

# Consultation Response

## January 2010



Race on the Agenda

## Response to *Consulting the Capital: London Councils' voluntary sector commissioning programme 2011 - 15*

### 1. Introduction

#### 1.1 About ROTA

Race on the Agenda (ROTA) is one of Britain's leading social policy think-tanks focusing on issues that affect Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) communities. Originally set up in 1984, ROTA aims to increase the capacity of BAME organisations and strengthen the voice of BAME communities through increased civic engagement and participation in society.

**ROTA's Articles of Association state that the charity is set up "to work towards the elimination of racial discrimination and to promote equality of opportunity, human rights and good relations between persons of different groups".**

For historical and demographic reasons, our work prioritises London, but our activities and a number of our projects have national and international significance. To this end we work in close partnership with our membership and others interested in race equality, human rights and the promotion of good relations.

Our presence in London is enhanced by the regional network MiNet. **MiNet** is the London focused BAME network of networks, which joined ROTA in 2002 to strengthen the voice for London's BAME third sector in the development of regional policy.

#### 1.2 ROTA definition of BAME and approach to race equality

ROTA works on social policy issues that have an impact on race equality and BAME communities. ROTA's definition of 'race' encompasses all the protected characteristics under equality legislation including:

- Colour
- Nationality
- Ethnic or national origin.

We use the term BAME to refer to all groups who are discriminated against on the aforementioned grounds. This definition includes but is not exclusive to people of African, Asian, Caribbean, European and Eastern European, Irish, Greek, Turkish, Jewish, Roma and South East Asian decent as well as refugees and asylum seekers.

### 1.3 Methodology for this response

This response is based on evidence gathered through ROTA's 2009 consultation with London's BAME third sector, which was undertaken to identify the top five concerns of London's BAME communities to inform our policy priorities. During this consultation we contacted BAME organisations via email, telephone, outreach interviews and focus groups over a four month period. This January we followed up last year's consultation by asking a sample of our members, through questionnaires, telephone interviews and a focus group, questions which explored some of its findings which relate to the London Councils commissioning priorities further.

Additionally, this response is based on evidence from the following ROTA research projects and policy responses:

- ROTA's recent response to the Mayor's draft Health Inequalities Strategy<sup>1</sup>
- ROTA's 2009 response to the Mayor's draft equalities framework, Equal Life Chances for all<sup>2</sup>
- An event held by ROTA and BEAM-EM in 2009 about mental health and BAME communities<sup>3</sup>
- ROTA's Female Voices in Violence (FVV) project, which is exploring the impact of serious youth and gang violence on BAME women and girls<sup>4</sup>
- ROTA's 2006 – 2009 youth-led research project, Building Bridges, which looked at serious group offending<sup>5</sup>
- ROTA 2005 – 2007 research on homelessness<sup>6</sup>
- ROTA's 2006 – 2008 Restoring Relationships Project and current Transformative Justice Project, which explore and promote the use of restorative justice as a means of addressing hate crime against London's BAME communities<sup>7</sup>
- MiNet's 2008 report<sup>8</sup> which looked at the impact of the recession on the BAME VCS in London
- HEAR's 2008 report<sup>9</sup>, which looked at the infrastructure available to equality sectors in London.

---

<sup>1</sup> ROTA (2009) *Response to the Mayor of London's draft Health Inequalities Strategy*. Available at <http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/Reports.aspx>.

<sup>2</sup> ROTA (2009) *Response to the Mayor of London's draft equalities framework, Equal Life Chances for All*. Available at <http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/Reports.aspx>.

<sup>3</sup> Feedback from this event is summarised in ROTA (2009) *Response to 'New Horizons: Towards a shared vision for mental health'*. Available at <http://www.rota.org.uk/Downloads/New%20Horizons%20submitted%20F.pdf>.

<sup>4</sup> More information about this project is available on the projects pages of ROTA's website at [http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV\\_BBP.aspx](http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV_BBP.aspx). The final report will be available from the end of February from the publications pages of ROTA's website at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk).

<sup>5</sup> More information about this project is available on the projects pages of ROTA's website at [http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV\\_BBP.aspx](http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV_BBP.aspx). The final report will be available from the end of February from the publications pages of ROTA's website at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk).

<sup>6</sup> ROTA (2007) *The visible and hidden dimensions of London's homelessness: A Black, Asian and minority ethnic account*.

<sup>7</sup> To find out more about these projects please visit <http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/TJP.aspx> and <http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/RRP.aspx> respectively.

<sup>8</sup> MiNet (2009) *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*. London: ROTA.

<sup>9</sup> HEAR (2008) *Gaps & solutions: Supporting London's equality sectors*. ROTA.

## 2. Consultation response

### 2.1 Overall comment

#### **Race inequality and poverty are key challenges facing London**

ROTA welcomes the opportunity to take part in the consultation on this important fund, which has had significant impact on the lives of countless Londoners who have faced inequality and discrimination over the years. Unfortunately, many Londoners, and in particular those from BAME communities continue to face inequality and discrimination in many key areas of life, including health, community safety and relations, the environment, employment and education, as will be described throughout this response and highlighted through the report launched by the National Equality Panel earlier this week<sup>10</sup>.

We understand that the inclination in the aftermath of the recent recession may be to reduce investment in London Councils' fund. However, given the scale of inequality in London, and emerging evidence<sup>11</sup> about the disproportionate impact of the recession on those belonging to 'equality groups' and in particular those from BAME communities, we urge London Councils to maintain investment in this important fund at its current rate at least. We feel that continued investment at the current level will minimise the impact of the recession on London and will lead to cost savings in the longer term and urge London Councils, as part of the process to determine priorities, to undertake an economic analysis to substantiate this.

#### **The vision for the 2011 – 15 programme**

Inequality is a key challenge facing London, and as such should be explicitly referenced in the vision for this fund. It is essential to keep this fund focused on addressing inequality, rather than improving life in general for all Londoners, as highlighted by the National Equality Panel's report<sup>12</sup> which reported that the top 10 per cent of the country's population has wealth 100 times the value of that of the poorest 10 per cent.

#### **Continued funding for BAME and other equality organisations**

It is well documented<sup>13</sup> by ROTA and others that BAME organisations play a unique and vital role in addressing the persistent, deeply entrenched and specific inequalities faced by BAME communities. They do this, for example, by:

- Bridging the gap between BAME communities and generic services
- Providing services to meet needs that mainstream providers are either unaware of or do not have the expertise to address
- Empowering BAME communities and supporting their engagement in decision-making

---

<sup>10</sup> National Equality Panel (2010) *An Anatomy of Economic Inequality in the UK*.

<sup>11</sup> For example see 'EHRC & GEO (December 2009) *Monitoring update on the impact of the recession on various demographic groups*' and 'MiNet (2009) *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*. London: ROTA.'

<sup>12</sup> National Equality Panel (2010) *An Anatomy of Economic Inequality in the UK*.

<sup>13</sup> For information and evidence see, for example, 'HEAR (2008) *Gaps & solutions: Supporting London's equalities sectors*. ROTA' and 'Perry, J. & El-Hassan, A. A., Hact (2008) *More responsive public services. A guide to commissioning for refugee community organisations*. JRF; Delivering Race Equality Action Plan.

- Representing BAME communities and informing policy development
- Tackling the wider socio-economic determinants of health
- Advocating on behalf of people suffering discrimination
- Engaging otherwise isolated communities and providing them with bridges to other communities, thereby strengthening cohesion.

This response includes a number of case-studies about BAME organisations, which demonstrate this vital role.

Despite its unique value, the BAME VCS is under-valued and under-supported. The general picture presented by existing regional and national research is that it remains relatively fragile, suffering from a substantial lack of capacity due to severe under-investment and access to adequate infrastructure support. Many organisations struggle to grow and develop and even to sustain their operations. They operate in an increasingly challenging environment. They are being disproportionately impacted on by the recession<sup>14</sup> and the move from grant making to commissioning, which is favouring large and more resilient mainstream VCS organisations. In addition, the BAME sector has been faced by its own specific challenges, particularly:

- Government's cohesion policies, which have undermined BAME organisations
- The uncertainty of the continuity of support from Capacitybuilders for regional BAME networks, which are vital if the BAME VCS is to have any influence in regional and local policy development
- The continued and persistent inequalities faced by BAME people.

