

## ITEM 7

# Community Cohesion in Derby

A report Prepared by Tony Hurrell

For Derby Community Safety Partnership

January 2007

## Table of contents

Section	1	Executive Summary
	2	National Context
	3	Local Context
	4	Methodology
	5	Vision and Definition
	6	Data Collection
	7	Most Likely Cause of Community Breakdown in Derby
	8	Barriers to Cohesion in Derby
	9	Responses to 'Causes' and 'Barriers'
	10	Extremism
	11	Emerging Good Practice
	12	'A Reality Check' – Quotes and Comments
	13	Resources
	14	Recommendations

## **1 Executive Summary**

- 1.1 Describing how communities in Derby feel about cohesion in their city is not easy. This report is based on over 60 face to face interviews with local people and organisations. It concludes that there exists in Derby a shifting sense of belonging, with some communities being drawn back into themselves and becoming less likely to participate in the wider life of the city. The following three quotes go some way to summarise the position

“Everybody used to know each other; we would pick the teams from everybody on the Park. Today they turn up to the park with their own teams and fight for their territory.”

“People fight for their community, not the community.”

“It’s about where we can’t live, not where we can”

Changing this feeling of ‘defending’ ones community, to creating a feeling of being part of a more integrated community where everybody feels safe , secure and able to contribute positively, is a challenge the city must face.

## **1.2 Introduction & Methodology**

Derby has long been recognised as a Cohesive City. It has a strong reputation for Partnership working and finds itself well placed to deliver a Cohesion Strategy. All partners have displayed a positive approach to this work. There exists a real will to deliver this agenda.

Nationally there exists some sound guidance from which to work. The Institute of Community Cohesion and the Government White Paper on Local Government Reform both offer principles upon which the City can build its Cohesion Strategy.

In October 2006, the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) commissioned a piece of work to establish the views of Community Leaders’, The Voluntary Sector and The Public Sector on:

- Most likely cause of cohesion breakdown in Derby
- Barriers to cohesion in Derby
- Suggested action to tackle issues identified
- Methods of data collection

A total of 60 plus “face to face “interviews were undertaken.

This report is based upon those interviews, plus a review of the current research and searching for “Best Practice” solutions from Public Sector bodies.

This report details a way forward for the Derby City Partnership. It makes a series of recommendations for the Partnership to consider, prior to wider consultation with communities in preparation for producing a Cohesion strategy for the city.

### 1.3 **Vision**

Currently there is no agreed vision for cohesion in the city. The Partnership will need to agree a vision with its Partners.

The paper’s author focused his work by adopting the following:

“A city living with, and learning to respect each other”                      - Derby does it..

The Partnership has already agreed a workable definition of Community Cohesion. This may need to be simplified for ease of understanding by the wider community.

### 1.4 **Causes of Cohesion Breakdown**

Based on our findings the identified risks to Derby fall into two main categories:

#### Local

Most likely to an event caused by the spread of ‘rumour’ or triggered by a spontaneous event based on territorial disputes – either cultural or physical. This risk appears to be highest amongst young males, who, due to recent demographic changes have seen large numbers increase in inner city wards. Some People are choosing to defend their culture, their space, rather than seeing themselves as ‘one community’.

#### National / International

National and International tensions and wars can have a negative impact on local people. The developing National and International debate is seen to divide communities, not bring them together. There is a growing sense of views becoming polarised. There is also a feeling that the media can have a significant impact on the agenda.

Whatever the trigger the evidence shows that individuals and communities in Derby are being pushed into making choices which provide significant risks to the future of community cohesion in Derby.

### 1.5 **Barriers to Cohesion Building in Derby**

Whilst there are reasons for communities becoming polarised there exists locally other reasons for Cohesion not developing as it could.

Findings indicate the following Barriers to Cohesion in the City of Derby.

- The need for Strong Leadership
- Funding Gaps for some communities
- Skills Gap-Language and Job Search
- Over-Reliance on Volunteers
- Lack of Local Interpreter Services
- Slow/Poor Response to Incidents
- Lack of Community Intelligence
- Lack of 'Social Cohesion' Policy in City Educational Establishments
- The "Separate Lives -v- Separate Communities" dilemma
- Confusion over Volume/Complexity of Advisory Services
- Role of Capacity Building Organisations
- Demonisation of some Communities
- Poor Work Opportunities for Deprived Communities
- Lack of "One Stop Shop" provision
- Lack of Accurate Data
- Consultation Mechanisms

### 1.6 **Most Effective Response**

It is important that more people feel able to come out from their silos, being confident enough to trust the City to respond to their needs. Some communities need reassurance that this will be the case.

Detailed recommendations appear appendix(i).

The following are the key areas which will need to be addressed if Derby is to progress the cohesion in a positive manner. The critical areas for action are:

- Strong Leadership in the City - Political/Community/Faith
- Create a Structure to react to Incidents/Plan for Future/Undertake Risk assessments by creating a Cohesion Team
- Actions For Young People and Education establishments in the City

- Building Respect/Ownership for the City and its Neighbourhoods
- Re-building confidence to enable disadvantaged communities to access training and work

### 1.7 **Next Step**

To ensure 'buy in' from the wider community this report will be circulated for wider consultation. Final recommendations should be agreed at the end of the consultation process.

Ultimately, the report, together with the outcome of the consultation, should be compiled as the Community Cohesion Strategy for Derby. The Final Strategy should be presented at Derby City Partnership Board for approval, before adoption by all Partners and marketing to the wider community.

Here are three quotes that reflect the changing reality for some communities in Derby. It is a reality that will need to change if the City is to improve Community Cohesion.

