



**Final Report Part III:**

**From research to action: bridging gaps between the academic and policy debates**

**Table of Contents**

INTRODUCTION ..... 4

**CHAPTER 6: IDENTIFYING AND EXCHANGING “SOCIALLY INNOVATIVE” PRACTICES ACROSS EUROPE..... 6**

1. INTRODUCTION..... 6

2. BRIEF CONCEPTUAL BACKGROUND TO SOCIAL INNOVATION ..... 7

3. ANALYSIS OF SOCIALLY INNOVATIVE PRACTICES: *THE MENU*..... 9

    3.1 *Methodological tools* ..... 9

    3.2 *Towards a typology of social innovations*..... 9

4. INTERIM WORKSHOP..... 13

5. COMPLETE MENU OF INNOVATIVE PRACTICES ..... 21

    5.1 *Overview of Social Innovation Practices in 10 “CITISPYCE cities” across Europe* ..... 22

    5.2 *Tables by city* ..... 24

REFERENCES ..... 44

**CHAPTER 7: IMPLEMENTATION OF PILOT ACTIONS – SOCIAL INNOVATION IN ACTION ..... 45**

1. INTRODUCTION..... 45

2. SOCIAL INNOVATION ..... 47

3. SELECTION OF PILOTS..... 50

    3.1 *Process*..... 50

    3.2 *Expressions of interest and final selection*..... 51

    3.3 *Reflections on the selection of pilots and lessons to be learned*..... 53

4. IMPLEMENTATION OF PILOTS ..... 55

4.1 Progress made .....	55
4.2 Actors.....	56
4.3 Top-down and bottom-up.....	61
4.4 Transferability.....	63
5. CENTRAL IDEAS: THE LOGIC OF INTERVENTIONS .....	65
5.1 Central ideas and success factors in SIPs.....	65
5.2 The balancing act of strengthening resilience, stimulating self-sufficiency and self- efficacy, building competences and social networks.....	70
5.3 Different central ideas of pilots contain different – implicit – views of people.....	71
6. REFLECTIONS AND GENERAL CONCLUSIONS.....	75
REFERENCES.....	82
<b>CHAPTER 8: ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF SOCIAL INNOVATIONS: 21 CASE STUDIES IN PERSPECTIVE.....</b>	<b>83</b>
1. INTRODUCTION: THE POSITION OF WORK PACKAGE 7 IN THE CITISPYCE PROJECT.....	83
2. CASE STUDIES: INNOVATIVE PRACTICES THAT HAVE BEEN ASSESSED .....	84
2.1 The selection .....	84
2.2 Clustering the innovative practices.....	85
3. THEORETICAL UNDERPINNING OF THE CASE STUDIES.....	88
4. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY .....	92
5. KEY FEATURES OF THE INNOVATIVE PRACTICES: AN OVERVIEW .....	94
5.1 Employment.....	94
5.2 Entrepreneurship .....	99
5.3 Education and personal development .....	106
5.4 Recognition, trust, empowerment, neighbourhood development.....	116
6. ASSESSMENT OF THE INNOVATIVE PRACTICES IN PERSPECTIVE .....	129
6.1 Addressing the key dimensions of inequalities .....	130
6.2 Success factors.....	132
REFERENCES.....	135
ANNEX: THE LIST OF THE CASE STUDIES ON INNOVATIVE PRACTICES .....	136
<b>CHAPTER 9: POLICY ISSUES AND PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS.....</b>	<b>137</b>
1. INTRODUCTION .....	137
2. ADDRESSING THE CAUSES AND SYMPTOMS OF INEQUALITIES .....	138
2.1 The societal level causes (structural, semiotic, material) .....	140
2.2 The individual level causes (actors-related causes) .....	141
2.3 The target groups involved.....	142
3. THE SUCCESS FACTORS IN BRIEF.....	143
3.1 The internal success factors.....	144