The plight of London's Race Equality Councils illustrate the fragile position the BAME sector is in; over the last two years seven have closed leaving only 13. Similarly, the findings of reports<sup>15</sup> by Imkaan and the Women's Resource Centre provide evidence of the decimation of the BAME women's sector.

For these reasons, ROTA is deeply concerned about the BAME sector and urges London Councils to continue to support the sector through its important fund.

### **Making mainstream VCS services more accessible to BAME communities**

We would like to take this opportunity to commend the approach and commitment of the staff of London Councils' policy and grants team, as well as members of the grants committee, towards supporting commissioned organisations to ensure equalities considerations are at the heart of their work. As this response will highlight, BAME communities face a range of barriers in accessing mainstream third and public sector services. As such, we well as supporting BAME organisation to respond to more complex and specific issues, we would urge London Councils to continue this good work.

---

<sup>14</sup> 'MiNet (2009) *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*. London: ROTA.' and 'NEP (2008) *Supporting Equality Groups: An overview of support to the diverse third sector in England*. Women's Resource Centre.'

<sup>15</sup> Imkaan (2008) *A Matter of Life and Death: the loss of specialist services for BAMER women and children experience violence*; Women's Resource Centre (2009) *Not just bread, but roses, too: Funding to the women's voluntary and community sector in England 2004 - 2007*.

## The methodology of London Councils' consultation

We have concerns about the methodology employed through this survey, which potentially disadvantages more unpopular and uncommon issues and those which disproportionately impact on minority communities. For example, mental health has consistently come up through ROTA's work as a key concern for BAME communities in London. However, it is likely that the service relating to mental health issues within BAME communities (service 75) is less likely to be 'voted' as a high priority, as BAME organisations and people are less likely to participate in this consultation (because of their small numbers and lack the capacity to take part this lengthy and complex survey). We recommend London Councils redress this in analysing responses, for example, by giving additional weight to those from BAME organisations and undertaking additional research into the needs and aspirations of disadvantaged or discriminated against groups from which lower response rates have been received.

Our response only considers services related to our policy priorities and which we have evidence on.

We look forward to further engagement with London Councils in the development of the priorities and specifications for this fund, in particular in the equality impact assessment.

## 2. The challenges that the fund should tackle

### 1. Which of the six challenges do you think are most important?

Challenges	Very important	Important	A priority	Not a priority
Challenge 1 : Helping Londoners live longer, healthier, more independent lives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Challenge 2 : Reducing the impact of crime – including violence against women and children, supporting preventative approaches, and helping victims to rebuild their lives	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenge 3 : Creating an environmentally sustainable London	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Challenge 4 : Increasing prosperity and helping the poorest Londoners lift their lives out of poverty	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Challenge 5 : Ensuring everyone especially young people achieve their full potential	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Challenge 6 : Promoting stronger more empowered and cohesive communities; and increasing levels of participation in London's public life and cultural activities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Do you agree that these are the most appropriate challenges? If not, what others might be better and why?**

ROTA’s 2009 consultation with London’s BAME third sector identified social cohesion, social exclusion, health and social services, education, and poverty and deprivation as the top five concerns of those who participated. Additionally, our consultation found immigration, gender and age, criminal justice, housing and regeneration, and employment as significant concerns for BAME communities. As such, we have listed all challenges except three as very important.

We are not in a position, based on our limited knowledge about the environment, to make a judgement on how important Challenge 3 is.

The remainder of our response aims to provide more specific information about what is important to London’s BAME communities and their organisations under the other challenges.

## 1. The services we fund now & what services we should fund in the future

### Challenge 1: Helping Londoners live longer, healthier, more independent lives

**We currently fund organisations providing the following services. What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?**

Service Type	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
2 Second tier support to increase sporting opportunities for disabled people: £130,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11 Support a pan-London programme of competitive sporting and physical activities for children and young people, linking with London boroughs’ sports participation programmes: £130,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
18 Support advocacy schemes and legal advice services to promote take up of direct payments and benefit entitlements for people with disabilities and carers: £450,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24 Enable improvements in health, working with disadvantaged communities to support local action: £220,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
73 Enable people aged 50 & above & carers to access good quality care through direct payments, individual budgets, advocacy & discretionary care services: £200,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
75 Promote mental health and emotional well-being through access to counselling and support services for BMER groups and vulnerable adults £340,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
102 Second tier support to the following health & social care frontline services numbered 18, 24, 73, 75: £180,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## Service 24

As mentioned, inequalities in terms of health and social care is a key concern of those who participated in ROTA's 2009 consultation and its follow up in 2010. Additionally, ROTA's varied research has persistently identified health as a key issue for London's BAME communities. Our recent response the Mayor of London's draft Health Inequalities Strategy<sup>16</sup> detailed key health related inequalities faced by London's BAME communities, which should be addressed under Challenge 1. These included:

- Particular risk factors and illnesses disproportionately impacting on BAME communities, which are not being adequately addressed. For example there are higher rates of coronary disease among Pakistani and Bangladeshi groups, hypertension among African-Caribbean groups, sickle cell disorders and thalassaemia among African and African Caribbean groups, and certain sexual health issues among certain BAME groups, for example HIV among certain African communities. Other areas which are a specific issue amongst certain BAME groups such as female genital mutilation.
- Particular socio-economic issues that disproportionately or only affect BAME communities and which are determinants of health. For example, BAME communities face unequal outcomes in terms of work, and face discrimination in the workplace, which impacts on health and well being.
- BAME communities continue to face significant barriers in accessing health services, and often do not until they have reached crises points. For example, barriers include:
  - lack of awareness by health service staff at all levels about equality, diversity and BAME communities, preventing them from providing appropriate and accessible services. This is evident, for example, in the approach that is used to detain and section BAME people, as well as in the way they are stereotyped as 'aggressive' by healthcare providers<sup>17</sup>. This is exacerbated by inequality in employment in the health service, which is resulting in a workforce, particularly at senior levels, that is not reflective of London's communities;
  - Gypsies and Travellers being excluded from full services due to their apparent transient status<sup>18</sup>;
  - lack of response to special needs, for example relating to dietary requirements, clothing and bathing;
  - lack of awareness by the frontline staff of health services about the rights and entitlements of refugees and migrants;
  - language barriers;
  - lack of information and data about BAME communities, which in turns means services are not designed to meet their needs.

---

<sup>16</sup> ROTA (2010) *Response to the Mayor of London's draft Health Inequalities Strategy*. Available from the 'publications' pages at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk).

<sup>17</sup> ROTA (2007) *Developing the Mayor's Health Inequality Strategy for London: Stakeholder engagement on race equality*. 12 October 2007. Event report.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid.

Given the above, we have identified service 24 as high priority and recommend that some of this funding is allocated through BAME organisations, which play a particularly important role in ensuring appropriate health services are accessible to BAME communities because of their understanding of culturally sensitive health issues and trust within and access to their communities.

### **Service 75**

It is well documented by ROTA<sup>19</sup> and others that BAME people, especially from black African and black Caribbean communities are: over-represented within and often follow more coercive pathways through to the acute end of the mental health system, including referral from the criminal justice system; more likely to be pathologised; more likely to receive drug rather than talking therapies; and more likely to be over-medicated. Despite this, BAME communities are failing to access the community, primary and mental health promotion services that might break what a Sainsbury Centre report<sup>20</sup> has described as a 'Circle of Fear'. Within South Asian communities, there is a lack of awareness about mental health issues and stigma which is preventing access to appropriate services.

Additionally, mental health is persistently raised as a key issue of concern for London's BAME communities, including through our 2009 and 2010 consultations of the sector and our recent national event on mental health.

As such, we have identified service 75 as a high-priority.

### **What other service areas do you think we should prioritise under this challenge?**

We have no further comments in relation to this question.

---

<sup>19</sup> Most recently during the ROTA/BEAM-EM consultation about mental health and also in ROTA's submission to the Joint Committee on Human Rights on the human rights of older persons in healthcare in February 2007.

