Settled ethnic minorities, refugees, and new migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Locally based and support is provided London-wide, but overseas’ persons also benefit from training (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</td>
<td>The Forum’s mission is to promote the rights of migrants and refugees by developing sustainable community organisations that contribute to an inclusive society. Its work addresses all aspects of the social exclusion of migrants and refugees with the aim of meaningful integration in the UK. We provide advice and support to individuals and community organisations, produce research and work in partnership to influence policy and facilitate better understanding and inclusion. MRCF runs a resource centre that provides space for training, meetings and cultural activities, and office space and support services for community groups. Its resource centre premises allow it to have daily contact with individuals and the main communities in the area. Its meeting rooms are in constant use by different groups and the people and advice services and mentoring support is available to hundreds of vulnerable individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</td>
<td>In 2010, MRCF involved 92 people in its work on a volunteer basis. Between them, they spoke 42 languages and dialects, illustrating the diversity of the communities in their catchment area. The Forum’s mentoring scheme supported 75 vulnerable migrants throughout the year. Its three day per week capacity building project delivered 141 individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</strong></td>
<td>advice sessions of fundraising, project development, delivery and governance to 32 community organisations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</strong></td>
<td>MRCF has established a user-led infrastructure that aids in capacity building for local community-led alliances. It supports the rights of migrants and refugees by assisting in the development and strengthening of their community organisations. In addition, MRCF develops and runs programmes that provide support to individual migrants and refugees. These programmes are issue-based and usually address needs that cannot be addressed by community organisations such as the Overseas Health Professionals training programme, which provides support for migrant doctors and dentists in the process of verification of their qualifications in the UK. To date, the project has provided support to more than 3,500 individuals from 98 countries across the UK.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</strong></td>
<td>MRCF delivered training and employment support to 3,500 overseas doctors and dentists, trained 90 digital activists for 6 weeks, and delivered English classes, training on self-advocacy, job search skills, welfare rights, and health awareness for hundreds of newly arrived migrants. The Forum organised eight public events, bringing together community leaders and policy makers to enhance the debate and instigate change. It published two reports reflecting concerns raised in these meetings and ran successful lobbying campaigns to ensure the voices of its members were heard and considered in the debate (regular e-newsletters are distributed to 5,000 subscribers).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</strong></td>
<td>The Forum’s approach clearly directs migrant organisations outwards from the concerns expressed within their communities to a fuller engagement with other groups within local civil society and towards policy makers and politicians making key decisions. In planning programmes of work it makes use of ‘power analysis’ techniques, which map the chains of authority and interest in a particular policy domain, looking for the points where advocacy will be most persuasive and effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.</strong></td>
<td>The Forum constantly reviews its work against an agreed set of benchmarks. Progress against these benchmarks is carefully evaluated in a process that involves obtaining feedback from the groups involved in Forum projects - both from the standpoint of the benefits gained and also the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
quality of the experience for the individual who has been involved in this work. Analysis of this feedback allows the Forum to obtain a stronger sense of what is working positively in its work. Other measurable impacts of the Forum include:

- numbers of visits to its website; number of bookings for events, training and meetings in its Resource Centre; number of individuals seeking legal advice; number of capacity building support sessions; number of policy changes addressed through campaigning, media and partnership work; measurable improvements in migrant access to health services in line with the work done as part of the Forum’s ‘Good Practice Guide to Accessing Health’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Integration [No.7]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title (original language)</strong></td>
<td>ENAR Migrant Integration Toolkit [Also referred to the MRIP Toolkit]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title (EN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation (original language)</strong></td>
<td>The European Network Against Racism [ENAR]. The toolkit was one key output from the ‘Migrants’ Rights and Integration Project’ (MRIP). The MRIP Project was managed by ENAR’s UK partner, Migrant Rights Network.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation (EN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government / Civil society</strong></td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body [amount]</strong></td>
<td>Funded as a part of the EPIM (European Programme on Integration and Migration)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Reference (incl. url, where available)** | Toolkit can be downloaded at: [www.edf.org.uk/blog/?p=15083](http://www.edf.org.uk/blog/?p=15083)  
ENAR website: [www.enar-eu.org/](http://www.enar-eu.org/) |
<p>| <strong>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</strong> | The project commenced in 2009 and since that date has conducted a series of reviews of integration policies in each country. The Toolkit was launched in 2011. There is no planned finishing date, as this is a practical tool and a the |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Type of initiative</strong></th>
<th>Developing a 'best policy'migrant’s integration approach at the national level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main target group</strong></td>
<td>This toolkit has been designed to help groups working with migrant communities across Europe in local and regional contexts in the field of integration. This toolkit is for everyone interested in the idea of good practice for migrant integration, and outlines how this can be promoted as a means to achieve greater equality and fairness throughout European society.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</strong></td>
<td>This serves all levels of integration initiatives’ implementation: Local; Regional, National [UK], EU-wide at the same levels. The UK element of the overall MRIP project was managed by the Migrant and Refugee Communities Forum (MRCF). One of the key reasons ENAR recruited MRCF was because its own office and work is situated in geographical areas in which immigrant and black and minority communities form a sufficient critical mass to facilitate the establishment of structures and support mechanisms that are capable of existing for extended periods. The needs of comparable communities across the UK can benefit from the Toolkit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</strong></td>
<td>MRIP was designed to test the extent to which the six member states in the study [Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Italy, Sweden and the UK], were using the EU Common Basic Principles, in particular the principle on ‘mutual accommodation’, within the policies they were operating - at national and regional levels. The project began in 2009 and during the first two years of work partners reviewed the range of integration policies which were being developed in their respective countries and assessed the extent to which they were being influenced by the EU common framework. In 2010 they then commenced a series of peer review examinations of specific integration projects to assess the degrees of success they had achieved in achieving empowerment and the enhancement of migrant rights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</strong></td>
<td>The toolkit itself; was developed to support migrants’ integration activities at local and regional levels. The toolkit provides guidance, especially relating to ENAR’s 15 principles. The overall aim was to provide good practice on a range of different activities and actions related to migrant integration, to aid in devising strategies for those pursuing integration projects and to improve communication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</strong></td>
<td>Strategies in order to reach wide audiences to promote a positive understanding of migrant integration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</strong></td>
<td>The project built on grassroots contributions by national ENAR members active in migrant support to develop a practical operative framework of best practices in the field of migrant integration, strengthening and making more visible migrants’ voices at the national and EU levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</strong></td>
<td>The project conducted a series of peer review evaluations of integration initiatives in the six partner countries. These attempted to look at the impacts of integration initiatives across a range of policy headings – such as employment, children of migrant families, media discourses, vulnerable workers and community cohesion. The critical issue examined was the extent to which various stakeholders had been drawn into these processes, had changed their perceptions on what integration meant, and had developed new commitments to seeing the work carried through to completion. The completion of the peer reviews was followed by the organisation of roundtable discussions in each partner countries to aid in the identification of lessons and experiences, and good practice issues which had the potential to be transported between projects and countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</strong></td>
<td>It was planned to be transferable. The MRIP toolkit was widely disseminated through ENAR’s various communication channels (Weekly Mail, Facebook and Twitter accounts etc) and directly to ENAR members (in 30 countries including the 27 EU member states, Turkey, Iceland and Croatia). The publication was also disseminated to the EU Institutions in Brussels and to other EU agencies and networks (145 boxes were sent within Belgium + 107 across Europe).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.</strong></td>
<td>The toolkit draws on the work of migrant support organisations in six European countries. Each of these groups has, to a greater or lesser extent, considered its work in the context of the European Union’s ‘Common Basic Principles (CBPs)’ on migrant integration. The organisations that have contributed to this work are: Institute de recherche, formation et action sur les migrations, IRFAM - Belgium, Association for the Integration of Refugees and Migrants - Bulgaria, KISA - Action for Equality, Support, Anti-racism - Cyprus, Centro d’Iniziativa per l’Europa del Piemonte - Italy, Centre Against Racism - Sweden, and the UK Race and Europe Network - United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The MRIP toolkit was launched on 26 November 2011 at a conference in Brussels. Participants included ENAR member organisations, academics, EC officials and other relevant</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
stakeholders drawn from across the EU including EU Institutions in Brussels, and other EU agencies and networks. This event enabled the sharing of good practice but also a sound reflection on the challenges linked to integration work in the current political climate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Education - Northern Ireland [No8]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title (original language)</strong></td>
<td>Title of Key Stage 3 children’s publication: Migrant Workers - Education for Employability and Local and Global Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title (EN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation (original language)</strong></td>
<td>The Department of Education (delivered via the Northern Ireland Curriculum board). The European Studies Programme is a post-primary curriculum based programme linking schools in Ireland with schools across Europe through sustained collaborative projects furthering tolerance, mutual understanding and appreciation of the cultures of others (currently more than 300 schools in 25 European Countries are engaged in the programme).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation (EN)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government / Civil society</strong></td>
<td>Government [Education Department]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funding body [amount]</strong></td>
<td>Department of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</strong></td>
<td>This resource is already in place, Learning for Life and Work (LLW) is a statutory Area of Learning in the Northern Ireland Curriculum and has four components. Taking a European Union perspective, EU4U focuses on one of the four: Local and Global Citizenship. The European Studies Programme (and funding) will cease at the end of June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of initiative</strong></td>
<td>This is a child-friendly booklet, produced under Learning for Life and Work (LLW). This a statutory Area of Learning in the Northern Ireland Curriculum and has four components.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main target group</strong></td>
<td>KS3 school children in NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate level of implementation:</strong> Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Regional [NI]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Brief description (max. 1000 chars)** | This school children’s resource considers issues of diversity and cultural identity. It also supports teaching of Local and Global Citizenship by encouraging the class to explore:  
- aspects of Equality and Social Justice, and Democracy and Active Participation;  
- factors that influence individual and group identity;  
- ways in which individuals and groups express their identity;  
- prejudice and stereotyping;  
- how people may experience inequality or discrimination on the basis of their group identity; and  
- Democracy and Active Participation – by allowing pupils to participate in a democratic process.  
Each activity session gives pupils a chance to develop a range of Thinking Skill and Personal Capabilities. |
| **Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)** | The purpose of this integrated activity is for pupils to consider issues of diversity and cultural identity and to investigate the local impact of the global market and the experiences of workers who have come from other countries to Northern Ireland. It explores terms and aims to deepen understanding of issues and challenges that face migrant workers. Diary writing is a core activity in this integrated unit, allowing pupils to look at these issues and challenges from the viewpoint of the Polish Martynowicz family. Using role-play, pupils learn to empathise with migrant workers and their families. This aspect can be modified for use in other EUMS. |
| **Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to 'one off activities')** | It is statutory Area of Learning in the Northern Ireland Curriculum. And is therefore embedded as part of teaching and learning. |
| **Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact** | ESP aims to develop an awareness and appreciation of other cultures, thereby fostering mutual understanding among |
Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?

Learning for Life and Work (LLW) is a statutory Area of Learning in the Northern Ireland Curriculum and has four components. Taking a European Union perspective, EU4U focuses on one of the four: Local and Global Citizenship. EU4U encourages pupils to:

- explore, understand, evaluate and make informed decisions about the workings of the European Union (EU);
- recognise that the EU influences their lives as individuals and as contributors to society and the economy;
- understand and investigate those influences;
- recognise their place in the EU and that they can have a voice in the EU;
- think critically about how they contribute to the EU; and
- gain confidence in their role as a member of the EU.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.

The NI Curriculum website delivers the resources on behalf of the Partnership Management Board, a strategic planning group that includes a wide range of organisations, all of whom have an investment to provide the suitable skills and training to school children and students under their collective remit. Some examples are: Council for Catholic Maintained Schools; Classroom 2000; Department of Education; Education and Library Boards (BELB, SEELB, NEELB, SELB, WELB); Education and Training Inspectorate; Educational Technology Strategy Group; Initial Teacher Education; NI Council for Curriculum Examinations and Assessment (CCEA); Regional Training Unit; and Universities Council for Education and Training.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.

