



Part IV: Conclusions and Recommendations

Table of Contents

PART IV: CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	1
CHAPTER 10: CONCLUDING REMARKS AND EXTERNAL FEEDBACK.....	3
1. INTRODUCTION	3
2. NOTES ON METHODOLOGY.....	4
3. SYNTHESIS OF KEY FINDINGS	5
3.1 <i>Tackling the causes of inequalities</i>	5
3.2 <i>Placing young people at the heart of policy making</i>	7
3.3 <i>Embracing social innovations</i>	7
4. IMPACT – RESEARCH INFORMED PRAXIS	8
5. IN CONCLUSION	11
ANNEX 1: DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES UNDERTAKEN DURING THE PROJECT	12
CHAPTER 11: STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS.....	26
1. INTRODUCTION	26
2. KEY ISSUES WHICH NEED TO BE ADDRESSED	28
2.1 <i>Institutional mindsets which fail to recognise and tap into young people's potentials, knowledge and lived experiences:</i>	28
2.2 <i>Institutional mind sets and ways of working which limit scope for change:</i>	28
2.3 <i>The current framing of public policies which may contribute to inequalities.....</i>	29
2.4 <i>Policy responses to austerity which have restricted the scope of youth policies and reduced support services for young people</i>	29
2.5 <i>Policy approaches to education and training which contribute to young people's inequalities:.....</i>	30
2.6 <i>Failure to recognise and respect the needs of young people which leads to distance, distrust and disillusion.....</i>	30
3. STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS.....	31
3.1 <i>Institutional approaches to policy-making affecting young people and their life chances</i>	31
3.1.1 Change institutional attitudes towards 'young people'	31
3.1.2 Change ways of working within institutions	32
3.2. <i>Harnessing social innovations to address key causes of social inequality</i>	34

3.2.1 Education and development.....	34
3.2.2 Employment and entrepreneurship.....	36
3.2.3 Recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement.....	38
4. FUNDING PROGRAMMES AND RESOURCES TO SUPPORT SOCIAL INNOVATIONS BY AND FOR YOUNG PEOPLE AND INCREASE THEIR IMPACT:	39
4.1 <i>Funding policies and programmes</i>	40
4.1.1 Improving the complementarity of funding programmes of different departments within and between institutions in terms of priorities, timescales and application criteria.....	40
4.1.2 Improving continuity of policies and programmes aimed at assisting the most marginalised:	40
4.1.3 Introducing greater flexibility within existing funding programmes and publicising them more widely to enable small-scale organisations to access support	41
4.1.4 Broadening the scope of policies and programmes for young people facing inequalities to include those furthest from the mainstream.....	41
4.2 <i>Actively supporting the start-up, development and transfer of socially innovative practices</i>	42
5. MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION	44

Chapter 10: Concluding remarks and external feedback

Ajmal Hussain, Olga Jubany, Berta Güell, Helen Higson, Jill Robinson

Aston University and Universitat de Barcelona

1. Introduction

In this final chapter we summarise the main findings from the CITISPYCE project and synthesise these with reactions from the various stakeholders with whom we have interacted along the way. In so doing, we have been able to draw out some concluding remarks about the importance of engaging young people in the challenges of tackling social inequalities. More detailed findings are to be found in the Strategic Recommendations, published as a separate output to this report.

We begin by reiterating the importance of the methodological approach employed. Then we synthesise some key messages derived from the project, enabled by the methodological approach that uniquely placed research and action side by side.

We have engaged a range of local, national and EU-wide stakeholders in a number of different fora including: conferences, workshops and panel discussions. The synthesis which forms this chapter is drawn from these. Most notably, they include a workshop held in Krakow (Poland) in September 2014 at the midway point of the project where young people interacted with policy makers, academics and NGOs in a ‘market place’ to exchange experiences and discuss solutions. There is also reflection on a seminar held in Brussels in September 2015 where senior decision makers from a number of EU Directorates deliberated with researchers and NGOs on the findings emerging from the project. We also include reflections from our Final international Conference held in December 2015 in Birmingham. At this event we were proud to host a space in which dialogue was again generated with a broad range of stakeholders including: CITISPYCE partners, young people from across the EU, a representative from the EU Youth

Forum (EU-CoE), policy-makers (including representatives from municipalities), academics, NGOs and members of statutory agencies. We shared our research findings and asked questions in interactive sessions to engage stakeholders towards addressing issues that have been at the heart of the CITISPYCE project.

2. Notes on Methodology

This investigation was immersed within the qualitative and multi-method research debate, arguing for the relevance of its nature when approaching an object of study which engenders a complex world of social relationships. Thanks to the reflexivity, depth and comprehensiveness of qualitative methods, this project has been able to unravel young people's inequalities in deprived neighbourhoods and identify existing social innovation strategies to confront them.

Whilst several research techniques have been applied, the framework of analysis has been qualitative with a strong reliance on ethnographic methods, i.e. in-depth interviews, participant observation and focus groups. This has been complemented with secondary quantitative data to reflect on the different manifestations of social inequalities and levels of deprivation within each city. By adopting a comparative perspective, the findings of each phase of investigation have systematically been cross-nationally analysed, highlighting the main patterns of convergence and divergence between national/local contexts from a triangulated approach.

As an action-research project, CITISPYCE has also focused on the assessment of Socially Innovative Practices (SIPs) aimed at tackling social inequalities. This has implied the design of other methodological approaches, first to identify and gather SIPs, then to implement and transfer some of them in pilot actions, and finally to analyse their impact and policy implications. The findings have thus been up-scaled through action with young people, creating spaces for dialogue between young people, policy makers and practitioners at a range of levels. It has been this unusual methodological approach what has enabled us to grasp young people's voices from the ground and formulate recommendations at the policy level.

Of course, there are limitations to all forms of research methodology. Qualitative methods alone cannot give more than generalizable indications, but we have sought to mitigate any limitations of our results by ensuring that we have triangulated our enquiries, methods and subjects. We

have grounded our findings on strong secondary base data from cross-EU and local city sources, and we have constantly tried to reflect our findings back to key stakeholders, as summarised in this chapter, as a way of validating and legitimising our analyses. We believe that our partnership of expertise in different disciplines and methods, from hard quantitative to ethnographic reflexiveness brings a validity to our recommendations. We further believe that the messages that we give are generalizable across a range of contexts.

3. Synthesis of Key Findings

3.1 Tackling the causes of inequalities

Our research revealed the importance of identifying and addressing the causes of inequalities. Although we discerned these to be largely associated with macro level forces (i.e. financialisation of the economy, cuts in public funding driven by austerity measures, combined with the social exclusion that results from these processes and the paternalistic approach of policy making that ‘blames the victim’), we also recognized through feedback to our project that it is possible to succeed in tackling the causes of inequality.

This could be facilitated by an approach to inequalities that recognises these as relational: what is classically known as between the ‘haves’ and the ‘have nots’. The levels of unemployment in a number of countries in this project revealed a gulf between those affecting young people and those affecting the general population. In all cases young people are twice as likely to be unemployed.

Other areas in which disparities exist between young people and the rest of society are in the distribution of power. Young people report being politically disengaged and disempowered. This affects how young people perceive hierarchies, power and how they relate to them. “We are the present!” (not so much we are the future!) is a slogan young people narrated to us in this regard. Furthermore, recognition of young people’s needs and capabilities in wanting to develop themselves is also insufficiently addressed. This is reflected in the increased marketisation of higher education, which disadvantages many from accessing it. In this climate it is important to recognise formal and informal education, as well as bottom-up approaches involving young people as ways to address such disadvantages.