<sup>20</sup> Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (2009) *Breaking the Circles of Fear*



## **Case study: Making mental health services more accessible**

### **MAAN Somali Mental Health<sup>1</sup>**

MAAN Somali Mental Health project was set up in 1994 to meet the needs of the Somali community in Sheffield and, more specifically, to help address the difficulties Somalis face in coping with mental illness. The project employs seven people who in different ways support people within the community that suffer from mental illness.

The project is able to assist members of the community with mental health problems at all stages from conversations with their GP, transfer to hospital, discharge and future appointments with their GP, accommodation, and reintegration into the Somali community. The project is, however, often made aware of a case of mental illness very late in the process.

The issue of mental health is still not openly discussed or acknowledged among Somalis. Therefore, apart from supporting individual cases of mental illness among Somalis, this project seeks to be a vehicle for the community to identify, understand and address mental health issues and needs within the community. Informing the community about the consequences of experiencing civil war, being an asylum seeker, unemployment and khat chewing on people's mental health is an important part of the work to make the community aware of, and open about, mental health issues.

Further, the project acts as a bridge between the Somali community and service providers. For instance, this role implies on the one hand informing community members about the need to take medication to cure mental illness and on the other hand to explain to service providers that Somalis often consider medication to be dangerous.

More specifically, MAAN Somali Mental Health Project:

- Offers support, counselling, interpreting, home visits, and hospital visits to
- Somalis with enduring mental health problems
- Provides information and assistance on other services such as housing, GPs, hospitals and social services

## Challenge 1: Reducing the impact of crime

We currently fund organisations providing the following services. What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?

Service Type	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority
68 Reduced involvement of young people (aged 11-24) in violent crime – with an emphasis on the prevention of involvement in gang culture, knife and gun crime: £200,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
67 Reduce the incidence & impact of hate crime through information campaigns, policy & good practice development work, community cohesion initiatives, & the provision of support services for victims of race & faith hate crime & homophobic crime: £200,000 per annum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
79a Engagement and involvement of disadvantaged groups (that experience high victimisation levels), to reduce crime and its impact: £200,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
80 Reduce youth offending and anti-social behaviour among young people (aged 11-24) through diversionary activities: £300,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
70 Reduction of violent behaviour through domestic violence perpetrator programmes £100,000 per annum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
72 Provide domestic violence education and preventative initiatives to help children and young people to defuse conflict and reduce violence, particularly gender-based violence: £180,000 per annum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
42 Increase access to refuge-based services and appropriate gender-specific hostel & supported housing options for women & children: £450,000 per annum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
43 Increase access to services for women with no recourse to public funds to enable them to exit domestic violence or prostitution: £150,000 per annum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
59 Interventions for children and young people involved in or at risk of sexual exploitation: £200,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
59a Treatment service for children and young people who have experienced sexual exploitation £135,000 per annum funded by MPS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
60 Counselling and psychotherapy support for those affected by domestic violence or rape and sexual abuse to improve access to services and knowledge of rights and promotion of safe choices, emotional health and well-being: £570,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
61&63 Advice, outreach, referral & drop-in services for those affected by domestic violence or rape & sexual abuse to improve access to services & knowledge of rights & promotion of safe choices, emotional health & well-being: £1,000,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
62 Interventions to improve outcomes for children and young people who have witnessed domestic violence: £300,000 per annum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
65 Provide routes out of prostitution and the associated violence and abuse through outreach, counselling and support and advice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Service Type	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority
for women: £200,000 per annum			
69 Support to children and young people who have experienced sexual abuse: £200,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
78 Second tier support for local victim support services: £150,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
101 Second tier support to the following community safety frontline services numbered 67, 79a, 80: £70,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
107 Second tier support to the following violence against women & children frontline services numbered 43, 59, 60, 61, 63, 62, 65, 69, 70 and 72: £180,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Services 68 and 80

ROTA's 2006 – 2008 youth-led research project 'Building Bridges'<sup>21</sup>, which explored serious youth offending in London, found that weapon carrying and gangs are a concern for most of the young people who took part in the project and affects them to varying degrees. Additionally, it reported significant disproportionality in the number of black Caribbean victims and perpetrators of serious youth violence in London, as well as those young people who were not born in the UK. As such we have identified services 68 and 80 as a high priority.

The Building Bridges research provides a valuable insight as to *why* many young people in London are choosing to arm themselves and/or join gangs; and presents a series of recommendations from the young participants themselves for effective preventative solutions. It highlights the key role played by BAME organisations in these solutions because of their invaluable links to affected communities and their understanding of the inequality and disadvantage that can lead young people to arming themselves and participating in gangs. Additionally, the project highlighted the benefits of youth-led projects in addressing issues of concern to young people; both in terms of developing informed and relevant policy, but also by enabling young people to develop confidence and skills. We recommend London Councils read the report from this award winning project<sup>22</sup> in developing the specifications for these services and ensure that some of them are delivered by BAME organisations. Additionally, we recommend that London Councils consider the work of Independent Academic Research Studies on youth empowerment<sup>23</sup>.

ROTA's current FVV project<sup>24</sup>, which we include a case-study about later, is highlighting the distinctive impact serious youth violence is having on many BAME women and girls. To date, this has largely been ignored by policymakers and service providers leaving many unmet needs, which should be addressed under Challenge 2. As such, we recommend that London Councils consider the final report in develop specifications for these services from this project which will be launched on 24<sup>th</sup> February. We would be delighted if interested staff and members of London Councils would attend the launch event, which

<sup>21</sup> More information about this project is available on the projects pages of ROTA's website at [http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV\\_BBP.aspx](http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV_BBP.aspx). The final report will be available from the end of February from the publications pages of ROTA's website at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk).

<sup>22</sup> Building Bridges won the London Peace award in 2008.

<sup>23</sup> To find out more about IARS please visit <http://www.iars.org.uk/>.

<sup>24</sup> More information about this project is available on the projects pages of ROTA's website at [http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV\\_BBP.aspx](http://www.rota.org.uk/pages/FVV_BBP.aspx). The final report will be available from the end of February from the publications pages of ROTA's website at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk).

illustrates the key role of frontline and policy and voice BAME organisations in addressing inequality.<sup>25</sup>

## Service 67

### Hate crime

ROTA's research<sup>26</sup> into hate crime and restorative justice identified that in 2006/7, "the most commonly reported hate crime in London was racist crime (9,976), followed by homophobic crime (1,184 incidents) and faith crimes (696 incidents)". While it is encouraging that such incidents are being reported to the police, this level of victimisation remains a concern. For these reasons, we have identified service 67 as a high priority.

With the enforcement approach that is being taken in response to youth violence, and policy responses to terrorism, ROTA's is finding that confidence in the criminal justice system is waning among BAME communities, and they will continue to be victimised without the support of state institutions. This highlights the importance for work by the VCS, including by BAME organisations, to address the impact of hate crime, and test and deliver innovative solutions to it.

### Community cohesion

Community cohesion was identified as the number one concern of those who participated in our 2009 consultation. While participants generally considered it important for relationships between diverse communities to be strong, this was not their main community cohesion related concern. Rather, they were concerned about the links between inequality and tension where it exists and felt that addressing inequality is a prerequisite to cohesion. Additionally, there was concern about the statutory policy around community cohesion that has been developing over recent years; particularly that too often empowerment and cohesion objectives are pursued by statutory agencies at the expense of equality,<sup>27</sup> by ignoring diverse needs and undermining BAME organisations. There was concern that cohesion debates have created a false dichotomy between 'bonding' and 'bridging', misunderstanding that bonding for marginalised communities is a prerequisite to bridging as has been evidenced<sup>28</sup>. Finally, there was concern about the apparent lack of understanding by statutory agencies of the potential role of BAME organisations in strengthening community relations by acting a bridge between often isolated communities and others. These concerns echoed the considerable response by BAME and other equality sectors to Communities and Local Government's 2008 consultation on its proposed Cohesion Guidance for Funders<sup>29</sup>. As such, we feel these concerns should be considered in developing service specifications which should ensure appropriate balance between bridging and bonding activities and the need to build equality as a prerequisite to cohesion.