The DE has a duty to review attainment across all statutory aspects of the curriculum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Employment [No.9]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>PLAB and Clinical Attachment Project for Refugee Doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td><em>The Refugee Council also operates a similar project. Refugees into Teaching (RiT) supports those with a background in teaching who are looking to requalify and access employment within primary and secondary education across England. Funding for direct services under this project finished in 2011 but the project still accepts registrations. Weblink below</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>A range of funders provide for the various aspects of the project needs. They are:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Main partners in the project and their services for Refugee Doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Glowing Results: IELTS, free course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ RAGU (Refugee Advice and Guidance Unit, Metropolitan University): Career guidance and advice, voluntary/work placements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Whipps Cross University Hospital NHS Trust: providing clinical attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ Newham University Hospital NHS Trust: providing clinical attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ West Middlesex University Hospital NHS Trust: providing clinical attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other organisation supporting Refugee Doctors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ General Medical Council [GMC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ London Deanery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>▪ British Medical Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (incl. url, where available)</td>
<td>Refugee Council, ‘Services and links for Refugee Health Professionals’, available at: <a href="http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/what_we_do/refugee_services/refugees_into_jobs/refugee_health_professionals/services_and_links_for_r">www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/what_we_do/refugee_services/refugees_into_jobs/refugee_health_professionals/services_and_links_for_r</a>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
<td>The project provides support for London based refugee doctors to re-qualify to UK standards and secure employment appropriate to their professional qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
<td>Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Local / regional / national</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brief description (max. 1000 chars) | i) The Project provides a free 6 week preparation courses for PLAB Part 1 and Part 2 tests. PLAB (Professional and Linguistic Assessment Board) tests are the main route by which International Medical Graduates demonstrate that they have the necessary skills and knowledge to practice medicine in the UK. Clinical attachments can be arranged for doctors who pass PLAB Part 2 test to help them in familiarizing with NHS. The project provides free PLAB 1 & PLAB 2 preparation courses and assistance in arranging clinical attachments.  

ii) The Refugee Council has also produced a short video aimed at refugee health professionals on recognising and dealing with communication and cross cultural issues within the NHS, as part of their training. Additional project support:  

- Practical support in improving the language and communication skills  
- Financial support to cover travel expenses while attending courses and clinical attachments  
- Help with job search – job interview techniques and practice |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Thematic area</strong></th>
<th><strong>Integration [No.10]</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>COSLA (the Convention of Scottish Local Authorities) Migration Policy Toolkit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>COSLA Strategic migration partnership [CSMP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preparations for CAPS interviews (Clinical Apprenticeship Scheme, an employment scheme for refugee doctors, run by London Deanery).**

**Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)**

This is specially to cater for refugees wishing to work as doctors in the UK

**Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)**

There is a need for trained medical professionals and this process takes many years. Capitalising on already trained persons, and supporting them to become compliant with UK regulations, circumnavigates the time to train from scratch. Additionally, support is provided beyond the PLAC training, namely enhancing employability via CV support; job search, and continued support while settling in a new job.

**Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact**

Successful outcomes

**Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?**

This is specially developed to cater for refugees wishing to use their existing skills set to work as doctors in the UK

**Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.**

See above, some partners provide either funds or clinical placements.

**Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.**

Several organisations (including the GMC) will ensure that refugees will undertake thorough testing and internal reviews throughout the process.
Funding body [amount]  Scottish local government, Scottish national government, and UK government. COSLA’s work in this area was initially funded by the UK Borders Agency, but since the Toolkit was published in 2009 Scottish Government has provided match funding.


Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist  The toolkit was launched in May 2010. But the Toolkit was published in 2009 and two intensive support pilot projects were completed in Shetland and Glasgow. Dumfries and Galloway have used the Toolkit themselves to develop a demographic action plan with input from COSLA. The team now plan to work with a number of local authorities across Scotland in the next two years. The toolkit, outcomes and lessons learned are available to all Las Usage is ongoing.

Type of initiative  The project will address policy and capacity building across the different spheres of government, reinforcing Scotland’s capacity to coordinate, implement, monitor and evaluate national integration strategies for migrants, particularly non-EU migrants

Main target group

Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National  Regional

Brief description (max. 1000 chars)  The toolkit provides LAs (local authorities) with an understanding of local demographic challenges; helps LAs to better estimate the number of migrants in their area, enabling accurate grant allocations and planning for appropriate services; suggests policy options to attract, retain and integrate migrants, including work to support both migrants and settled communities. Issues covered include: civic leadership from local politicians; integration; managing communications; supporting front-line staff. There is a focus on face-to-face communication, for instance training of local councillors and front-line staff so they have accurate information on migration, its benefits and their role in promoting this, and similar work with local people. The toolkit uses a broad definition of migration, including international and within-UK migration.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</th>
<th>The Scottish Government identified in-migration as a key solution to achieving their ambitious population targets and counteracting demographic challenges. Migration can fill skills gaps, contribute to the economy, add diversity and boost the working age population. Although the mid-2009 Scottish population estimates reveal the highest population since 1979, Scotland still faces significant demographic issues. Many local authorities are experiencing significant demographic challenges such as a growing elderly population, a decreasing working age population and in some areas depopulation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to 'one off activities')</td>
<td>The Toolkit aimed to help local authorities and their community planning partners better understand the demographic challenges faced in their areas and plan strategies for using migration as a mechanism to counteract the difficulties they were facing. Four years on from the initial publication of the Toolkit, CSMP is now seeking to assess its utility as part of the Migration Matters Scotland project and as a means of developing updated resources for councils and their community planning partners to utilise going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</td>
<td>Four years on from the initial publication of the Toolkit, CSMP is now seeking to assess its utility as part of the Migration Matters Scotland project and as a means of developing updated resources for councils and their community planning partners to utilise going forward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</td>
<td>Some aspects such as the comprehensive Welcome Packs would be transferable. The driver for this is an aging population. Also, the nature of the programme is to promote shared learning between LAs, tailored to specific local needs and trends. Shetland has also looked at international lessons as part of this work, to understand how transport services in remote parts of Sweden bring communities together, and how the Faroe Islands grew their population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</td>
<td>Individual LAs have received intensive support with the toolkit either to begin strategic work on migration and integration, or to review existing work and develop responses for the future. The toolkit is also available for any local authority to use independently. COSLA has worked closely with two local authorities to date, and other local authorities have used the Toolkit independently. LAs can receive support from COSLA in gathering data to better understand local demographic and migration trends, and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
developing local dialogue, and to decide an overall strategy that links to their Single Outcome Agreement and the Scottish Government National Outcomes, using the toolkit to consider actions which could contribute to the overall strategy. Specific outcomes included (in Shetland, for example), a Welcome Pack for new migrants including information on events in the community centres and local shops, training for front-line staff to develop their understanding of migration and role in promoting it, and measures to keep councillors informed of issues that migrants may face as well as problems that occur within existing communities. The process of producing the Toolkit has also led to improvements in the quality of data available to local authorities on their migrant populations and the Toolkit signposts to the best sources of data.

