

Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper: a consultation response from British Future

June 2018

1. Summary

1.1 British Future welcomes the integration green paper, which is an important step towards an integration strategy for England. This response draws on extensive public engagement in 60 towns and cities in the UK over the last 18 months. Our priorities for practical action to promote integration include:

1.2 Stronger leadership: Many different actors need to contribute to a successful integration strategy. Because integration is a national priority that happens locally, local government has a central role in providing vision and leadership. While it has the confidence and capacity to act, there are important barriers where this is patchy or missing. Work is an important site of integration, but business has been a missing voice in the integration debate.

1.3 Making integration an 'everybody' agenda. Integration too often remains narrowly framed as about migrants and minorities, and their relationship to the host community. The integration agenda has too often been left to take care of itself in mono-ethnic towns which can struggle most with new arrivals.

1.4 Fluency in English is an essential foundation. We propose that the new English language strategy should include a new Learning English free view channel; enabling asylum-seekers to learn English at a concessionary rate; and addressing the gender imbalance whereby few men take English classes.

1.5 Increasing contact: Schools make many important contributions to successful integration - and could do more to increase contact across ethnic, faith and class divides. We propose mandatory twinning of faith schools, and admissions guidelines for nurseries. The design of housing and public spaces significantly affects opportunities for contact. More effective housing regulation and longer family tenancies could prevent neighbourhood decline emerging as a key tension in the areas of fastest churn.

1.6 Tackling prejudice effectively: Racism and hate crime are important barriers to integration. Councils need to ensure effective anti-prejudice strategies reach tougher audiences, not just those most onside.

1.7 A learning culture: There is currently weak institutional learning about effective (and ineffective) interventions to promote integration. Finding an effective approach to share learning from the five action areas would be a good starting point for changing this.

2. About British Future

2.1 British Future is an independent, non-partisan think tank that works for a confident and inclusive Britain that is fair and welcoming to all. In the six years since we were founded we have developed a unique understanding of public attitudes to immigration and integration. We also work with business, local authorities, faith and civil society organisations to put in place policy and practices that bridge community divides and support local integration. We called on the Mayor of London to appoint a deputy for integration¹ and in 2017 we advocated that the mayors and leaders of the new combined authorities appoint deputies or cabinet members for

¹ Katwala, S. Somerville, W. And Ballinger, S. (2016) *Making Citizenship Matter: why London needs an office for citizenship and integration*, London: British Future.

integration². British Future also runs an integration network which brings central government, councils, faith and civil society organisations to network to share ideas and coordinate work. We have also worked with a number of local authorities to help them develop integration strategies, include Bradford, one of the integration action areas.

2.2 A major aspect of British Future's current work concerns immigration policy after Brexit. Leaving the EU is an opportunity to put in place an immigration system that works for employers, protects refugees, but also has greater public trust and support. But we feel that this confidence cannot be fully restored without engaging the public in a debate about the future direction of immigration policy. This is why British Future, along with HOPE not hate set up the National Conversation on Immigration, with our findings feeding into Parliament's Home Affairs Committee's own inquiries on the future direction of immigration policy. Over a 15 month period we hosted an open survey and undertook a nationally representative poll. We also visited 60 towns and cities across the UK where we met with local stakeholders and ran separate citizens' panels made up of members of the public recruited to be representative of the local area³. These groups were asked for their views on immigration and on integration, both local and nationally. This response draws from the some of the findings of the National Conversation on Immigration.

3. Strengthening leadership

3.1 For integration to be successful many different actors need to be involved. These include local authorities, other public services, business, faith and civil society organisations, as well as individuals in the places they live and work. The green paper sees local authorities as leading local integration, coordinating the many organisations and individuals who need to be involved. British Future agrees with this position and supports the requirement for local authorities to include an objective to promote integration as part their public sector equality duties as outlined in the Equality Act 2010.

3.2 British Future welcomes the proposal to pilot programmes of work in five areas, all of which have vision and track record in integration. However, we are concerned about the capacity of some local authorities to plan, coordinate and sometimes deliver programmes of work to promote integration. Our National Conversation on Immigration visits and our work in West Yorkshire and the West Midlands have highlighted inspiring local authority work. But we have also encountered councils who lack vision and where budget cuts, ineffectual leadership and low staff morale have hampered their desire to promote integration. British Future feels that local government needs to be vibrant, thriving and visionary for the integration strategy to be a success. We believe this requires a national debate on local government in the 21st century, covering funding, leadership, organisation and size, staff skills and overall direction of its work.