---

<sup>25</sup> To find out more about this event or to request additions to the waiting list please contact Liz Carr at ROTA on 020 7902 1177 or e: liz@rota.org.uk .

<sup>26</sup> ROTA (2008) *Addressing Hate Crime through Restorative Justice and cross sector partnerships: A London Study*

<sup>27</sup> See ROTA & HEAR (May 008) *Response to the CLG's consultation on 'Community cohesion Guidance for Funders'*.

<sup>28</sup> For example. See 'McGhee, D. (2003) *Moving to 'our' common ground: a critical examination of community cohesion discourse in twenty-first century Britain*. Sociological Review, 51, (3), 376-404', 'Temple, B. & Moran, R. (February 2005) *Learning to live together: Developing communities with dispersed refugee people seeking asylum*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation' and 'Mayor of London (July 2007) *London Enriched: The Mayor's Draft Strategy for Refugee Integration in London*. Greater London Authority.'

<sup>29</sup> Communities and Local Government (2009) *Cohesion Guidance for Funders. Summary of Responses*

## **Service 79a**

We have identified this service as a high priority because:

- Of the high levels of racist crime experienced by London's BAME communities.
- Much of ROTA's work<sup>30</sup> on crime, including our Transformative Justice Project, which is currently funded by London Councils, has highlighted the importance and effectiveness of involving victimised groups in responses to the crime they have experienced.
- This was a key recommendation from our Building Bridges and FVV projects, which highlight the importance of engaging groups, including young people and women, affected by serious youth offending and violence in developing effective recommendations for policy and practice.

Additionally, those who participated in our 2009 and 2010 consultations raised concerns about the role of the media in promoting negative attitudes towards certain BAME communities, which London Councils should consider under this service.

## **Services 59, 59a, 60, 61&63 and 69**

As outlined earlier, ROTA's FVV project has identified the significant unmet sexual health and related needs of many BAME women and girls as a result of association with gangs, which should be targeted through these services and which should include those delivered by BAME women's organisations. Again, in developing the specifications for these services we recommend that London Councils considers the final report from our FVV project.<sup>31</sup>

We have not considered prioritising any of the other services under this challenge as we do not have evidence to support our reasoning. However, in relation to service 42, we would like to direct London Councils to a recent report<sup>32</sup> by Imkaan about the crises facing the BAME women's refuge sector despite high-levels of need. This compares to the findings of ROTA's FVV project which sees BAME women and girls calling for support from BAME women's organisations.

Additionally, in relation to service 43, although we have not done specialist work around the 'no recourse to public funds' issue, we are aware that it is a significant concern for many of the BAME organisations that we work with. We were pleased with government's announcement last November for a pilot scheme for women experiencing domestic violence but who cannot access safe housing and support due to their insecure immigration status. This scheme will provide funding for a woman with 'no recourse to public funds' in a refuge for up to 40 days pending an application to remain in the UK under the Domestic Violence Rule. However, we feel the scheme is limited in comparison to the level of need and as such London Councils should continue its support for this service.

## **What other service areas should we consider funding under this challenge?**

We have no further comments in relation to this section.

---

<sup>30</sup> For example please see ROTA (2009) *Policy & Race. Issue 1. Transformative Justice*.

<sup>31</sup> For a copy of the report or to be added to the invitation list for the launch event at City Hall on 24 February please contact Liz Carr on 020 7902 1177 or e: [liz@rota.org.uk](mailto:liz@rota.org.uk).

<sup>32</sup> Imkaan (2008) *A Matter of Life and Death: the loss of specialist services for BAME women and children experience violence*

## Case study: BAME organisations strengthen community cohesion

### Enfield Saheli<sup>1</sup>

Enfield Saheli is an Asian Women's organisation, which runs a range of services, including group counselling and yoga classes. In order to continue to engage the most vulnerable it is important that the group counselling services remain exclusively for Asian women who would be less likely to use them if they were open to all and who would be highly unlikely to use mainstream third or statutory sector services.

The yoga classes, on the other hand, are open to all women and are having a positive impact on community cohesion in the locality. The organisation engages the most marginalised Asian women, building their self esteem and then enables them to mix with other women, for example, through the yoga classes.

## Challenge 3: Creating an environmentally sustainable London

We currently fund organisations providing the following services. What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?

Service Type	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
12 Second tier support to increase community engagement and participation in local and regional planning & policy development: £160,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14 Second tier support to improve accessible transport services: £100,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23 Promote more sustainable forms of transport, including cycling and walking: £310,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
55 Promote energy efficiency, use of renewable energy and water conservation: £310,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
56 Facilitate green procurement, waste minimisation, reuse and recycling: £207,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

As mentioned, as the environment is not one of ROTA's policy priorities we do not feel qualified to consider in detail the services proposed under Challenge 3. However, we are aware that London's BAME communities are disproportionately impacted on by damaging environments. Those who responded to our 2010 survey expressed concerns about the concentration of London's BAME communities in deprived areas, which are often neglected, with poor quality housing, street lighting, play areas and so on. We recommend that any services commissioned include targeted action to address these inequalities.

**What other service areas should we consider funding under this challenge?**

No further comment.

## Challenge 4: Increasing prosperity and helping the poorest Londoners lift their lives out of poverty

We currently fund organisations providing the following services. What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?

Service Type	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
28 Increase access to affordable, quality childcare through supporting organisations working with employers, childcare providers and children and parents themselves: £120,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53 Services to tackle child poverty covering the London Child Poverty Commission's four key strands: labour market, housing and mobility, life chances 0-19 and mental health: £400,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1b Ensure that communities across London benefit from 2010 Olympic games - Volunteering activities £150,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5 Promote tourism across London £100,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13 Improve health and safety in the workplace and communities through information, advice and training, focusing on women, BME communities and trade unions: £110,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44 Day centre facilities for homeless people and people at risk of homelessness: £1,000,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46, 48 & 51 Provide an advice and representation service relating to discrimination and tribunal cases £860,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47 Specialist support & access to perm/temp accommodation for target groups - single homeless, ex-offenders, women affected by domestic violence, people with addiction problems: £1,570,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38 Improve access to advice for black & minority ethnic, refugee & migrant communities, in the fields of welfare rights, housing, immigration & asylum, health, education, & employment: £1,790,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50 Provide legal advice and representation across the various areas of social welfare law: £900,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10 Support and develop existing and emerging social enterprises: £450,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4 European Social Fund programme to improve employability and labour market entry: £2million (net of ESF grant - £4million gross) per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
103 Second tier support to the following homelessness frontline services numbered 42, 44, 47, and 52: £140,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
104 Second tier support to the following legal & advice frontline services numbered 38, 50, and 46/48/51: £140,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
106 Second tier support to the following frontline services numbered 4 & 53 tackling poverty: £260,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>



## **Service 53**

Poverty and social exclusion was identified as one of five of the main concerns of those who took part in ROTA's 2009 consultation. This is because of the disproportionate and detrimental impact these issues have on London's BAME communities as demonstrated by a 2009 City Parochial Foundation study.<sup>33</sup> It reported that the proportion of people living in poverty varies enormously by ethnic group. Whereas about 20-25% of people in white and Indian households live in poverty, this rises to 35% for black Caribbean, 50% for black African and Pakistani and 65% for Bangladeshi households. Higher levels of poverty are only partially accounted for by varying employment rates among different ethnic groups. Low pay is also a significant factor, with Pakistani and Bangladeshi employees far more likely to be paid less than £7.50 an hour than white or Indian employees. These facts have an obvious impact on child poverty levels.

In relation to mental health we refer back to relevant comments made in relation to service 75 proposed under Challenge 1.

For these reasons, we have identified service 53 as a high priority and recommend that those commissioned undertake targeted action to address the above inequalities and include BAME organisations.

## **Service 13**

Community safety, in a range of forms, including hate crime and serious youth violence, for reasons considered earlier, are of particular concern to BAME communities and as such we have identified this service as a high priority.