Outcomes measures of the toolkit are largely process or output-based. For instance, the number of LAs supported, strategies produced and actions put in place (such as the development of local Welcome Packs).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Citizenship [No.11]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>Peterborough New Link Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>Peterborough New Link Asylum and Migration Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Government &amp; civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>New Link initially received £2.2m over three years from a Home Office Invest to Save Fund, following an approach from Peterborough City Council, the police and health services, and the Red Cross.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the</td>
<td>2004 - 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>finishing date if it has ceased to exist</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of initiative</strong></td>
<td>The project employed workers speaking several community languages, and developed links with community groups made up of both new migrants and long-term residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main target group</strong></td>
<td>Migrants (new and settled); asylum seekers &amp; refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indicate level of implementation:</strong> Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Local - regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</strong></td>
<td>The New Link Centre was an advice, information and signposting service for new migrants to Peterborough. A major emphasis was on integration, and identifying areas of conflict or tension between new migrants and settled communities. Services provided through New Link included English language training, citizenship and integration skills, information on local regulations and requirements, support for migrants in knowing their housing and employment rights, building a database of migrant skills to match them to employers, mediation services in neighbourhood conflict, and work on capacity building and education of service providers, community groups and local media to promote positive messages about migration in Peterborough and counteract harmful myths. The service emphasised that some conflict was based not on myths but on practical issues or misunderstandings, and worked with migrants to explain concerns of settled communities and resolve practical issues. Some negative public debate about the investment in services to migrants was countered by a strong press and communications strategy emphasising the benefits for existing residents of ensuring new migrants had good information about local norms and were able to find local work and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</strong></td>
<td>As below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to 'one off activities')</strong></td>
<td>The two-way process of mediating between new migrants and settled communities, plus myth busting practices all aid in moving towards sustainable social acceptance and cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</strong></td>
<td>New Link’s success was measured in outputs of its individual projects (such as getting migrants into highly-skilled work), reduced levels of visible tensions, and improved reputation in local and national press.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?
The range of services provided, many of these needs are similar in other EUMS.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review, assessment and implementation of the practice.
Invested partners were: Peterborough City Council, the police and health services, and the Red Cross. These are all in daily interaction scenarios with migrant. Their input was invaluable.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.
See above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Social Integration – women in NI [No.12]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>Women’s World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>Craigavon Intercultural Programme [CIP] is a community group in NI. It is committed to the concept of social inclusion and seeks to be a catalyst in promoting innovation and opportunities for community development. CIP promotes integration between communities and works towards the creation of a society in which all are respected regardless of race/nationality. It runs a series of projects, and Women’s World is one of these.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>Funded by CIP (which in turn is funded by: Craigavon Council; Community Foundation NI; OFMDFM Racial Equality Unit; Neighbourhood renewal; PEACE III; BBC Children in Need).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference (incl. url, where available)</td>
<td>Community Intercultural Programme, ‘Women’s World’, available at: <a href="http://www.craigavonintercultural.org/content/about-womens-world">www.craigavonintercultural.org/content/about-womens-world</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
<td>2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
<td>Women’s World is a multicultural support group that provides a comprehensive programme for women and their families from a diverse range of ethnic backgrounds in a welcoming and supportive environment. Newcomers to the area are offered mutual support, the opportunity to engage with other cultures, share expertise and experiences and learn more about the local area and region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
<td>Immigrant women from certain cultures often find themselves isolated in the home and, in such cases, have very little contact with members of the host society. It is important to reach out to them as they tend to be at a high risk of social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Local - regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</td>
<td>The project aims to provide an atmosphere where women are able to learn informally and formally at their own pace, builds on their knowledge and experiences and offers them greater confidence in enhancing their skills. The projects aims to: • offer culturally appropriate support, information and a referral service for women and their families in partnership with statutory organisations. • develop an informal support network for women from different cultures. • provide outreach work in the community, offering advice and case work with practical support. • promote skills development, educational pursuits and gainful employment. • promote health and wellbeing. • facilitate the integration of women through engagement with local women’s groups. • establish a befriending scheme for individual women and families in need. • develop and support cultural and social activities for women and their families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</td>
<td>The main activities carried out by the project included personal development courses, training, information sessions, aerobics, craftwork, cookery, English lessons and other integration related exercises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</td>
<td>The project had a number of outcomes: • It supported migrant woman from different cultural backgrounds, languages and abilities. • It built on the culture and heritage of all participants and helped them to help themselves, their family and their communities. • It provided opportunities for personal growth and social economic development through lifelong learning. • It took a holistic approach to addressing women’s, physical, emotional, mental, social and spiritual needs. This holistic vision enhanced their self-esteem and promoted their personal empowerment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact | N/A  
---|---
Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States? | Please see above, under sustainable outcomes.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice. | CIP is a community based group composed of representatives from culturally diverse communities. The group offers a range of services to both indigenous and new communities. CIP aims to establish an information and knowledge network which will contribute to building an equitable society which respects difference and celebrates diversity, its members are from diverse background, and all contribute to a range of projects together with beneficiaries.

The project provides a good example of how project beneficiaries can participate in group activities, field trips, the sharing of experiences and the building of new friendships.

Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment. | N/A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Education [No.13]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>Individualised ESOL provision: Slough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>Slough Borough Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>Government and partly from a European Integration funded [EIF] project called 'Migration Works'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
<td>2009 - ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
<td>The Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills (Ofsted) is a non-ministerial department of the UK government. This project is an Ofsted good practice example showing how Slough Borough Council supports the integration of learners into the community, and prepares them well for employment or further study through a carefully personalised programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
<td>The programme is intended for newly arrived third country nationals who have been admitted to the UK in a category that may lead to settlement and have been in the UK for less than five years. Many are spouses, some are highly qualified from their home country, but they all want to improve their language skills and their prospects of working or studying further.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Local - regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</td>
<td>The ICT and ESOL tutors deliver sessions jointly to provide bilingual support for learners and to put the language into a computing context. Each ICT or language course is offered at a range of levels to suit the learner’s needs. The courses typically run for 10 weeks, although many shorter taster courses are also offered. Some of the taster courses have an element of challenge, like ‘learn 50 new words in a day’; others give learners a flavour of vocational programmes, provide personal development, such as driving theory, and confidence building related to finding employment. The course includes sessions on information, advice and guidance. The first session takes place following initial applications and results in an action plan for each learner. Learners’ aspirations, their objectives and any barriers to learning, and their support needs, are discussed and recorded. Guidance continues flexibly throughout the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</td>
<td>The mix of formal training and social skills Learners also benefit from a wide range of purposeful visits, such as going to a beach, a museum or to the Houses of Parliament. They are encouraged to share their background through the diversity day, when they give presentations, food demonstrations and show examples of festivals from their own countries to raise awareness of different cultures. The</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
course also has an annual celebration event when learners share their stories and what they have learned.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</td>
<td>Its formal acceptance by Ofsted as a good practice provides assurances that it will continue to run.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</td>
<td>See Ofsted assessment outcomes, below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</td>
<td>See comment under transferable actions, above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</td>
<td>Managers have worked well together and used feedback from learners to develop customised programmes that add value and create opportunities. This has been done through having one person working with the groups to provide a well-coordinated and concentrated effort to support learners through their different programmes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.</td>
<td>Inspectors said that this programme improved the economic wellbeing of newly arrived immigrants to exceptional levels. They described the programme as being ‘outstanding in offering an extensive range of programmes and enrichment activities that have raised learners’ skills and expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Social Integration [No.14]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[2] IDeA – Integrating New Migrants – communicating important information. Part II: What’s out there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>I&amp;DEA – Improvement and Development Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</td>
<td>2007 and 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of initiative</td>
<td>Aiding the integration of new migrants. National level coordination will be better informed by local policies. These guides are planned to support local activities. These were developed as part of the government's Cohesion Delivery Framework which provided guidance and support to local authorities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main target group</td>
<td>All new migrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</td>
<td>Local/ regional / national</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brief description (max. 1000 chars) | [1] The guide is for LAs and their partners of relevance to many agencies in the statutory and voluntary sector involved in local service delivery, with employers, statutory service partners, community leaders, voluntary organisations and also with local people. The guide is highly relevant to many aspects of a council’s responsibilities to build stronger communities, have sound community cohesion knowledge, develop partnerships that make a positive difference and effectively engage with communities as part of decision-taking. It is also directly relevant to local authorities’ race equality duties under the Race Relations Act1 and their duties under the Standards Board for England. The guide is also relevant to the fulfilment of other performance standards, for example, under Ofsted. Every local situation is different but the practical questions, checklists and examples from councils and other agencies can be used as starting points to examine what the priorities should be in your council area.  

[2] The guide comprehensivey details precisely what information resources are available for migrants across the UK (whether online, hardback or paper copies, and where there were insufficient resources available to migrants). The formation is structured around 20 key topics which migrants have informed the guide about via focus gps. These include: right to work; welfare; family services; doctors; national insurance & tax; trade unions; interpreters; homelessness; money & banking; housing; discrimination; ESOL; school places, etc. |
| Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars) | All of the above. |
| Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’) | These guides provide detailed necessary information for [1] LAs, and for [2] migrants, respectively. |
| Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact | N/A |
| Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States? | All the information subjects are the same areas of concerns for newly arriving migrants across the EU. Having access to these kinds of resources aid the integration process significantly. |
| Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice. | The guides are dynamic tools, and part of The Migration Programme, an initiative to develop and promote good practice on migration from a range of stakeholder partners: the Improvement and Development Agency (IDEA), the Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo), and other bodies. Local councils are encouraged to exchange good practice through events, web-based resources and national and regional initiatives. |
| Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment. | Positive feedback from focus groups. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Social Integration [No.15]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title (original language)</td>
<td>‘Learning to Advise’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title (EN)</td>
<td>Learnin to Advise’ is one of the Cohesion Institute’s Good practice case studies (weblink provided below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (original language)</td>
<td>Stoke-on-Trent Citizens Advice Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation (EN)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government / Civil society</td>
<td>Civil Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding body [amount]</td>
<td>The original project was funded for 12 months: 2004 – 2005 under the ‘Purposeful Activities’ funding provided by the Home Office. The project was so successful that the Home Office agreed to fund a second year. The bureau re-evaluated the project and made a commitment to continue and develop the project into the foreseeable future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The project was developed to reduce the number of access courses in a year from three to two, but to introduce the additional element of leader's training for members of the same communities. We also introduced the role of mentors, so that 'graduates' from the scheme would support new trainees providing mentors with a new experience, and providing mentees with additional assistance. The project has been funded by Stoke Local Strategic Partnership since 2006 helping to meet the Partnership's targets for community cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference (incl. url, where available)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centre for Social Relations Coventry University, 'Good practice case study', available at: <a href="http://resources.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/GoodPractice/Projects/Project/Default.aspx?recordId=172">http://resources.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/GoodPractice/Projects/Project/Default.aspx?recordId=172</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate the start date of the promising practice and the finishing date if it has ceased to exist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Building good relations / encouraging interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Challenging myths and prejudice, bullying, harassment and abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Education (includes schools, FE and HE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educates, empowers and integrates members of the refugee and asylum seeking community into a mainstream organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Encourages community cohesion: refugee and asylum seeker volunteers provide advice to the general citizens of Stoke-on-Trent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trainees learn valuable personal skills. Has provided a stepping stone towards leadership amongst their own communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main target group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers / refugees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicate level of implementation: Local/Regional/National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local / regional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brief description (max. 1000 chars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The project: the key element of &quot;learning to advise&quot; is a four week access course for a group of ten asylum seekers/refugees in preparation for the three month volunteer adviser's training course at cab. The access course includes a range of introductory sessions on issues that volunteers from the host community are usually already familiar with. Particular attention is paid to the changes Stoke-on-Trent has undergone in the last 30 years to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highlight any element of the actions that is transferable (max. 500 chars)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as sustainable (as opposed to ‘one off activities’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as having concrete measurable impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give reasons why you consider the practice as transferrable to other settings and/or Member States?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
but also in less populated regions where integration services may be lacking. Learning to advise, therefore, provides a model for integrating migrants that can be adapted to meet the needs of different communities at local and regional level in a wide range of Member States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explain, if applicable, how the practice involves beneficiaries and stakeholders in the design, planning, evaluation, review assessment and implementation of the practice.</th>
<th>Please see above boxes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explain, if applicable, how the practice provides for review and assessment.</td>
<td>This was also independently assessed by the Cohesion Institute as a Good Practice Case Study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 8: Discrimination complaints submitted to Equality Bodies

