



ISSN 1475-8202

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

Number 158, June 2014

(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](http://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 ...?

- CILIP *Update* – page 1
- *Museums Journal* – page 2

### Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies

- *Primary schools providing access to out of school care: research report* – page 2
- *The condition of Britain ...* – page 3
- *Can a neighbourhood approach to loneliness contribute to people's well-being?* – page 6
- 3rd Peter Townsend Memorial Conference: presentations – page 7

### Health & Wellbeing issues – Libraries, Museums, Archives and Cultural and Heritage Organisations

- “UCL launches Museums on Prescription” – page 9

### Broader issues – Government, Government Agencies and Local Government

- *Public services: the good, the bad, and the future* – page 9

Abbreviations and acronyms – page 10

---

## Did you see ...?

### CILIP *Update*

The June issue includes a very useful, practical article about the development and implementation of an evaluation toolkit for Newcastle Libraries:

- Becky Cole “Rich, emotive evidence of impact” [pp42-44]<sup>1</sup>

### ***Museums Journal***

The June 2014 issue<sup>2</sup> has a number of key articles, including:

- Sharon Heal “Editorial: Resilience should be a means to an end”, which briefly argues that all the talk about resilience (“the new kid on the block”) must be seen as a means to an end – “Resilient museums have to be connected to and engaged with their communities” [p4]<sup>3</sup>
- Geraldine Kendall “No hiding place”, an analysis of the new report<sup>4</sup> which finds that the Arts Council’s distribution of National Lottery funding “comes up short” [pp12-13].

## **Tackling social and digital exclusion – Other Agencies**

### ***Primary schools providing access to out of school care: research report***

This new research report<sup>5</sup> (which has been compiled for DfE by TNS BMRB<sup>6</sup>) provides valuable background information – for example:

- “In 2013, 64 per cent of all primary schools in England provided access to before school care, 70 per cent provided access to after school care and 19 per cent provided access to holiday care.
- Overall, around half (53 per cent) of all primary schools in England provided access to both before school and after school care during term time. This is equivalent to 9,900 primary schools.

<sup>1</sup> *CILIP Update*, June 2014. Further information at:

<http://www.cilip.org.uk/cilip/membership/membership-benefits/monthly-magazine-journals-and-ebulletins/cilip-update-magazine>.

<sup>2</sup> *Museums Journal*, June 2014. Further information from:

<http://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal>.

<sup>3</sup> Available at: <http://www.museumsassociation.org/museums-journal/comment/01062014-editorial#.U6QsaSlq-Uk>.

<sup>4</sup> Peter Stark, Christopher Gordon and David Powell. *The PLACE report: policy for the Lottery, the arts and community in England*. The PLACE Report, 2014. Available to download as a pdf (3310 kb) from:

[http://www.theplacereport.co.uk/downloads/The\\_PLACE\\_report.pdf](http://www.theplacereport.co.uk/downloads/The_PLACE_report.pdf). This is a follow-on to the report: Peter Stark, Christopher Gordon and David Powell. *Rebalancing our cultural capital: a contribution to the debate on national policy for the arts and culture in England*. The ROCC Report, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (3040 kb) from: [http://www.theroccreport.co.uk/downloads/Rebalancing\\_FINAL\\_3mb.pdf](http://www.theroccreport.co.uk/downloads/Rebalancing_FINAL_3mb.pdf).

<sup>5</sup> *Primary schools providing access to out of school care: research report*. DfE, 2014. Available to download as a pdf (324.61 kb) from:

[https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/315838/RR349\\_Out\\_of\\_School\\_Provision\\_in\\_England\\_final\\_ml.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/315838/RR349_Out_of_School_Provision_in_England_final_ml.pdf).

<sup>6</sup> TNS BMRB was formerly the British Market Research Bureau – see: <http://www.tns-bmrb.co.uk/home>.