- 3.2 *The external success factors* ..... 144
- 4. THE INNOVATIVE PRACTICES IN CONTEXTS ..... 145
- 5. PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS..... 145
  - 5.1 *General policy recommendations* ..... 147
  - 5.2 *Specific policy recommendations*..... 151
    - 5.2.1 Employment & Entrepreneurship..... 151
    - 5.2.2 Education and development..... 156
    - 5.2.3 Recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement, and neighbourhood development ..... 158
- REFERENCES ..... 160
- ANNEX I - SCHEME: THE CLUSTERS OF THE INNOVATIVE PRACTICES..... 161

## **Introduction**

In the following chapters the attention shifts from the changing nature of social inequalities towards exploring the nature of social innovations by and for young people in Europe's major cities. We have sought to identify and analyse innovations in the light of a range of factors, both specific to local space and shared across cities. As with social inequalities, partners have brought different disciplinary perspectives to bear on the concept of social innovation by and for young people. In particular, this has been in relation to the actors involved, the distinctive attributes that a social practice should display in order to be considered innovative and success factors. These different approaches to social innovation should not, however, be regarded as competing, but rather as complementary and valuable in aiding our understanding of the complexities of the factors at work.

Part III covers the activities in which policy-makers come to the fore as they consider the implications of the findings from the previous phases of the CITISPYCE project and the potential to address inequalities of the types of social innovations gathered together in the Menu of Innovative Practices described in Chapter 6. Existing policy measures to combat inequality have tended to be 'top-down' initiatives targeted at traditional 'disadvantaged' groups but the lengthening period of austerity has changed the nature and scale of the task. Arguably, there are now far more young people with more complex challenges who need new kinds of support but reductions in public spending at all levels make this difficult to achieve. Nevertheless, the gaps which now exist between public policies and the realities of life for many young people offer opportunities for new actors from civil society e.g. third sector organisations, private companies or individuals to respond with new ways of thinking and doing.

By seeking out examples of potentially innovative social practices at the local level, it has been possible to gain fresh insights into young people's responses to the manifestations of inequality as perceived and/or experienced by them on the ground. Some of the innovative social practices uncovered in our research are the product of very local conditions and specific histories but policy-makers and practitioners identified a number in different neighbourhoods and cities which appeared to share characteristics in terms of the problem addressed, solution implemented or approach adopted. Chapter 7, therefore, describes the process of selection by policy-makers and practitioners of socially innovative practices (SIPs) which they see as having the potential for transferability. It goes on to examine the implementation process and the lessons learnt from the different experiences with regard to the critical success factors involved. Chapter 8 examines

in depth twenty-one socially innovative practices which have been the subject of detailed Case Studies together with related pilot projects. It provides evidence on the design, implementation and outcomes of these innovative practices, while paying attention to their innovative elements as well as to their transferability. It adds to our knowledge and understanding of social innovations; how and why they happen and how they can achieve positive outcomes. Chapter 9 takes the evaluation of our findings on social innovations against inequality by and for young people a stage further; examining how these practices address not only symptoms but possibly also causes of social inequalities as identified in the first phases of the CITISPYCE project. In so doing we return to our original research question with reflections and recommendations on how such innovative social practices might assist policy-makers to combat young people's inequalities more effectively in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century.

## **Chapter 6: Identifying and exchanging “Socially Innovative” Practices across Europe**

Olga Jubany and Berta Güell

Universitat de Barcelona

### **1. Introduction**

This chapter gathers the key socially innovative practices and initiatives that have been identified during the phase of fieldwork across the ten cities involved in the project (Athens, Barcelona, Birmingham, Brno, Hamburg, Krakow, Sofia, Venice, Malmö and Rötterdam). This comes after examining the causes and symptoms of social inequalities at the macro level, analysing the effects of deprived neighbourhoods in the (re)production of social inequalities among young people at the meso level, and gathering the perspectives of young people to overcome them at the micro level. Following the objectives of the Interim Evaluation, a main task has been to detect emerging themes related to the innovative practices against inequalities uncovered in the fieldwork and draw up a Menu of Innovative Practices that collates and structures them along key variables.

This Menu is based on the gathering of 45 projects, initiatives and practices regarded as socially innovative to tackle, navigate and overcome social inequalities affecting young people in the ten mentioned cities. Such practices have been developed and fostered by institutions or municipalities (top-down level), as well as by associations, grass-root organisations and groups of young people (bottom-up level) with varying degrees of organisation and different structures of governance.