## **Services 44 and 47**

Although we have not prioritised service 44 and 47, because homelessness is not currently one of our policy priorities, we would like to refer London Councils to ROTA's 2005 - 2007 research on homelessness<sup>34</sup> in developing the specifications for the services. Our research reported that BAME people were over-represented among London's homeless population and are more likely to face complex problems and additional barriers in accessing appropriate services than other homeless people. It made a series of recommendations as to how to make services more accessible to BAME homeless people and highlighted the important role of BAME organisations in enabling this.

## **Services 46, 48 & 51 and 38**

BAME communities continue to face unequal treatment and outcomes in a range of key areas of life including employment, welfare rights, housing, immigration & asylum, education and health. Furthermore, these inequalities have been exacerbated by the recent recession which is disproportionately impacting on London's BAME communities.<sup>35</sup> This was highlighted by recent research<sup>36</sup>, which found that BAME people, and in particular younger people<sup>37</sup>, are faring the worst in terms of job losses as a result of the recession. This research reported that members of the black Caribbean and black African

---

<sup>33</sup> City Parochial Foundation (2009) *London's poverty profile*

<sup>34</sup> ROTA (2007) *The visible and hidden dimensions of London's homelessness: A Black, Asian and minority ethnic account.*

<sup>35</sup> See for example 'Muriel, A. & Sibieta, I (2009). *Living Standards during Previous Recessions.* IFS Briefing Notes No. 85';

<sup>36</sup> EHRC & GEO (December 2009) *Monitoring update on the impact of the recession on various demographic groups.*

<sup>37</sup> See also IPPR's analysis earlier this month on the latest available data from the Labour Force Survey which is available at <http://www.ippr.org.uk/pressreleases/?id=3846>.

community saw unemployment levels rise by 6.9 per cent – from 13.2 per cent in the first quarter of 2008, to 20.1 per cent in the third quarter of 2009. This compares with a 2.8 per cent rise in white unemployment, up from 4.8 per cent to 7.6 per cent, over the same period. The trend became even more marked in the six months that followed, with Asian and black Caribbean and African unemployment rising by 2.2 per cent and 4.4 per cent respectively, whilst white unemployment has risen by just 0.8 per cent. This has significant implications not only in terms of employment but also the other areas proposed under services 46, 48, 51 and 38.

As mentioned, ROTA and MiNet's work<sup>38</sup> on the recession are highlighting its disproportionate impact on BAME organisations. Not only are they less resilient than mainstream VCS organisations to the challenges posed by a recession, but this work is finding an increase in the demand for advice and debt services provided by BAME organisations, many of which are already over-capacity and finding it difficult to respond to the level of need.

Given the above, we have identified services 46, 48, 51 and 38 as high priority. Again, we recommend that services should undertake action targeted at the specific inequalities faced by BAME communities and include those delivered by BAME organisations.

### **What other service areas should we consider funding under this challenge?**

A number of those who responded to our 2010 consultation suggested a need for increased support for small BAME-led businesses, which London Councils should consider under this Challenge.

#### **Case studies: Addressing unemployment**

The value of the BAME third sector to firstly reach London's disadvantaged population, and thereafter deliver key services in an holistic fashion to address worklessness is unrivalled. This is highlighted by the work of LEAP which, after two years of people leaving its programme, 75% are still in work. Moreover a member organisation of Harrow Association of Somali Voluntary Organisations (HASVO) holds an impressive rate of moving six out of ten single Somali mothers into work. These achievements are explained by the unique relationship the organisation holds with the services users, which has provided culturally appropriate childcare and childcare training, not a one size fits all provision. Therefore ensuring people are capable and able to access the labour market and more importantly supported and encouraged to remain in the workforce, is fundamental to alleviating the continuing long term pressures of the recession.

---

<sup>38</sup> See for example, 'MiNet (2009) *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*. ROTA' and MiNet's webpages on ROTA's website at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk) which includes a number of recession related policy responses and briefings.

## Challenge 5: Ensuring everyone especially young people achieve their full potential

We currently fund organisations providing the following services. What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?

Service Type	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
19 Improving educational attainment of disadvantaged children & young people £580,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
30 Reduce bullying and its impact £170,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71 Support a helpline for children and young people to provide support, advice and signposting to children and young people in crisis in London: £230,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
81 Second tier service to promote and develop effective approaches to Muslim youth engagement £250,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7 Provide educational and participatory programmes/ activities in all art and culture forms for disadvantaged children and young people: £960,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52 Reduce youth homelessness through targeted prevention activities with at risk groups: £700,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25 Second tier support to promote play: £150,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
100 Second tier support to the following children and young people's frontline services numbered 19, 30, 68 and 71: £100,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Services 19 and 7

At present, black Caribbean, mixed white and black Caribbean, Traveller Irish and Roma Gypsy children have, on average, attainment rates below the national average. Furthermore, black Caribbean, mixed white and black Caribbean and black African children are more likely to be permanently excluded from mainstream education, and for reasons that their white peers may not be excluded for. Black Caribbean and black African children are more likely to be placed in lower tiered classes and be entered into lower-tiered examination papers.<sup>39</sup> Additionally many BAME families and particularly refugee and migrant families face difficulties in navigating the British education system which impacts on the quality of education they receive.

All of the above has been confirmed by research conducted by ROTA over the past two decades. Our seminal book, *Inclusive Schools, Inclusive Society*<sup>40</sup> highlighted these issues as barriers to an inclusive education system, which offered equal chances to all BAME groups. It is concerning that 10 years on from its publication both a recent ROTA consultation and a workshop held at the sixth London Schools and the Black Child Conference raised these as persistent concerns.

<sup>39</sup> Department for Education and Skills (2006a) *Ethnicity and Education: The evidence on minority ethnic pupils aged 5 – 16*. London: DFES; Department for Education and Skills (2006b) *Permanent and Fixed Exclusions from Schools and Exclusion Appeals in England 2004/5*. London: DFES

<sup>40</sup> ROTA (1999) *Inclusive Schools, Inclusive Society*

At present, government's Back on Track programme<sup>41</sup>, which aims to develop and improve alternative provision than schools, fails to respond to these educational inequalities, or acknowledge the disproportionate representation of BAME young people within pupil referral units.

In relation to art and culture, some participants in our January focus group on London Councils' commissioning priorities, felt that promoting heritage was particularly important during times of economic difficulties. The reason for this is that meeting equality objectives may not be thought of as a priority as attention in public authorities will be directed to other areas and corners may be cut. It was therefore felt that BAME organisations are well placed to ensure addressing and understanding aspects of diversity and some focus should be placed on this.

For these reasons, those who participated in ROTA's 2009 consultation identified education as one of five key concerns for London's BAME communities. As such we have identified services 19 and 7 as high priority.

Again, commissioned services should undertake action targeted at the specific educational inequalities faced by BAME communities and include those delivered by BAME organisations, as well as supplementary schools. Supplementary schools play a vital role in addressing educational inequalities, particularly in London. The services provided by them range from the national curriculum at GCSE levels through to cultural studies and mother tongue and English language classes including ESOL. The benefits to London that supplementary schools provide include that of contributing to social cohesion, both within communities through fostering positive intergenerational relationships and between diverse communities, raising educational achievement levels and strengthening cultural, ethnic and British identities. While supplementary schools may be delivered in local areas, they often draw pupils from all over London and as such should be funded by London Councils in certain instances.

## **Service 52**

Although we have not prioritised this service, because homelessness is not one of our policy priorities or areas of expertise, we would like to refer back to our comments made in relation to services 44 & 47 which are also relevant to service 52.

## **What other service areas should we consider funding under this challenge?**

A number of those who responded to our 2010 consultation suggested a need for support for BAME parents as a way of ensuring BAME children and young people are enabled to fulfil their potential, which BAME young people should consider under this Challenge.

---

<sup>41</sup> To find out more please visit <http://www.teachernet.gov.uk/wholeschool/behaviour/altprov/>.

## Challenge 6: Promoting stronger more empowered and cohesive communities; and increasing levels of participation in London's public life and cultural activities

We currently fund organisations providing the following services. What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?