Yet, in such a climate of shrinking opportunities and recognition of a widening gap between young people and mainstream society, young people might be pushed to take any opportunity at the expense of a longer term career. Stakeholders in our project overwhelmingly agreed that young people should be encouraged to prioritise developing themselves as ‘critical citizens’, rather than filling low-level precarious employment which is the hallmark of the current economy.

Our research at neighbourhood level revealed how inequalities manifest in social infrastructures that are in place to serve young people. Our conversations with policy makers and practitioners at the city and neighbourhood level also revealed how these infrastructures work to re-inforce inequalities too. We discerned three key concepts from this phase of research which were later further explored in conversations with young people. These were:

- Distance: young people from deprived neighbourhoods are distanced both physically and socially from the centre of cities, as well as from other groups of people.
- Neglect: resources are withdrawn from places.
- Withdrawal of trust: and a sense that in many places things have been better.

In response, young people demonstrated how they addressed these issues through changing the perspective from othering, “them,” to communing, “us”. Distance was thus addressed through bridging; neglect through fostering attention; and withdrawal of trust through brokering recognition.

In our conversations with stakeholders we were also told that these findings were unremarkable, BUT that they were insufficiently addressed by policy makers. These conversations yielded possible ways forward too. For example:

- bridging distances through getting ‘close-up’ to young people, changing sides and LISTENING. An example was the *Knowledge alliances in Malmö*
- paying attention to individual lifeworlds and interests through reclaiming space. An example being *Teatre pa Tothom in Barcelona*
- recognising individual strengths through: listening and responding in education and training. For example: *Amaro Records in Brno*

Together with our stakeholders we also questioned whether it is innovative to listen, or rather why it has become innovative to listen. We have discovered that just listening is not enough. Rather, it should be careful listening, better identifying the needs of young people, with greater attention to their voices, and taking them into consideration in policy making – or even better, involving young people themselves in that process.

3.2 Placing young people at the heart of policy making

One key way in which social inequalities affect young people is in the tendency they promote toward individualism on their part.

Most of our stakeholders believed that, compared to a decade ago, the situation for young people in their city had not improved. Yet, although the situation had worsened, some young people were believed to have become more empowered and engaged with civil society through various strategies of resilience, or coping.

At the same time, however, through the various stages of research and action on this project, we encountered consistent messages that in the various cities we were researching it was seldom possible for young people to have an influence on youth policies and engage with social issues. There seemed to exist no effective mechanisms for young people to influence public policies that matter to them.

A key example was the over emphasis on employment-related policies aimed at young people. There thus exists considerable ambiguity, around the focus of current policies targeting young people. These seem to favour limited outcomes i.e. employment at the expense of more rounded, holistic, ‘wrap-around’ services or preparing young people to be job ready rather than *simply in a job*.

3.3 Embracing social innovations

Some policy makers not only isolate young people from the rest of society when designing initiatives, but there is also a tendency among practitioners to cluster young people either as ‘marginalised’ or as ‘competent’ (for example, employable or non-employable because of

competence, motivation or opportunity). Our stakeholders helped us to raise important questions with policy makers about the logic employed to demarcate constituencies of young people, and address them differently or in relation to each other. Some NGOs and social enterprises with which we worked offered important insights into schemes which might help certain young people. These are based on skill levels that could then be used in innovative strategies to engage other young people through peer-to-peer interventions. Inherent in such approaches is the risk of reproducing the neoliberal and paternalising schemes that fuel the causes of inequalities. Usually this is done through the use of crude statistical data-sets that do not offer a holistic picture of young people's lives or the environments in which they live.

Throughout the project, however, a consistent message has been that when designing and implementing projects, policy makers and practitioners should take into account the different needs of young people and the fact that some may be (more or less) resilient and (more or less) competent and/or motivated. Therefore, proposed solutions to inequalities facing young people need to be more targeted and more responsive to their specific needs and perceptions of the problem. Further, in a climate of shrinking public resources it seems like a quick win, then, to involve young people in the design of solutions *for* them. The piloting and transfer of social innovations that was a key part of the action research activities of the CITISPYCE project reveals one way this can be done. By enabling young people to share their innovations with peers across the EU, it is possible to have the effect of empowering others to addressing their experiences of a number of inequalities facing them. Furthermore, through encouraging a sense of collective empowerment, this may contribute to tackling the splintering and retreat of young people into individualisation.

4. Impact – research informed praxis

Overwhelmingly, our stakeholders have recognised the added value of researchers being involved in generating knowledge about and solutions to tackle the causes of inequalities. Thanks to the action-research methodology, research-informed pilot actions have been implemented to address some of the causes and symptoms of social inequalities identified during the fieldwork.

Key examples of policy and projects that are in place and have been transferred or up-scaled as a result of the CITISPYCE project include: The Loft, which was transferred from Birmingham to Athens; Amaro Records, which aims to open in a Roma neighbourhood in Brno in 2016 following a successful encounter with colleagues who founded Educational Demos in Barcelona; ‘The New Opportunity’, which is being up-scaled in Rotterdam; Beatfreaks, a social enterprise/collective of young people from Birmingham using cultural production to engage with mainstream society which has been transferred to Venice and Krakow.

Such pilots are aimed at different profiles of young people (in terms of skills, abilities and opportunities) and relate to the fields of employment, entrepreneurship, education and personal development. Another area to which many pilot actions have related is the development of young people’s social competences (the social, emotional and intellectual skills needed to interact successfully with society). They address such problems as low self-esteem and self-confidence, lack of trust and poor understanding of social norms and thus contribute to young people’s empowerment, recognition, trust and engagement with their communities and neighbourhoods. Although such practices may not tackle in a direct way the causes of social inequalities (often linked to issues of un/under-employment and a lack of access to adequate education and/or training), they contribute to the acquisition of transferable skills that may be applicable in those fields.

The success in transferring practices from one place to another allows us to draw key lessons for policy-makers and practitioners. Thanks to a detailed assessment of the success factors, we are able to conclude that it is possible to transfer innovative practices (or better, the innovative ideas and approaches) from one national context to another. The role of the context needs to be respected in terms of the tools and methods which should correspond to local conditions. The philosophy, general goals and approaches are, however, transferable, taking into consideration the needs of the local contexts and the local target group.

The workshops in Krakow, Brussels and Birmingham, where a range of stakeholders were brought together and spaces created for dialogue with young people, were about reaching beyond the academic and putting our research into practice and challenging ways of thinking. The workshop in Krakow was aimed at presenting and discussing which Socially Innovative Practices (SIPs) out of nearly 50 identified during our fieldwork had more potential to be transferred. While the one in Brussels was used to present a range of SIPs (drawn from 21

detailed Case Studies of SIPs in ten cities) that had been thoroughly analysed and evaluated in terms of success factors, potential of transferability, and impact on social inequalities after they had been implemented in pilots. These pilots provided valuable insights, but the remaining Case Studies of SIPs may be considered as more informative for the following reasons: (1) pilots were selected to be transferred because (among other reasons) they were not so demanding in terms of resources (2) the other case studies were selected as best examples in specific contexts. Finally, the Final Conference Case Studies workshops in Birmingham were valuable in highlighting some of the hints of our key findings and recommendations, as the last space of discussion and gathering of external feedback.

In another vein, the list of dissemination activities included as an Annex to this chapter provides an indicative sample of the extent of the reach the consortium has achieved at a number of levels and across numerous sectors of society in disseminating the messages from the CITISPYCE Project. These include formal events in academia but also a range of sharing events across the partnership over the course of the project. These have included informal ‘drop in’ sessions as well as organized meetings with young people in neighbourhoods and progress updates with local and national stakeholders and interest groups (politicians, members of the business community, NGOs including housing, health and employment associations/foundations). Partners have also shared information about CITISPYCE and its findings formally and informally with other networks such as Eurocities representing 130 of Europe's largest cities and 40 partner cities across 35 countries in Europe, the EU – CoE Youth Partnership, the Seismic network in UK, SIX (Social Innovation Exchange), and contacts within other European and nationally funded research projects e.g. MyPlace, WILCO, Partispace.

