

'Our Shared Future' – Recommendations

We are pleased to reproduce the **Recommendations** (57 in total) of the report published on 14th June 2007 by the Commission on Integration and Cohesion, entitled 'Our Shared Future'. This will give you a current practical assessment of actions approved by central Government. We would recommend that you look at all of these and see how your own organisation and community can be involved. It may be that some are directly relevant to you to actually instigate. It may also be the case that you could offer support and guidance to others. If you are unsure in any way, please contact Julian Harrison at Leicestershire County Council. He would be happy to advise and assist you.¹

In some cases, there will be a statutory duty for you to do community cohesion work. However, in many cases that won't be the case. In these situations, we would argue that there is a more important factor to consider – your responsibility as organisations, communities and as individual human beings to work towards achieving greater harmony, fraternity, compassion and human (and not necessarily solely economic) prosperity.

We would also suggest that you cross-reference the report **Recommendations** contained in this factsheet with the **Executive Summary**² as well as the factsheet detailing our plans for work in Leicestershire.³ The latter is particularly important as we hope that in that particular document we will not only have identified key cohesion actions for Leicestershire, but also managed to convey what they are in clearly understandable language without including unnecessary and jargonised terminology and phrases – the sort of things you can see in the following recommendations (e.g. "BVPI performance", "LSP management", "PSA target" etc).

Recommendations⁴

	Recommendation	Report Ref ⁵
1	We recommend the adoption of a new definition of integration and cohesion.	3.15
2	We recommend that central Government sets out a clear statement of integration and cohesion policy.	4.11
3	We recommend Government invest in a national shared futures programme from 2008-2012, leading from the European Year of Intercultural Education up to the Olympics and using the themes of both to underpin key messages.	4.14
4	We recommend that every local area should: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Map their communities; • Use that map as one important way to identify tensions and opportunities; • Monitor their BVPI⁶ performance on cohesion • Mainstream integration and cohesion into their Sustainable Community Strategies, LSP⁷ management and wider service delivery, particularly for youth provision. 	4.24
5	We recommend that there should be a single national PSA⁸ target for community cohesion.	4.27
6	We recommend that local areas should be encouraged to develop their own local indicators of integration and cohesion.	4.27
7	We recommend that The Audit Commission should ensure that locally determined integration and cohesion measures are clearly incorporated into the Comprehensive Area Assessment regime.	4.27

¹ Julian Harrison can be contacted by email (inharrison@leics.gov.uk) or by ringing 0116 305 7018.

² Factsheet Reference B4 – 'Our Shared Future' – Executive Summary

³ Factsheet Reference B6 – What are we going to do in Leicestershire?

⁴ From the Commission on Integration and Cohesion website http://www.integrationandcohesion.org.uk/Our_final_report.aspx

⁵ Relates to the Chapter/Paragraph in actual report.

⁶ BVPI = Best Value Performance Indicator

⁷ LSP = Local Strategic Partnership

⁸ PSA = Public Service Agreement

8	We recommend that Communities and Local Government's forthcoming guidance on LSPs and Sustainable Community Strategies should make explicit reference to the need to address the cross-cutting issues of integration and cohesion.	4.27
9	We reaffirm the proposal that Local Authorities should have workforce strategies in place that have clear action plans for targeted recruitment – and recognise the need for flexible working for women in particular. And that political parties consider again how they can ensure their candidates better reflect the communities they serve – whether through positive measures, or more targeted recruitment.	4.33
10	We recommend that the Electoral Commission, working with the new CEHR ⁹ , should seek a voluntary agreement on the part of political parties to behave as if they are bound by the positive duty in the Race Relations Amendment Act, and the forthcoming duty to promote good relations enforceable by the CEHR.	4.33
11	We recommend that LGA ¹⁰ , IDeA ¹¹ and central Government should consider these family groups when providing guidance to areas on integration and cohesion.	4.42
12	We recommend that LGA, IDeA and central Government support should move away from static guidance to particular areas towards workshops, ongoing training groups, and partnerships between those local areas who would not normally meet each other as part of existing local and regional structures.	4.42
13	We recommend an ambitious response to the Ajebo report on Citizenship Education.	5.8
14	We recommend consideration of how existing citizenship ceremonies for people from abroad becoming new citizens can be strengthened.	5.8
15	We recommend consideration of an expansion of citizenship ceremonies to include all young people.	5.8
16	We recommend a new programme of voluntary service for young people expressly linked to local citizenship.	5.8
17	We recommend a national body to manage the integration of new migrants, sponsored by Communities and Local Government, but independent of Government.	5.22
18	We recommend that Communities and Local Government develops a sample welcome pack based on current good practice, and works with the local areas in family group a) in particular to ensure that it is implemented.	5.29
19	We recommend that along with joint development of welcome packs, these partnerships between Local Government, the voluntary and community sector and faith communities are formalised in a way that suits existing LSP structures – potentially through local service level agreements or contracts.	5.32
20	We recommend that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Employers should recognise that they have a responsibility – jointly with other parties – to deal with the integration and cohesion issues arising from the growing number of migrant workers they employ (whether employed directly or through an agency). In particular, they should offer English classes for new migrants (focused at first on the vocabulary they will need on the job), and should promote understanding of different cultures and groups by providing cultural training in the workplace. 	5.33
21	We recognise that finite resources means that we need to be creative in how we deliver ESOL ¹² support, but we recommend that it is reviewed in four ways (see text for these).	5.42