In order to enhance the bridge between academia and policy, an Interim Workshop was held, aimed at presenting a selection of social innovations and discussing them with stakeholders and young people previously involved with the project. This includes interviewees from both stages of the fieldwork (experts and youngsters) and policy-makers or further stakeholders interested in testing innovations from elsewhere. The Workshop was held in Krakow on 19<sup>th</sup> of September

2014 with the representation of academics, stakeholders, policy-makers and young people from the ten cities, organised in two sessions. The sessions undertook interactive methods to foster debate and proved successful in what regards the reactions and feedback from young people invited, and the gathering of preliminary expressions of interest from policy-makers to implement pilots. Both the Menu and the workshop, in turn, have served as the basis to inform the selection and implementation of Pilot Actions.

## **2. Brief conceptual background to social innovation**

Although the concept of social innovation was already discussed by classical sociologists such as Durkheim, Weber and Schumpeter in the XIX and XX centuries, it has strongly come to the fore in the EU political discourse and in the social sciences literature, especially within the context of the economic crisis (Hubert 2010). Whilst there is much discussion over what concerns the actual definition, the cause-effect relationships or the related policy implications, in the current debate it is regarded as a hybrid concept, flexible enough to adapt to a variety of situations, including both the academia and policy domains (European Commission 2013). From the policy dimension, social innovations are framed as new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations (Murray et al 2010). The ‘social’ component of innovations refers both to the ends and the means (Hubert 2010 in Grisolia and Ferragina 2015).

In social sciences literature (sociology, social anthropology ...), social innovation tends to be understood as both a normative and analytical concept in the formation and analysis of solutions to social exclusion problems in European cities and one with an eventual input into the development of new social integration strategies (Gerometta et al 2005). As a normative concept, social innovation has been criticised for becoming too much of a buzzword that juxtaposes the qualifier “social” to the private sector jargon (Phills, Deigleimer and Miller 2008: 36), in order to avoid deep discussions on structural inequalities (Grisolia and Ferragina 2015). Yet, it still presents analytical features which help in framing the articulation of responses to processes of social exclusion.

A key component of social innovation is the empowerment dimension, by allowing – in this case – young people to participate and increase their capabilities (Goldsmith 2010; Gerometta et al 2005). This can encompass strengthening resilience, building social capital and networks, providing access to media and information resources, access to education and labour market, support in starting one’s own business, etc. Social innovation can exist at several interrelated

levels: bottom-up participative actions to deal with a shared problem or social need at the local level; innovative responses from social actors to broader societal challenges for the greater good; and innovations in public governance to create conditions in which social innovation can flourish. Yet, social innovation is often aimed at promoting the local development (Murray et al 2010), including that of deprived neighbourhoods. Finally, another feature of social innovation is linked to the governance dynamics, as it often involves building new forms of organisation and interactions for tackling social issues (Hubert 2010; Gerometta et al 2005).

Research projects dealing with social innovation have used a diversity of definitions to cover multiple dimensions and draw a changing reality in terms of both outcomes and processes (European Commission 2013). These definitions have addressed basic questions like why, what and how social innovation is manifested, such as what new responses can we find to long-standing or new social problems? Or what means, approaches or strategies are being applied (e.g. use of new technologies and social media)? Who should benefit from social innovations and to what extent vulnerable groups are considered as both drivers and recipients of social innovation? Who is carrying out processes of social innovation and what kind of resources are being used? Or how are the different actors cooperating between them to mobilise resources and what logics of governance do they establish?

For the purposes of this project, ‘social innovation’ refers in a wide sense to those policies, services and practices that meet new social needs of specific vulnerable groups like young people (resulting from social inequalities and social exclusion) or better meet the existing ones in a more effective and/or sustainable way. This chapter displays different ways of innovating in deprived neighbourhoods, by addressing social inequalities affecting youth through logics of bottom-up or top-down organisation (or a mixture of them).

