



## Active Inclusion Learning Network Troubled Families Transnational Event 9-10 April 2014, London.

### **Report on Sub-Theme: [\[Long term unemployment\]](#)**

**Author: [\[Giovanna Mangano - ISFOL\]](#)**

#### **1. The 5 good practices selected for the Peer Review Meetings and 3 more spare practices are:**

The practices to be debated during Platform2 meetings were selected taking into account the 8 top points identified on day one: innovative points, learning points, critical factors, aspects to be transferred (see tables 2-3-4-5 for details on the top points).

Participants were split again in 4 groups each of one scored the 10 surveys coming out with the highest score from the day before. The new marking process was based on the 8 top criteria listed in the above mentioned tables, thus the new assessment was based on a revised score of 0 to 8. Specifically practices received one point for each of the top points they contained. What was remarkable, was the different point of view of the 4 groups of experts on practices so that in some cases the same practice received very different scores. Such cases were debated with participants in order to work out an average and agree on the final score. Furthermore since most of the questionnaires came from UK, in order to assure a view as European as possible the selection process attached a specific attention to the countries where the experiences took place and the social-economic contexts where they were implemented. Nevertheless participants did not lose sight of the value of each practice.

On the basis of this selection process, following the 5 best practices and further 3 spare practices (SP) selected by participants for the Peer Review Meeting. For each practice the final mark is indicated. Please note that some practices received the same score.

#### **Best practices:**

- 1. TF.MGU16**  
Title of the intervention: "Growing Lives"  
Organization: Derventio Housing Trust  
Country: **UK**  
Score: **7**

2. **TF.MGU3**  
 Title of the intervention: "WAW trajectory. An integrated approach to work, poverty and welfare "  
 Organization: Vierdewereldgroep Mensen voor Mensen (or Fourth World Group People for People)  
 Country: **Belgium**  
**Score: 6**
  
3. **TF.MGU14**  
 Title of the intervention: "Supporting People: Housing Support Programme"  
 Organization: city of Birmingham  
 Country: **UK**  
**Score: 6**
  
4. **TF.MGU29**  
 Title of the intervention: "Choices Plus"  
 Organization: Gingerbread NI  
 Country: **Northern Ireland, UK**  
**Score:5**
  
5. **TF.MGU17**  
 Title of the intervention: Social Cooperative Enterprise - SCE "I Change"  
 Organization: "Integration through Local Cooperation" - DP ENTOS  
 Country: **Greece**  
**Score:5**

**Spare practices:**

- SP1) **TF.MGU25**  
 Title of the intervention: "Restart 2 Transfer of Innovation Project"  
 Organization: Gingerbread NI/Possibilities NI  
 Country: **Northern Ireland (UK), Germany, Lithuania**  
**Score: 5**
  
- SP2) **TF.MGU15**  
 Title of the intervention: "Working in Handsworth and Shard End (WiSH)"  
 Organization: Birmingham City Council, Department for Work and Pensions  
 Country: **England – UK**  
**Score: 5**
  
- SP3) **TF.MGU27**  
 Title of the intervention: "Essential Skills programme"  
 Organization: Tish Holland Upper Andersonstown Community Forum  
 Country: **Northern Ireland – UK**  
**Score:4**

## 2. The innovative points drawn from the collected practices were:

1. **Product for individual assessment to provide quality services:** it was stressed the importance of developing tools and strategies to better tackle personalised approaches. Participants particularly emphasised the importance of systematising the collection of information and took the case of **IT tools** to collect information about individual needs and strengths such as: strengths or gaps in skills, specific needs in terms of financial or care assistance, aspirations, etc. A such tool would allow to have an overall view of the person thus to provide tailored and high quality services. Furthermore this could help in including any kind of disadvantaged people.
2. **Identifying specific barriers + creative ways to work around them:** participants agreed that personalised approaches are the key to find out the right solution for the social inclusion of disadvantaged people. To this end it was emphasized the importance of identifying and deal with any specific barrier (social, economic, health,...) pushing people toward marginalised conditions. Practices should be “flexible” in order to manage individual needs. Anyway treating barriers is often complex and requires different and large resources so that sometimes it is necessary to find out creative ways to work around them. Participants particularly referred to **financial solutions** and the importance of a flexible and common use of funds. For example personalised budgets or pooling funds could be good early solutions.