Furthermore, we have actively sought the engagement of young people (such as Immy Kaur – co-founder of the Impact Hub in Birmingham - and Beatfreeks) to play a key role in our dissemination activities. A web design company started by a young person created a dedicated website for young people to stimulate interest in and encourage the exchange of ideas and opinions about our project activities (www.citispcevoices.eu). The socially innovative practices created by young people and used as Case Studies have been informal channels for dissemination about CITISPYCE to their own social networks both virtual and physical. We have used young people to help facilitate project events including the Final Conference, where they facilitated, chaired and participated in panel and workshop sessions. This has demonstrated

how young people can become critical agents for change in an economic climate that is increasingly hostile to them. We have also engaged with young people and policy-stakeholders beyond the conference through the use of social media, including the use of live streaming of the conference and twitter, again facilitated by young social entrepreneurs. This was a two way process in that those engaging via twitter could vote and submit questions/comments to the chair of the conference panels and thus participate in the debate.

5. In conclusion

From the outset, our intentions have been to connect our research with those who are responsible for the development and implementation of policies and practice which affect the lives and opportunities of marginalized young people in cities across Europe. Through the dialogues we have had with different stakeholders regarding our findings and their responses, we have prompted reflection and review of the impact of current policies on the symptoms and causes of inequality. We have created spaces for connecting young people who have developed new ways of navigating inequalities with those who have the ability to shape future policies and practice. The project has developed a dialogue with the pan-European network of major cities and city regions, Eurocities, in order to reach city-level decision makers and practitioners. It will continue to disseminate findings through this network and associated organizations and, at the time of writing this report, three proposals for publications have been accepted and further publishing opportunities are currently under consideration. In addition, we have set up an international Cascading Network for the sharing not only of the CITISPYCE findings and activities but related research and project activity by cities and NGOs as well as academic institutions within and beyond Europe.

Annex 1: Dissemination activities undertaken during the project

Partner	Dissemination Activity	Nature (journal, conference, etc)	Transnational / National Dimension	Audience reached
Aston	Launch of CITISPYCE project	Half-day event with invited representatives from Birmingham City Council (including cabinet members and a range of NGOs & civil society actors	National	Various – across society
Aston	Production of Logo and various social media instruments including Twitter account and dedicated websites)	Electronic and hardcopy materials. Web dissemination (see below) for specific activities	Transnational	Various – across society
Aston	Participation in meeting of SOCIETY FP7 project, Edinburgh 2013	Presentation and discussion	Transnational	Academics
Aston	Presentation at Conference in Berlin	Presentation	Transnational	Academics, policy analysts
Aston	Presentation and participation at Birmingham City Council Community Intelligence Network	Forum of policy makers and academics	Local/national	Fellow academics and policy makers (on-going)
Aston	Chairing of Birmingham Child Poverty Commission	Meeting of stakeholders from across public and private sector	National	Various public and private sector
Aston	Production and distribution of Executive Summary	Publication	Transnational	Various, including policy makers, young people, academics
Aston	Update on project to inaugural meeting of SEISMIC network	Participation in discussions	National	Various Academics, policy analysts, other think tanks, networks

Aston	Policy article	The New Statesman	National/ transnational	Policy/academic /civil society
Aston	EU funded academic network	Conference: Midlands Youth Labour Market Forum	National	Policy/academic
Aston	Invited participation in Kerslake Review of Birmingham City Council governance	Invited to evidence-gathering meeting with senior UK civil servants held at Birmingham City Council	National	Policy
Aston	Presentation at Birmingham City Council Young People engagement event organised as part of MYPLACE project.	Conference	Transnational	Young people from across EU
Aston	Invited presentation given to interdisciplinary group of academics at University of Kent Christchurch	Presentation and discussion	National	Fellow academics
Aston	Policy Briefs (2)	Publications	Transnational	Policy
Aston	Presentation to Eurocities Working Group on Employment, Birmingham Apr 15	Presentation	National/ transnational	Policy
Aston	Paper based on empirical research presented at International Conference of Europeanists, Sciences Po, Paris	Conference	Transnational	Fellow Academics
Aston	Invited participation in Eurocities Social Affairs Forum, Brussels	Presentation and discussion	Transnational	Policy-makers from major cities across EU
Aston	Discussion of initial findings within seminar organised by Aston Centre for Europe on Young	Presentation and discussion	National	Academics and students

	people's perceptions & experiences of inequality			
Aston	Paper based on empirical research for Polish Journal of Social Economy	Publication (forthcoming)	Transnational	Academics, policy-makers
Aston	Papers based on empirical research for collaborative publications by Citispyce partners HAW, MU	Publications (forthcoming)		Academics, policy-makers, students
Aston	Blog posts and exchanges between young people via dedicated website and twitter specifically for young people	Social media communications www.citispycevoices.eu twitter account: www.twitter.com/citispyce	Transnational	Young people across Europe
Aston	Final conference 2- 4 Dec 2015 Twitter feed/live streaming/	Social media communication of proceedings & participation by live feed and twitter	National	General public, policy-makers, young people
Aston in Bulgaria	Article based on empirical research in Population Journal, Issue No)3-4, Jan 6,2015	Publication	National	Policy-makers & academics
Aston in Bulgaria	Joint paper with MU for: Sofia: SGEM International Multidisciplinary Scientific Conferences on Social Sciences and Arts, 2014, p. 487-494.	Conference presentation and publication	International	Academic

UB	Mention of Citispyce within a Master's session on immigration and the labour market in Spain (Venice, Italy)	Lecturing	Transnational	Students
UB	Infoday related to the elaboration of research proposals within the H2020 programme (Tarragona, Spain)	Conference on research proposals	Local/national	Fellow Academics
UB	Regular update about the development of the project in the European Social Research Unit web (www.ub.edu/ESRU)	Web dissemination	Transnational	Various, including academics, policy makers, young people, civil society agents, etc. The web has more than 85,000 visitors
UB	Presentation and general update of the project within the research group meeting GRECS, UB	Research group meeting	Local/national	Fellow academics
UB	Article on the project within a publication of LERU called: "Social Sciences, Humanities & Interdisciplinary Research. A showcase of excellent research projects from LERU universities".	Article	Transnational	Fellow academics, policy-makers, EC.
UB	Presentation of paper focused on the results of CitiSpyce in Barcelona	CES Conference, Paris, July 2015	Transnational	Fellow Academics
UB	Presentation of paper focused on the results of	3 rd ISA Forum of Sociology, Vienna, July 2016	Transnational	Fellow Academics

	Citispyle in Barcelona			
HAW	Paper based on empirical research presented at International Conference of Europeanists, Sciences Po, Paris	Conference	Transnational	Fellow Academics
HAW	Conference "Arrival City", 11 Dec 2015	Conference for local policy makers, NGOs and academics	Local/national	Fellow academics, NGOs and policy makers
HAW	Conference "City as a refuge", 3 Sept 2015	Conference to disseminate findings to delegates from Chicago, Birmingham, Hamburg	Transnational	Policy makers, academics, NGOs
HAW	Paper based on empirical research presented at international Conference on Public Policy, Milan 1-2 July 2015	Conference	Transnational	Fellow Academics
HAW	Presentation at regional conference on disconnected youth, 7 Oct 2015	Conference	regional	Fellow academics, NGOs and policy makers
MAH (MG)	Presentation of Citispyle at seminar on Urban integration, January 18, 2013	Seminar	Local	Students, policy makers, NGOs, general public, academics
MAH (JA, MG, MS)	Presentation of Citispyle for students and colleges at MAH, September 16, 2013	Lecture	Local	Students and colleges
MAH (MG)	Presentation of Citispyle at breakfast meeting at NGO Glokala Folkhögskolan, 4 October, 2013	Lecture	Local	NGO representatives