***“Everybody used to know each other; we would pick the teams from everybody on Arboretum Park. Today they turn up with their own teams, prepared to fight for their territory.”***

***“People fight for their community, not the community.”***

***“It’s about where we can’t live, not where we can.”***

## 2 **The National Context**

- 2.1 Creating cohesive communities is a major policy theme of both National and Local Government. It is seen as a practical response to the problems of extremism and social breakdown. There exists at national level an increasing feeling, and fear, that communities and cultures are becoming more and more divided.
- 2.2 Darra Singh, Chair of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion, states, "There are arguably no more important issues facing the country today than how we promote integration between communities and improve cohesion at the local level".
- 2.3 Many people have negative thoughts about the current cultural mix and the threat posed by it. However the evidence shows this perception is largely misplaced. Communities can gain great benefits by creating harmony within. These benefits have been found across the spectrum, education, employment, safety and social inclusion. Cultures can mix for positive outcomes, but work is needed to achieve that aim. There is a need to change this negative perception.
- 2.4 Nationally, there exists a dilemma – 'segregation or integration', 'multi-cultural or mono-cultural'. Sometimes people find themselves being forced to make choices, looking for conflict and difference when none exists.
- 2.5 Derby has also been affected by national headlines. Its reputation was dented by the link of a failed 'Suicide Bomber' to the city and the widely reported "stand-off" on Normanton Road in summer 2003. Both incidents are now over 3 years old, but are still quoted back to the city today. People have formed an opinion about the situation in Derby. It is acknowledged that the city has need to respond. Derby should do all it can to deal with rumour, dispel myths and prevent extremism. The city will need to face the challenges presented by its past, as well as deal with its future image, and then deal with the risks presented to it.
- 2.6 Ted Cantle, Chair of the Institute of Community Cohesion, helps point the way. He paints the picture and sets out the challenges facing any city. Using his direct quotes gives real clues as to what a cohesive city may look like.

"The search for identity is like chasing shadows and much greater emphasis should be placed on how we actually relate to each other. There should be a common sense of belonging which is not restricted by common culture."

"...these parallel lives do not meet at any stage, with little or no opportunity to explore differences and build mutual respect..."

"Social and political capital and the sense of trust upon which they depend can only be built on dialogue and exchange."



On self segregation he says, “However, in reality, locational choices are often constrained by social economic factors, the lack of social and cultural facilities, the location of suitable schools and, most of all, by real concerns about the lack of safety and security. Areas preferred by minority groups generally contain the worst housing and worst environment; therefore, it is hard to believe these choices are a result of free choice.”

“Sharing experience is not sufficient and will not develop, unless there is also a shared sense of vision and purpose.”

“There is a danger we just focus on ethnicity and faith – or even just one, the Muslim faith. However, there is a much more complex problem and we have to address the fear of difference generally.”

“...we have to invest in changing attitudes and values, hearts and minds. This has to be mainstream activity for all Public Services.”

“We have promoted difference and failed to promote things we have in common.”

These quotes highlight the agreed national position on the issues that must be addressed if the city is to build Cohesion in its communities.

- 2.7 Additionally, the government White Paper on Local Government Reform has devoted a single chapter (8) to cohesion. Whilst saying much on the agenda, it produces another challenge for the city to face up to, the challenge of extremism. I quote, “The task of addressing this Agenda is made more challenging because it has to be undertaken alongside extremism. There is a battle of ideas at stake, we need to build and entrench shared values and win hearts and minds. All parts of society have a part to play”.

The White Paper then offers 8 guiding principles on how to identify the areas to tackle to deal with Cohesion:

- Strong leadership and engagement
- Developing shared values
- Preventing the problems of tomorrow
- Good information
- Visible work to tackle inequalities
- Involving young people
- Inter-faith work
- Partnerships

The Partnership should identify actions under each of these headings

- 2.8 The White Paper goes on to indicate that it is a prerequisite that both The Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) Community Strategy and Local Area Agreement (LAA) are aligned with any emerging cohesion strategy. It adds that this work is not an 'add on' or an 'optional extra', it is integral to providing improved public services. Only by making this business, core business will Derby make the step-change government is looking for.
- 2.9 A summary of the National research indicates there are a number of key Policy areas that will impact on the long term success of a cohesion agenda in any City. These would include policies on Regeneration, Employment, Housing, Education and Community Safety.
- 2.10 Maintaining people in their separate communities, creating separate lives will not work. People need to feel able to access service provision in a fair and equal way. Otherwise people will remain in silos, where they can be demonised and remain separate. That will not build cohesion. Whilst this is seen as the real challenge nationally it also indicates how difficult this issue will be for the city of Derby.

### **3 The Local Picture**

- 3.1 Derby is a City of 233,000 people. Most recent estimates quote around 18% of that population as belonging to a minority ethnic group. The city has a higher than average Asian population. Recent years have also seen an influx of Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Migrant Workers settling in or close to the Normanton area of the city.