## 3. The learning points drawn from the innovative practices were:

1. **User vocational choice/focus on context of area as well as skills:** practices showed the importance of involving users in the decisional process in order to improve their prospective of inclusion. Particularly was stressed the importance of taking into account the user’s aspirations and motivations for tailoring the right vocational path and allowing users to decide on it. This should also consider the background of people and the social and economic context where practices are implemented in order to link skills and individual potential with the labour market demand.
2. **Strong relationship between research/ planning pre project evaluation:** partners all agreed on the relevance of a careful and focused planning process for the success of an action. To this end previous experiences, data, research outcomes in the field, as well as a pre-project evaluation and ongoing mainstreaming are all aspects to be taken into account from the start-up of a project in order not to waste learned lessons and to improve the prospective of success.

**4. The main critical factors that led to success in the collected practices were:**

1. **Value for money:** in time of crisis it is vital the good management of money. Participants attached particular relevance to “sustainability” both in terms of length of effects on the society after the end of the action and in terms of economic self-sustainability, for example through the sale of products in social-pharm experiences. The creative use of budgets, such as pooling funds, were also stressed as factors leading to success.
2. **Collaboration with all key actors:** collaboration among agencies at all levels is crucial for the success of social inclusion actions, as stressed in the EC “Active inclusion” recommendations too. Nevertheless participants also pointed out the positive impact of collaboration with all key actors, included users.

**5. The aspects that the experts would like to be transferred into their own national context, and why were:**

3. **Mentoring individuals looking at behaviours as well as skills:** taking charge of the person in his complexity, to support inclusion both in social contexts and in the labour market. This means carrying out mentoring actions not just in order to improve or adapt skills to the labour market demand but also to support performances and social behaviours. Changing mind-sets should be the aim.
4. **Use of bottom up flexible approaches + more equal partnerships:** This would be about looking at what are the needs of your clients and then working in a partnership to provide a holistic response to those needs.

**6. Further important points that experts identified about the collected practices were:**

1. **Poor evaluation:** participants pointed out that practices usually do not carry on evaluation activities. Most of times the project itself does not include evaluation or it is sometimes carried out inside with consequential effects on the effective objectivity of results. Evaluation should be considered from the planning phases of a project.
2. **Innovation pilots:** in order to find out innovative solutions and strategies, it should be important to particularly take into account pilot projects.
3. **Guidance on questionnaires**

**7. The questions to be taken to the Peer Review meetings in order to identify the most innovative and collective practices are:**

1. **Context:** what is the context of your project?
2. **Transferability:** is the practice transferable? (to other EU countries/regions, to other targets. Can it be a best practice model?)
3. **Sustainability:** is the practice sustainable? (in terms of financial aspects, mainstreaming and the wider mission/work of the organization)
4. **Networking:** Is this project able to activate other actors?
5. **Expenses:** Is there a detailed budget including cost analysis?
6. **Outputs:** What are the specific outputs? (not employers by organization)
7. **Funds:** What is the origin of funding?
8. **Background:** Is your project best practice? How much taken from previous best practices?
9. **Users:** What was the customer journey?
10. **Innovation:** what is new and what difference/ innovation in this practice?
11. **Full impact:** what was the whole impact of the action? (not just for users, but also on: families, local environment, stakeholders. Thus to have a wider view on effects of the action)

**8. Any other comments or observations from the sub-theme group:**

1.

2.

3.

4.

*[include as many points as required, providing adequate detail for each point]*