3.3 Sharing good practice about integration is a key to overcoming some of the postcode lotteries we have seen in England. British Future welcomes the government's commitment to supporting this process. However, we are not convinced that the Cohesion and Integration Network has the relationships and structures to achieve this aim. We suggest that Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) staff reconsider how best to share practice and consider the role of the five Integration Areas, the Greater London Authority and combined authorities and the Local Government Association in this process and run an open tendering process for any new project.

3.4 The green paper recognises that many different organisations have a role in promoting integration and specifically mentions business as one of them, although it does not set out proposals to achieve this aim. We believe that work promotes social and economic integration and we welcome the green paper's commitment to addressing the high levels of unemployment

² Katwala, S., Rutter, J., Mohammad, A and Ballinger. B. (2017) *Integration: from national rhetoric to local reality. How the new mayors for city-regions can help* get integration right at local level, London: British Future.

³ Rutter, J. And Carter, C. (2018) *National Conversation on Immigration: an interim report to the Home Affairs Committee*, London: British Future and HOPE not hate.

experienced by some migrant groups, particularly refugees. But the type of work that migrants do also affects their integration. Situations where migrants largely work with other migrants are usually not conducive to integration. During the National Conversation on Immigration we have heard about employers who organise their shifts by linguistic group, so that Poles work alongside other Polish speakers on particular production lines, for example. Yet business groups have been largely absent from debates about integration in the UK. This needs to be addressed, both nationally and locally. British Future recommends that employers of large numbers of migrant workers (we would suggest a threshold of more than 10) should be involved in the development of local integration strategies. This requirement could be light touch for small and medium enterprises but require more of big business in sectors that employ large proportions of migrant workers. We also recommend that businesses that employ large numbers of migrant workers be obliged to account to local authorities in which they operate about how they will house migrant workers and encourage integration.

3.5 The green paper is an important step towards filling a significant gap: the historic lack of a national integration strategy in England. Integration is a national priority that requires local action to deliver it – but sustained and visible leadership from national government are essential if momentum is to be maintained. Government should consider adapting the model of Germany’s annual integration summits, as a useful way to provide a clear focal point for political and public debate about the progress made and the future challenges, to share learning, and to mobilise sustained stakeholder engagement from local government, business and civic society.

4. Supporting new migrants and resident communities

4.1 British Future welcomes the proposals set out in this section of the green paper. In particular, we are glad that the green paper commits to helping refugees to integrate. The proposal to involve Local Authority Asylum Liaison Officers in coordinating advice to those granted refugee status is good. We would recommend that MHCLG and the Home Office together develop more detailed proposal on refugee integration. In particular, we believe there is a need for a review of what happens to refugees during the ‘move on ‘ period immediately after refugee status is granted, where refugees have 28 days to get receive their documentation, find new housing, access benefits and look for work.

4.2 EU nationals living in the UK may struggle with the new registration and settled status that will become mandatory after 2021, for example, children in care or those who struggle to understand English. British Future believes that all local authorities need to consider how they assist in the process of registering EU nationals with the Home Office. Large numbers of unregistered EU nationals with a precarious immigration status has the potential to undermine integration.

4.3 British Future supports the articulation of integration as being a two-way relationship. However most of the proposals in this section of the green paper focus on migrant and minority ethnic groups, rather than the majority ‘residents’. British Future believes that integration has to be an ‘everybody’ issue, else it is not integration.

4.4 In the past, integration was something that only mattered in the most diverse towns and cities, but took care of itself everywhere else. But it is often mono-ethnic English towns that struggle the most to accept new arrivals. In many of these places there is a big gap between public views about the nature of integration and the academic and policy debate. The public see integration in mostly social and cultural terms and rarely acknowledges that integration takes place in economic and structural domains. British Future believes that there needs to be deeper, on-going public engagement from the Government on both immigration and integration. This could be achieved, as suggested by the Home Affairs Committee, by holding an annual migration day in Parliament that is preceded by public consultation, an approach taken by the Canadian Government. An alternative would be to require local authorities to undertake a locally representative survey, focus groups and open meeting as part of the process of developing local integration strategies.

4.5 At both national and local level, policymakers need to actively ensure that engagement with civic society properly reflects the pluralism of all ethnic and faith communities in Britain today, with particular priority to ensuring a much stronger share of voice for women and younger people than has traditionally been the case in much national and local engagement with minority faith communities.