MAH (MS)	Presentation of Citispyce at the conference on "Developing a Social Innovation Infrastructure in Sweden", January 13, 2014	Lecture	National	Various, including policy makers, practitioners, academics
MAH (JA, MG, MS)	Presentation of Citispyce for civil society, practitioners and civil servants, 2 April, 2014	Lecture	Local	Various, including policy makers, practitioners, general public/young people, academics
MAH (MS)	Presentation of Citispyce at conference for youth workers, April 24, 2014	Lecture	Regional	Youth workers and academics
MAH (JA & MG)	Presentations of CITISPYCE and our Sofielund case study at "Framtidsveckan Sofielund", Malmö, May 5, 2015	Conference (seminar week) in the Malmö city district Sofielund	Local/national	Various, including policy makers, general public/young people, academics
MAH (MS)	Presentation of Citispyce at the EuroMemo conference in Roskilde, September 25, 2015	Lecture	International	Economists and other academics
MAH (JA)	Presentation of CITISPYCE at the Nordic Big City conference, Malmö, September 30, 2015	Conference	Transnational	Policy makers and fellow academics
MAH (MS)	Presentation of Citispyce for doctoral students at MAH, October 29, 2015	Lecture	Local	Doctoral students

MAH (JA)	Presentation of CITISPYCE at joint symposium Malmö University-University College London, November 12, 2015	Conference (bilateral research symposium)	Transnational	Fellow academics
MAH (MS)	Presentation of Citispyce at the doctoral course in Cultural Political Economy, December 17, 2015	Lecture	International	Doctoral students
City of Malmö	Presentation of the finding's so far	Steering group meeting EUROCITIES	Transnational	Chair and vice chair of the 8 Working Groups inside SAF
City of Malmö	Presentation and participation at the Round Table in SAF, Turkey	SAF, Social Affairs Forum meeting,	Transnational	Members from all over Europe and Turkey
City of Malmö	Presentation and participation at a joint Working Group meeting	Working Group meeting	Transnational	Working group members from two working group with focus on young people
City of Malmö	Presentation and participation at the cooperation platform in Prague	Cooperation platform e.g. information meeting for new officers from members city of EUROCITIES	Transnational	Policy advisers and policy officers from all over Europe + members of the Executive committee
City of Malmö	Presentation of findings at a member meeting	WG Employment	Transnational	Policy Officers inside Europe interested in Youth unemployment
City of Malmö	Mailing the "New Statement article" and "The Booklet"	Mailinglist	national	Peers working with youth unemployment, youth education, social issues referring to young people and NGOs in

				Malmö, Stockholm and Gothenburg
City of Malmö	Mailing the “New Statement article” and “The Booklet”	mailinglist	local	Dep Mayors with education & employment as his responsibility in Malmö
Masaryk University	Publication of a paper based on empirical research in SGEM Conference Proceedings	Publication	Transnational	Fellow Academics
Masaryk University	Presentation of a paper at International Conference on Public Policy, Milan, Italy	Conference	Transnational	Fellow Academics
Masaryk University	Presentation at conference (Non)-Discrimination of Roma held in Museum of Romani Culture, Brno, Czech Republic	Conference	Transnational	Various, including policy makers, young people, academics
Masaryk University	Workshop in Brussels for EU level stakeholders – WP7 (D7.3)	Workshop	Transnational	Various, including policy makers and academics
Cracow University of Economics	Presentation of the nature of the project to two groups of young people in Cracow	Local events – meeting at a school and local youth centre. Presentation augmented by Prezi tool: http://prezi.com/zp1-ijegmq3g/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy&rc=ex0share	Local (Krakow)	Young people, teachers, representatives of the youth centre
Cracow University of Economics	Presentation of the research and implementation activities to a Nowa Huta (Krakow District) community	An event held by a local theatre for young people, their families and other representatives of Nowa Huta community (around 150 people). Augmented by Prezi tool:	Local (Krakow)	Young people, representatives of Nowa Huta community

		<p>http://prezi.com/zp1-ijegmq3g/?utm_campaign=share&utm_medium=copy&rc=ex0share</p> <p>A photo from the event: http://ukryteskrzydla.pl/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/u_skrzysdla_final-8.jpg</p>		
Cracow University of Economics	Planned (January) submission of a paper on values and attitudes of Greek and Polish youth	Journal of Youth Studies http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/cjys20#.VebtIJTCdzJ	Transnational	Fellow academics
Cracow University of Economics	Preparation of a report on the activities and effects of the project to a Polish audience	Publication	National	Policy makers, general audience
Cracow University of Economics	Informing about the nature and effects of the project through a University unit website	Website http://www.msap.uek.krakow.pl/index.php/pl/projekty-realizowane/citispyce	National	General audience
Municipality of Krakow	Informing on the project and the effects through a official municipal website	Website http://www.krakow.pl/sport/90142,artykul,citispyce.html	National	General audience
Municipality of Krakow	Informing on the effects of the project (especially reports concerning Krakow)	<p>- Website http://www.krakow.pl/sport/90142,artykul,citispyce.html</p> <p>Events, conferences on the situation of young people - the CITISPYCE reports may be useful during work on municipal strategic documents supporting Cracow University of Economics in dissemination activities undertaken by this partner</p>	Local (Krakow)	Policy makers, heads of municipal units, NGO actors

Birmingham City Council	Distribution of draft executive summary to BCC youth workers		Local	Youth workers and youth policy makers.
Birmingham City Council	Distribution of executive summary to West Midlands Migration Partnership	To be distributed once the report has been finalised.	Local and regional	
Birmingham City Council	Discussion at Financial Inclusion Partnership meeting.	Forum of policy makers and practitioners	Local	Local debt and money advice providers, policy makers from social housing providers.
Birmingham City Council	Discussion at Private Sector Dinner	Meeting to discuss how the Business community can help alleviate child poverty	Local	National and local businesses including financial sector.
Birmingham City Council	Discussion at Big Lottery and local Voluntary and Community sector organisations	Workshop to discuss application to discuss lottery funding to address child poverty.	Local	Big Lottery, local voluntary sector organisations working with young people and families, Faith organisations.
Birmingham City Council	Distribution of draft executive summary to BCC youth workers		Local	Youth workers and youth policy makers.
Birmingham City Council	Distribution of executive summary to West Midlands Migration Partnership	To be distributed once the report has been finalised.	Local and regional	
PlusConfidence	Extensive paper in Dutch on fieldwork II, a.o. used as input for a meeting of city of Rotterdam with four ministries to show problems of disadvantaged young people in	Publication and policy conference	National/local	Policy makers local and national

	the city and discuss solutions			
PlusConfidence	Paper summarising Citispyce findings as policy input for Rotterdam youth policy plans and budgets 2016	Publication	Local	Policy makers and practitioners
PlusConfidence	Book on Dutch Citispyce research, to be published in January	Book	National	Academics, policy makers and practitioners
PlusConfidence	Presentations and participation in Knowledge network on young people Rotterdams Talent (3 times)	Knowledge network meetings, forum	Local	Academics and policy makers
PlusConfidence	Active participation in three Rotterdam policy input conferences with practitioners and young people, linking up young people with policy makers	Conference	Local	Policy makers, young people and practitioners
PlusConfidence	Organising working group with policy makers, public organisations and private service providers to improve integrated service delivery (7 meetings)	Working group	Local	Policy makers, decision makers, service providers
PlusConfidence	Consulting with policy makers on Rotterdam youth policies (4 meetings)	Discussions with policy-makers re: findings of Citispyce project	Local	Policy makers
PlusConfidence	Training 18 youth workers in city of Zwolle (8 meetings) on results of	Training	Local	Practitioners, educators