- 3.2 Actual data for Derby relies on the 2001 Census data, and that itself does not break down into more narrow community groups. Therefore, the city does not have a 'real' picture of the complexity or number of different community groups. What can be said is that the city has a truly multi-cultural make up, albeit most of these diverse communities struggle to co-exist in two wards in the city – Arboretum and Normanton .
- 3.3 Large disturbances typify the problem elsewhere, but not in Derby. However, two incidents have placed Derby on the 'national radar' and as a consequence, Derby has been highlighted by the Government as being one of the top 20 'Risk Cities'.
- 3.4 The first incident refers to the fact Derby was home to one of the UK's first suicide bombers. The second, a 'stand-off' on Normanton Road in the summer of 2003 between young people from two different communities. The incident was diffused quickly and Community Leaders responded effectively. This was very much a 'storm in a teacup'. Derby was then able to negotiate a moratorium on being allocated single male Asylum Seekers for a period of about 2 years, ending in January 2006. This was due to the excessive number of single males, 18-35 years, being allocated to Derby, which in itself was the single biggest reason for rising tensions in the area during 2003. The general feeling in the city is that tensions between those groups have reduced. However, only a small spark is required to reignite tensions. Complicating the mix in recent years is an arrival of Eastern Europeans. The picture is becoming more and more complex and will require constant monitoring.
- 3.5 Additionally recent reports of 'youth fights' in the city centre, brings some urgency to the work, (December 2006.). Fights based on 'territory' or 'culture' are often good indicators that some parts of the community are battling hard to protect their identity. Such trivial incidents may give the city a good indication of the strength of feeling simmering beneath the surface. They may be a precursor to more widespread disturbances based on "territorial" disputes.
- 3.6 In other areas of the city there exists strong feelings that "New Communities" threaten a way of life, they threaten jobs and generally are seen as a negative influence. These views are largely based on little, or no, contact with the groups concerned. Some areas of the city are seen being more welcoming to newcomers than others.
- 3.7 On a positive note Derby has an excellent reputation for cohesion and partnership working. Derby is in fact well placed to deliver this agenda. Many participants make strong and favourable comment about the relaxed, safe atmosphere in the city. They feel it's a good place to be. This together with a real willingness from the "Partners" to work together to deliver this, and other strategic agenda, is a positive on which to build. Also the progress being made on the Neighbourhood delivery programme brings a real opportunity to find a mechanism by which to deliver parts of this work.

- 3.8 Derby has compiled a 'Welcome Pack' for newcomers, which introduces the city together with a summary of national customs and laws. However Derby does not have a 'Welcome Centre', nor does it have a fully developed 'Cohesion' or an 'Engagement' Strategy – all of which make it vulnerable to criticism. This presents a risk to the city, many other areas already have such policies and strategies in place.
- 3.9 Derby is also well placed on a number of other counts. It has an established 'Faith Forum' at the University of Derby. It will include wider community groups alongside minority ethnic groups in this work. The city has an opportunity to work with Government Office and it can use recently published work/good practice to aid deliberations. Derby has a strong community strategy and an operational Local Area Agreement. Derby can be confident that it will meet government objectives, answer the questions set by Ted Cante and produce a workable, if challenging, set of actions which will go some way to answering some of the risks identified. There is a real will among partners to make this happen.
- .
- 3.10 Derby continues to respond positively to this agenda. Cohesion will play a significant part in building and maintaining the reputation of the city. That reputation will impact the economic viability of the city together with its ability to attract investment, tourism and regeneration funding. Furthermore it will impact greatly on the feeling of wellbeing and self confidence in the city. Confident citizens are more likely to participate fully in the life of their city or their neighbourhood. Derby's long term future is likely to be linked to how its leaders respond to being 'in the 'spotlight', and how well they feel able to respond to the issues raised in this report.

## **4    Methodology**

4.1 The approach used followed four stages:

1. A full review of the previous work undertaken by Joe Pearce and Isobella Stone for the Partnership.
2. A full review of current National Guidance, National Policy and 'Best Practice'.
3. 60 plus 'Face to Face' interviews with Public Sector/Community/Voluntary Sector representatives.
4. Preparation of Report for Partnership consideration

4.2 The interviews were based around a 'Questionnaire' and Suggested 'Action Plan' given to recipients prior to their interview. Notes of the interview were taken and the report is based on those notes. All participants were encouraged to comment upon the actions and suggest their own. It is fair to say the actions/recommendations contained in this report are made as a result of suggestions from those interviewed. No action is recommended, nor comment included, unless a majority of a particular sector agreed.

4.3 Following consideration of this report, it is suggested a further period of consultation is undertaken, involving all stakeholders to obtain 'buy in' to the final strategy. Ultimately the strategy can only be successfully implemented with participation from communities of the city.

4.4 All consultee's will receive a copy of the report for comment and reply

## **5 Vision & Definition**

### **5.1 Derby does not currently have an agreed 'vision' for cohesion in the city.**

It is important for the City, to create a 'vision'. It will also need Partners to agree what successful Implementation of the Cohesion Strategy would look like.

Such a vision needs to 'melt down' to its communities. It should be owned by them.

For the sake of record, the vision used by the author was –

'A city living with, and learning to respect, each other' .....Derby does it.

### **5.2 Derby already has an agreed, workable, definition for Community Cohesion. It states:**

A cohesive community is one where:

>There is a common vision and sense of belonging for all communities.

>The diversity of people's different backgrounds is appreciated and positively valued.

>Those from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities.....and

>Strong and positive relationships are being developed between people from different backgrounds and circumstances.

### **5.3 Whilst this definition accurately reflects the work, it may need to be simplified prior to wider consultation. Local people will need to understand and share the meaning.**

## 6 Data Collection

- 6.1 Currently, most Partners rely on data provided by the City Council. Some rely on their own data, such as Health, Education and Connexions Service. However, with the Data Warehouse undertaking its 'Fit for Purpose' trials in January, it is understood that by spring 2007 one set of data, populated by all agencies, will be available to share citywide. Currently, this is still largely reliant on 2001 census data and will not give numbers for specific community groups. The census data is regarded as being out of date, most communities being under represented.
- 6.2 During visits to each group, community self estimates have been obtained which can now be used by the city. Whilst cautious of this approach, the figures quoted should be trusted unless proof can be presented to the contrary. There is no definitive method and such 'community self estimates' may assist some services plan for their future. They will need regular checking and updates. The 'self estimates' for communities thus far visited are:

➤ Afghani	-	500
➤ Afro-Caribbean	-	6,000 (99% Jamaican)
➤ Bangladeshi	-	500
➤ Bosnian	-	500 (200 Bosnia/Roma)
➤ Cameroon	-	90
➤ Congolese	-	250
➤ Hindu	-	300 families
➤ Sikh	-	10,000
➤ Kurdish	-	1,200 (mainly single males)
➤ Muslim	-	18,000 (estimate across cultures/countries)
➤ Pakistani	-	10,000
➤ Indian	-	12,000
➤ Persian	-	250
➤ Somalian	-	400
➤ Polish	-	4,000 (2,000 older generation families/ 2,000 younger migrant workers)
➤ Irish	-	15,000
➤ Great Lakes	-	150
➤ Chinese	-	1000
➤ Kosovan	-	500
➤ Latvian	-	100
➤ Zimbabwean	-	1000

More work is required to ensure that all communities are visited to gain outstanding self-estimates

One large anomaly is the "Irish" community. One explanation being that as many feel fully integrated they do not feel the need to identify themselves as other than "British".