The practices included in the Menu are regarded to be innovative as far as they: i) meet new social needs or better meet the already existing ones of specific vulnerable groups like young people; ii) find new ways of meeting social needs which are more effective, efficient and/or sustainable than the alternatives; iii) empower people, allowing them to participate and increase their capabilities; iv) promote the awareness of rights and active citizenship; v) turn social challenges to opportunities; and vi) increase social capital, social trust and enhance society’s capacity to undertake actions at the local level. We may also consider as a criterion to identify social innovations, those practices which go beyond the local level and take into account the interdependencies between cities and countries and the consequences this has in the growing inequities within Europe (Stigendal 2013).

### **3. Analysis of socially innovative practices: *the Menu***

#### **3.1 Methodological tools**

In order to produce the selection of Social Innovation Practices, several methodological tools were designed. In the first place, a fiche template was elaborated to structure the information along common indicators. These include:

- a short description of the practice,
- the innovative nature and the social inequalities addressed,
- the origins and structure of the practice,
- the territorial scope,
- the actors involved,
- the target groups,
- funding and resources,
- results and success factors, and
- transferability issues.

In addition, a table was produced with a summary of the five practices for each city, so it delivers a brief overview of the whole “menu”. Last, a crossed matrix was designed and completed in order to obtain a big picture of all social innovations identified within the Citispyce project, structured along dimensions of social innovation (detailed in the section below) and policy areas. As it is shown, some of the practices are placed in more than one box, as they relate to more than one dimension and/or area. This table is not to be taken as a fixed categorisation, but as a tool to present an overview of all the initiatives.

#### **3.2 Towards a typology of social innovations**

As reflected in the summary tables and in the fiches located at the end of the report, the innovative nature of the practices selected is manifold, reflecting the theoretical conceptions around social innovation. Some of them are focused on addressing the *causes* of social inequalities (e.g. local welfare programmes against youth unemployment, facilitating access to housing, support in education, health assistance, programmes of antidiscrimination against ethnic minorities). These initiatives arise in the context of a shrinking welfare state and are often led by NGOs or associations which offer services for disadvantaged groups who otherwise would not have access to.

In contrast, other practices are more tailored to address the *symptoms* of social inequalities which do not attempt to change the socio-economic structures, but have a more palliative character (e.g. after-school leisure programmes, projects focused on sports or artistic genres, food banks). Here we must take into account the complexity and shortcomings in some cases to distinguish between causes and symptoms of social inequalities. Going beyond an analysis framed in binary terms, the results of this investigation have shown that causes and symptoms are often intertwined and one reinforces the other, especially at the meso (neighbourhood) and micro (individuals) levels.

On the other hand, there are some practices in which innovation relates to the *means* they use, the *approaches* they adopt, or the *dimensions* they tackle related to the types of social inequalities. By *means* we understand, for instance, the use of virtual social media and technology (e.g. groups of WhatsApp, YouTube tutorials, Facebook groups) to devise innovative ways of studying, communicating, sharing resources and organising social networks together. Another innovative method is the use of creative arts or sports to provide skills and abilities which can then be applied to seek a job, continuing education or becoming an entrepreneur. These are sometimes related to non-formal education with the involvement of social/street/youth workers who are in regular contact with youngsters. This is the case of, for instance, the school of theatre Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom or the 'Educational Demos' project, both located in Barcelona.

The innovative *approaches* focus on new ways of dealing with problems and finding solutions, also linked to the concept of resilience, often connected to the use of innovative means. For instance, in Brno the NGO IQ Roma Service increases chances of labour market inclusion for the most disadvantaged (including the young Roma) through a complex intervention called 'triangle approach'. This combines the 'Ethnic-friendly employer' campaign, a media campaign about active Roma 'We do work', counselling and training activities. The approach adopted by the organisation Energy Control in Barcelona in relation to the prevention of drugs consumption among youth is also very innovative in the context of Spain and within Europe, despite not being so new (existing since 1997). This focuses on raising awareness of the risks associated to the drugs consumption on a peer-to-peer basis accepting the recreational use of drugs linked to leisure, instead of attempting to prevent consumption at all. Another example is the 'Challenge Sports' project in Rotterdam which uses sports to teach young people social skills, help them find their way (back) into education or employment and build social capital.