	Citispyle research. Develop a new module in a one year training for youth workers (top study for higher vocational training) of InHolland (nationally operating professional high school) NB these activities were not paid from Citispyle.			
Plusconfidence	Symposium on book (De jeugd maar geen toekomst? Naar een effectieve aanpak van sociale uitsluiting) in cooperation with SWP publisher (Amsterdam)	Conference	national	Practitioners, policy makers, academics, educators
PlusConfidence	Conference and book presentation in cooperation with city of Rotterdam (forthcoming, May 2016). Costs not covered by Citispyle.	Conference	Local, national	Academics, policy makers, practitioners, young people
KMOP	WP 10- Invitation sent to two organisations to participate as collaborative entities in the Cascading Network of the project Citispyle. One of them has already published information about the project on their website	Website of another organisation	Transnational	Various-international stakeholders

KMOP	Paper based on empirical research, included in the consortium publication proposal (tbc)	Publication – scientific journal (tbc)	Transnational	Academics, Policy makers and readers of the scientific journal
KMOP	Contribution to a paper based on empirical research, in collaboration with our partners from Poland (tbc)	Publication – scientific journal (tbc)	Transnational	Academics, Policy makers and readers of the scientific journal
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Paper based on empirical research presented at International Conference of Europeanists, Sciences Pro	Conference	Transnational	Fellow Academics
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Article based on empirical research published on the journal "La rivista di servizio sociale" ["Journal of Welfare and Social Work"]	Publication	National	Fellow Academics, Social Planners and Social Workers
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Participation at Birmingham City Council Community Intelligence Network	Forum of policy makers and academics	Transnational	Fellow academics and policy makers
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Tutoring and Presentation of three Master thesis based on empirical research	Academic work and publication	Local/National	Fellow academic and students
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Seminars and lessons based on empirical research	Academic work	Local/National	Students
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Conferences with local social workers and policy makers	Forum of policy makers and social workers	Local/National	Various, including policy makers, young people, academics
Ca' Foscari University in Venice	Article based on empirical research to be published in a	Publication	Transnational	Fellow Academics

	<p>potential special issue of the journal "Journal of European Social Policy" (forthcoming)</p>			
--	---	--	--	--



Chapter 11: Strategic Recommendations

Aston University and Masaryk University

On behalf of the CITISPYCE Consortium

1. Introduction

In the course of the CITISPYCE project (2013 – 2015) we have mapped a wide range of causes and manifestations of inequality in cities across Europe. We have also found, via interviewing policy makers, practitioners and young people, evidence of innovative social practices initiated by young people themselves, as well as by institutions and third sector organisations. Finally, by analysing the data through the lenses of different disciplines within the consortium, we have begun identifying aspects of social innovations which have the potential to address not only symptoms but the underlying causes of inequality.

Our initial reflections have been drawn from all phases of the project and have been assessed through feedback and interaction in workshops and conferences. The Final Conference in December 2015 gave us a further opportunity to share our ongoing work with policy-makers, practitioners and young people. This has helped to refine our thinking on the role that social innovations developed by and for young people could play in “assisting policy-makers to tackle the challenge of growing and changing social inequalities.” Whilst we acknowledge the intrinsic complexity of these inequalities, we consider that our findings, even though based mostly on small-scale local practices, offer valuable learning points for policymakers at all levels.

Above everything else, we stress the importance of changing the prevailing discourses around policies relating to young people if real progress is to be made in mitigating social inequalities experienced by young people across Europe. Our findings call for significant changes in the way

policy-makers and practitioners regard young people. It is vital that we take advantage of the experiences, stories and reflections of young people to help shape future policies to combat their inequalities. This implies a shift in the paradigm that frames our responses to disadvantaged young people. We must move away from treating young people as a *problem* to one which acknowledges and harnesses young people's *potentials*, and away from seeing them as a category to be worked *on* towards one that can be worked *with*. This in turn should force us to look again at the underlying philosophies and mechanisms in policy making over the past few decades.

The change of paradigm, approach and philosophy represents a systemic change which will be hard to achieve. Such a change presupposes a change in mind-sets and ways of working of policy-makers at all levels, based on more appropriate knowledge and understanding of the causes of inequalities and social exclusion of disadvantaged young people. Obtaining this knowledge requires listening to young people and giving them a voice and participation in policy making. This aspect is included in several ways in the following set of recommendations because it is so central to this issue.

The other way, in which a paradigmatic change may happen is through the incremental implementation of socially innovative practices and their scaling up, leading to the adoption of their principles in mainstream policies. In this way the new approaches may become more widespread practice. Moreover, the young people's feedback on such policies and their positive impacts on young people and more general social benefits can work in favour of these practices. Both mechanisms of gradual and incremental changes can, over time, lead to the paradigmatic change (Streeck and Thelen, 2005) or third order change (Hall 1993) required.

We set out below some of the key issues emerging from our research that need to be addressed by policy-makers at all levels in order to improve their capacity to combat social inequalities as they currently manifest themselves in cities across Europe. In particular, they highlight significant barriers to their ability to harness the potential of socially innovative practices of and for young people. These issues are followed firstly by recommendations relating to institutional mind-sets and ways of working which frame their approach to young people and underpin many existing policies and programmes. Secondly, we consider how social innovations might assist policy-makers to tackle specific dimensions of inequality where societal and individual causes

intersect. Thirdly, we make recommendations regarding funding mechanisms and the provision of other resources to facilitate, upscale and sustain social innovations by and for young people.

2. Key issues which need to be addressed

2.1 Institutional mindsets which fail to recognise and tap into young people's potentials, knowledge and lived experiences:

There is a strong paternalistic approach to policy-making at all levels, based on a view of young people as a problem to be solved. Young people themselves are seldom directly involved in policy making or in co-determination of the measures at all. Thus, these policies do not sufficiently take into account the ambitions and abilities of young people themselves, hence they often accomplish the opposite of what is intended. This paternalistic attitude fosters dependency and learned helplessness; going against people's own ambitions fosters resistance or exit. Young people often lose motivation, lacking trust in public administrative institutions and front-line workers, and become disengaged, and self-excluded.

Briefly, a **change in paradigm** is needed in order to suppress the principles of conditionality and enforcement. Policy-makers need to engage more directly and openly with young people in order to recognise their potential, empower them, engage them, and help them with their self-development. It is important to build together with them their general and social skills, their links with community, thus involving them much more in designing the policies addressed to them.

2.2 Institutional mind sets and ways of working which limit scope for change:

Our findings have revealed three significant barriers to changing the mind-sets of policy-makers: complex and often rigid bureaucratic processes; departmental territoriality (silos) which limits the potential for cross-fertilisation of ideas, knowledge and sharing of resources; and a risk averse culture. We found examples of these at all levels of governance and in all the countries in which we conducted our research. This restricts the possibilities for co-opting external change-makers such as young social innovators and youth-led social enterprises. It will require a systemic change which will not be easy to achieve. Such a change presupposes a change in

mind-sets of the policymakers, amongst others, based on more appropriate knowledge and understanding of the causes of inequalities and social exclusion in deprived neighbourhoods.