4.6 There is a particular need to engage British Muslims in developing local integration strategies in a way that builds trust. The framing of much public discourse as a ‘them and us’ debate about Muslim integration is felt to place British Muslims unfairly under the spotlight. In some areas, this generates suspicion about the Government’s motives on integration. We support the call from the Citizens Commission on Islam, Participation and Public Life⁴, chaired by Dominic Grieve QC MP, for the government to reassess its engagement with Britain’s Muslim communities, and for both government and Muslim civic society groups to take proactive steps to rebuild broken relationships.

4.7 The process of acquiring British citizenship is a means to promote integration. British Future welcomes the green paper’s proposal to review the content of the *Life in the UK* test. New British citizens should be asked questions which broadly reflect common knowledge among existing citizens, which is often not the case with the current test. However, we believe that the Government could better use citizenship as a lever to promote integration.. It is costly – over £8,000 for a family of two adults and two children who are EU nationals and over £15,000 for a similar family from outside the EU. The high cost of getting citizenship deters many people from applying for it..

4.8 With Brexit being a ‘reset moment’ for immigration policy, and following the important lessons of the Windrush scandal, this is an opportune moment for a broader review of the objectives of citizenship policy in Britain – including assessing the impacts of citizenship for social and economic integration, reviewing current policies on eligibility, processes and costs, and how the process could encourage civic and political participation, for example by embedding voter registration in the citizenship process. Councils could also look at holding citizenship ceremonies in iconic locations involving longer settled local residents as a gesture of welcome that brings communities people together.

4.9 British Future welcomes the planned evaluation of the Controlling Migration Fund. We believe that this fund has enabled many local authorities to deal with some of the short term pressures and issues that can impact on attitudes to new arrivals and thus on integration. The National Conversation on Immigration findings show that there are marked local differences in the local impacts of migration, so it is right that local authorities should have the flexibility to decide how this money is spent⁵. We would like the Government to commit to extending this fund after 2020 when the current grant round is set to expire. However, we would suggest that the Government encourages more partnership across local authority boundaries to make better use of this funding

4.10 The National Conversation on Immigration shows that poorly-maintained and overcrowded private rental accommodation emerges as a point of tension in many areas. British Future believe it is essential that local authorities have sufficient funding to regulate the private rental sector. We recommend that MHCLG look at the best way to achieve this – this may be through the Controlling Migration Fund or ring-fencing or allocating funds within the broader local government funding settlement.

⁴ Citizens Commission on Islam, Participation and Public Life (2017) *The Missing Muslims: Unlocking British Muslim Potential for the Benefit of All*, London Citizens UK.

⁵ P20-21 in Rutter, J. And Carter, C. (2018) *National Conversation on Immigration: an interim report to the Home Affairs Committee*, London: British Future and HOPE not hate.

5. Education and young people

5.1 In many towns and cities, schools are an integration success story, a view that is held by experts and the general public alike. Many participants in the National Conversation on Immigration citizens' panels believed that children from different backgrounds got on well together in their local schools. The green paper, rightly, draws attention to a number of problems, in relation to educational segregation and under-achievement and suggests a number of proposals to deal with these problems, which we broadly support. However we would like to make the following comments and recommendations:

5.2 Raising levels of educational achievement has rightly been a priority of successive governments. British Futures welcomes the Opportunity Areas programme and other initiatives to promote educational achievement. Yet marked differences in levels of achievement by ethnic group remain and the use of broad ethnicity categories means that these are not always picked up by central government⁶. We recommend that all schools use extended ethnicity codes to analyse their achievement data and would also like to see extended categories for Polish and Romanian children.

5.3 While many migrant and refugee children do well at school, those who arrive in the UK late in their educational careers (after 13 or 14 years) sometimes struggle to learn a new language sufficiently well to pass GCSE exams at 16, particularly refugee children who may have an interrupted prior education. We would like to see better provision for this group, which might take the form of a curriculum that focuses on core subjects with intensive English language support. The numbers of young people who need this tailored support is may be small within a given area, so collaboration between schools, colleges and across local authority boundaries should be encouraged.

5.4 Knowing about England's different faith traditions has a role to play in combating misconceptions about different faith groups. At present, GCSE religious education courses require that children study two religious traditions in depth. However, for children aged between 5 and 14 in England there is some variation in what they learn as religious education syllabuses are usually set locally by the Standing Committee on Religious Education or by the governing body of the school. British Future recommends that the Department for Education reviews locally agreed and school syllabuses for religious education, looking at both the quality of religious education teaching and the extent to which all children learn in depth about different faith traditions in the UK.