- 15 per cent of primary schools offered access to the full suite of out of school care (i.e. before school, after school *and* holiday activities). This is equivalent to 2,800 primary schools. This is markedly lower than the proportion of schools providing access to wrap around care and suggests that schools are concentrating their efforts on term time provision ...
- Higher proportions of schools in 30 per cent most deprived areas were offering access to both before and after school care than in the remaining 70 per cent least deprived areas (56 per cent and 51 per cent respectively). This is driven by before school activities being more common in deprived areas (73 per cent of primary schools in deprived areas run before school activities, compared with 61 per cent in the remaining 70 per cent).
- The proportion of schools offering holiday care was higher in the 70 per cent least deprived areas than in the 30 per cent most deprived areas (20 per cent and 15 per cent respectively).
- On a regional basis, the provision of both before and after school care was most common in London (66 per cent), the North West (60 per cent) and the West Midlands (57 per cent). It is perhaps worth noting that these three regions contain the three largest cities in the UK and it is likely that there is a correlation between urbanisation and the demand for out of school care.” [p5]

Useful for planning where we might access children and young people that we are aiming to reach.<sup>7</sup>

---

### ***The condition of Britain ...***

This major new report<sup>8</sup> from IPPR has just been published (and has hit many headlines).

The report begins by defining its goals for society, which includes:

“Our overarching goal for society should be greater equality of social relations. We seek a society in which people relate to each other as free and equal citizens, and in which unjust hierarchies of power, esteem and standing are progressively overcome. This broadens the centre-left’s commitment to equality beyond purely distributional concerns, although these remain vital. Achieving this vision of equality requires us to challenge concentrations of power by redistributing it to people and places; expect everyone to meet their obligations to contribute to building a better society; and strengthen institutions that bring people together and address the root causes of injustice.” [Full report, p11]

---

<sup>7</sup> Source: NCB *Policy & Parliamentary Information Digest*, 23 Jun 2014.

<sup>8</sup> Kayte Lawton, Graeme Cooke *and* Nick Pearce. *The condition of Britain: strategies for social renewal*. IPPR, 2014. Available to download as a pdf (2520 kb) from: [http://www.ippr.org/assets/media/publications/pdf/the-condition-of-britain\\_June2014.pdf](http://www.ippr.org/assets/media/publications/pdf/the-condition-of-britain_June2014.pdf). Also available is: *Condition of Britain: strategies for social renewal – summary of recommendations*. IPPR, 2014, from: [http://www.ippr.org/assets/media/publications/pdf/CoB-recommendations\\_June2014.pdf](http://www.ippr.org/assets/media/publications/pdf/CoB-recommendations_June2014.pdf). Finally, the whole report is available to read online at: <http://www.ippr.org/read/the-condition-of-britain-strategies-for-social-renewal>.

It then reviews “The Condition of Britain” through the findings of its other research reports<sup>9</sup>, looking at where we are in terms of the Beveridge Report’s “Five Giants” (want, idleness, ignorance, disease, squalor) and in tackling the ‘five pathways to poverty’ identified in “Breakdown Britain”<sup>10</sup> (as the Centre for Social Justice termed it in 2006), worklessness and dependency, family breakdown, addiction, educational failure, and indebtedness.

The report argues that:

“... governments have tended to place too much faith in both central government and in markets to address major social problems. This has helped to concentrate power in the hands of a few, made it harder for citizens to take responsibility for solving their own problems, and weakened some of the institutions that enable people to live a meaningful life together.” [Summary, p2]

Instead, it suggests building a stronger society based on the ‘three pillars’: “spreading power, fostering contribution and strengthening shared institutions.” [Summary, p2]

This includes:

“... ambitious plans to expand affordable childcare and provide greater security for older people with care needs, adapting the welfare state to profound changes in family life and better preparing Britain for an ageing society. We argue for a social investment strategy focused on jobs, skills and homes, rather than income transfers. This includes shifting public spending on housing from ‘benefits to bricks’, and guaranteeing work or training for young people rather than allowing them access to the adult benefit system. We call for the restoration of reciprocity to the social security system and higher (temporary) benefits for those who have paid into the system. And we propose new institutions to protect people against abuses of market power, including an Affordable Credit Trust to endow affordable local lenders that are capable of competing with extortionate payday lenders.” [p6]

It then goes on to present detailed, costed policy recommendations. These include (and main points only listed here):

- Families: Raising children and nurturing relationships
  - Greater paternity entitlements for working dads
  - Guaranteed affordable childcare for all young children
  - A better qualified childcare workforce

---

<sup>9</sup> Summarised in: Kayte Lawton (ed). *The Condition of Britain: interim report*. IPPR, 2013. Available to download as a pdf (2070 kb) from: [http://www.ippr.org/assets/media/images/media/files/publication/2013/12/Condition-of-Britain\\_interim\\_Dec2013\\_11645.pdf](http://www.ippr.org/assets/media/images/media/files/publication/2013/12/Condition-of-Britain_interim_Dec2013_11645.pdf).