2.3 The current framing of public policies which may contribute to inequalities:

The language in which policy-makers speak and in which documents are written may perpetuate inequalities as it may restrict young people's ability to access information or to engage in dialogue with those in authority. Traditional area-based approaches to regeneration, and interventions specific to certain neighbourhoods, can lead to resentment and division based on a sense of entitlement to public resources. Different cultural points of view between policy-makers and young people over the priorities for their city e.g. over the planning and use of space can reinforce the distance that young people feel from the mainstream. For these young people, the poor quality and provision of public infrastructure in their neighbourhoods is yet another sign of their inequalities as it appears that the public authorities do not see them as important. It adds to their frustration and, combined with increasing difficulties in finding guidance and support, instils a growing sense of isolation and powerlessness. This further exacerbates the feeling of distancing and disconnect and, in turn, contributes to a break down in trust between themselves and those in authority. Some of the social innovations we have uncovered can reconnect and facilitate dialogue between young people and policy-makers because they are able to win the trust of both.

2.4 Policy responses to austerity which have restricted the scope of youth policies and reduced support services for young people:

A major impact of the crisis on young people has been the narrowing down of the focus of policies to those which deal with what is perceived to be the main problem: unemployment. Such policies provide support which is conditional, accompanied by disciplining requirements, and forces them towards jobs of poor quality or welfare schemes. Combined with cuts in funding for services and welfare benefits, this restricted view of the needs of young people means that many of them in deprived neighbourhoods of European cities can no longer access measures which could offer the kind of wrap-around provision needed. Even where youth services are still available, they appear to concentrate on 'employment at any price' and

preventing anti-social behaviour. Across the board, there is a striking lack of coherent frameworks. Policy approaches to social inclusion of young people (outside school) seem piecemeal at best, based on projects and successive waves of experimental policy. One policy fashion replaces another, jeopardising previous results. These initiatives seem to be driven more by the imperative of having to make budget savings rather than developing ‘new’ responses to young people’s needs. Worryingly, the case studies from the ten cities in our research are full of stories of disinvestment.

2.5 Policy approaches to education and training which contribute to young people’s inequalities:

There are serious structural inequalities in educational provision across the EU, but they are particularly pronounced in post-communist and Southern European countries. Young people in deprived neighbourhoods, especially but not exclusively from minority ethnic or migrant backgrounds, are frequently channelled into low-level formal education pathways which are perceived to be of poor quality and stigmatising. Little is done to raise such young people’s aspirations or to help them realise their potential. There is also a lack of acknowledgement by official authorities of the value of informal education as a means of acquiring essential skills and social competences (self-belief, confidence, teamwork etc) to cope with the challenges of adulthood. A number of the social innovations analysed in our sample seek to fill this gap in provision but they lack resources for wider coverage and/or organisational and promotional help from the authorities.

2.6 Failure to recognise and respect the needs of young people which leads to distance, distrust and disillusion

We have identified social innovations that address dimensions of social exclusion which are largely neglected in mainstream policies. The practices are unique in that they address neighbourhood, individual, spatial and group dimensions, often in a combination with political/civic and social dimensions.

Self-confidence, creativity, empowerment, sociability, trust and engagement are strongly supported through these innovative approaches. The other related characteristic is a highly

individualised approach and emphasis on the process to balance relationship, recognition, mutual trust, empowerment and co-determination. Typically individual or group/community work based on the partnership/ co-creation principle is the norm/quality standard.

Finally, there is a collective empowerment principle applied. This means that young people are empowered to deal collectively with the problems of inequalities. This is an important precondition for effective social inclusion in the case of young people who are seeking constructive alternative solutions to those based on the ‘standard pathways’ offered by mainstream policies or, in the case of young people who are living from day to day, without any ambition to change their social exclusion.

3. Strategic Recommendations

3.1 Institutional approaches to policy-making affecting young people and their life chances

This is a major task at EU, national and local levels and is essential if we are to achieve the paradigm shift in institutional responses to dealing with young people’s inequalities that is needed.

3.1.1 Change institutional attitudes towards ‘young people’

Disadvantaged young people are perceived as ‘not belonging’ to society and are regarded by policy-makers as a ‘problem’ to be solved. It is vital that policy-makers change from seeing ‘young people equalling ‘problem’ to ‘young people having potentials that could be actualised.’

We recommend:

- Listening to the voices of young people themselves, by engaging more directly and openly with disadvantaged young people in order to recognise their potential, empowering them, engaging them, and helping them with their self-development
- Being less directive and resisting the temptation to micro-manage the dialogue and any initiatives which may emerge
- Co-opting or working in partnership with individuals and social enterprises which have established trust with young people and can act as **connectors/bridge**

builders between them and policy-makers

- Using the communication, peer-to peer learning and mentoring skills of such organisations to establish open dialogue, facilitating the active participation of disadvantaged young people in discussions about their peer group
- Building local and national Knowledge Alliances where all parties meet on equal terms.

3.1.2 Change ways of working within institutions

Complex and often rigid bureaucratic processes act as barriers to the involvement of individual social entrepreneurs and newly established or small-scale NGOs in design and delivery of programmes to assist young people. It is important to simplify processes.

We recommend:

- Introducing more flexible, light touch regulatory mechanisms for small-scale funding programmes and for support to new and/or micro-organisations;
- Subsidiarity – devolving more decision-making powers on the use of resources to the lowest level to reduce delays in project design and implementation;

Departmental territoriality (silos) limits the potential for cross-fertilisation of ideas, knowledge and sharing of resources. Policy-makers need to break down internal silos.

We recommend:

- Instigating more formal as well as informal cross-departmental working to achieve a more joined up approach in terms of policy objectives, desired outputs and outcomes and resources to be allocated e.g. more round table events on topics of mutual interest and concern
- Establishing a dedicated champion for young people facing inequalities (e.g. Birmingham City Council) within the institution with power to bring together representatives of all areas of policy with potential vested interest. ie Create Internal Knowledge Alliances

Public institutions have a high sensitivity to risk - financial and reputational - which frequently prevents them accessing external knowledge and networks by co-opting or funding new,

unproven organisations or initiatives. They need to change their attitude to risk.

We recommend:

- Using connectors/bridge-builders with proven track record of trust within local communities to broker introductions to new organisations operating in the relevant policy fields
- Engaging such organisations in open dialogue to understand how they work before making any commitments
- Undertaking a cost/benefit analysis of traditional versus possible new ways of working
- Making use of examples of good research-informed practice to support new approaches

Policy-making is frequently bounded by institutional custom and practice and received knowledge. This often shows itself in a paternalistic approach to the design and implementation of policies and a lack of awareness of the differences between causes and symptoms of social inequalities. Policy-makers need to change this paternalistic mindset.

We recommend:

- Recognising and accepting that a controlling role in the development and delivery of programmes, usually associated with being the primary funder, is no longer realistic or appropriate because of reductions in resources (money and personnel)
- Being open to co-opt external organisations with appropriate knowledge and skills of the issue(s) or target group(s) to work on an equal footing

Policy-makers need to improve their understanding of the changing nature of inequalities in post-crisis Europe.

We recommend:

- Accessing current research through Knowledge Alliances between universities and/or policy think tanks and policy-makers to provide a more informed understanding of the differences between causes and symptoms of inequalities. This is so that officers are clearer about the purpose/objectives of policies and programmes to deal with aspects of inequality and can plan accordingly with

regard to the use of resources, time-scales and evaluation or measurement of effectiveness.

3.1.3 Modify institutional responses to the impact of austerity measures

Policy-makers have responded to budget cuts by imposing more conditions upon any support still offered, removing services altogether or replacing them by less costly ‘new’ initiatives which fail to meet the needs of disadvantaged young people on the ground. This has meant that young people are falling through the gaps left in mainstream policies and programmes thus adding to their inequalities.

Initiatives which seek to fill these gaps in ways that also help connect (or re-connect) young people with those in authority may not just be compensatory. They may also stimulate changes in the approach to policy-making and delivery which counter the current tendency to limit the scope of interventions. Policy-makers need to be open to alternative ways of filling the gaps.