Service Type	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
1a Ensure that communities across London benefit from 2012 Olympic games - Cultural activities £300,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6 Promote access to cultural activities across London: £1,000,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3 Second tier support to improve access to cultural activities for disabled people: £110,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9 Promote access and participation in carnival activities and regionally important outdoor events £120,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17 Undertake policy work and campaign/lobby for the Legal and advice sector £250,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27 Undertake policy work and campaign/lobby for the Disability sector £285,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29 Undertake policy work and campaign/lobby for the Older people sector £230,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31 Undertake policy work and campaign/lobby for the Black, Minority Ethnic, Migrant and Refugee (BMER) voluntary sector: £500,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33 Undertake policy work and campaign/lobby for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender community organisations: £100,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34 Undertake policy work and campaign/lobby for the women's sector: £300,000 per annum	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
76 Co-ordinate engagement of London's voluntary sector with city-wide policy, governance and funding structures: £300,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
105 Second tier support to the following culture and Olympic frontline services numbered 1, 6, and 7: £140,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

### Service 31

BAME communities and their organisations are under-represented in various forms of democracy as both a cause and affect of inequality, as the following facts and figures demonstrate:

- At the end of 2005, there were 74 Members of Parliament (MPs) in London. Only seven per cent come from BAME backgrounds.<sup>42</sup>
- London has 1,861 borough councillors. In 2004 only 20 per cent of these were from BAME backgrounds. Only 12 per cent of the 33 London boroughs had a leader from a BAME background.<sup>43</sup>

<sup>42</sup> Greater London Authority (2007) *The State of Equality in London*. London Equalities Commission.

<sup>43</sup> Ibid

- Nationally, in 2005, 24 per cent of the black community were not registered to vote compared with only six per cent of the white community.<sup>44</sup>
- In 2006 only 21 per cent of the 198 Community Empowerment Networks (CEN) representatives in London were from BAME communities.<sup>45</sup>
- Nationally only one third of LSP boards have a BAME member. The lack of monitoring by LSPs on the ethnic make up of their members makes it difficult to take action to address this under-representation.<sup>46</sup>

Participants in ROTA's January research, which specifically related to London Councils' current consultation, highlighted the importance of regional, sub-regional and local BAME policy and voice support to address this under-representation. Participants felt that if London Councils withdrew funding for service 31, BAME communities would not be adequately represented in London, particularly at a regional level. Those who took part in our focus group identified the following important aspects of this type of policy and voice support:

- Breaking down policy initiatives to small groups to understand and encourage their engagement in policymaking processes and to ensure their organisations are better equipped to withstand policy changes.
- Gathering evidence from BAME communities about their assets and aspirations and using it to inform policy and service development at local, regional and national levels.
- Supporting other BAME organisations with less experience to influence policy and engage with democratic structures and processes.
- Raising awareness among policymakers and service providers about the value of engaging with and listening to BAME organisations in policy and service development.

The findings of our January research confirms those of many other related studies<sup>47</sup>, and as such, we have identified service 31 as a high priority. We feel it is particularly important that London Councils continues to fund service 31 because of the uncertainty about the continuation of Capacitybuilders' funds for regional BAME networks considered earlier.

In order to further illustrate the impact of regional BAME policy and voice organisations, the remainder of this section includes some feedback from the BAME third sector and other relevant parties about how valuable ROTA's policy and voice services are. Additionally, we have included case studies about two of our current policy projects.

As ROTA's work has had wide ranging impact in terms of outcomes intended by London Councils for service 31, we have only included a snap shot here. However, we refer

---

<sup>44</sup> Ibid.

<sup>45</sup> Women's Resource Centre (September 2006) *The Women's Voluntary and Community Sector. Briefing by the Women's Resource Centre.*

<sup>46</sup> BTEG BME Policy Matters, Issue 1. BME Third Sector Providers & The Criminal Justice System. Black Training and Enterprise Group.

<sup>47</sup> For example HEAR's 2008 report 'Gaps & solutions: Supporting London's equality sectors', NEP's 2008 report, 'Supporting Equality Groups: An overview of support to the diverse third sector in England' and Voice for Change England's 2008 report 'Bridge the Gap: What is known about the BME Third Sector in England' which found that regional BAME policy and voice organisations were generally a very effective way of addressing the impact of the under-representation of BAME in local, regional as well as national democratic structures and processes.

London Councils to ROTA's monitoring reports from services funded through 31 over the years for a more comprehensive picture and would be happy to answer any further questions.

### **Feedback about ROTA's policy and voice services**

As part of the research phase of the development of ROTA's new communications and engagement strategy, stakeholders from a range of organisations were interviewed by an independent consultant. The findings demonstrated that knowledge and awareness of ROTA as an organisation working with and for BAME organisations was high, as was knowledge of its policy and research work. The following quotes from those who were interviewed demonstrated this:

*"A very effective policy-based organisation that is in the front rank of promoting issues of diversity and equality at the policy level."* (London BAME VCS)

*"They are London's BME policy body. They have a great deal of experience in this field and keep abreast of policy developments and through MiNet with the broader BME community."* (London public sector)

*"It's a policy and research body that works in partnership with others to try to achieve its aims. I'm inspired by their work."* (National/BAME Policy Body)

*"I know them for challenging racism and hate crime, for helping community workers and community groups to become aware of the issues."* (London BAME VCS)

*"I would say that ROTA is an organisation on the climb...we don't have any worries about their ability to deliver."* (National Public Sector)

In terms of ROTA's work to campaign for issues that matter to the BAME VCS, several of our publications were singled out as being relevant, useful and informative, in particular:

- Our monthly policy e-newsletter
- Regular policy briefings
- Our bi-annual 'Agenda' magazine

(All of which are funded by London Councils.)

One interviewee commented about these publications that: *"They're high quality and (I) would miss them if they weren't produced, especially the transformative justice newsletter and policy bulletin."* (London BAME VCS)

ROTA's commitment to representing the views of, and issues concerning, a wide variety of marginalised groups was also highlighted by some of those interviewed:

*"ROTA is not just about racial equality, but about a range of equality issues that affect BAME communities as they affect everyone else - gender, disability, sexuality, religion, etc."* (Regional network)

*"I'd say that they're an organisation that's prepared to stand up wherever they see inequalities, not just on race."* (London public sector)



ROTA is also well known for housing MiNet, the London regional minority network, and for using this 'network of networks' to inform policy development and campaign activity and provide a voice for these organisations. The close link with MiNet enables ROTA to strengthen the voice of BAMER communities.

The research found that ROTA is also well known for its events and networking, in order to involve, include and strengthen the voice of the BAMER voluntary sector across a range of policy issues.

*"I find their events useful and well run. They usually have a good variety of attendees and speakers, which is a good thing."* (London public sector)

### **Case-study: ROTA's Female Voice in Violence project<sup>1</sup>**

FVV considers the impact of serious youth and gang violence on women and girls. To date, policy on the subject has focused on boys and young men, ignoring the distinctive female experience. As such, women and girls that are gang associated have resultant health and related needs that are not being met. FVV has found, for example, that young women and girls who are associated with gangs are at risk of sexual violence. Those who have been victimised are unlikely to take up generic health services, including those provided by Haven and Rape Crisis Centres, because of concerns around their independence from the state and subsequently that they will be reported to the police because their experiences are gang related.

With considerable impact, through this project, ROTA has been drawing the attention of regional and national policy makers, and local service providers, to this previously ignored issue, the impact of which extends beyond this particularly vulnerable group and well into future generations. For example, the following changes are clearly attributable to ROTA as the only agency with evidence about and raising these specific issues:

- Changes to the GLA strategy to end violence against women, 'The Way Forward', which now recognises and responds to this specific type of violence which disproportionately impacts on young BAME women and girls. Having gained a seat on the GLA's Violence against Women Panel, we remain actively involved in the development, implementation and monitoring of this strategy.
- Changes to the GLA's thinking and strategy on serious youth violence, which is now viewed as a violence against women and girls issue.
- The prioritisation of young people by the Metropolitan Police Service (MPS) Rape and Sexual Violence Reference Group, which previously only focused on adults.