The *dimensions* that have been considered as socially innovative are mainly related to the effects that deprived neighbourhoods have on young people by (re)producing social inequalities. These dimensions arise from the comparative findings of WP3 focused on analysing how young people

are affected by neighbour-related factors like the social infrastructure, the social structure, or the most recent social history. Such findings were then considered and contrasted during the fieldwork of WP4 when talking to young people. In this sense, we looked at how young people experience social inequalities in deprived neighbourhoods, how they face them in their everyday lives and their engagement in socially innovative practices, both organised by them or by other bodies or institutions. The dimensions of social innovation are thus directly related to responses to social inequalities.

One of the key findings arising from fieldwork is revealed by the effects caused by physical elements or symbols that divide a deprived neighbourhood from the rest of the city in terms of reinforcement of the 'ghettoisation' of the area. Therefore, actions oriented to bridging urban and social distances between and within neighbourhoods could help in a greater mobility and networking with the resources offered in other parts of the city. Social distance could be mitigated by ethnic or kinship communities which offer a safe environment, or by organisations providing easy access to services within the deprived neighbourhood. It is the case, for example, of the Health and Social Community Centre of Fakulteta (Sofia), oriented to provide consultation, training, and health and social assistance to young families, children and young people of the Roma community who do not tend to use services outside the area.

On the other hand, the existence of neglected and abandoned spaces has also been reported as a phenomenon in many cities, intensifying an image and impression of decay. Here, the dimension of social innovation would be (re)claiming such spaces and giving them a (new) use undertaking activities with which young people may feel identified. Communing is an increasing trend to foster participation of residents in decision-making linked to urban regeneration schemes (e.g. urban gardening, skateparks).

Finally, another influence of the neighbourhoods in (re)producing social inequalities is represented by the social infrastructures available for young people. There are youth services which lack resources, are limited to short-term projects, and are bound to conflicting agendas of public order, employability, and also human rights and social inclusion (Güntner et al 2014). In this sense, exclusionary forms of servicing could be addressed through innovation in service provision offering reliable and robust funding. This is also connected to an issue of trust which, in the interviews with young people, proved to be fundamental for their social inclusion. Innovative projects thus relate to the promotion of trust and empowerment of young people so that they recognise and achieve their personal goals, and foster civic engagement for a more cohesive society. This is the case, for example, of 'Own Strength Conferences' in Rotterdam,

oriented to promote self-confidence and empowerment of young people and help in achieving their goals in the future, as well as programmes of mentorships (e.g. Mentoring for refugees in Hamburg or the Brightful project in Malmö).

Two further dimensions explored during the fieldwork are represented by those social innovations aimed at fostering engagement and civil participation, or taking into account the gender perspective and kinship programmes. The Community Lab in Emilia-Romagna (Italy) is probably the initiative that better highlights the implementation of a deliberative process to assess and design the local welfare agenda bringing back society into a horizontal process of governance and active citizenship. The innovative character of this initiative also relies on the fact that social inequalities are rooted in environments where there is a lack of engagement in collective issues. Therefore, the promotion of participation among young people in deprived areas is regarded as a social innovation which enables the development of resilience strategies. The dimension of gender and kinship is highlighted by the practices of Dolce Lounge and Little Miss Creative (both in Birmingham) or the Health and Social Community Centre (in Sofia). The latter covers important needs such as enhancement of youth's personal development and reduction of risky behaviours, training of youth leaders or empowerment of girls and women towards gender equality.

This chapter sheds light on social innovations categorised into five key dimensions:

- bridging urban and social distances within and between neighbourhoods
- recognition, visibility and usability of neglected spaces (e.g. communing)
- promotion of trust and empowerment, linked to the fostering of young people skills and the provision of reliable and robust youth services
- encouragement of engagement and civil participation among young people
- inclusion of gender perspective and kinship programmes for young people in deprived neighbourhoods

On the other hand, the selected practices include both *bottom-up* initiatives resulting from individuals, groups of young people or organisations, and *top-down* projects responding to a more structured programme designed and implemented by institutions or the local government. In some cases, this is not so clearly distinguished as there might be different logics of governance behind them, also influenced by the agencies funding the project/programme/initiative (e.g. co-financing between public and private funds). In this sense, a lot of the criticism about restructured

relationships between the state, local government and communities is that they result in complex and contradictory logics of accountability and governance. Linked to the origin of the practices, some adopt a more *formal* organisation, often coinciding with the top-down measures, whereas others are more *informal* evolving to growing levels of institutionalisation.