5.5 Changes to schools admissions procedures and new faith and single sex schools have the potential to undermine attempts to increase levels of social contact across ethnic, faith and class divides. We believe that the Department for Education must give greater consideration to opening new faith and single sex schools in areas of high educational segregation.

5.6 British Future recommends that it should be mandatory for all pupils to engage in activities that deepen their level of contact with children from different ethnic, faith and class backgrounds. We would also like to see mandatory school twinning of (i) all faith schools and (ii) in all schools in local authorities with high levels of educational segregation by faith, ethnicity and social class. Twinning might involve linking classes in schools with where the intake is different – an approach used by the Linking Network. Alternatively, twinned schools might share some of their facilities such as playing fields or performing arts spaces. Another option is for schools to twin by sharing sixth form teaching. Other options might include bringing pupils from twinned schools together to undertake volunteering through a 'local' citizenship service offer.

5.7 The Government should not be prescriptive about the form that twinning would take: schools should be able to decide the approach that they take. Expecting all faith schools to develop and

⁶ Rutter. J. (2015) *Moving up and getting on: migration, integration and social cohesion in the UK*, Bristol: Policy Press.

sustain such a relationship would be a reasonable expectation for all publicly-funded schools. This balances the valuable role which faith schools play in the English educational system with a practical way to uphold the commitment, expressed by all major faiths, to educate children to be citizens of a shared society. The impact of school twinning would depend on sustained commitment from schools. Government should find effective ways to share, celebrate and reward outstanding practice. The quality of engagement would naturally become one useful indicator for Ofsted assessments of how schools were fulfilling their existing citizenship obligations.

5.8 British Future also recommends that the 50% rule covering admission in over-subscribed faith schools apply to all maintained schools, and not just to new academies established under the Free School programme.

5.9 British Future would also like to see the obligation to undertake activities that deepen levels of contact with those from different ethnic, faith and class backgrounds extended to home educated children and those attending independent schools. We have concerns that some home educated children are not receiving a broad and balanced education, and also believe that it is insufficiently regulated.

5.10 Extending early education is a government priority and has an important role to play in promoting integration. In families where English is not the home language, going to a nursery enables children to start school speaking English. Early years' provision also enables mothers to work. Parenting can also be a life experience that brings people of different backgrounds together. However, there are high levels of social segregation in early years' provision in many parts of England, which often exceeds that seen in schools⁷. In families where a mother works, children are much more likely to attend private or not-for-profit nursery provision than public provision which tends to operate between 9am and 3pm and only in term-time. This can add to ethnic segregation, for example, in Greater London in 2016 83% of children of Bangladeshi ethnicity attend public sector nurseries, compared with 43% of children of white British ethnicity⁸.

5.11 There are levers to increase social mixing in the early years, for example, encouraging more schools to offer 8am to 6pm provision in line with private and not-for-profit nurseries. We welcome the Government's commitment to provide £50 million funding to help schools set up high quality nursery provision. But we feel that other action is needed. Although all three and four year old children receive free early education in England, nurseries do not have to set out their admissions policies, unlike schools which are bound by statutory guidance on admissions. There is some evidence to suggest that private nurseries have sometimes refused to offer places to families who only need their allocated free hours of early education. This practice can only heighten social segregation. We would like to see the Department for Education bring in statutory admissions guidance for nurseries and for local authorities to monitor levels of social segregation in early years provision in their areas.

5.12 The green paper promotes National Citizenship Service where young people undertake residential team building activities with those from different backgrounds. British Future welcomes the support for this programme and also the commitment by the government to promote new and innovative ways to promote social mixing. However, we believe that the Government should review the remit of the 'National' Citizenship Service to see it could encourage more sustained social mixing at a local level. A future 'Local' Citizenship Service might bring together school and college students of different backgrounds with older people to volunteer together in their local community, bridging age, ethnic and economic divides.

6. Boosting English language skills

⁷ Harding, C. And Hardy, G. (2016) *The Social Mix in London's Early Years Provision*, London: Family and Childcare Trust.