Table 3 – Numbers of discrimination cases on any ground submitted by third country nationals (TCNs) in 2014*

A freedom of information request was sent to HM Government Courts and Tribunals. A response was received on 11 May 2015 informing us that the Ministry of Justice does not hold the information necessary to fully complete this section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of cases</th>
<th>Grounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(report the 10 Largest nationality group that submitted a complaint by the end of 2014)</td>
<td>Racial or ethnic origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.B. No data exists on nationality or ethnic group of complainant</td>
<td>Not a category in the data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Tribunal Receipts 2013/14 (England and Wales)</td>
<td>3,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims Accepted by Employment Tribunals 2011/12</td>
<td>4,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Employment Tribunal and Employment Appeal Tribunal statistics (GB)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 - Outcome of discrimination cases on grounds of ethnic origin submitted by third country nationals*

No data on nationality of complainants in discrimination cases.

A freedom of information request was sent to HM Government Courts and Tribunals. A response was received on 11 May 2015 informing us that the Ministry of Justice does not hold the information necessary to fully complete this section.

* Provide data for 2013 if 2014 not available by March 2015
Annex 9: Case law – max 5 leading cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Family Settlement/Right to a private and family life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision date</strong></td>
<td>11 July 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key facts of the case</strong></td>
<td>A challenge by way of Judicial Review[^1] to the financial requirements under the Immigration Rules. Changes made in July 2012 imposed new financial requirements for sponsoring family resettlement of non-EEA nationals, namely the introduction of a minimum income requirement of £18,600.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Main reasoning/argumentation**                  | The Claimants argued that setting the MIR is contrary to Article 8 ECHR, the right a private and family life.  

The Respondent argued that the interference was necessary and proportionate to the legitimate aim of maintaining the economic wellbeing of the country. The Respondent claimed the previous provisions requiring applicants for family settlement to demonstrate that they would maintain themselves adequately without recourse to public funds were not conducive to clear, straightforward, consistent and transparent decision-making and assessments were time consuming. A further argument made by the Respondent was that a maintenance requirement which only covered basic subsidence is not sufficient to provide a reasonable degree of assurance that such persons could independently support themselves and that such a lack of financial resources would inhibit the integration of the migrant partner in the UK.  

The High Court held that for British Citizens or refugees the new financial requirements had been set significantly higher than the annual minimum wage and are therefore so onerous that they result in a disproportionate interference with the right to a family life and are beyond a reasonable means of giving effect to the legitimate aim. However, the Court did not find the financial requirements to be unlawful but provided suggestions to the Home Office of less intrusive responses to achieve their stated policy aims. The Respondent appealed the decision of the High Court. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case (max. 500 chars)</th>
<th>Are the minimum income requirements required to sponsor the settlement of a non-EEA partner in the UK set too high so as to amount to a breach of Article 8 ECHR.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case (max. 500 chars)</td>
<td>The Court held that there had always been a maintenance requirement at a certain level and that maintenance requirements are not unique to the UK. Therefore appropriate weight should be given to the judgement of the Secretary of State who had based the new requirements on the results of independent research and consultation. Accordingly the Court found the MIR was not contrary to Article 8 ECHR.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details (max. 500 chars) | “There is nothing in the 1971 Act or the common law that grants a “constitutional right” of British citizens to live in the UK with non-EEA partners who do not have the right of abode in the UK and who are currently living outside the UK.” At para 138.  
“[M]y answer to Issue Three is "no, the judge’s analysis and conclusion that the new MIR were, in principle, incapable of being compatible with the Article 8 rights of the UK partners (and others if relevant) was not correct".” At para 153.  
Key quotations relating to integration  
“The Secretary of State does not have to have “irrefutable empirical evidence” that the individual features of the policy proposed will achieve the social aim intended. It is enough that she should have a rational belief that the policy will, overall, achieve the identified aim.” At para 142.  
“The conclusion that a family with more income would be more likely to be capable of integrating is not susceptible of empirical proof, but a belief in the link between higher income and the likelihood of better integration is rational.” At para 142. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>30 July 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reference details | Hounga v Allen and another [2014] UKSC 47  
Available at: www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2014/47.html. |
| Key facts of the case (max. 500 chars) | Aged 14 Miss Hounga, a Nigerian national, was brought to the UK by her employer, Mrs Allen, to work for her. Miss Hounga knowingly agreed to acquire a visa by providing a false identity. On arrival in the UK Miss Hounga commenced work for Mrs Allen but did not receive any financial remuneration for her work. In addition, she was subjected to physical abuse and received threats that she would be imprisoned should she leave |
the house and be identified by the police as she was residing in the UK illegally. Following an incident of abuse she was ejected from the house and was thus dismissed from her employment.