#### **4. Interim Workshop**

The workshop was organised as a space of exchange between academics, policy-makers from different municipalities (e.g. Birmingham, Rotterdam, Hamburg, Malmö, Krakow) and young people from the participating countries, having a total of around 50 participants. Some of the policy-makers did not belong to the consortium, creating an added value and further synergies between the academia and policy levels. The workshop was organised with the following objectives:

- To share project findings and the selection of social innovation practices in ten cities across Europe
- To gather feedback from those on the ground: stakeholders and young people
- To reflect on these innovative practices in terms of transferability to other cities
- To identify together which innovative practices could be of interest for exporting and implementing as pilot actions in other cities.

In order to ensure their involvement and stimulate the debate, an interactive methodology was designed together with Beatfreaks (one of the practices selected in Birmingham). After a welcome and presentation of the objectives of the day, a dynamic ‘marketplace’ was settled where each city had a stall to present their practices. Whilst there was a member of each city explaining the initiative in each stall, the rest of participants circulated from stall to stall listening to the presentations with the opportunity to make any questions, if interested. In order to encourage participation, many of the practices were presented by the same people involved in them and creative mechanisms were designed to ensure communication and transcend language barriers among participants. Considering time constraints, each city selected a couple of practices (making a total of 27 out of the 45) which had more potential to be transferred in terms of timing (within November 2014 and March 2015), resources and with no need for complex organisational structures. These were the following:

#### **ATHENS:**

Local Bazaar

Municipal Remedial Teaching Centre

Social Grocery

**BARCELONA:**

Educational Demos

Energy Control

Forn de Teatre Pa' Tothom

**BIRMINGHAM:**

Beatfreeks

The Loft

Back on Track

**BRNO:**

Ethnic Friendly Employer brand

Gendalos (The mirror)

Complex approach to employment of Roma

**HAMBURG:**

Mentoring for Refugees

Cultural Bus

Youth Jobcentre JBA

**KRAKOW:**

Mistrzejowice (Youth District Council)

Mój trener (My sports instructor)

Free tuition for the pupils

**MALMÖ:**

ESF funded preparatory project

Brightful

**ROTTERDAM:**

Buzinezzclub

Challenge Sports

**SOFIA:**

Health and Social Community Centre

Legalisation of Roma homes

New Chance for Success

**VENICE:**

Etam

Community Lab



*Stalls in Marketplace, Krakow City Hall, Poland*

Participants expressed very much interest in practices implemented elsewhere. Whilst some of the initiatives had been applied for years in various contexts, there are elements such as the approach, the relation to the target group, the means they use, the way to organise it or the actors participating that makes them innovative. It is also interesting that without knowledge of each other, similar social innovations have been implemented in different cities in response to common realities. For example, it is the case of a group of theatrical companies working with vulnerable groups (young people in Barcelona and disabled people in Krakow) to deal with social difficulties and create pieces of theatre based on their own experiences. In terms of transferability, participants expressed that it is not only a matter of resources and timing available, but also of local culture adaptation. In Krakow, for instance, a young person was interested in the local bazaars implemented in Greece, but they could see it hard to apply due to the individualistic approach and the lack of a broad social capital among youngsters in their city.

The use of role models also raised much interest as a good practice with successful results. It was the case of the “Challenge Sports” programme with the involvement of top-sport athletes or the “Buzinezzclub”, both in Rotterdam, displaying cases of young entrepreneurs who had achieved to set-up a business. On the other hand, the action of “Beatfrecks” during the workshop was a good example of the high potential a group of active and creative young people has to generate enthusiasm and engagement amongst others, notably young people. Their intervention was much valued and useful.