⁸ *ibid*

6.1 Fluency in English underpins social and economic integration, yet as the green paper says, too many people do not speak English well or at all in this country. Migrants who work long hours and those who have little social contact outside their ethnic or linguistic communities are among the groups who struggle to learn English. British Future welcomes the importance given to English language provision in the green paper and the proposals to develop an English language strategy for England as well as a network of conversation clubs. We believe that both high quality formal classes as well as informal support have an important role to play in helping people learn English, building their confidence and motivation. However, a strategy in itself is not enough. British Future would like to see the Skills Funding Agency revise its regulations on the entitlement to study at a subsidised rate, as well as encouraging greater innovation in provision.

6.2 There is public support for providing English classes for migrants. In polling undertaken by British Future in 2017 some 67% of people agreed with the statement *“the Government should provide more support for teaching people to speak English.”*

6.3 Recent policy towards English has been characterised by instability and change. Funding regulations, schemes and approaches have changed from year-to-year, sometimes after college terms had started. The new English language strategy should aim for greater policy stability and give providers the certainty they need to plan their services in the long-term.

6.4 In England, about 180,000 students are enrolled on English language courses at any given time, mostly in state further education colleges, but also in local authority adult education services, charitable provision, private colleges and private welfare-to-work companies. In England, Skills Funding Agency money allows eligible students to study for free or at very low cost – an arrangement known as concessionary fees. In England asylum-seekers are only allowed to enrol at a concessionary fee after they have fulfilled six months legal residence, for a non-EEA family migrant this period is 12 months. There are also restrictions placed on those who are not actively looking for work. These restrictions mean that asylum-seekers and family migrants cannot study for many months and may put in place survival mechanisms in place – relying on relatives and friends to interpret. Once in place, these survival strategies are hard to shift and can act as a barrier to learning. British Future would like regulations to change in England and asylum-seekers and family migrants be allowed to study English at a concessionary fee on arrival.

6.5 In recent years between 75% and 85% of English language students have been female. British Future would like MHCLG and the Department for Education investigate the reasons for this gender imbalance and take steps to address it.

6.6 Employers have an important role to play in encouraging English language acquisition. British Future would like to see more short (one hour) classes and conversations clubs offered in or near workplaces that employ migrant workers, for example, in some of the big distribution depots. We also believe that practices such as organising shifts by linguistic group should be actively discouraged.

6.7 A number of countries have used Freeview channels to help migrants and refugees learn its language. British Future believes that a Learning English Freeview channel would be beneficial in the UK and would benefit migrants who find it difficult to attend classes.

7. Places and community

7.1 Evidence from the National Conversation on Immigration suggests that the public see diversity and migration through a local lens. Local conditions, particularly residential segregation and badly maintained private rental accommodation impact public opinion and how people see integration working in their neighbourhood. Conversely, good planning and design, attractive public spaces and thriving high streets encourage social integration. British Future thus welcomes the weight given to place-based interventions in the integration green paper and the desire to reduce levels of residential segregation.

7.2 Some of the five Integration Areas have involved planners and architects in local discussions about integration – looking at how they might encourage social mixing. We have been particularly impressed by the planning that went into redeveloping City Park in Bradford which has been successful in bringing people of different ethnic backgrounds into the centre of this city. British Future believes more local authorities should look at how planning and urban design can encourage social mixing.

7.3 The green paper asserts sport can promote integration and gives examples of successful projects. British Future would like more recognition given to the role of parks in bringing people together. An attractive and well-used public park is a site for a range of healthy, outdoor activities that cross generational, ethnic and class divides. Like attractive high streets, parks can help frame the identity of an area and have a role to play in developing an inclusive and welcoming civic identity. British Future believes that the social and economic benefits of public parks are such that they should be considered a core public service. But Heritage Lottery's 2016 State of the UK Public Parks report shows that there is a growing deficit between the rising use of parks and the declining resources that are available to manage them. We would like funding for parks to be protected within local government funding settlements.

7.4 Cultural activities are also mentioned as a means to promote integration, with the green paper describing Arts Council England's Creative People and Places programme. Its evaluation does suggest that this programme has encouraged greater participation in the arts in neighbours with low and medium levels of arts engagement. But British Future is concerned that some artists and organisations, including those funded by Arts Council England, work in a way that exacerbates socio-economic, political and cultural divisions. Models of outreach to so-called 'hard-to-reach' audiences can seem intent on delivering what artists believe communities should want without any prior conversation with the people themselves⁹. As a consequence, arts projects that aim to bring people together may sometimes reinforce social divides or at best only reach an audience from higher socio-economic groups that already engage with the arts. British Future would like to see Arts Council England give greater consideration to integration as an aim of some of funded projects, looking at who these projects reach (and do not reach) and why this is so.

