



ISSN 1475-8202

The Network Newsletter: tackling social exclusion in libraries, museums, archives and galleries

Number 151, November 2013

(Formerly published as *Public Libraries & Social Exclusion Action Planning Network Newsletter*, issue 1, May 1999 – issue 29, September 2001)

The Network's Website is at www.seapn.org.uk and includes information on courses, good practice, specific socially excluded groups, as well as the newsletter archive.

Contents List

Did you see ...?

- *Museum Practice* – page 2

Tackling social and digital exclusion – Libraries, Museums, Archives and Cultural and Heritage Organisations

- “Leaving Fort Ref: Frontiers of Embedded Librarianship” – page 2

Tackling social exclusion – Other Agencies

- Loneliness Resource Pack – page 3

Health & Wellbeing issues – Government, Government Agencies and Local Government

- The restructure of the NHS – additional information – page 4
- *Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region: final report* – page 5

Migration issues – Other Agencies

- *Migrant Roma in the United Kingdom* – page 7

Broader issues – Other Agencies

- *Love thy neighbourhood: people and place in social reform* – page 11

Abbreviations and acronyms – page 14

Did you see ...?

Museum Practice

The latest issue¹ focuses on under-fives. It includes:

- Rebecca Atkinson “Early learning: embedding provision in museums”
- Rebecca Atkinson “Developing provision for young children”, ideas for successful under-fives sessions
- Rebecca Atkinson “How do young children experience museums?”, which looks at Elee Kirk’s research into how four- and five-year-old children experience natural history museums
- Rebecca Atkinson “Further resources”, online resources and reports on museums and young children
- Esme Ward “Culturebabies”, top tips for welcoming babies into museums
- Under-fives case studies

Tackling social and digital exclusion – Libraries, Museums, Archives and Cultural and Heritage Organisations

“Leaving Fort Ref: Frontiers of Embedded Librarianship”

This is the title of a webinar that took place in September.² The slideshow is available online³, and there is also a brief article⁴ available that outlines the key points from these important presentations. In addition, the recording of the webinar is still available to listen to⁵; and there is a weblink⁶ to other related resources.

¹ *Museum Practice*, November 2013, <http://www.museumsassociation.org/museum-practice/under-5s>. This is available to Museums Association members only – see <http://www.museumsassociation.org/join/31072012-mp-newsletter> for more information.

² Source: *WebJunction Crossroads*, Nov 2013.

³ See:

http://www.webjunction.org/content/dam/WebJunction/Documents/webJunction/9.24.13_Leaving.Fort.Ref.pdf.

⁴ Betha Gutsche “The future of reference is outside the library”, *OCLC WebJunction*, http://www.webjunction.org/news/webjunction/the-future-of-reference-is-outside-the-library.html?utm_source=WhatCountsEmail&utm_medium=Crossroads&utm_campaign=Crossroads.

⁵ See:

<https://oclc.webex.com/ec0606l/eventcenter/recording/recordAction.do?theAction=poprecord&AT=pb&isurlact=true&renewticket=0&recordID=64472677&apiname=lsr.php&rKey=0485ff18292d4090&needFilter=false&format=short&&SP=EC&rID=64472677&siteurl=oclc&actapname=ec0606l&actname=%2Feventcenter%2Fframe%2Fq.do&rnd=8614939568&entactname=%2FnbrRecordingURL.do&entapname=url0108l>. The recording lasts 1 hour 27 minutes.

⁶ See:

http://www.webjunction.org/events/webjunction/Leaving_Fort_Ref_Frontiers_of_Embedded_Librarianship.html.

As Jamie LaRue, director of Douglas County (CO) Libraries puts it: “It’s not just time to leave your desk; it’s time to leave the building.”

The article continues:

“If public libraries are to fully embody their role as bedrock of the community, they need to see themselves as much more than information specialists. Those who staff our libraries have important work as relationship builders, storytellers, and assets to the community.

[Jamie LaRue says] ‘I believe this is one of the most profound transformations going on in librarianship today. This is the future of reference services, not just passively waiting behind Fort Reference for people to come in and ask us questions, but actively organizing, understanding, cataloging our communities, figuring out where we can have the greatest impact, and making our communities stronger.’”