At a local level, ROTA has seen the following developments in relation to practice:

- Enfield Youth Offending Service has commissioned gender-specific work related to serious youth violence, and both the police service and schools in the borough have contacted ROTA for support in taking work on gender and serious youth violence forward.
- Islington has begun to re-assess their intelligence on serious youth violence based on a gendered understanding of the issue.
- Southwark is reporting successful multi-agency work to safely disrupt the actions of girl only gangs.
- Lewisham has set up a girls and gangs steering group, to build upon the work of a forum which they have been running for the past year.
- Lambeth are seeking to gender-proof the work they conduct on serious youth violence in the coming year.

Additionally, following calls from the women and girls who have participated in our project, we are highlighting the vital role of BAME women's organisations in responding to these unmet needs, both by bringing young women and girls who have been victimised to generic services, and in supporting the services to develop the expertise needed to appropriately respond to their complex needs.

### **Case-study: The ROTA-led Winning the Race Coalition<sup>1</sup>**

After listening closely to the concerns of the BAME sector during our work over the last few years around the Discrimination Law Review and the establishment of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) about the potential dilution of protection against inequality and discrimination for BAME groups, ROTA established the Winning the Race Coalition in February 2009. This Coalition, comprised of BAME and other equality organisations, aims to ensure the concerns of the sector shape the development of the Single Equality Bill, which is now going through parliament, and to prepare the sector for its enactment. The Coalition, which has gained significant profile and been established as *the* expert body on race equality issues in relation to the Bill among the BAME third sector and policymakers, has had considerable success. Following policy development work including meetings with the Equalities Minister Michael Foster, the Solicitor General, a series of meetings with the Chair of EHRC and several submissions and an oral evidence session at the House of Commons, ROTA has seen several significant changes to the Bill for the benefit of BAME communities, including: the broadening of the definition of a public authority, the broadening of the scope of the Bill, the inclusion of positive discrimination, and measures to address multiple discrimination.

### **The success of ROTA's projects is because they were undertaken by a BAME policy and voice organisation**

It is unlikely that the above projects would have had such wide reaching impact if carried out by any one other than a BAME specific policy and voice organisation because:

- We have access to and the trust of BAME communities and find out about sensitive issues that other organisations are unlikely to hear about. Through the FVV project, for example, we listened to the experiences of 300 BAME women and girls in London who are at risk of, or have been affected by, their gang association.
- We are closely connected to and informed by London's grass-roots BAME organisations, through MiNet, London's only regional BAME organisation, which is housed at ROTA.
- We are led by and for London's BAME communities and have a commitment to ensuring that issues of importance to them are addressed.
- We have years of experience working in the field of race equality, qualifying us to propose effective solutions and recommendations to such issues.

### **Service 76**

In addition to service 31 we have prioritised service 76 because we have valued from some of the services currently provided through it, particularly networking opportunities with London's wider third sector. We have not prioritised any of the other services included under this challenge as we have no evidence of their impact on our members. However, we have good relationships with many of those currently funded and believe the work they do plays an important role in addressing the inequalities faced by many of London's diverse communities.

### **What other service areas should we consider funding under this challenge?**

We have no further comments.

## 7. We also support 3<sup>rd</sup> Sector capacity building and currently fund organisations providing the following services

What priority do you think we should give to the continued support of these service areas?

Service Type	High Priority	Medium Priority	Low Priority
15 Provide community accountancy services for voluntary organisations across London: £590,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16 Provide sub-regional co-ordination and network management of the London network of local CVSs, and regional coordination and network management of the wider voluntary and community sector infrastructure: £500,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20 Improve the knowledge and skills of the voluntary sector in premises management through second tier support: £100,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21 Improve the use of Information and Communication Technology by front-line voluntary organisations through second tier support: £100,000 per annum	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

We have not considered the need for second-tier or capacity building services here or in relation to any of the Challenges because we have no concrete evidence of their benefit to London's BAME sector. However, we do feel that good quality infrastructure is invaluable to BAME organisations as confirmed by many of those who took part in our January consultation that specifically related to London Councils' commissioning priorities. We have done considerable work<sup>48</sup> around the particular support needs of BAME organisations, which we hope London Councils will consider in assessing the need for capacity building and second-tier support services and in developing specifications that are responsive to all the needs of London's diverse VCS.

BAME organisations have many general support needs in common with other similar sized frontline organisations. Those that were identified as high priority by those who participated in our 2010 consultation related to: evaluation and demonstrating impact; ICT including knowledge and data management; strategic planning, fundraising and finance; governance and leadership; quality assurance; human resources; and communications. These can often be met by generic capacity building or second-tier support providers that proactively engage with BAME organisations and provide responsive services. However, this type of good quality support is patchy across London leaving many BAME organisations, in particular smaller ones, without adequate support which impacts on their efficiency and ability to serve and advocate on behalf of their communities. CVSs appear to be the main providers of general support to BAME organisations locally, but only 65% of BAME organisations access support from CVSs and say it fully or almost fully meets their

<sup>48</sup> See for example 'HEAR (2008) *Gaps & solutions: Supporting London's equality sectors*. ROTA' & 'MiNet (2009) *The Economic Downturn and the Black, Asian and minority ethnic (BAME) third sector*. ROTA.

needs.<sup>49</sup> HEAR's 2008 report<sup>50</sup> identified typical barriers BAME organisations face in accessing suitable support which included:

- Generic support organisations, because of the growing emphasis on '*empowering*' groups and lack of resources, not providing the intensive support required by many BAME organisations, particularly smaller ones which make up most of the BAME sector.
- Generic support providers not 'reaching out' to BAME organisations, with the latter left unaware of the support they could potentially be receiving.
- Language and cultural barriers.
- Generic support organisations automatically referring BAME organisations to specialist BAME support organisations for more general support which the former could have provided.

Additionally BAME organisations have many distinct support needs, arising from the specialist nature of their work, that are not widely understood by generic support organisations. Some examples of such support needs, which are more effectively met by specialist support organisations, include support on:

- How to work with refugee women facing domestic violence and without recourse to public funds because of holding spouse visas;
- How to enable rape crises centres to respond to the complex needs of young BAME women who have experienced sexual violence as a result of their gang association
- Obligatory quality standards for giving immigration advice;
- The 2002 Local Government Association Guidelines on faith groups and community action, which recommend that a local authority's preference for faith groups to establish separate legal entities or semi-independent structures '*should not be rigidly imposed*'.

HEAR's 2008 report found that under-investment in BAME capacity building and second-tier support organisations meant that many BAME organisations were left with unmet specialist support needs. This confirmed the finding of a 2004 report<sup>51</sup> that only 38% of BAME organisations access specialist BAME support which meets their needs fully or a lot as well as MiNet's recent work on the impact of the recession on the BAME sector.

Many of the reports that have been produced about the support needs of BAME organisations have recommended partnerships between generic and BAME support providers (including specialist policy and voice organisations) to enable the former to develop services that 'reach' BAME organisations. The effectiveness of this type of collaboration is demonstrated by a partnership between ROTA and LVSC (London Voluntary Services Council), which has enabled the latter to deliver its '*Ready Steady Start*' programme, which provides start-up support to emerging and new groups, to BAME organisations. The majority of course attendees are now BAME organisations.

---

<sup>49</sup> Needham, J. and Barclay, J. (2004) *Infrastructure for BAME organisations in London*. Government Office for London.

<sup>50</sup> HEAR (2008) *Gaps & solutions: Supporting London's equality sectors*. ROTA'

<sup>51</sup> Needham, J. and Barclay, J. (2004) *Infrastructure for BAME organisations in London*. Government Office for London.

London Councils should respond to these recommendations in developing the priorities for the next commissioning round and the service specifications.

#### **4. More questions about the services we currently fund...**

There are a range of additional considerations we need to take into account when determining future priorities. We would welcome any views you may have on the following. If you have any background information to support your views, it would be helpful to us if you could make reference to this in your response below.

**1. Are there any services that you feel are less of a priority for London Councils funding because, for example, they are now covered by statutory provision etc?**

No comment.