## **7 Most Likely Cause of Cohesion Breakdown In Derby**

### **7.1 The responses fell into 2 categories.**

#### **(i) Local Tensions**

Participants feel that cohesion breakdown in Derby is most likely to be triggered by a trivial incident. Suggested motives centred on males seeking female company inappropriately or some form of 'territorial' dispute in Normanton. New to this debate is seen to be the recent influx of Eastern Europeans to the city. It is clear tensions are beginning to rise between these communities. Some careful monitoring will be required to ensure positive integration of this group.

Also, significant is the apparent lack of tolerance in some areas of the city to 'new communities' or anybody regarded as 'different'

There is also evidence that some smaller communities still feel isolated, not receiving the support they feel they deserve. Frustration exists towards both service providers and Capacity Building organisations. Comment was made that service providers pay 'lip service' to engagement merely 'ticking the box'. Additionally, some of those charged with building capacity for community groups are being seen as self promoting, rather than capacity building the community groups themselves. Whilst acknowledging existing good work this perception is a real concern for some community groups. This issue will need to be addressed in order to deal with a growing sense of injustice.

#### **(ii) National Messages**

There is no doubt National Foreign Policy still dictates the 'mood' for some communities. Little impact will be felt by local action if there exists strong feelings within a community for the way their religion or culture is portrayed by National Policy or Politicians.

The continued 'demonising' of some groups by the national media is also seen to have a major impact. It breeds prejudice and reinforces negative stereo types of some groups. Some people in Derby never come into contact with people from different cultures/countries and form their ideas of such groups based on their portrayal in the media. (Both Travellers and Muslims appear to be affected by this phenomenon).

### **7.2 These two issues - local tensions and national messages - create communities which are forced to make choices, people are forced into corners and fight for their territory. Suspicions are becoming more entrenched. They are fuelled by both rumour and myth. For many, these rumours and myths, have become a reality. This is a real threat for the city and will need to be confronted.**



- 7.3 Some communities feel 'under siege'. For example, immigration has centred in the inner city wards in the city – Normanton and Arboretum. New communities have settled there in numbers and continue to do so. Stories exist of Eastern Europeans sleeping 5/6 to a room and being exploited by local recruitment agencies. Others are struggling to learn new skills. This is a complex community which needs a mix of solutions.
- 7.4 For very different reasons other communities in Derby appear to feel threatened by the new cultures coming to the city. There are some areas of the city identified as not welcoming new communities. Evidence exists of some people feeling they have not been made welcome in their new home, then seeking alternative accommodation in different areas of the city. They are likely to choose to settle in Normanton/ Peartree or other areas in the South of the city. Some people have said, "Well, they have chosen to live there, it's their choice". The reality is often different in that it may be about where they 'can't live', not where they 'can'. This may become another threat to cohesion in Derby.
- 7.5 Work will need to focus not only on ensuring cultures mix peacefully in one part of the city, but in other areas on them becoming more tolerant of those with different cultures/beliefs to their own.
- 7.6 These issues will need to be tackled if the city is to uphold its tradition of being a safe, cohesive location. There are very real threats, some of which are outside the city's control but much within its control.

## **8 Barriers to Cohesion**

The following have been identified by interviewees as 'Barriers to Cohesion' in the City of Derby.

### **8.1 Leadership**

"No one single message", is an emerging theme. Surprise was expressed about the lack of visible leadership, both 'Political and Faith', when matters arise that can cause tensions to increase. This may not in fact be the case, but it is a perception widely held. People, therefore, refer to their own "local" Leaders for guidance and advice to fill the void. Such 'Local Leaders' may offer a parochial view and not represent the broader context in which the issue is based. A citywide Leadership group could fill this void.

### **8.2 Funding**

Community groups feel they receive little financial support. Some acknowledge there is funding available via External Funding Unit/Business Grants/Normanton Regeneration/Lottery etc, but few have the skills or capacity to access those funding streams. People are confused and frustrated. Evidence exists of community volunteers using their own personal finances to try to keep centres up and running. Attending city events is also difficult because they have to fund attendance from their own pockets. Resources are a key issue to facilitate engagement. Work to simplify the situation by External Funding Management and the existence of the 'small change' pot are seen as positives, but frustration is still apparent.

### **8.3 Skills**

It is evident that for some communities two skill areas still need addressing – Language and Job Search. Without these skills access to work opportunities will be denied. Without employment people will feel excluded and will be less able to participate positively in the life of the city. Essentially creating an attitude within the individual more likely to drive them back into their culture/group for support, thereby re-enforcing the view that 'their' group gets a 'Bad Deal'

### **8.4 Volunteers**

The over reliance on volunteers to support smaller groups is a real issue. In many cases an individual, or a few people, keep things going. There exists evidence of illness, personal crisis or finance, suddenly halting work in some communities. There is an over reliance on goodwill. Whilst 'volunteering' is a very positive act, when done in isolation it leaves communities vulnerable.

Some of those currently doing this valuable work, and keeping things on an even keel, are losing both energy and patience. They feel their work is not recognised.

#### 8.5 Slow Response

Agencies are perceived to respond slowly, if at all, to issues raised. This leads to a loss of trust and causes frustration. “Do they really care?” best sums up the message from some interviewees. Feedback loops are informal and rely on personal contact rather than formal mechanisms. Communication is vital and is currently a missing link.