As the article concludes:

“All of these positive impacts have a viral effect. Once these organizations and individuals know what resources and support the library has to offer, they will refer others. It’s a powerful way to demonstrate the library’s value to the power brokers in the community. The goal is to become so indispensable to these leaders and to community life that they can’t imagine doing without the library.”

Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies

Loneliness Resource Pack

JRF and the Joseph Rowntree Housing Trust have been working on a “three-year action research programme exploring and identifying what makes us feel lonely where we live and work and what we can all do about it – personally and professionally.”⁷

They have now produced a resource pack which includes:

- *Living with loneliness?* This is a four-page summary of the causes of loneliness⁸
- *Let’s talk about loneliness*, a summary of ideas and actions to reduce loneliness⁹

⁷ Taken from: http://www.jrf.org.uk/publications/loneliness-resource-pack?utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=Weekly+publications+and+blogs+wb+4th+November+2013&utm_content=Weekly+publications+and+blogs+wb+4th+November+2013+CID_12269c4e2d047b26a8a1a1ffde25eaf4&utm_source=Email%20marketing%20software&utm_term=Publication%20Loneliness%20resource%20pack.

⁸ *Living with loneliness?* JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (173.32 kb) from: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/living-with-loneliness.pdf>.

⁹ *Let’s talk about loneliness*. JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (364.52 kb) from: http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/JRF_Loneliness_summary.pdf.

- *Neighbourhood approaches to loneliness: our stories*¹⁰: “The stories you will read here come directly from just some of the many people who have carried out the fieldwork, speaking to 2,000 people across four very different neighbourhoods, two in Bradford, two in York.” [p2]
- *Working with your community to reduce loneliness*¹¹, a series of ‘top tips’
- *Can do guide*¹²: “People in four areas across Yorkshire came together to put their ideas into action. They were brought together through JRF’s and JRHT’s ‘Neighbourhood Approaches to Loneliness Programme’, but their experiences are common to all sorts of community activity. They talked to us about the challenges they faced in getting their ideas off the ground and how they overcame them. This guide is based on these experiences.” [p2]
- *How you can reduce loneliness in your neighbourhood*, a brief description of how the JRF and JRHT went about their project¹³
- *Workshop sessions to help you explore loneliness in your neighbourhood*, “five one-hour group work sessions to get you thinking and talking about loneliness.”¹⁴
- *Let’s talk about loneliness*, a short YouTube film¹⁵ of interviews with people from the communities involved in the research.

Health & Wellbeing issues – Government, Government Agencies and Local Government

The restructure of the NHS – additional information

Following on from the information in the August Newsletter¹⁶, the King’s Fund have recently produced three very helpful flow-charts¹⁷:

¹⁰ *Neighbourhood approaches to loneliness: our stories*. JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (456.14 kb) from:

http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/JRF_Loneliness_case_studies.pdf.

¹¹ *Working with your community to reduce loneliness*. JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (115.69 kb) from:

http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/JRF_Loneliness_Stakeholder.pdf.

¹² *Can do guide*. Red Consultancy/JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (1680 kb) from:

<http://www.candoguide.org.uk/pdf/NALP%20Can%20Do%20booklet%2009279FINAL.pdf>. [NB you need to register on-site – and, after I had, there was a problem in downloading the pdf, which I have reported.]

¹³ *How you can reduce loneliness in your neighbourhood*. JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (217.8 kb) from:

http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/JRF_Loneliness_Process.pdf.

¹⁴ *Workshop sessions to help you explore loneliness in your neighbourhood*. JRF, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (108.11 kb) from:

http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/JRF_Loneliness_Sessions.pdf.

¹⁵ *Let’s talk about loneliness*. [film, 9 minutes 35 seconds] Available at:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LI3JtxwVMbo>.

¹⁶ *The Network Newsletter ...*, 148, August 2013, pp11-12.

¹⁷ The flow-charts have been reproduced by Young Minds (who also alerted me to this information) – see:

http://www.youngminds.org.uk/news/blog/1655_working_in_the_new_nhs_structures.

1. Who is accountable to whom?
2. Who makes decisions about finance and who can influence ...
3. What is the funding and where does it go?

Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region: final report

This major report¹⁸ has just been published.