<sup>10</sup> *Breakdown Britain: interim report on the state of the nation*. Social Justice Policy Group, 2006. Available to download as a pdf (2070 kb) from: <http://www.centreforsocialjustice.org.uk/UserStorage/pdf/Pdf%20Exec%20summaries/Breakdown%20Britain.pdf>.

- Increases in child benefit focused on young children
- Universal credits reform to promote dual-earning
- More support for strong relationships
- Young people: enabling secure transitions into adulthood
  - A distinct work, training and benefits track for young people
  - Guaranteed earning or learning for young people
  - Expanded opportunities for young people in National Citizen Service
  - Young adult offenders brought under the remit of youth offending teams
- Working life: promoting work and rewarding contribution
  - Institutional independence for the National Insurance Fund
  - More generous temporary benefits for those who have paid in
  - A Work Programme focused where it can be effective
  - A 'New Start' supported employment programme
  - Stronger incentives to hire and retain disabled workers
  - An Affordable Credit Trust to endow local non-profit lenders
- Housing: mobilising local leadership to build more homes
  - Powers for local areas to bring forward land for development
  - Incentives for local areas to bring down the housing benefit bill
  - Powers for local areas to set housing benefit in the private sector
  - Housing capital budgets devolved to combined authorities
  - Full housing spending devolved to combined authorities in time
- Crime and exclusion: putting people and places in control
  - An entitlement to restorative justice for victims
  - Neighbourhood justice panels in every area
  - A 'Troubled Lives' programme to tackle deep social exclusion
- Older people: living well together in an ageing society
  - A right to flexible working for carers
  - An entitlement to support for moderate care needs
  - A review of how national insurance could protect against high care costs
  - Neighbourhood networks to help older people overcome isolation  
[Taken from Summary, pp3-6]

There are important issues discussed in this report, and it's worth skimming if only because it points the possible direction that the Government elected next year may start to take.

Finally, here are comments from Class's Ellie O'Hagan:

"The report itself was interesting with some good recommendations. I particularly liked its ideas around restorative justice and tackling the causes of crime early on, as well as its suggestions around family – paid time off for fathers to attend antenatal classes, better paternity leave and greater access to relationship counselling. But in my mind the whole thing felt a little like tinkering. Largely positive tinkering (with the

exception of freezing child benefit), and perhaps more significant tinkering than the tinkering that has come before – but tinkering nonetheless. There was no discussion of what the overarching vision is: what is a state, what does it do, and for whose benefit? Perhaps that’s why the recommendations focused largely on the people in the middle. The report had very few things to say about an ever-wealthier superrich and an ever-poorer poor ...”<sup>11</sup>

---

## ***Can a neighbourhood approach to loneliness contribute to people’s well-being?***

This new report<sup>12</sup> from JRF evaluates the overall impact of the JRF “Neighbourhood approaches to loneliness” programme, and has some useful learning for us.

“The Neighbourhood approaches to loneliness (NAL) programme ran for three years from December 2010. The programme team chose four neighbourhoods with different characteristics to understand whether those differences would influence the success of the programme. The neighbourhoods were:

- Bradford Moor, an inner city area in Bradford, with diverse tenure and ethnicity;
  - Carr, a suburban area in York, with little community focus, with majority home ownership;
  - Denholme, a rural area in Bradford, with a mix of tenure; and
  - New Earswick, a suburban area in York with majority social renting.”
- [p4]

This report:

- highlights that good practice requires skilled staff who are able to communicate effectively and provide pastoral support to volunteers;
- reveals changes in community researchers resulting from their involvement in the programme;
- demonstrates where there has been community impact; and
- shares wider lessons which can be learnt from taking a neighbourhood approach.” [p1]

From the summary report:

- “The programme was life changing for those most closely involved. Many gained confidence, self-worth and emotional intelligence. Some made

---

<sup>11</sup> From: <http://classonline.org.uk/blog/item/what-to-make-of-the-ippr-report>.