**2. Are there any services where you consider the level of current funding to be too low to have a real impact? Should there be a minimum level of funding for a prioritised service?**

We feel London Councils should consider monitoring returns in order to determine the answer to this question. Additionally, we refer back to our introductory comments about the need to ensure a focus on inequality and continued support for BAME organisations through this fund.

**3. Are there any services which are currently really important elements of London Councils funding but would be far more effective if better resourced?**

No comment.

**4. We currently fund 59 service areas. Do you think that there is scope for merging any of those areas, and if so, which ones?**

No comment.

**5. London Councils is committed to ensuring services are accessible to all.**

**Are there any services that you consider have particular access issues for the following groups?**

Age, gender, disability, race/ethnicity, sexuality & religion

No comment.

**6. Are there particular equality groups that our funded services should particularly target? Please specify.**

BAME people, because of the range of inequalities and discrimination they continue to face, should be a particular target of all funded services. This is particularly important at the current time when BAME people are facing a range of additional and complex challenges caused by the recession.

Furthermore, BAME people belonging to additional equality groups (for example, older and younger BAME people, disabled BAME people, BAME women and girls, LGBT BAME people, BAME people of particular religions and beliefs and refugees and migrants), who face multiple disadvantages, should be targeted through commissioned services.

## 5. London Councils Grants: Adding value

Our funding complements many of the services provided by London boroughs. We want to know your views on this important aspect. If you have any background information to support your views, it would be helpful to us if you could make reference to this in your response below.

NB: These questions are principally targeted at respondents from statutory bodies and voluntary organisations - if you do not want to answer them please move on to the next section.

### **1. To what extent do you think that the services currently funded by London Councils add value and complement the work of the London boroughs, Metropolitan Police, NHS and other statutory agencies?**

Currently funded projects add value to the work of all local statutory agencies by responding to the needs of those who 'fall through the net' and do not take up mainstream public services. Examples have been given throughout this report which highlight how BAME organisations do this.

BAME policy and voice organisations further complement this role in many ways. For example, ROTA's high quality policy responses, which influence regional policy development (see early examples), in turn informs the work of local statutory agencies which are supported in making their services more accessible and responsive to the needs of London's BAME communities. Additionally, ROTA engages supportively with a range of regional statutory bodies that have influence over local statutory agencies through representation on their advisory bodies or by bringing them together through forums.

For example, members of the Transformative Justice Forum, which is hosted by ROTA and funded by London Councils, include representatives of the Crown Prosecution Service, the Metropolitan Police Association, the Association of Chief Police Officers, London Probation, Government Office for London and the Home Office. This Forum provides members with support on responses to hate crime in London, in particular through the use of restorative and transformative justice techniques.

### **2. Are there any elements of the currently funded services that you consider to be duplicating the work of the London boroughs, Metropolitan Police, NHS and other statutory agencies?**

The services currently provided that target BAME communities are, in many cases, responding to needs that mainstream public services providers are failing to meet. As such, we do not feel they are duplicating the work of the above agencies.

#### **2.1 Are there areas of voluntary sector provision we currently support which are an insignificant contribution when compared with public sector provision?**

No comment.



**3. Which of the services that we currently fund do you consider results in cost savings to the work of London boroughs, the Metropolitan Police, NHS and other statutory agencies? What is the extent of these savings?**

Although we have not had the capacity to gather robust evidence, these case studies we have collected indicate the probability that BAME organisations save the above agencies significant sums. We suggest London Councils undertake an economic analysis as part of the process of preparing for the upcoming funding period to substantiate this belief.

Additionally, a number of studies from other equality sectors have highlighted the economic benefits of community-based services which we believe would also be applicable to those provided by BAME organisations. For example:

- A 2006 study<sup>52</sup> published by the Women's Resource Centre proved women's organisations represent a return on funding of 385%.
- A 2007 evaluation<sup>53</sup> of the Evolve Project, which is based at a women's organisation and supports female offenders, compared its cost of support for 250 women a year at £222,000 to the cost of keeping one woman in custody at £77,000 per year.
- A 2008 study<sup>54</sup> by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation recommended that local authorities increasingly move towards low-cost but high impact community projects in addressing poverty and reducing public spending.

(Please also see response to question 1 directly above.)

**4. Which services do you think result in cost savings because they are funded at a London-wide level rather than single borough funding? What is the extent of those savings?**

See response to the next question.

**5. What makes the services we currently fund, or one's you may have identified as being a future priority, suited to being commissioned on either a London-wide or sub-regional basis rather than at a local level?**

It makes sense for the services we have identified as high priority to be delivered over areas larger than a borough for many reasons, for example because:

- Some of them respond to the needs of a minority group who may not make up critical mass in a local area.
- We have proposed services that are not currently being met by local statutory agencies.
- In relation to service 31, as demonstrated, there is a particular need for this function at a regional level.

---

<sup>52</sup> Matrix Research and Consultancy (2006) *The economic and social impact of the women's voluntary and community sector - a pilot study*. The Women's Resource Centre.

<sup>53</sup> NACRO (2007) *Evaluating the evolve project, Interim Report, Prisons and Resettlement Research*.

<sup>54</sup> Arradone, G. (2008). *What role for community enterprises in tackling poverty*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York.

**6. What do you consider would be the impact of withdrawing funding from any of the services that London Councils currently supports?**

We would have particular concerns about withdrawing funding for services 75, 67, 13, 46, 48, 51, 38, and 31, which are the only services that explicitly address the discrimination and inequality faced by BAME communities. In particular, we would be concerned about withdrawing or reducing funding for service 31 which, as demonstrated earlier, is critical to addressing the under-representation of BAME communities in democratic structures and processes.

**7. What do you consider the impact would be of withdrawing funding from any of the services we currently support - in particular, the potential for an adverse impact upon the key equalities areas of age, gender, disability, race/ethnicity, sexuality or religion?**

See response to question 6 above.

## **6. The recession and the wider funding environment**

The recession is affecting the demand for services provided by the voluntary sector and the ability of funders to resource those services.

**1. Are there services we should prioritise to meet the challenges posed by the longer-term impact of the recession on Londoners?**

As considered earlier, the recession has had a disproportionate impact on London's BAME communities. It has affected not only levels of unemployment but is also beginning to exacerbate a range of other inequalities.

As such, services that target those most affected by the recession should be prioritised. In order to lessen the future impact of the recession, this should not only include services around employment, social welfare, debt and so on, but also address associated inequalities such as in health and education, which will enable BAME communities to be more resilient to the impact of the recession in years to come.

MiNet<sup>55</sup>, the regional BAME network housed at ROTA, has done considerable work around the recession which London Councils should consider while developing its commissioning programme for the forthcoming period.

**2. Are there proposed changes to the funding environment for a particular service (for example, due to reductions or increases in the levels of resources from public bodies and charitable trusts) that you think we should consider when setting our future priorities?**

Some potential changes which may impact on funding for the third sector include the following:

---

<sup>55</sup> To find out more about MiNet and to read its recession-related publications, please visit the MiNet webpages on ROTA's website at [www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk).

- The uncertainty about the continuity of support from Capacitybuilders for regional BAME networks, including MiNet.
- Conservative policy in relation to the third sector, which is likely to have a negative impact on resources available for second-tier services including policy and voice and capacity building services.
- Conservative statements around funding for work by the third sector to address 'social breakdown' could indicate an acceleration of the move away from resourcing BAME organisations to address specific inequalities.

This response was produced in partnership with MiNet:



© 2010 Race on the Agenda

### targeting social policy

An organisation investing in sustainable future  
Printed on Greencoat Offset – 100% recycled fibre, Totally Chlorine Free (TCF). bio-degradable and NAPM recycled certification

---

### Race on the Agenda

Units 217 & 303  
Waterloo Business Centre  
117 Waterloo Road  
London SE1 8UL, UK

t: +44 (0) 20 7902 1177  
e: [rota@rota.org.uk](mailto:rota@rota.org.uk)

---

Registered Charity: 1064975  
Company Limited by Guarantee: 3425664

---

[www.rota.org.uk](http://www.rota.org.uk)