7.5 The green paper commits the government to looking at ways to reduce residential segregation. In London, much of the south east and in many core cities, high property prices have sometimes contributed to residential segregation by socio-economic group and sometimes by ethnicity. Having a mix of tenures, types and sizes of property in new housing developments can help combat this trend. British Future welcomes the Mayor of London's commitment to enforce a 35% on-site affordable housing target as well as the desire to increase this target at a later date. But we are concerned that outside London property developers are using viability assessments – introduced in 2012 - to bid down the amount of affordable housing they have to build in new developments¹⁰. By over-paying for land, developers can cite these financial appraisals to lower the amount of affordable housing they are required to provide under Section 106 agreements. The amendment of the National Planning Policy Framework is an opportunity to close this loophole.

7.6 It is also essential that large housing developments include enough public space – such as pocket parks, supermarkets, cafes and community gardens – where people can meet and mix. We are concerned that some of the new Housing Zones in London may not be well-served by such social infrastructure, limiting opportunities for social mixing.

⁹ Avas Mohammad, speech to the Museums Association conference 2017 available at <http://www.britishfuture.org/featured/can-culture-help-bring-britain-together/>

¹⁰ Grayston, R. (2017) *Slipping through the loophole: How viability assessments are reducing affordable housing supply in England*, London: Shelter.

7.7 Residential mobility impacts on the ability of people to establish local attachments and form friendships with their neighbours. Areas that experience high levels of population churn also tend to manifest less integration. Residential mobility is highest in the private rental sector and housing law sustains this. The six month *de jure* minimum for a shorthold tenancy has become the *de facto* maximum for many households, forcing them to move home frequently. A longer 'family' tenancy would reduce some of the undesirable population churn that is seen in many inner city areas. British Future recommends that MHCLG looks at policies to reduce churn in the private rental sector. We would also want local authorities to work with universities and big employers to ensure that some neighbourhoods do not become blighted dormitories for students and migrant workers.

7.8 Evidence from the National Conversation on Immigration shows that concerns about immigration are often focussed on neighbourhood decline and anti-social behaviour in certain streets and neighbourhoods with much private rental accommodation¹¹. Of the 11,500 dwellings in Wisbech, Cambridgeshire, some 1,100 are homes of multiple occupancy - essentially private-rental accommodation for migrant workers, much of it poor quality and over-crowded. British Future welcomes the Government's commitments to take action against rogue landlords. But as already recommended, we would like funding allocated to local authorities for housing regulation to be protected. We also believe that some local authorities have been slow in introducing selective landlord licensing or other measures when problems have arisen, sometimes as a result of lobbying from landlords. British Future believes that it is never acceptable for landlords who are councillors to sit on committees concerned with housing regulation.

7.9 As already noted, we also recommend that businesses that employ large numbers of migrant workers be obliged to account to local authorities about how they will house migrant workers and encourage integration.

8. Increasing economic opportunity

8.1 Work promotes economic and social integration. British Future welcomes the proposals outlined in this section of the green paper. We feel that the changes to Job Centre Plus help that are set out in the green paper will benefit some of ethnic groups who experience high levels of unemployment.

8.2 British Future is concerned about the labour market outcomes of refugees. Analysis of Annual Population Survey data undertaken by the Centre for Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford shows big gaps in average earnings between refugees and non-refugees. Levels of unemployment are much higher, with those who migrated to the UK to claim asylum some 19 percentage points less likely to be in employment than UK-born persons. Refugees will of course benefit from a more personalised approach offered by better Job Centre Plus assistance. British Future also recommends that asylum-seekers who have been in the UK more than six months and have not yet received a decision on their case should be allowed to work. This will enable more rapid integration and also prevent secondary migration and ethnic clustering within the UK. In many cases those newly granted refugee status move to London and other big cities to be near co-nationals whose networks they use to find work.

8.3 The type of work that migrants do also affects their integration. Situations where migrants largely work with other migrants are usually not conducive to integration. As already noted, British Future recommends that businesses that employ large numbers of migrant workers be obliged to account to local authorities how they will encourage integration.