<sup>12</sup> Angela B Collins and Julie Wrigley. *Can a neighbourhood approach to loneliness contribute to people’s well-being?* JRF, 2014. Available to download as a pdf (940.02 kb) from: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/neighbourhood-loneliness-full.pdf>. There is also a summary (87.90 kb) available at: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/sites/files/jrf/Neighbourhood-loneliness-summary.pdf>.

tangible gains, such as returning to college or employment; many acquired skills.

- Partner organisations reported greater awareness of loneliness, with the subject now higher up their agenda. Those directly involved also felt they had gained personally.
- The programme's strengths were its community development approach and the pastoral support offered by its team. Having one person or organisation to draw people together and communicate messages was crucial. The programme manager's combination of community development and inter-personal skills was pivotal.
- Local people found the community research approach empowering. It allowed them to fail or succeed and to learn as they went. It has produced small teams of residents dedicated to creating change for themselves and their neighbours. Community researchers have set up a range of activities; many require little, if any, agency input to continue.
- There were some uncertainties. Conflicting advice from the Job Centre about benefit entitlements led some volunteers to question their involvement. The programme's flexible timetable left some unsure about what commitment they were making.
- The evaluation concludes that community activism of this kind can contribute to the well-being of people at risk of or experiencing loneliness. Local people can play a central role in this activity and such involvement can, in turn, enhance community well-being." [p1]

---

### **3rd Peter Townsend Memorial Conference: presentations**

This two-day Peter Townsend Memorial Conference 2014 was funded by the ESRC as part of the research project, "Poverty and Social Exclusion in the UK", and the presentations have just been made available online<sup>13</sup>.

Of particular interest is the paper, "Social Exclusion in the UK"<sup>14</sup>, by Ruth Levitas and Eldin Fahmy, which covers:

- "The approach to social exclusion in the PSE – multidimensional poverty and the [Bristol Social Exclusion Matrix]
- Some headline figures for BSEM indicators
- Social resources and participation" [p2]

The BSEM looks at the three key areas in which social exclusion can operate (Resources, Participation, and Quality of Life) and then highlights the critical points in each:

#### Resources

- Economic
- Access to Services

---

<sup>13</sup> See: <http://poverty.ac.uk/take-part/events/final-conference>.

<sup>14</sup> See:

<http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Levitas%2C%20Social%20Exclusion%20in%20the%20UK.pdf>.

- Social
- Cultural (Education and Skills)

#### Participation

- Economic
- Social
- Cultural
- Civic and Political

#### Quality of Life

- Health and Well-being
- Living Environment
- Crime, harm and criminalisation.<sup>15</sup>

This paper then includes headline figures to illustrate this, for example:

Cannot afford 5+ social and material necessities	27.7% of all adults
Lacks adequate access to 3 or more services	21.3%
Completed full-time education aged 16 or less	52.2%
Speaks to less than 3 friends monthly	24.4%
No working age adults in household in paid work	17.0%
Does not use any listed social and cultural facilities (Libraries, public sports facilities, museums and galleries, evening classes, public or community hall)	19.6%

There are also useful presentations looking at poverty and exclusion in Scotland<sup>16</sup> and Northern Ireland<sup>17</sup>; poverty, exclusion and disability in the UK<sup>18</sup>; poverty and gender<sup>19</sup>; ethnicity and poverty<sup>20</sup>; poverty and youth<sup>21</sup>; and “pensioner poverty and social exclusion”<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>15</sup> The BSEM was first published as: Ruth Levitas *et al.* *The multi-dimensional analysis of social exclusion*. Cabinet Office: Social Exclusion Task Force, 2007; and was assessed for *The Network Newsletter* ... 69, March 2007, pp10-12.

<sup>16</sup> See: <http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Bailey%2C%20PSE%20Scotland.pdf>.

<sup>17</sup> See:

<http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Tomlinson%2C%20Poverty%20and%20Social%20Exclusion%20NI.pdf>.