| Main reasoning/argumentation (max. 500 chars) | Miss Hounga argued that her dismissal amounted to discrimination on the grounds of nationality (defined under the protected characteristic of race under s.9 of the Equality Act 2010) on the basis that Mrs Allen had treated her less favourably than she would treat others. The court of first instance allowed the claim and awarded damages to Miss Hounga. The decision was overturned by the Employment Appeals Tribunal (EAT) on the basis that the inextricable link test was applied and such a link was found. Therefore the EAT held that the illegal status of Miss Hounga was a material part of her claim and that in allowing the appeal the EAT would be condoning such behaviour. The Decision of the EAT was then appealed to the Supreme Court. |
| Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case (max. 500 chars) | Can the illegality defence defeat the complaint of discrimination in the context of illegal migrant workers. |
| Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case (max. 500 chars) | The Court held that there was a lack of an inextricable link between the complaint and the claimant’s illegal conduct and that the entry into the illegal contract was merely the context for the abuse suffered by the claimant and her subsequent dismissal. The Court went on further to discuss the policy basis for the defence of illegality. They observed that while preserving the legal system was an aspect of the policy that founds the defence, the link to the aspects of Miss Hounga’s claim scarcely exists. In addition the Court noted the Government’s commitment to prevent trafficking in human beings and that whilst the material facts of Miss Hounga’s case do not amount to trafficking applying the illegality defence would run counter to this policy. |
| Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details (max. 500 chars) | “[M]y conclusion is that Miss Hounga succeeds in her appeal, on the particular facts of this case, on the ground that there is insufficiently close connection between her immigration offences and her claims for the statutory tort of discrimination, for the former merely provided the setting or context in which that tort was committed, and to allow her to recover for that tort would not amount to the court condoning what it otherwise condemns.” At para 67. |

| Thematic area | Citizenship |
| Decision date | 25 March 2015 |
**Reference details**

Pham (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) [2015] UKSC 19

(On appeal from [2013] EWCA Civ 616)

Available at: [www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2015/19.html](http://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKSC/2015/19.html).

**Key facts of the case**

(max. 500 chars)

The appellant, Mr Pham, was born in Vietnam in 1983 before claiming asylum in the UK in 1989 and being granted indefinite leave to remain. He then acquired British citizenship in 1995. On 22 December 2011 the respondent, the Home Secretary, deprived Mr Pham of his citizenship under s.40(2) of the British Nationality Act 1981 because it was suspected that he had been involved in terrorist activities. Subsequently the Vietnamese authorities have declined to acknowledge that Mr Pham is a Vietnamese national.

**Main reasoning/argumentation**

(max. 500 chars)

The appellant argued that the decision of the respondent to strip Mr Pham of his British citizenship would leave him stateless in breach of s.40(4) the British Nationality Act 1981 as he was not considered a national by Vietnam "under the operation of its law" as required under Article 1(1) of the Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons (1954). The respondent argued that on the date of removal of citizenship there was no evidence that the Vietnamese government did not recognise Mr Pham as a Vietnamese national and moreover that depriving him of his citizenship was proportionate to the legitimate aim of maintaining national security.

**Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case**

(max. 500 chars)

Should reference be made solely to the text of national legislation in the respective state or can the practice of the government also be taken into account when determining whether a person is considered as a national of a State under Article 1(1) of the 1954 Convention.

If, when considering whether depriving citizenship, that would also result in the loss of the individual’s EU citizenship, whether such consideration falls under EU law and if so what consideration should be given to the question of proportionality.

Is the Home Secretary therefore precluded from depriving Mr Pham of his British citizenship solely on the basis that the Vietnamese government do not consider him to be a national and therefore removing his British citizenship would render him stateless.

**Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case**

(max. 500 chars)

The Court unanimously dismissed the appeal.

The Court held that there was no evidence to show that the Vietnamese government had not treated the appellant as a non-national "by operation of its law" and therefore unanimously dismissed the appeal. It observed however that Article 1(1) of the 1954 Convention takes into account more
than solely the text of the law of the respective state, including the practice of a government to be a factor of consideration.

The Court declined to answer the issues surrounding EU law and proportionality as they had not been raised at the lower court. However, it did observe that the Court of Justice for the European Union (CJEU) in *Janko Rottman v Freistaat Bayern* 2010 had not explicitly stated that removing citizenship in a situation without a cross-border element is outside the scope of EU law.

**Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details**

"I would accept that the question arising under article 1(1) of the 1954 Convention in this case is not necessarily to be decided solely by reference to the text of the nationality legislation of the state in question, and that reference may also be made to the practice of the government, even if not subject to effective challenge in the courts." At para 38.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Discrimination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>15 July 2014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Reference details | *The Public Law Project, R (On the Application Of) v The Secretary of State for Justice the Office of the Children's Commissioner* [2014] EWHC 2365 (Admin)  
Available at: [www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2014/2365.html](http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/Admin/2014/2365.html). |
| Key facts of the case | Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (LASPO) identifies priority cases which most require public funding. In 2014 the Lord Chancellor published The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2014 that, if enacted, would impose a residency test on the legal aid provided for in Part 1 of Schedule 1 of LASPO. The result of the order would mean that individuals that otherwise pass the legal aid “better than fifty-fifty chance of establishing a claim” test in cases which have the highest priority for legal assistance would be unable to receive assistance on the basis that they lack a sufficiently close connection with the country to whose laws they are subject. |
| Main reasoning/argumentation | The Claimant argued that the provision introducing the residency requirement was discriminatory and is contrary to common law and in breach of Article 6 ECHR when read with Article 14 ECHR. In addition the Claimant argued that the Lord Chancellor did not have the power to introduce the amendment by way of delegated legislation. The Lord Chancellor argued that provisions were legitimate with regard to the savings of |
costs and advancing the public confidence in the legal aid system.

**Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case** (max. 500 chars)
Are the residency test provisions proposed in The Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act 2012 (Amendment of Schedule 1) Order 2014 discriminatory and thus unlawful.

**Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case** (max. 500 chars)
The Court found that the order was *ultra vires* and unlawful.

The Court established that there was no obligation for the state to provide legal aid for the category of cases under Part 1 of Schedule 1 and thus the justification for such a provision should not be for the denial of legal aid but for the discrimination between those that are eligible and those that are not. The Court found that the discrimination could not be justified solely for the purpose of saving of costs, nor for the need to engender public confidence.

**Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details** (max. 500 chars)

“The mere saving of cost cannot justify discrimination.” At para 82.

“Certainly it is not possible to justify such discrimination in an area where all are equally subject to the law, resident or not, and equally entitled to its protection, resident or not. In my judgement, a residence test cannot be justified in relation to the enforcement of domestic law or the protection afforded by domestic law, which is applicable to all equally, provided they are within its jurisdiction. In the context of a discriminatory provision relating to legal assistance, invoking public confidence amounts to little more than reliance on public prejudice.” At para 84.