“Health and well-being are much needed assets for us all and for the societies in which we live in today’s increasingly complex world. At first sight, overall population health indicators have certainly improved across the WHO European Region over the last decades. Yet when we look more closely, we can see that improvement in health status has not been experienced equally everywhere, or by all. There are widespread inequities in health between and within societies. They reflect different conditions in which people live and affect the magnitude and trends in health inequities in today’s Europe.” [p v]

Therefore, the WHO established a review social determinants of health and the health divide:

“... carried out by a consortium chaired by Michael Marmot [¹⁹] of the Institute of Health Equity, University College London and supported by a joint secretariat from the Institute and the WHO Regional Office for Europe.” [p vii]

The review’s analysis:

“... shows that action is required across the whole of government, on the social determinants of health, to achieve advances in health equity. Health ministers clearly have a role in ensuring universal access to high-quality health services. However, they also have a leadership role in advancing the case that health is an outcome of policies pursued in other arenas. So close is the link between social policies and health equity that the magnitude of health inequity shows how well society is meeting the needs of its citizens. Health is not simply a marker of good practice but is also highly valued by individuals and society.

¹⁸ UCL Institute of Health Equity. *Review of social determinants and the health divide in the WHO European Region: final report*. WHO Regional Office for Europe, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (3970 kb) from: http://www.euro.who.int/_data/assets/pdf_file/0006/215196/Review-of-social-determinants-and-the-health-divide-in-the-WHO-European-Region-final-report-Eng.pdf.

¹⁹ Michael Marmot is the author of *Fair society, healthy lives: the Marmot Review – strategic review of health inequalities in England post-2010*. The Marmot Review, 2010. Available to download from: <http://www.instituteofhealthequity.org/projects/fair-society-healthy-lives-the-marmot-review>.

The review makes the moral case for action on social determinants of health – social injustice kills and causes unnecessary suffering. There is also a strong economic argument. The cost of health inequities to health services, lost productivity and lost government revenue is such that no society can afford inaction. Tackling inequities in the social determinants of health also brings other improvements in societal well-being, such as greater social cohesion, greater efforts for climate change mitigation and better education.” [pp xiv-xv]

The review isolates “Key issues in understanding and promoting health equity” as:

- “Social determinants of health – we must address the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age – key determinants of health equity. These conditions of daily life are, in turn, influenced by structural drivers: economic arrangements, distribution of power, gender equity, policy frameworks and the values of society.
- Taking a life-course approach to health equity. There is an accumulation of advantage and disadvantage across the life-course. This approach begins with the important early stages of life – pregnancy and early child development – and continues with school, the transition to working life, employment and working conditions and circumstances affecting older people.
- There is a social gradient in health – that is to say, health is progressively better the higher the socioeconomic position of people and communities. It is important to design policies that act across the whole gradient and to address the people at the bottom of the social gradient and the people who are most vulnerable. To achieve both these objectives, policies are needed that are universal but are implemented at a level and intensity of action that is proportionate to need – proportionate universalism.
- In relation to the most excluded people, it is important to address the processes of exclusion rather than focusing simply on addressing particular characteristics of excluded groups. This approach has much potential when addressing the social and health problems of Roma and irregular migrants as well as those who suffer from less extreme forms of exclusion and dip in and out of vulnerable contexts.
- The need to build on assets – the resilience, capabilities and strength of individuals and communities – and address the hazards and risks to which they are subject.
- The [importance] of gender equity – all the social determinants of health may affect the genders differently. In addition to biological sex differences, there are fundamental social differences in how women and men are treated and the assets and resilience they have. These gender relations affect health in all societies to varying degrees and should shape actions taken to reduce inequities.
- Much focus has been, and will continue to be, on equity within generations. The perspectives of sustainable development and the importance of social inequity affecting future generations means that intergenerational equity must be emphasized, and the impact of action and policies for inequities on future generations must be assessed and risks mitigated.” [p xvii]

It then goes on to make a large number of recommendations to start to deal with these issues. These include:

Theme A: the life-course

- Childhood development
- Child poverty
- Employment, working conditions and health inequities
- Older people.

Theme B: wider society

- Social protection policies, income and health inequities
- Gender
- Local communities
- Social exclusion, vulnerability and disadvantage

Theme C: macro-level context

- Social expenditure
- Sustainable development and health

Theme D: systems

- Governance
- Priorities for public health, ill health prevention and treatment
- Between-country differences
- Within-country differences
- Measurement and targets.

The review is illustrated with graphs and tables, eg Child poverty rates in selected European countries in 2009 and change since 2005.