⁹ CEHR = Commission for Equality and Human Rights

¹⁰ LGA = Local Government Association

¹¹ IDeA = Improvement and Development Agency for local government

¹² ESOL = English for Speakers of Other Languages

22	We recommend that the outcomes of the youth strand of the DfES/HM Treasury ¹³ Children and Young People's Review take integration and cohesion into account, and consider ways of spreading good practice about how to work with young people on integration and cohesion.	6.10
23	We recommend that in the current review of Government strategy, incentives to encourage adult participation with young people should also be considered.	6.11
24	We recommend that Faith communities should be encouraged to work with Government, the LGA, and other relevant agencies to develop a programme to help increase 'religious literacy' on the part of public agencies.	6.24
25	We recommend that a set of clear guidelines should be developed to enable Local Authorities and others to be able to award public service contracts to faith based bodies without fear that there will be issues over whether this will lead to proselytising or pressure on users of services to accept the religious beliefs of the providers.	6.24
26	We recommend that community development values, methods and outcomes should be promoted at a local level, with explicit recognition of its importance in enabling integration and cohesion and an integral component in the delivery of good public services and local governance.	6.31
27	We recommend that the sustainable community strategy and Local Area Agreement in each local area should include a strategic approach to community capacity-building, based on the Firm Foundations framework, and funded adequately through co-ordinated channels.	6.31
28	We recommend that a community-based 'community cohesion audit resource' should be developed for use by local agencies such as neighbourhood management teams and community groups which allows tension monitoring and offers suggestions and ideas for conflict resolution and meaningful interaction.	6.31
29	We recommend that the current Review of Policing in England and Wales by Sir Ronnie Flanagan underlines the importance of Neighbourhood Policing to integration and cohesion, and links back to the key principles outlined in our report.	6.40
30	We recommend that the CEHR is represented locally, through a network of teams similar to the existing Race Equality Councils – and that this local network is designed as a delivery arm that is sensitive to the different challenges being experienced by the integration and cohesion family groups outlined in this report.	7.7
31	We recommend that every Local Authority maintains a communication plan to ensure that all communities are kept abreast of changes and the reasons for them, not just those minority communities that have typically been seen as "hard to reach".	7.17
32	We recommend that local areas consider how best to engage their local media in local structures.	7.22
33	We recommend that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Authorities should develop myth busting strategies aimed specifically at established communities. That Local Authorities should work with the media to actively rebut myths and misinformation, in between and during election periods. 	7.29
34	We recommend that a rapid rebuttal unit should be established jointly with partners including the CEHR, Communities and Local Government, LGA, LGiU ¹⁴ .	7.29
35	We recommend that ONS ¹⁵ urgently reinvigorate their work on co-ordinating migration statistics at a national level, and begin to report directly to the new Migration Impacts Forum.	7.34
36	We recommend that Communities and Local Government and ONS urgently provide support to Local Authorities in developing tailored systems for calculating population change between censuses, using data most appropriate for meeting their local needs.	7.37

¹³ DfES/HM Treasury = Department for Education and Skills/Her Majesty's Treasury

¹⁴ LGiU = Local Government Information Unit

¹⁵ ONS = Office for National Statistics

37	We recommend that Local Authorities and LSPs conduct a brief 'audit' of opportunities for cross- cultural and inter-faith engagement in their areas.	8.8
38	We recommend that Communities and Local Government should clearly set out what their strategy is in funding intercultural dialogue.	8.8
39	We recommend that local areas consider how shared activities can be used as the driving force for the interaction projects that they fund.	8.9
40	We recommend that a nationally sponsored 'Community Week' with a focus on celebrating all communities and inter-community engagement should start early in 2008. Preparations for this week should also be seen in the context of recent calls for a national Community Day.	8.10
41	We recommend that Communities and Local Government should commission a programme of research to explore more closely what works in different neighbourhoods and why, building on contact theory and the initial evidence from our work.	8.10
42	We recommend that there should be a national school twinning programme, with support from the centre delivered by a new website of good practice run by DfES.	8.10
43	We recommend that the recommendations outlined in Sir Keith Ajegbo's report on Citizenship Education should be taken forward as a matter of urgency by DfES – with a particular focus on Continuous Professional Development for teachers.	8.12
44	We recommend that schools should consider buying in support or training on conflict resolution and mediation to ensure they are able to manage the consequences of increased dialogue.	8.12
45	We recommend that the CEHR, in partnership with the CBI ¹⁶ , be tasked with convening regular forums where representatives of employers and employees (from both the public and private sectors) meet to set out clear action plans for how employment issues can contribute integration and cohesion.	8.24
46	We recommend that large employers consider allowing employees 3 days paid leave a year for participation in defined activities.	8.25
47	We recommend that Communities England, and funding partnerships developed to deliver regeneration programmes, should demonstrate that they have mainstreamed integration and cohesion how their funding is being directed, and that local communities have been engaged in regeneration plans from the start.	8.28
48	We recommend that the Academy for Sustainable Communities is better linked into mainstream integration and cohesion policies, and builds on its recent work with the Institute for Community Cohesion by upskilling planning and housing practitioners in key integration and cohesion themes.	8.28
49	We recommend that Regional Development Agencies should be encouraged to award contracts to businesses that have a clear corporate commitment to employment diversity and equality policies. And that in the development of their lifelong learning strategies, they should commit to delivering tailored courses that upskill particular parts of the local workforce – responding to the needs of settled communities, for example, who may be unable to compete in the face of cheaper labour – while making the most of the new skills brought by new communities.	8.28
50	Aligned with our guidelines on single community funding, we recommend that when buildings and assets are transferred to communities, it is with the express intention that they will normally be resources for all groups and individuals within the local community.	8.28
51	We recommend all public agencies involved in the funding of affordable housing and area based regeneration, including major Regional Development Agency programmes, should ensure that equality impact assessments on policy are extended to include assessment of the impact of the policy upon cohesion and integration.	8.33