<sup>18</sup> See:

<http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Heslop%2C%20Poverty%2C%20Exclusion%20and%20disability%20in%20the%20UK.pdf>.

<sup>19</sup> See:

[http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Dermott%2C%20Gender\\_0.pdf](http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Dermott%2C%20Gender_0.pdf).

<sup>20</sup> See:

[http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Pantazis%2C%20Poverty%20and%20Ethnicity\\_0.pdf](http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Pantazis%2C%20Poverty%20and%20Ethnicity_0.pdf).



## Health & Wellbeing issues – Libraries, Museums, Archives and Cultural and Heritage Organisations

### “UCL launches Museums on Prescription”

This interesting piece appeared in the “New Practice” section of *Museum Practice*<sup>23</sup>:

“A team of University College London (UCL) researchers has been awarded funding to explore the value of role of museums in social prescribing.

The scheme will complement existing social prescription services, where patients are referred to non-medical sources of support, such as Arts on Prescription run by Arts for Health and Books on Prescription [<sup>24</sup>].

Museums on Prescription [<sup>25</sup>], which is the first project of its kind in the world, will connect socially isolated, vulnerable and lonely older people, referred through the NHS, local authority adult social care services and charities, to partner museums. The Arts and Humanities Research Council is funding the £550,000 project.

Over the course of the three-year project the team will review existing programmes and set up two schemes with museums in central London and Kent, including the British Museum, Islington Museum, Tunbridge Wells Museums and Art Gallery and Canterbury Museums and Galleries.

UCL will also work in partnership with organisations such as Age UK and Arts Council England to explore the potential to roll out Museums on Prescription nationwide.”

---

## Broader issues – Government, Government Agencies and Local Government

### ***Public services: the good, the bad, and the future***

This interesting new “Policy Paper”<sup>26</sup> from Class argues that:

---

<sup>21</sup> See:

<http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Fahmy%2C%20Poverty%20and%20Youth.pdf>.

<sup>22</sup> See:

<http://poverty.ac.uk/sites/default/files/attachments/Patsios%2C%20Pensioner%20poverty%20and%20social%20exclusion.pdf>.

<sup>23</sup> Available to Museums Association members only.

<sup>24</sup> See: <http://www.booksonprescription.org.uk/>.

<sup>25</sup> See: <http://www.ucl.ac.uk/museums/research/museumsonprescription>.

<sup>26</sup> Roger Seifert. *Public services: the good, the bad, and the future*. Class (“Policy Paper”), 2014. Available to download as a pdf (675.90 kb) from:

[http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2014\\_Policy\\_Paper\\_-\\_Public\\_services\\_-\\_the\\_good,\\_the\\_bad,\\_and\\_the\\_future.pdf](http://classonline.org.uk/docs/2014_Policy_Paper_-_Public_services_-_the_good,_the_bad,_and_the_future.pdf).

“... while there is a definite need to engage public service users and staff in the provision of services, accountable politicians have to be the guardians of those services as they are the only ones with the power and authority to control the senior managers who run them. Local councils should have enhanced, rather than diminished roles, but MPs and ministers are the final decision-makers and should neither hide behind fake protocols nor wash their hands and run for cover.

The argument that private sector profit-seeking senior managers will make the most efficient and effective resource allocations and service delivery decisions is no longer plausible. Failures of the market-centred approach have been sustained and consistently repeated, contributing greatly to the vast societal inequalities we are experiencing today.”

Recommendations include:

- Ensuring equity in service provision through national standards
- Senior decision makers must be held accountable
- Budgets must be set by national political leaders
- Political responsibility must be reasserted
- There must be agreed national standards throughout all services
- The workforce and community must be engaged to a greater extent
- Existing regulation must undergo urgent reform
- Risk assessment must be made by experts, users, staff and politicians alike
- The spirit of public service must be rekindled.<sup>27</sup>

---

## Abbreviations and acronyms

DfE = Department for Education  
JRF = Joseph Rowntree Foundation  
NCB = National Children’s Bureau

---

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](mailto:john@nadder.org.uk)

June 2014

---

<sup>27</sup> Taken from: <http://classonline.org.uk/pubs/item/public-services-the-good-the-bad-and-the-future>.