This review provides valuable data to support our prioritising work with particular communities and with people with specific health needs.

Recommended.

Migration issues – Other Agencies

Migrant Roma in the United Kingdom

This major report²⁰:

²⁰ Philip Brown, Lisa Scullion and Philip Martin. *Migrant Roma in the United Kingdom: population size and experiences of local authorities and partners – final report.*

“ ... provides hard data on the size of the new settled Roma migrant communities; an indication of the major gaps in statutory (and non-statutory) provision; and a sense of what needs to be done to challenge the Roma’s current invisibility in terms of government policy.”²¹

It is also very timely, given the current political controversy about Roma people settling in Sheffield.

The report begins by defining “Roma”:

“As it is most commonly used in EU policy documents and discussions, the term ‘Roma’ here refers to a variety of groups of people who describe themselves as Roma, Gypsies, Travellers, Manouches, Ashkali, Sinti and other titles. The use of the term Roma is in no way intended to downplay the great diversity within the many different Romani groups and related communities, nor is it intended to promote stereotypes.”²²

It then sets out the context for this research:

“On 5th April 2011 the European Commission published a communication entitled ‘An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020’ [²³], which called on all Member States to prepare, or adapt strategic documents to meet four key EU Roma Integration goals: access to education, employment, healthcare and housing. The communication admitted that progress on Roma integration had not been satisfactory and explicitly requested that states develop National Roma Integration Strategies which included “targeted actions and sufficient funding (national, EU and other) to deliver” on the goals.

The UK’s submission to the call comprised a document outlining both the legal framework in the UK in respect of Roma and the approaches adopted by the UK government as well as those of the devolved administrations of Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The content of this document focused overwhelmingly on inequalities and other issues impacting on indigenous UK Gypsies and Travellers; the attention placed upon migrant Roma arriving, typically, from Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) was minimal. [²⁴”

University of Salford, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (8300 kb) from: [http://www.salford.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/363118/Migrant Roma in the U K final report October 2013.pdf](http://www.salford.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/363118/Migrant_Roma_in_the_UK_final_report_October_2013.pdf).

²¹ Taken from the IRR review at: <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/no-going-back-for-the-roma/>.

²² Taken from: European Commission. *Justice*, http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_en.htm.

²³ *Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, The Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions, An EU Framework for National Roma Integration Strategies up to 2020*. European Commission, 2011. Available to download as a pdf (101.37 kb) from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2011:0173:FIN:EN:PDF>.

²⁴ *Council conclusions on an EU Framework strategy for Roma integration up to 2020: Great Britain and Northern Ireland*. European Commission, 2012. Available to

The research (carried out via a mix of surveys and semi-structured interviews) made some important findings, highlights of which are noted here (of particular importance is the information on size and distribution of the Roma communities):

- “We estimate that as of 2012 there are at least 197,705 migrant Roma living in the UK. Based on the responses from key informants this is considered a conservative estimate of the population. It is likely that this population will continue to increase.
- The population estimate for England is 193,297 individuals. It is suggested that Scotland has at least 3,030 migrant Roma individuals with 878 in Wales and 500 in Northern Ireland.
- The data indicates that the population of migrant Roma is predominantly urban and located in existing multi-ethnic areas. This study suggests that in England populations are concentrated in the North West and London with significant populations in Yorkshire and the Humber, East Midlands and West Midlands. There is a significant degree of uncertainty from key informants about the implications the end of transitional rights for Roma from Romania and Bulgaria will have for migration flows.
- The estimate of approximately 200,000 migrant Roma individuals is similar in number to projections for the population of indigenous Gypsies and Travellers in England and Wales which is estimated to be between 200,000 – 300,000 individuals. When combined together the population of migrant Roma and indigenous Gypsies and Travellers would equate to around 400,000 – 500,000 ‘Roma’, as defined by the Council of Europe, living in the UK.” [p7]

In terms of the engagement of migrant Roma with service areas:

- “A number of authorities reported that they were aware of migrant Roma living in their areas that rarely came into contact with the authority in any way. This was largely attributed to migrant Roma tending to be accommodated in private rented housing and not engaging, in any perceptible way, with local authority services or with key statutory partners.
- Authorities reported that the main way they came into contact with Roma was through educational issues/children’s services. This was often as a result of some sort of crisis within the household or when issues were reported by the general public or referrals made by other agencies (e.g. housing services, environmental health, police etc.).” [p8]

In relation to addressing the needs of Roma people:

- “Migrant Roma were often seen as arriving with varied and complex needs. Particular issues discussed related to the presence of poverty, experience of entrenched discrimination resulting in an absence of trust and lack of literacy abilities (in any language).

download as a pdf (97.40 kb) from:

http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/files/roma_uk_strategy_en.pdf.