#### 8.6 Schools/Colleges

All participants agree that Young people are critical to this debate. What happens in city schools and colleges is important. They are seen as one of the few places where cultures really can, and generally do mix. However, when tensions rise, they are perceived to be slow to recognise the problems. Some people feel that issues can be denied. There is widespread acceptance, and understanding, that a school/college is at the mercy of its own reputation but some consultees feel some Head Teachers are not sufficiently focused on the issue. Some people feel that schools can act as ‘islands’. It is seen as important for ‘education’ to develop a unified approach that makes sense to students when they return to their communities. Any Failure to admit failings/problems within schools and creating individual responses can be seen as ‘the system in denial’

Additionally, ‘cohesion’ is not directly programmed into the school curriculum. More worryingly there is no formal, or informal, mechanism for school managers to discuss the social cohesion agenda. However, such mechanisms do exist to discuss issues such as ‘Drugs’ and ‘Teenage Pregnancy’.

‘Outside school’ projects are emerging to create ‘Leaders For Tomorrow’ they deal with the real issues/choices presented to young people. This is sporadic across the city and often dependent upon funding from outside mainstream provision and is mainly focused on the Muslim community.

The education establishment, together with the Youth Service will need to act as a key delivery partner if a cohesion strategy for Derby is to be successful.

#### 8.7 Separate Lives/Separate Communities

There exists a widespread feeling that communities and individuals are more and more likely to retreat into their “silos”. All participants believe there is a need to bring people together, the will exists, but the fear is that opposite is occurring. All agree that remaining in silos creates people/communities living separate lives. However, at the moment, it is made too hard for that to happen. There are few policies/events/activities which encourage ‘mixing’. Indeed, because of what

people read, hear and view, they are being forced to retreat further into corners, making it less likely that the city will create a 'multi-cultural' environment.

Funding applied to cross cultural events needs to be more rigorously tested to ensure it has met the agreed outcome, that it was in fact a Multi-cultural event. The evidence suggests that it rarely does.

#### 8.8 Too Many Organisations/Too Much Advice

People are confused by what is on offer. Many organisations now offer support, guidance and advice, some even charge. Criticism is levelled at Capacity Building organisations. Some communities feel they have become a 'means to an end'. They stand accused of fighting for resources, not for communities, but for their own projects. They look to sustain and improve their own staffing levels, often then competing with then same community groups they are 'thought' to be capacity building . There may be good reason for this, but this perception will need to be dealt with

#### 8.9 Access to Work/Employment

Clarity is needed as to what employment initiatives are available, and who they are targeted towards. There exists confusion within some communities as to what is on offer and where to access relevant training. Job Search and language courses were two courses mentioned specifically.

Some good outreach work is beginning but is yet to be fully established in the priority areas.

Employment is key for communities to feel valued, therefore being able to contribute in a positive way to the city. Economic wellbeing creates a feeling of self-confidence

#### 8.10 Community Intelligence

A great deal of information lays dormant in communities. During visits, many individuals passed on 'snippets'. It is essential to record this information. Communities see the need for action, but agencies are often not even aware of it. Additionally, employees also hold 'intelligence' but few have avenues down which to pass it. Whilst the police in Derby have established an 'informal' community intelligence network, the lack of a more formal approach may damage the city's ability to assess risk, respond to rising tensions or plan for future events.

The intelligence/information loop needs to be a "two way" street. Agencies, leaders and elected members also need routes to pass on what they know, as well as receiving what the community knows. Without an accurate, timely and

visible information flow the city will exist on rumour, innuendo and misinformation. This is largely the picture today and is a recipe for cohesion breakdown.

#### 8.11 Data

The research shows the city does not know enough about its 'smaller' community groups. Whilst in number this is a small percentage of the city's population, the impact is more considerable. Previous reports have recommended that agencies in the city record detail below the census data requirement. Unfortunately, this has not been actioned and estimates of numbers are exactly that, estimates. The innovation of the Data Warehouse, plus use of the 'Community Self Estimates', should ease this blockage.

#### 8.12 Interpreters

Some participants have reported very slow responses to problems due to the lack of Interpreter Services in the city. There is awareness that a service has been proposed, but not delivered. This in itself displays a lack of urgency by agencies and is viewed as an uncaring approach by the city to an identified need.

#### 8.13 Consultation

Some groups quote the multiplicity of 'consultation forums' and events. Many no longer attend as they see themselves as being viewed as 'tokens'. They feel they are only there to fill the seats, whilst only the usual 'suspects' are listened to. If they do speak, they risk loss of funds. This is a major problem for a city intent on engagement and the new approach to engagement is eagerly awaited.

#### 8.14 Myths

Demonising and continually perpetuating myths about some communities is fuelling prejudice. Identified as one of the biggest barriers it also presents one of the biggest challenges. Presenting positive images, dispelling the myths will be difficult but very necessary if real cohesion is to be achieved in Derby.

## **9 Consultee Suggested Responses to Tackle ‘Cause’ and ‘Barriers**

The following is a summary of suggestions receiving majority/unanimous support from consultees:

### **9.1 Myth Busting Campaign**

If you want to change a negative image, present a positive one. Traditional routes, like use of media - but also city wide campaigns could include posters, billboards, events, bus adverts, and handouts. In some cities, 70% of this work has been directed towards areas with little or no minority ethnic representation. This would be useful in Derby in dealing with the areas that are perceived to be less ‘welcoming’.

### **9.2 Pride for Derby/Respect for Derby**

People have been clear; it is easier to be ‘loud and proud’ about your city than your nationality. It is easier to be asked to support Derby County than England if you come from the Cameroon, for example. Therefore there exists support for the “Respect in Derby” campaign.