Following the marketplace, there was a session with young people with round-table discussions about the most striking points of the practices presented and the relation to their needs, problems, concerns or interests. Youngsters were also asked to select an initiative that they would like to see implemented in their city and comment on the main perceived shortcomings of it if it were to be applied (i.e. hindrances). More specifically by city, young people expressed the following comments in relation to their problems, needs and potential solutions:

- In Hamburg, RH<sup>1</sup> felt that self-help groups were a good thing but too often they seemed to be for a small number of ‘insiders’. They were not open and lacked the tools to open up to ‘newcomers’. The voluntary classes held by older students to teach younger people who normally lack support from their parents (Remedial Teaching Centre of Athens) was also one of the favourite practices in Hamburg.

---

<sup>1</sup> This relates to the initials of a participant. Please note that this is applied in the following bullet points too.

- RS from Brno said that young people need a space where they feel valued and acknowledged by others and also spaces for self-expression. Sometimes they are accused of illegal actions when they are using spaces in ways that others do not like (e.g. graffiti). RS liked a combination of the projects Beatfreaks and Forn de Teatre Pa Tothom in Barcelona to motivate young people, empower them, and give them confidence and self-respect. The challenge is that it would cost money and there is a lack of trust, but the offer of free benefits (e.g. a free meal) might persuade youngsters to give it a try.
- A participant from Rotterdam commented that his job was to make children independent and get them back into school. He liked the project which could help children to get involved from different countries through sport to prevent them getting into trouble with the police, etc. It offers varied opportunities and there is no age limit. On the other hand, LD from Rotterdam felt that a project like Beatfreaks for young creatives would help encourage and channel self-expression. There are arts/creative schools, but the problem is the lack of employment. As a creative person himself, now he feels more engaged and is stimulated to see whether a creative hotspot in Rotterdam where people come together can be realized. LD also liked the Educational Demos project from Barcelona, as it could help in building trust between young people and society and it would be a good way to deal with their daily concerns.
- The participant AH from Birmingham felt that it was not how young people expressed themselves but how their self-expression was dealt with by those in authority. The problem is how to get policy-makers to understand. Birmingham also liked a combination of “Buzziness Club” from Rotterdam and the “Multisectoral learning through the testing of the Pentahelix Model” applying a consultative approach with young people of Malmö. They often do not know how to turn their good idea or their talent into a business and get lost in the process. This initiative gives them few avenues to connect and outline their needs to those in authority.
- For Malmö, a general comment was that Local Authorities are poor at connecting with young people. A solution might be if students were given power to investigate them.
- From Athens, young people experience extreme pressure at school and have no time for leisure activities and time to dedicate on personal relationships. On top of that, daily

difficulties, the fear of unemployment and uncertainty make things more complicated. FG liked Beatfreaks as it empowers young people and encourages them to take responsibility. She believed it would be easy to make it happen – “I can see the space (*I need*) and I know how to make it happen”. “It’s a positive form of rebellion”.

- For Barcelona, JR felt that youngsters are often narrow-minded in relation to others from outside (newcomers, etc.) and they need opportunities to meet/learn more about other cultures, etc. (e.g. by facilitating low-cost trips). SM also liked the project My Sport instructor (Krakow) and saw it as easy to implement because all cities could make use of their sports facilities and this would lead to a sense of community. The challenge may be to find volunteers to help and to spot talent.
- For Venice, participants felt that young people do not have enough chances to show who and what they are. Disadvantaged youngsters have no role model/leaders and they are disconnected from others. In this sense, it would be good to use role models and good practices on a peer-to-peer basis for people facing more problems.
- In Krakow there was a preference for the ‘Local Bazaar’. “You can create a community” because the problem in the city appears to be a lack of a sense of community. The challenge would be to get a response from people in an area – “they are so reserved”. In this regard, someone in Venice proposes that a sense of community could be created through the Social Street project implemented in Venice (first seen in Emilia Romagna) whereby Facebook is used to create an online community in the street which turns into an actual community. It’s low cost. It could happen in all cities but the challenge is bureaucracy at the higher levels (e.g how to get and use physical spaces). The voluntary classes held by students to teach younger people was also one of the favourite practices in Krakow.