“It does not seem to me necessary to choose between the many different ways in which PLP seeks to advance the same argument, whether it is equal treatment under the common law, or a breach of Art. 14, read with Art 6. I conclude that residence is not a lawful ground for discriminating between those who would otherwise be eligible for legal assistance by virtue of Schedule 1 LASPO.” At para 88.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thematic area</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decision date</td>
<td>9 October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key facts of the case</td>
<td>Mr Al-Jedda was born in Iraq and came to the UK in 1992 where he was granted British nationality 8 years later in June 2000. Due to Iraqi laws in force at the time when Mr Al-Jedda acquired British nationality he automatically lost his Iraqi nationality. In September 2004 Mr Al-Jedda travelled back to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Iraq where he was arrested and held without charge for over three years. Subsequently Mr Al-Jedda sought a number of unsuccessful challenges with regards to his detention.

In 2007, by virtue of s.40(2) of the *British Nationality Act 1981*, the Appellant, the Secretary of State for the Home Department (SSHD), ordered Mr Al-Jedda be stripped of his British Nationality. Mr Al-Jedda appealed against the order and a series of appeals by both parties followed.

| Main reasoning/argumentation (max. 500 chars) | The Appellant noted that the wording of s.40(4) requires that to place an order the SSHD must be “satisfied” that the order would not make a person stateless. The fact that Mr Al-Jedda could have applied for the restoration of his Iraqi nationality meant that the Appellant could be satisfied that the order would not render him stateless. |
| Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case (max. 500 chars) | The issue on appeal to the Supreme Court was whether s.40(4) of the 1981 Act precluded the Secretary of State from removing an individual's citizenship if doing so would render that individual stateless purely because they had failed to apply for citizenship that was available to them elsewhere. |
| Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case (max. 500 chars) | The Court held that the SSHD had not clearly established whether Mr Al-Jedda had the right to restoration of his Iraqi nationality and that restoration would have been immediate. The material consideration of the SSHD when making the assessment of whether an order would make an individual stateless is whether at the time of the order the person holds another nationality. |
| Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details (max. 500 chars) | “Section 40(4) does not permit, still less require, analysis of the relative potency of causative factors. In principle, at any rate, the inquiry is a straightforward exercise both for the Secretary of State and on appeal: it is whether the person holds another nationality at the date of the order.” At para 32.

“For present purposes the significance of the subsection is that, as an addition to the person who will "have" another nationality on the date of registration, Parliament, reflecting the terms of the 1961 Convention, there refers to the person who will "acquire" another nationality. Parliament would have been capable of making an analogous addition to section 40(4). After the words "would make a person stateless", it could have added the words "in circumstances in which he has no right immediately to acquire the nationality of another state". But it did not do so; and the Secretary of State therefore invites the court to place a gloss, as substantial as it is unwarranted, upon the words of the subsection.” At para 33. |

| Thematic area | Community Cohesion |
### Decision date
16 September 2013

### Reference details
R v (D) R (Judgment of H.H. Judge Peter Murphy in relation to wearing of niqaab by defendant during proceedings in Crown Court) [2013]

### Key facts of the case
**Key facts of the case (max. 500 chars)**
The Defendant was charged with witness intimidation and the alleged offence was said to have happened whilst the Defendant was wearing the burqa (loose clothing covering the body and head) and the niqaab (a veil that covers the face) and thus no issue of visual identification would arise at trial. The Defendant refused the Court’s request that she remove her niqaab during the trial. The trial judge, Murphy J, then decided to hand down this separate judgement which considered the extent to which a Defendant is entitled to wear the niqaab during proceedings in the Crown Court.

### Main reasoning/argumentation
**Main reasoning/argumentation (max. 500 chars)**
The Defendant argued that her Article 9 ECHR right to manifest her religion should permit her to wear the niqaab during trial proceedings. Murphy J explored whether a limitation could be justified under Article 9(2) ECHR. As there is no legal restriction on the wearing of the niqaab anywhere in the UK, Murphy J referred to the principles of the rule of law, open justice and the adversarial trial as the basis for the limitation. He argued that the ability of the jury to see the witness is of cardinal importance to an adversarial trial and that restricting the right to wear the niqaab would serve the legitimate aim of administering the criminal courts fairly and equally and protecting the rights of victims of crime and the public at large.

### Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case
**Key issues (concepts, interpretations) clarified by the case (max. 500 chars)**
When a defendant may cover their face during proceedings at the Crown Court. The case discusses the wearing of the niqaab but explicitly states that the judgement would also apply to men and people of all or no faiths in comparable situations.

### Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case
**Results (sanctions) and key consequences or implications of the case (max. 500 chars)**
Taking into account the concept of proportionality when imposing a limitation on a Convention right Murphy J chose to take the least restrictive approach. He held that the issue of identification of a defendant should be held in open court, they should be asked to remove their niqaab and if the request is denied the Court should adjourn to allow for a female officer to identify the defendant. It will often be appropriate to repeat this procedure at key stages during the trial. A defendant is free to wear the niqaab during proceedings except when giving evidence. A court may make use of screens to shield the defended from public viewing. If the defendant refuses then the Judge will not allow them to give evidence and must give the jury a clear direction regarding their failure to give evidence.
based on the terms suggesting in the Equal Treatment Bench Book.420

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key quotation in original language and translated into English with reference details (max. 500 chars)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“In general, the defendant is free to wear the niqaab during trial. The judge should, nonetheless, in the absence of the jury, advise the defendant of the possible consequences of so doing, and make it clear that she will not be free to do so while giving evidence. She should be invited to remove the niqaab during trial, and given time to reflect and take advice if she wishes to do so. Again, if there is an issue of visual identification to be decided by the jury, it may necessary to order that the niqaab be removed, at least while evidence relevant to that issue is given. 83. If the defendant gives evidence, she must remove the niqaab throughout her evidence. The Court may use its inherent powers to do what it can to alleviate any discomfort, for example by allowing the use of screens or allowing her to give evidence by live link. Again, the judge should, in the absence of the jury, advise the defendant of the possible consequences of refusing to remove the niqaab. She should be invited to remove the niqaab and given time to reflect and take advice if she wishes to do so. If she refuses, the judge should not allow her to give evidence, and must give the jury a clear direction in the terms suggested in the Bench Book, with appropriate modifications, about the defendant’s failure to give evidence.” At paras 83-84.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---