Both a citywide programme and a neighbourhood programme are supported. Participants spoke of symbolic events, local cultural events, a Song for Derby, Derby Ambassadors – there are a myriad of ideas to support this type of initiative. It is an excellent issue on which to consult widely.

‘Sign up’ by leaders/employees and residents would be critical – “If we want to respect each other, then we should expect respect when we are dealt with”, was one quote. In other words any such initiative will need to show all partners respecting not only each other, but their clients also.

Signing up to a ‘Citywide Charter of Belonging’ is another avenue to explore, ( Blackburn with Darwen example.) it demonstrates a more symbolic way of dealing with this issue.’ Pride for Derby’ is a popular image.

### **9.3 Neighbourhood Charters**

The city should be encouraged to take the idea of a ‘City Charter – Pride for Derby’ idea into the Neighbourhoods. As the city rolls out its neighbourhood programme, it is suggested charters could be agreed by local people. Local communities should articulate how they want their local area to ‘look’ and ‘feel’. This is another good area for wider consultation, giving local people local ownership; there is a clear role here for Neighbourhood Teams

#### 9.4 'Rubbing Shoulders'

A simple term that paints its own picture. All consultees want to see people coming from within their 'silos'. Suggestions include cross faith visits, cross community lunch clubs, school exchanges, community football events. Often quoted are the 3 themes of football, food and dance. Such events should be local and feature in the Cultural City Programme. Essentially people see the need to 'rub shoulders' and experience different cultures within their local community setting.

#### 9.5 Work with Young People

Much of the visible impact of cohesion manifests itself in the behaviour of young people on the streets or within the education establishments in the city. The beginnings of any serious disorder will be witnessed by pre-cursor events amongst this group first.

Within Derby a great deal of good work has started/is continuing in this area. Best practice in creating respect, busting myth, developing leaders needs to be spread across the city. (Work seen in Derwent/Osmaston/Normanton and Dudley are excellent examples.) Work at street level is also seen as critical as many young people grow up outside both faith and family. Guidance will need to be come from somewhere. Youth Service Provision needs to be targeted to areas of highest need.

However, most of our young people do grow up in school. Schools are quoted as the critical factor here. Schools, Derby College and the University of Derby should be seen to be applying their considerable knowledge and skills to determine a city wide response to this issue. Establishment of a 'Heads' Forum on Social Inclusion is suggested as 'vital'. Continuing, and further developing, the good work of the 'Citizenship Team' within schools and the Youth service will also be important to the delivery of this part of the agenda.

Young people need a voice and an innovative solution needs to be found to the problem of involving Young People. Most of all, work needs to be better co-ordinated across the sector. Engagement with Young People needs to be extended and made "real"

#### 9.6 Leadership

There is a call for stronger, clearer more responsive leadership at the Community, Political and Faith level. For some communities faith leadership is a significant feature in forming their wider view of the world. When the reputation of the city, or part of the city, is at risk, communities expect a fast,

clear response from its Leaders. Communities also expect their own Leaders to be involved.

The city requires a 'Leadership Group' with a structure that allows Leaders to make informed, timely decisions. Those leaders need the skills to develop the agenda and the courage to talk for the community, not just their constituency or their community.

Leaders of the future need to be identified be encouraged and offered opportunities.

Leadership is recognised to be the most important issue at community level. The Partnership will need to get this right.

#### 9.7 Community Advisory Groups

When an incident occurs, the involvement of Community Representatives to advise the Leadership Group and Neighbourhood Teams is seen as a good way of ensuring solutions are 'best fit'. Involving communities in Strategic decision making is viewed as a positive step forward.

Additionally establishing a permanent group to advise on policy development and 'Quality Check' Activity would also benefit any new structure.

#### 9.8 One Centre, One Approach, One Welcome

There is evidence of too much advice, too many advice centres and too many community centres. This leads on to widespread support for a single centre approach, particularly from smaller emerging communities. Some groups have expressed reservation about who would be in control and some see a 'power struggle' ensuing. However most agreed that a single centre should provide:

- Performance space
- Learning space
- Single point for Agency advice
- Single point for Welfare advice
- Single point for Legal advice
- Appropriate cultural support
- Paid 'management'
- Paid Community Development Worker(s)
- Place to welcome 'newcomers' and introduce the city and its welcome pack

The suggestion is that any such centre should be located in Normanton.



## 9.9 Cohesion Team

There exists total support for the idea of creating a 'cohesion unit' in the city, (if not how to resource it). A team comprising expertise from Housing/CSP/Youth Service/Police/Hate Crime and Health would be a benefit to the city.

Data/information from across these disciplines, from within communities and from employees needs collecting and depositing in one place. Such information should inform decision making. The team would then create neighbourhood and citywide risk assessments for leaders and neighbourhoods teams alike. Charged with regular visits to community groups offering feedback, and contact would be a visible demonstration of 'commitment' and 'caring' that is not felt today. Such a team would enable the city to predict events rather than simply respond to events as it does today.

It is unlikely the city will successfully tackle cohesion issues without the resourcing of such a unit.

## 9.10 Opportunities/Skills/Employment

Consultees believe greater clarity of the opportunities that exist is necessary. They feel a need to understand more about what skills are required to be able to take up the offer. Whilst targeting is clearly being undertaken, more transparency is needed in local areas. Current 'outreach' provision needs to be thoughtfully placed. There exist a large number of very good schemes; however they appear in different strategic documents, i.e. the Local Area Agreement, the Community Strategy and the Children and Young Persons Plan. Their existence is not widely known.

## 9.11 City Strategy and Structure

A common complaint was that the city responds 'slowly' and has no 'strategy' to deal with issues that lead to a rise in tensions. The proposal to create a 'Cohesion Team', linking that to a Leadership Group, who are themselves informed by Community Advisory Groups, is seen as the best structural approach to ensure a quick, appropriate response to such issues.