¹⁶ CBI = Confederation of British Industry

52	We recommend all affordable housing providers receiving investment funding should demonstrate how this funding will assist in promoting cohesion and delivering mixed communities.	8.33
53	We recommend that in drafting their community lettings plans, Local Authorities should explicitly consider the dynamics of cohesion and integration locally. And in particular: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local Authorities and funders of new social housing should make clear the criteria used and judgements between need and choice that inform allocations policies in both new homes and older properties that become available, and how this relates to the considerations of integration and cohesion. All agencies, including Local Authorities and affordable housing providers, should operate inclusive allocations and lettings policies. Unless there is a clear business and equalities case, single group funding should not be promoted. In exceptional cases, where such funding is awarded, the provider should demonstrate clearly how its policies will promote community cohesion and integration. 	8.33
54	We recommend that Local Authorities should be encouraged to identify areas that are experiencing particular issues with unscrupulous landlords that relate to integration and cohesion, and use fully the powers available to them to address these issues.	8.33
55	We recommend: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That nationally, cultural development agencies, including the Arts Council and the Heritage Lottery Fund, should require applicants for funding to demonstrate their commitment to integration and cohesion outcomes and [sic] part of its funding criteria. That this same principle should apply to local public agencies when considering the potential for “bridging” activities across communities when funding sports and arts projects. 	8.48
56	We recommend the adoption of our guidance on single community funding.	Annex C
57	We recommend the adoption of our guidance on translation.	Annex D

Full Report

The full report is available online from the Commission on Integration and Cohesion. Click on http://www.integrationandcohesion.org.uk/Our_final_report.aspx. If you want a hard copy, you can order it online or by writing to:

Communities and Local Government Publications
PO Box 236
Wetherby LS23 7NB

To telephone order, ring 0870 1226 236.

Glossary Links

Generally speaking, we would very much recommend the Glossary included on the IDeA (see below) website for a vast number of terms related to local government. This can be found by clicking on <http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pageId=10>.

For specific organisations and terms used in this particular factsheet:

BVPI (Best Value Performance Indicators):

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performanceframeworkpartnerships/bestvalue/bestvalueperformance/>

CBI (Confederation of British Industry): http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Confederation_of_British_Industry or their website: <http://www.cbi.org.uk/>

CEHR (Commission for Equalities and Human Rights) or EHRC (Equalities and Human Rights Commission): <http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelid=9234145> or alternatively, go to their website: <http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/>

DfES (Department for Education Skills): Now no longer exists. It has been replaced by the Department for Children, Schools and Families (<http://www.dcsf.gov.uk/>) and the Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills, which in itself has merged into the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills (<http://www.berr.gov.uk/>)

ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages): <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/ESOL> or http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/EducationAndLearning/AdultLearning/ImprovingYourSkills/DG_10037499

HM (Her Majesty's) Treasury: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/HM_Treasury or their specific website: <http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/>

IDEA (Improvement and Development Agency for local government): <http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelid=1>

LGA (Local Government Association): http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Local_Government_Association or their website: <http://www.lga.gov.uk/lga/core/page.do?pagelid=1>

LGIU (Local Government Information Unit): <http://www.idea.gov.uk/idk/core/page.do?pagelid=1115914> or their website: <http://www.lgiu.gov.uk/>

LSP (Local Strategic Partnerships): <http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performanceframeworkpartnerships/localstrategicpartnerships/>

ONS (Office for National Statistics): http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Office_for_National_Statistics or their website: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/default.asp>

PSA (Public Service Agreements): <http://www.communities.gov.uk/localgovernment/performanceframeworkpartnerships/localareaagreements/localpublicservice/>

We make no apologies for including further information on all these bodies and terms, as we know how confusing they can be and how often it is the case that their meaning and function is presumed to be known!