- Local authorities reported that they found catering for the diversity and complexity of needs challenging. Occasionally this was linked to the heterogeneity of the Roma population, meaning that ensuring appropriate and meaningful service provision could be demanding.
- Reductions in funding available for local authorities and partners were often cited as contributing to the challenges faced. Posts were being lost within many organisations (statutory and non-statutory) including in those services which usually led and undertook engagement with Traveller and/or diverse communities. This had the impact of reducing the capacity available to deal with Roma (including Gypsy and Traveller) issues at a time of rising demand, as well as eradicating institutional memory about how to address such issues when they were presented.” [p8]

In their (very fair) conclusions, the authors suggest that:

“The main conclusion from the research is that the migrant Roma population in the UK is significant and indications are that it is increasing. The data gathered in this study relies on estimates by stakeholders who have brought together hard data coupled with their grassroots experience to provide local estimates which can be scaled up to provide an indicative population of migrant Roma in the UK. Although a minority of UK local authorities provided local estimates of the migrant Roma population many of the responding authorities include large metropolitan cities and a spread of authority types across the country. We are confident that the sample obtained in this work forms as a sound and robust base as is possible at this current time to understand the size and nature of migrant Roma settlement in the UK. It should be noted that the response rate is not necessarily a failure of local authorities to respond to the survey; rather this points to the complexities associated with identification and engagement of migrant Roma populations, coupled with the reductions in the capacity of staff in many local authorities in the UK at the current time.” [p47]

Finally, the report indicates the need for further research, for example:

“More precisely what are the reasons Roma themselves provide for their migration decisions? Why do they settle in certain areas? What are their expectations? What are their self-assessed needs? How do the services and opportunities provided in local areas map onto these needs? How are such issues affected by different sections of the migrant Roma population?” [p48]

This key report begins to fill in some of the gaps in our knowledge of the settlement in the UK of Roma people, and is an important contribution to our own planning and delivery of services.

Recommended.^{25, 26}

²⁵ Source: *IRR News*, 1-7 Nov 2013.

²⁶ IRR have also published a brief report of a parliamentary meeting on the Roma experience of flight from the Czech Republic and settlement in the UK, see: <http://www.irr.org.uk/news/roma-voices-heard-at-last-2/>.

Broader issues – Other Agencies

Love thy neighbourhood: people and place in social reform

This new research report²⁷ from IPPR North aims to:

“... understand how neighbourhoods are changing in Britain, the pressures they face, the resources and capacities that exist within them, and how both people and policies can make them better places to live and work.” [p1]

It strongly recommends a new approach, based on much more neighbourhood-based working.

The report includes sections on:

- The state of neighbourhoods
- Neighbourhood policy since 1997
- Neighbourhood change
- Connecting neighbourhoods to economic opportunity
- Good neighbourhoods, future neighbourhoods
- Neighbourhood policy and social renewal.

It begins by setting the scene and summarising the current position of neighbourhoods in England, including highlighting that “there were some relative improvements in the North East, North West, East Midlands and London at the expense of other regions.” [p21]. However, the collection of the data that has been used (via the Index of Multiple Deprivation) was discontinued by the Coalition in 2010, so it is now much harder to carry out this kind of analysis.

The research then goes on to look at neighbourhood policy since 1997, including the New Deal for Communities programme and the National Strategy for Neighbourhood Renewal; after 2005:

“The Working Neighbourhoods Fund replaced the Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, and was allocated to 65 local authorities on the basis of their levels of people who were out-of-work and claiming benefits, rather than on measures of multiple deprivation. It was allocated as part of an un-ringfenced Area-Based Grant, which included a range of other previously ringfenced funds. The intention of this approach was to give local authorities and their partners more freedom to address local needs, necessarily focussing on neighbourhoods. Instead, Local Strategic Partnerships were asked to produce Local Area Agreements around a number of more general outcomes.” [p33]

²⁷ Ed Cox *et al.* *Love thy neighbourhood: people and place in social reform*. IPPR (“The Condition of Britain” series), 2013. Available to download as a pdf (5440 kb) from: http://www.ippr.org/images/media/files/publication/2013/11/love-thy-neighbourhood_Nov2013_11478.pdf.