The feedback loop, via the Cohesion Team, is seen as a vital mechanism for that structure.

This paper, once consulted, should result in a 'cohesion strategy' for the city of Derby.

## **10 Extremism**

- 10.1 This report does not tackle the issue of extremism in a direct sense. Rightly, Government is concerned about the growth of extremist views. It is believed that the actions recommended in this report will begin to tackle the issues which create a climate in which extremists flourish.
- 10.2 It is widely acknowledged that National and International policy fuels the debate, and, as some participants claim, “create terrorists”.

This is a difficult discussion within the context of this report, and the city. However, changing the cultural climate will be one way for the city to be seen to be tackling the Agenda. This, together with Local Leadership programmes for ‘Imams’ and ‘Younger People’ can be regarded as positive steps.

Ultimately, ‘Leadership’, ‘Rubbing Shoulders’, ‘Pride for Derby’, ‘Myth Busting’ and ‘Developing Strategies for Young People’ will not only build cohesion, they should create a climate where extremism is less attractive to Derby people

- 10.3 Additionally strategies targeting groups who feature high in poor educational achievement and employment figures will help rebuild confidence. They will help challenge the idea that this is a city seeking to marginalise those from vulnerable communities. This will help tackle the issue of National Extremism.

## **11 Emerging Good Practice**

11.1 Whilst completing this work it became clear that some excellent work is in progress, both in Derby and nationally. There is no need to reinvent all the wheels as some will meet Derby City needs. Work requiring closer scrutiny would include:

Engagement Techniques - 'Open Space Technology'-Derwent  
- Neighbourhood Management. Derby C.S.P.

Respect in Derby - Enthusiasm's 'Respect' programme in schools  
- 'Charter of Belonging' – Blackburn

Tackling Racism - 'Make it your Goal' Derby C.S.P.

Leadership  
- University of Derby Project in Normanton  
- HAC Project - Yasir Mahmood  
- JET Project - Normanton Road  
- JET" Imams Project"

Tackling Extremism - 'Greenlight Project' – Dudley

One Centre Approach - 'New Link Centre' – Peterborough

Data Collection - Leicestershire City Council

Cohesion Strategy - Leicestershire City Council

Young People - Derwent/Enthusiasm - Derby  
- Youth Service/Green Light – Dudley  
- Nexis Project – Derby College

"Rubbing Shoulders" -Zambezi Project - Derwent

## 12 **A Reality Check**

### 12.1 Quotes and comments from participants that bring life to this work include:

“The invisible population are here, it’s just they are only visible on our streets not our statistics”

“It’s about where we can’t live, not where we can”

“Extremists are made by government, not localities”

“People want us to respect each other but watch how politicians behave, they don’t respect each others views, it has to start at the top”

“The real champions remain unseen/unsung – they are not the ones who talk for themselves”

“Leadership comes from the heart, not a piece of paper”

“Second-Tier organisations don’t visit, they only look after themselves”

“They (the Council) don’t really want to talk to you, if you do talk, you gain enemies, they just want their chairs full, a ‘tick in the box”

“People fight for their community, not the community”

“We are all playing a game of Poker, keeping our cards close to our chest, never sharing, we compete for the same pot”

“The Second-Tier is so busy resourcing, its own priorities they forget – why they are really there”

“It’s like a jigsaw puzzle, people have their pieces in their box, but no-one brings the pieces together to complete the picture”

“The reality is the area is changing so when a threat comes, people look to exploit it, creating the spark”

“What’s mine is mine, never yours”

**If the city can find a way to talk to its people it will not only find out what people think, it will have a real chance to deal with their problems. A lot of people have a lot to say, they need to be seen where they are, not where agencies are. Neighbourhood working provides a serious opportunity to achieve this and is central to creating a real dialogue with real people.**

## **13 Resources**

31.1 There are a number of funding streams which may help the Partnership implement its Cohesion Strategy.

### **13.2 'Small Change Pot'**

This funding mechanism is currently under review. Currently, this is managed by External Funding Management Group. Grants run to a maximum of £3,000. Awards are approved by a panel of local residents but there is no 'formal' link to the Neighbourhood Team, Cultural City or other elements of the LAA.

The Co-ordination Manager does try to ensure the project outcomes meet broader currently agreed target areas across citywide priorities. It is an excellent mechanism for smaller groups to access funding. It is commonly used for 'new activity', one-off costs. Whilst it could provide an excellent way of driving forward 'Cohesion Activity' in neighbourhoods more work is needed to make this happen

### **13.3 European Funding (EDRF) Urban**

Maximum available is £130k which has to be match funded by 100%. These funds could be utilised for cohesion or capacity building events or a citywide celebration of cohesion marking the achievements of the city over the last 6 years.

### **13.4 European Funding – Normanton Regeneration – Urban II**

There may be available an additional £800k, in addition to the annual allocation which has to be match funded by 100% (not confirmed until spring 2007). It is likely that there will be a requirement to prioritise work on cohesion/capacity building and employment under priorities 1 & 3. If it is felt that this fund could help resource a 'new link' type building, however, there would be a requirement to commit for 20 years of future funding. Last spend by spring 2008.

### **13.5 Lottery Funding and Other Funding Streams**

The City Council no longer fund a 'Lottery Officer Post'. This may be a weakness in co-ordinating the applications made by the city groups for lottery funding. Additionally, the expertise that would benefit by some positive outcomes for the city is missed. However, the fund remains a source of future funding opportunities. A lottery protocol for the Partnership exists, but needs resources on an ongoing basis.

### 13.6 Existing Budgets

Resources are already applied to this work. Greater clarity of how monies are spent, and what outcomes/priorities are met would assist the debate. Reviewing and prioritising existing budgets would help build capacity.

### 13.6 Cohesion Team

Some Service providers already target resources for information gathering, Hate Crime, Social Inclusion, Youth Work, etc. Bringing together such resources, with some addition, would bring real benefits.