We recommend:

- Drawing on the knowledge and creativity of young people themselves and their lived experiences of policies and practices as they play out in their cities and communities
- Being prepared to identify and work with new actors or structures beyond the institution’s own established networks, particularly those involving young people who are facing inequalities e.g. social innovations which have emerged in response to an unmet need.

3.2. Harnessing social innovations to address key causes of social inequality

3.2.1 Education and development

Whilst recommendations regarding detailed changes to national education systems are beyond the reach of this project, the significance of access to quality educational opportunities in tackling the causes of young people’s inequalities cannot be ignored. There are frequent references in the CITISPYCE fieldwork reports to young people from deprived neighbourhoods/communities not having access to decent schools, being discouraged,

demotivated and limited in their prospects for training or employment post-school because of poor grades. The recommendations that follow are based on the evidence of several innovative social practices identified during the fieldwork at the local level. They have the potential to redress symptoms of inequalities in the short term and possibly causes in the medium to long-term.

Policy-makers should move from ‘one size fits all’ in terms of pedagogical approach and be open to alternative learning methods.

We recommend:

- Minimizing restrictions on the provision of public education by NGOs and parents’ associations in order to open up more opportunities for non-formal learning approaches to assist young people to acquire social and cultural competences and skills
- Working with Universities and other Further Education institutions to offer more routes to improving basic educational qualifications using peer to peer mentoring schemes e.g. Social innovations in Krakow (mentoring/coaching) and Hamburg (WhatsApp)
- Co-opting innovative arts or sports-based social practices which help develop social and emotional competences (confidence, self-belief) as well as basic skills to offer alternative pathways to learning. For example:
 - Beatfreeks, Birmingham helping young people navigate their way through their inequalities by improving their social and emotional competences, raising their aspirations and signposting pathways to further education or training
 - Pilot initiatives such as Educational Demos from Barcelona with Amaro Records in Brno which uses a shared interest in making music as a basis for building self-esteem and confidence and becoming ‘critical citizens’
 - Challenge Rotterdam – a project helping young people to develop the necessary attitude and skills to obtain and keep in education or employment.

3.2.2 Employment and entrepreneurship

One of the key causes of inequality is increasing labour market segmentation and exclusionary tendencies in labour markets where young people are disproportionately affected by unemployment, precariousness and low quality of jobs available. They are sometimes locked in the shadow economy. This is often accompanied by discrimination in the labour market and other areas in the case of immigrants or ethnic minorities. At the same time, mainstream policies have shown a growing convergence towards work-first, sometimes even workfare-like policies which are underpinned by moral/underclass discourse (MUD). Young people are perceived as ‘not belonging’ to society, and this is also communicated to them – demonstrating ‘othering’ as an exclusionary mechanism. Policy-makers need to change the principles of activation.

We recommend:

- Replacing conditionality requirements with effectiveness requirements, both on an individual level and on an organisational level, to provide more opportunities for professional discretion based on social work approaches and greater focus on effectiveness through needs-oriented and continuous performance of the institutions involved

Current labour market policies aimed at dealing with youth unemployment frequently fail to reach the most excluded since they require a certain level of skills and social competences to benefit from the support offered e.g. around job-search, CV writing and interview skills which many young people lack. Policy-makers should extend the reach of their interventions.

We recommend:

- Combining small scale policies/practices oriented towards empowerment, general individual and social development of young people and communities where they are living with the (larger scale) policies/practices focused more directly on employment or formal education. Such combinations may produce more synergy as individual and social development creates important pre-conditions for improved employability
- Increasing the numbers and proportions of disadvantaged youth in Active Labour Market Policy programmes (ESF projects included)
- Focusing the programmes even more on deprived neighbourhoods

- Adopting a comprehensive but individualised approach to tackle the multiple barriers to labour market entry, ie employment services must be accompanied by other social (wrap-around) services, infrastructures and support
- Ensuring that a certain proportion of their programme funding is allocated to support for the most disadvantaged young people to provide more individualised treatment with special focus on their needs in transition to the labour market.

In addition, employment policies often fail to take account of the ‘demand’ side of the labour market and insufficient effort is made in some countries to collaborate with employers in the provision of targeted support for specific for ‘hard to place’ and discriminated target groups.

We recommend:

- Involving employers directly by creating public-private partnership/pacts between employers and municipalities/cities
- Developing an integrated approach such as that piloted in Sofia (HESED) based on example from IQRS in Brno.

There is a disconnect between employment and other services for young people and their client groups. Although One Stop Shop initiatives exist in several of the CITISPYCE cities, they seldom reach those most in need. Our findings reveal distrust and disillusion amongst this target group with the help available.

We recommend:

- Improving the quality and reach of employment and other services for young people through ensuring better training for staff working in front line services of One Stop Shops and also in the back-office (coordinated strategy/actions) and improving the ‘signposting’ of such services
- Co-opting organisations working *with* and trusted *by* young people to provide informal one-stop shops where specialist advisors can be co-located and more approachable than in an official building e.g. Physical spaces

occupied by social innovations such as Amaro Records in Brno and Community-based NGOs e.g. HESED in Sofia

- Providing better signposting to young people at local level and strengthening outreach services through collaboration with community-based NGOs e.g. HESED in Sofia or Educational Demos in Barcelona

There is a gap in support for those young people who have positive “alternative ambitions” (e.g. arts, media, entrepreneurial). Many young people do not wish to join job-seeking programmes with their conditionality and lack of flexibility. Self employment is, therefore, seen as a potential alternative, even if a precarious one, but there may be little or no help available to support this choice. In our research, however, we found a number of examples of young people who had been supported and assisted to become self-sufficient within arts-based social innovations aimed at developing participants’ personal and social competences. These also provide a supportive network and safe environment in which they can gain the necessary knowledge, experience and self-belief to work independently. Policy-makers should make use of these alternative informal learning and mentoring projects.

We recommend:

- Co-opting their services e.g. Educational Demos Barcelona, Beatfreeks, Birmingham, Hidden Wings Krakow,
- Facilitating access to funding and other resources to enable such organisations to scale up their activities and thus provide training and support for a greater number of aspiring freelance workers

3.2.3 Recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement

Our research shows that there is a strong requirement to empower young people facing inequalities through targeted assistance to meet their individual needs, leading to improved social competences, increased confidence and self-belief. There is also a need, however, to empower local communities (in which many of these young people live) by introducing more open governance mechanisms and new policy approaches to deprived neighbourhoods. This will involve: bridging symbolic and spatial divides; addressing the perceptions of decay and neglect; and creating trust to encourage the participation of those who feel excluded from the mainstream.

We have observed socially innovative arts-based practices at the local level which are able to empower young people who suffer from low levels of educational attainment and limited social and cultural capital. e.g. Hidden Wings (Krakow), Educational Demos (Barcelona), Beatfreeks (Birmingham).

We recommend:

- Using small-scale local social innovations as ‘policy models’ or ‘policy guidelines’ for broader (mainstream) public policy reforms in addressing discrimination, neglect of the most disadvantaged and helping change an approach focused on a policy of enforcement/work first activation
- Co-opting socially innovative arts-based practices at the local level to work with young people who suffer from low levels of educational attainment and limited social and cultural capital to improve their social competences, build their self-esteem and empower them to become ‘critical’ citizens
- Establishing local community centres that provide integrated and culturally tailored services for young people in the area (NB Roma neighbourhoods have the most important significant need for such approaches).