It also considers physical regeneration; and the third strand of the Labour Party's programme, community-building:

“Unlike other neighbourhood policy objectives, the communities agenda, with its lower profile, was less subject to radical review and was slowly entrenched over time. This process was accelerated by the increased focus on community cohesion and integration that was prompted by the disturbances in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford in 2001 and the London bombings in 2005. Both of these events led to the initiation of a variety of local and national programmes to encourage interaction between people from different ethnic and faith backgrounds.” [p38]

It then briefly assesses work with neighbourhoods under the Coalition:

“In summary, there are three significant differences which clearly divide the Coalition government's neighbourhood policies with those of the New Labour era:

- There is very little particular focus on deprived neighbourhoods – programmes apply to all communities regardless of their capacity to use them, and few if any targets or indicators of success are in place.
- There is very little investment in physical regeneration, and what does take place is led by the private sector.
- Programmes largely depend on community initiative – they are supported by only very small sums of public money, and largely avoid or exclude local government and other state actors.” [p40]

The report then goes on to look at neighbourhood change:

“... neighbourhood change is primarily driven by the gradual movement of people in and out of the area, their varying economic, social and cultural statuses, and how these change the overall composition of the local population.” [p41]

It also includes the impact of major change (such as the arrival of new communities), and includes a handful of case-study communities.

The researchers looked at what makes a “good neighbourhood” – and, interestingly, factors include access to a “community hub” and a library within 20 minutes²⁸ – and then how this knowledge can be built into future neighbourhood development:

“Our research has identified a number of interesting trends which we expect to become increasingly apparent coming years, and which will change our perceptions about what makes a good neighbourhood ‘good’. These include:

²⁸ There is a diagram showing this on p52.

- A decline in car usage, and greater use of car sharing and more integrated modes of public transport, leading to wider pedestrianisation of district centres and other public places.
- A growing number of joint service centres delivering health, leisure, housing, employment and other community services under one roof.
- More age-friendly public places with greater provision of seating, toilets and accessible shops and services.
- Changes to waste storage and collection, with growing use of communal waste collection points as opposed to individual bins.
- The transformation of neighbourhood high streets and district centres from retail destinations to leisure, culture and local business hubs.
- The development of district heating systems and neighbourhood approaches to energy production and supply.
- Greater use of digital technology and social media to enable community collaboration and action.” [pp8-9]

Finally, the report

“... suggests that a new approach to neighbourhood policy and practice is the missing piece of the puzzle that will enable progressive policymakers to effectively address some of society’s most profound challenges.” [p9]

These include:

- Neighbourhood governance
- Community development
- Political parties and local democratic reform
- Public service reform
- House-building
- Energy and decarbonisation.

The report concludes:

“Neighbourhoods policy over the past two decades has made some significant impacts, not least in preventing many places from entering a spiral of decline, and there is much to be learned from the approaches that were adopted. However, neighbourhood change is a slow process which is primarily affected by the wider economic context, and government has had to change its approach and address wider issues of local economic development to become more effective in addressing neighbourhood decline.

That is not to say that there is no longer a place for neighbourhood policy: on the contrary, a new approach to neighbourhoods is vital to connecting neighbourhoods to areas of economic opportunity, and to improving and transforming those places that are experiencing concentrated and complex problems. It might also unlock solutions to some of the most profound challenges currently facing public policy.

When combined with concerted action across a range of spatial scales, a new neighbourhoods approach centred on unlocking social innovation by bringing together state, private and voluntary actors can be transformative. Local collaboration around a shared neighbourhood vision is the key to prosperous and dynamic neighbourhood futures.”
[pp13-14]

Abbreviations and acronyms

EU = European Union
IRR = Institute of Race Relations
JRF = Joseph Rowntree Foundation
UCL = University College London
WHO = World Health Organisation

This Newsletter was compiled by John Vincent, and all items are written by him, unless otherwise stated. Please send any comments or items for the next issue to:

John Vincent
Wisteria Cottage
Nadderwater
Exeter EX4 2JQ

Tel/fax: 01392 256045
E-mail: john@nadder.org.uk

November 2013