## 14 **Recommendations**

These recommendations are presented in line with the government's paper on Local Government Reform , "Cohesion headings".

### (I) **Strong Leadership and Engagement**

#### **Recommendation 1**

"That the Partnership establishes a Leadership Group to provide a strategic vision, and resource, to build cohesion in the city of Derby."

##### Membership

Members of the Authority, to include the Leader, The Chief Executive, Directors of Young People Services, Housing, CSP, Local Police Commander, Media Representative, Faith Forum Representative, Chief Executive of Primary Care Trust and Chair of the Advisory Panel

#### **Recommendation 2**

"That the Partnership creates a structure of Advisory Panels to work alongside Leadership and Neighbourhood Teams. To advise as appropriate to Ad Hoc issues arising from local incidents. To also act as a Standing Advisory Panel to the Leadership Group"

#### **Recommendation 3**

"That the Partnership creates a 'Cohesion Unit' to be based within the CSP.

##### Function to Include:

- To provide citywide risk assessments for both Leadership and Neighbourhood Teams.

It is believed that the actions recommended in this report will begin to tackle the issues which create a climate in which extremists flourish

- Collect relevant data from partners/employees/residents, community groups and elected members.
- Prepare information for each neighbourhood to pass to residents and employees, allowing feedback.

- Maintain regular contact with all community groups and partner agencies.
- Develop response to Cohesion Agenda in partnership with Neighbourhood Teams and partnership agencies.

#### **Recommendation 4**

“The Partnership review, consolidate and re-establish trust in the engagement mechanism with community groups. A new engagement strategy to be created building on the existing work already commenced in The C.S.P. and the City Council.”

#### **Recommendation 5**

“The Leadership Group seek to build capacity in the ‘Faith Forum’ and support its efforts in creating cross faith initiatives in the city.”

#### **Recommendation 6**

“The Partnership to work with Government Office East Midlands to provide City Leaders with enhanced skills and knowledge to shape the Cohesion agenda.”

#### **Recommendation 7**

“The Partnership to request Neighbourhood Managers to identify skills required in their area to allow marginalised communities to engage with them at the local level. Then access appropriate training providers to bridge any skills gap.”

### **(II) Developing Shared Values**

#### **Recommendation 8**

“The Partnership examines ways of developing “City” and “Neighbourhood” Charters’. (To be Agreed locally but concentrating on “Rubbing Shoulders” and the “Respect” Agendas”)

#### **Recommendation 9**

“The Partnership, together with “Marketing Derby”, host a “Respect for Derby/Pride in Derby” programme in 2007.”



### **Recommendation 10**

“The Partnership to promote ‘Rubbing Shoulders’ as a guide to cultural and neighbourhood events. Cross-cultural events to be encouraged and sponsored.”

### **Recommendation 11**

“The Partnership to promote a ‘Myth Busting’ campaign during 2007.

## **(III) Preventing Problems of Tomorrow**

### **Recommendation 12**

“The Partnership to establish a formal youth programme which targets those most likely to be disaffected. (Model of Green Light – Dudley.)”

Recommendations 5 & 6 also directed to this aim.

## **(IV) Good Information**

### **Recommendation 13**

The Partnership to seek funding to create an opportunity to establish a ‘one-stop shop’ to provide a welcome for new communities, one centre for legal advice/welfare support/cultural support and to provide a learning base, with a performance space (See New Link Project, Peterborough.)

### **Recommendation 14**

“That the current ‘welcome pack’ be re-visited and updated to take account of demographic changes of the last 2 years.”

### **Recommendation 15**

“The Partnership to revive the currently stalled Interpreter Service initiative

### **Recommendation 16**

“That the Data Warehouse initiative continues to be supported with all agencies agreeing to accept the data. To include the expanded categories based on community self estimates. To be revised and re-visited every 6 months.”

**(V) Visible Work to Tackle Inequalities**

**Recommendation 17**

That the Partnership make clear in a Cohesion Strategy those actions from its Local Area Agreement, its Community Strategy and other Partner Strategies that impact on Community Cohesion.

**Recommendation 18**

“That the Partnership commission specific work programmes with the Pakistani community in Normanton to re-build trust and confidence.”

**(VI) Involving Young People**

**Recommendation 19**

“That the Partnership requests Heads of schools, Derby College and the University of Derby to come together to create a cohesion programme for the sector to implement citywide. The forum should be seen to share ‘intelligence’ and “best practice” on social inclusion.”

**Recommendation 20**

“Each neighbourhood hold an ‘open space technology’ event aimed at engaging young people to determine their views on their area.” (Open space is an innovative model of engaging with communities, currently used in Derwent.)

**Recommendation 21**

“The Partnership evaluates activity in the city which is directed towards ‘Developing Leaders’ in order to create models of best practice for sharing citywide.”

**Recommendation 22**

“The Derby City Partnership encourage the youth service to continue to be innovative, responding to need as it is identified with flexibility to target its resources based on that need.”

### **Recommendation 23**

“The Partnership extend the role of the city ‘Young People’s Forum’ to ensure the views of Young People influence the developing strategy

## **(VII) Interfaith Work**

See recommendations 3 & 1.

### **Recommendation 24**

“The Partnership should receive ½ yearly updates from the Faith Forum on its work and encourages greater participation of the forum across the partnership’s working groups.”

## **(VIII) Partnership with Other Sectors**

### **Recommendation 25**

“The Partnership explores with local business leaders the feasibility of ‘buddying’ with a local community group to offer expertise and support.

### **Recommendation 26**

That the Partnership work with those charged with Capacity Building in the City to ensure identified and agreed needs of Community Groups are met.

### **Recommendation 27**

“The Partnership to identify, then make clear, the funds available for Community Cohesion work in the City of Derby”