4. Funding programmes and resources to support social innovations by and for young people and increase their impact:

The Report on Social Innovation: a Decade of Change, published by the European Commission in 2014, reveals the extent to which policy-makers have moved social innovation to the forefront of the political agenda: social innovation as a driver for social change. Social Innovation is a key part of the Social Investment Package. This includes the Employment and Social Innovation (EaSI) programme, which inter alia makes technical assistance available for conducting randomised evaluations to administrations undertaking social policy reforms. The European Social Fund has made provision for encouraging socially innovative projects and the Framework Research and Development programmes of the past decade have supported research around social innovation. Yet, there is little attention paid to the specific potential of social innovations by and for young people to combat social inequalities. Perspectives on the nature and potential of social innovations to bring about societal changes are largely institutional/ and top-down. As

we have already made clear, policy-makers need to rethink their attitudes towards young people and harness the potential of their social innovations.

4.1 Funding policies and programmes

4.1.1 Improving the complementarity of funding programmes of different departments within and between institutions in terms of priorities, timescales and application criteria.

Whilst we recognise that progress has been made to improve communication and collaboration across different Directorates General (DGs) in the Commission, we consider that more needs to be done to improve the situation within and between all levels of governance but particularly national and local levels.

We recommend:

- Moving to a greater alignment of deadlines between DGs for applications for EU projects & programmes; (EU Level)
- Increasing the level of collaboration across departments or directorates with a shared interest in young people so that different funding streams can be more closely aligned to tackle the same priorities; (EU, national and local levels)
- Aligning more closely national objectives and types of intervention with those of both EU and local levels for the application of EU funding programmes e.g. Youth Guarantee and ESF; (National level)
- Devolving powers to local level to enable those closest to the sites of intervention to harmonise application criteria across complementary programmes at EU and national levels.

4.1.2 Improving continuity of policies and programmes aimed at assisting the most marginalised:

Building trust and developing individual social competences of young people who have low levels of educational attainment and limited social and cultural capital takes time and needs a consistency of intervention.

We recommend:

- Ensuring greater consistency of grant priorities and criteria for applications over different budget cycles to avoid applicants having to waste time and resources

‘tweaking’ their work programmes to meet shifts in requirements e.g. change of target group, area or outputs

- Retaining a percentage of grant money available to extend ‘new’ or short-term projects aimed at supporting vulnerable young people which can demonstrate success (see measurement and evaluation section). This could be further assisted by not requiring such projects to go through a fresh application process which takes time and may leave a project without resources to continue in the interim period between grants.

4.1.3 Introducing greater flexibility within existing funding programmes and publicising them more widely to enable small-scale organisations to access support

We recommend:

- Simplifying the eligibility criteria for accessing funding programmes for small social enterprises or self-employed social entrepreneurs or organisations recently created and thus with limited ‘track records’
- Minimising the level of reporting required including the monitoring and evaluation data required
- Reducing the match funding requirements for small-scale organisations
- Publicising and providing easy access to advice on programmes such as EaSI.

4.1.4 Broadening the scope of policies and programmes for young people facing inequalities to include those furthest from the mainstream

Policies and funding regimes focused on employment e.g Youth Guarantee Scheme do not currently meet the needs of those who are furthest from the mainstream with low levels of educational attainment and limited social and cultural capital.

We recommend:

- Introducing a requirement for youth policies to include the principles of empowerment and partnership
- Making provision for support for services that are tailor-made and suitable to the ambitions and abilities of participants rather than one size fits all

- Giving priority to projects and interventions which combine employment and/or education objectives with the development of individual and social competences
- Preparing specific youth employment policies, or ensuring that a certain percentage of funding stream should be allocated to better tailored programmes and ESF projects aimed specifically at supporting the most disadvantaged target groups of young people

4.2 Actively supporting the start-up, development and transfer of socially innovative practices

Social innovations often arise from the vision of an individual or small group of like-minded people and frequently struggle for resources in the early stages of development e.g. the social innovators fund the activities initially from their own pocket because they cannot pass the necessary credit checks to access private finance. Public grant schemes also have eligibility tests which preclude individual social innovators or start-up companies from applying. If they do succeed in securing financial support, the money is usually for specific time-limited projects, and subject to evaluation on the basis of quantitative targets.

We recommend:

- **Creating a dedicated ‘social innovation-youth’ programme** for application at the local level to pilot new approaches by young people to tackling disadvantaged young people’s inequalities; (EU level)
- Involving existing young social innovators (e.g. those identified by networks such as the SIX network or the CITISPYCE consortium) in **a consultative panel** to advise on the shaping of such a programme
- **Giving greater discretion at local level** for the use of ESF or other Youth Programmes under DG Education and Training to test how such innovations are able to support alternative employment pathways and approaches (e.g. arts-based experiences) to assist young people in personal development, acquiring of social competences and skills, networking and increasing employability (EU, national and local levels). This may mean revising the conditions which regulate member states’ access to and use of ESF.

- **Dedicating a percentage of any funds available for social innovations** to support innovative practices which are *by* young people *for* young people

Our pilot projects have demonstrated that it is possible to transfer innovative social practices from one national context to another. It requires the sensitive application of the philosophy, general goals and approaches in a different context and a respect for local conditions in terms of the tools and methods used.

We recommend:

- **Supporting the transfer of social innovations** through transnational networks such as Eurocities and the use of Erasmus+ programmes for knowledge transfer
- **Fostering openness to new ways of working through supporting ‘go and see’/‘look and learn’ exchanges** between local officials in municipalities or practitioners in NGOs or social entrepreneurs
- **Raising greater awareness of Erasmus+** by the European Commission and its national representations with young social innovators by incentivising EU funding specialists in universities and municipalities to share their expertise.

Such innovative practices are scaled up and disseminated mainly thanks to NGOs. During our research, it became clear, however, that private organisations, public administration bodies or universities can also act as players. Be that as it may, what is a very crucial condition of success is the development of **broader coalitions of partners**: public, non-profit, for-profit partnerships. Single citizens, civic committees, young people, informal groups need support to become part of them. Municipalities are well placed to act as catalysts for bringing such coalitions together but only if they are prepared to facilitate rather than control.

We recommend:

- Collaborating with private and not-for-profit partners across the city and at area level to draw on the funds, expertise and connections to young people and other citizens' groups who are aware of innovative social practices with potential to be scaled-up

5. Measurement and evaluation

In post-crisis Europe, policy-makers and practitioners, whether from the public, private or voluntary sector, are increasingly obliged to consider the value for money of any policy intervention they make. They have traditionally relied on predominantly quantitative indicators to measure the impact of many of their policies and practices. Yet, it has become increasingly clear that quantitative indicators alone are not adequate to measure the impact of social innovations, particularly in mitigating social inequalities. The Case Studies of the socially innovative practices we identified across the ten cities in the CITISPYCE project highlight the need for a more holistic approach, incorporating qualitative as well as quantitative indicators and assessing both internal and external success factors. These Case Studies also illustrate the value of small-scale social experimentation at the local level and the importance of the role of researchers in analysing their critical success factors in relation to achieving specific policy objectives. Policy-makers also need to re-assess what their policy objectives should be. Mitigating the symptoms of inequality alone is not enough; the overarching aim should be to find ways to tackle the underlying causes.

We recommend:

- Adopting continuous and systematic monitoring and evaluation to distinguish more clearly the effects of policy measures, bearing in mind that a possible higher cost for early intervention to assist an excluded young person is likely to be more cost effective over the long-term
- Investing in longitudinal client monitoring (at city and also at local area levels, coordinated by local authorities) where possible: at least in countries with sufficient administrative capacity
- Creating Knowledge Alliances between policy-makers, researchers and young social innovators to develop more holistic measurement frameworks in order to harness social innovations against inequalities experienced by young people more effectively e.g. Using subjective indicators of employability (as personal development, capability to gain and retain a meaningful job) and quality of life alongside objective indications such as drop-out rates from the programmes, job retention rates and similar.