9. Rights and freedoms

9.1 British Future welcomes the Government's commitment to a society based on shared rights and responsibilities. As the green paper acknowledges, integration also involves confronting

¹¹ Rutter, J. and Carter, C. (2018) *National Conversation on Immigration: an interim report to the Home Affairs Committee*, London: British Future and HOPE not hate.

some difficult issues, about gender roles, for example. The law provides many clear boundaries – those who perpetrate domestic abuse risk a criminal sentence, for example. But underneath the law lie many grey areas and difficult conversations, which professionals such as teachers and social workers grapple with on a day-to-day basis. While regressive and prejudiced attitudes may not break the law, where such views are widely held, they provide the ‘oxygen’ in the form of tacit support for those who hold extreme or violent views.

9.2 In too many cases, regressive views are not challenged. Even those local authorities that are aware of regressive attitudes have struggled to deal with them and hold difficult conversations, which necessarily must take place in private. Youth workers, teachers, community and faith leaders need to be equipped with the skills to hold these conversations and have the time and place to do this. This will take time and will require local commitment and leadership to progress.

9.3 British Future welcomes the importance afforded to dealing with hate crime in the green paper. Experiencing hate crime or having a close friend or family member who has done affects social mixing and community relations. It can make victims and close contacts wary and mistrustful of other members of the ethnic group who had perpetrated the crime. It can also make victims reticent about visiting particular locations. As well as being illegal, hate crime inhibits integration. Public attitudes to race and diversity have changed over the last 25 years and the widespread, open racism of the 1960s has largely gone. Social norms have changed and the reporting of hate crime has increased, indicating that more people have confidence in the police to deal with this issue. But the spike in reported incident that was seen in 2016 shows that hate crime can easily resurface. British Future is also concerned about widespread fear and stereotyping of Muslims in many parts of the UK. We believe that local authorities, schools, civil society organisations need to do more to reinforce norms of decent behaviour, but in ways that reach and resonate with the broad majority of the public. Anti-prejudice strategies will have too little impact if they primarily reach those who are already most onside, rather than reaching tougher audiences with effective anti-prejudice messages. Many local authorities have officers and elected members in their job remit, but we feel that few of them have a long-term strategy for combating hate crime and prejudice. We would like local authorities to provide leadership and help develop interventions that reinforce norms of behaviour among those who can easily provide the ‘oxygen’ of tacit support to perpetrators of hate crime.

10. Measuring success

10.1 British Future welcomes the green paper’s commitment to develop an integration measurement framework to highlight integration challenges and help measure success. However, there are some inherent difficulties in achieving this aim; many aspects of integration are nuanced and subjective and can be difficult to measure. The sample size of many UK or England-wide official surveys is too small to draw to make their findings useful to local authorities. Integration is also a long-term process and it can be hard to pick up on significant social and economic changes in the short periods of time of associated with funding cycles. The lack of clarity about definition of social class, or consistency in the collection and reporting of data, is a barrier to effective analysis or policy interventions of the role of class in integration. But noting these caveats, British Future believes that there are ways of gathering better data on integration.

10.2 The government’s race disparity audit is a potentially important innovation in improving the evidence base for interventions on integration and social inclusion, though there is little public information about how this will now be developed and deepened over time.

10.3 City-region mayors can play an important role in catalysing action on integration. More consistent collation and reporting of relevant regional data could inform more effective strategies, and facilitate peer-to-peer learning across regions.

10.4 The Office for National Statistics should consider running Annual Population Survey boosts for the five Integration Areas and for combined authorities to enable them to have a better set of labour market and population data.

10.5 Local authorities and other public bodies collect a great deal of administrative data, for example about the background of people who use services such as libraries and sports centres, as well as that collected through the School Census. Local authorities could make better use of this data in respect to understanding integration.

10.6 Interventions to promote integration are often subject to an evaluation, but this process has limitations. Evaluations are usually commissioned by the funder – which may include the Government. While they aim to be objective, an evaluation often involves negotiation between the funding beneficiary and the evaluator, with overly critical findings toned down. We feel that should instead be used for reflection and institutional learning, with evaluators acting as ‘critical friends’ providing honest and supportive feedback.

10.7 Institutional learning by staff employed by councils and local government is often weak. Knowledge about interventions that are successful (or unsuccessful) in promoting integration is not captured and shared. A culture of ‘reflective practice’ needs to be more strongly embedded in local authorities and civil society organisations involved in integration, drawing on what already takes place in education and healthcare settings. Finding an effective approach to spread learning between the five action areas and to project this more widely is an important opportunity to begin to develop this practical learning culture on integration.