*Session with young people*

During the morning, parallel to the session with young people, there was time allocated for stakeholders and policy-makers to initiate discussions about the practices that had been presented and the potential transferability in their own cities. These were then gathered in the session for stakeholders and policy-makers which took place after lunch time. Stakeholders were mainly related to City Halls (e.g. Departments of Youth), NGOs, private initiatives, or public centres. The session was moderated by the two members of Beatfreaks to stimulate responses and expressions of interest about transferring the practices. The discussions were mainly about the needs young people are facing in their cities and a list of potential solutions, drawing upon some of the practices presented. Then, issues of transferability in other local environments were raised, in order to consider which practices could be piloted in response to their social needs and available resources.

A few policy-makers expressed their concerns about the impact that some of the social innovations may have on young people's lives in the long-run in terms of promotion of independence. In this regard, practices like the "Educational Demos" (hip hop productions) or the "Local Bazaar" (exchange of goods) are more addressed at offering spaces of non-formal education, leisure and sharing of resources within the neighbourhood. This can reverse the symptoms of the problems they may face, also perceived as a sign of resilience, yet it does not necessarily affect the root of the problems (e.g. unemployment, lack of training). Yet, it is also important not to underestimate the learning process that such initiatives can offer in terms of values, skills, abilities and empowerment which in the day after tomorrow could be of use. Having said this, other practices like the "Ethnic friendly employer" in Brno, the "Buzinezz Club" in Rotterdam, the "Municipal Remedial Teaching Centre" in Athens, or the "Health and Social Community Centre" in Sofia are examples that tackle much more directly the causes of social inequalities. Yet, in terms of transferability, they involve quite more complex structures and resources, which may make it more challenging to test in a pilot, at least within the scope of the Citispyce project.

Nonetheless, it was clear from the discussion that a pilot action could take several formats, as long as it ended up in a pilot-plan following a checklist with a range of indicators, which were: a) a transfer of one practice from one place to the other; b) putting into practice a project or initiative identified in the fieldwork not yet implemented; or c) adding or changing some of the elements of existing practices: a likely/feasible option of not transferring a complete initiative from one place to another, but adding an important part inspired by practices elsewhere to an

already existing initiative. Having these formats in mind, several cities made expressions of interest:

- Venice in importing the “Educational Demos” from Barcelona;
- Hamburg in importing the Roma project from Sofia and “Challenge Sport” from Rotterdam;
- Birmingham in importing the “Buzinezzclub” from Rotterdam and the “Local Bazaar” from Athens;
- Krakow in importing “Challenge Sport” from Rotterdam;
- Athens in importing “The Loft” from Birmingham and the “Theatre Forn Pa’Tothom” from Barcelona;
- Brno in importing the “Educational Demos” from Barcelona, the Refugee project from Hamburg, and the “Buzinezzclub” and “Challenge Sport” from Rotterdam;
- Malmö, Barcelona and Rotterdam were not yet clear about their intentions on setting up pilots themselves. Policymakers from Rotterdam were interested to know what initiatives were promoted as a solution, and they had interest in some initiatives. Nonetheless, they were interested on networking on a higher level, and could take advantage of the contacts made with the policy-makers from the city of Malmö.

Parallel to the session with stakeholders, the hosting partner from Krakow prepared a trip to the ex-soviet neighbourhood of Nowa Hutta for the young people, with an organised visit to a youth organisation. After the workshop a space for feedback and evaluation was allowed, and partners were invited to complete a form and send it back for inclusion in the workshop report. This was structured along a series of questions, according to the observations and discussions partners had had with participants:

- To what extent did the practices presented reflect the experiences of young people in your city context related to social inequalities and social innovation?
- What practices do you consider raised more interest among young people and stakeholders and why?
- Is your city interested in implementing/transferring a socially innovative practice from those presented at the workshop? Why this one? What are the core aspects that make it innovative and what social needs does it address?

In general terms, the workshop was successful in meeting its objectives, allowing a space for exchange and debate, and building up bridges to connect the academia, the policy arena and

civil society. It was an excellent opportunity to get to know practices that are being implemented in different countries, and participants believed that the practices presented were strongly related to the experiences and needs that young people have in their city context. Despite the different country origins, it was evident from the workshop that young people face similar needs and problems. Key issues discussed involved the problem of self-expression among young people, the lack of spaces, places, provisions for young people in local and state contexts and finally society's and local authorities' response, which often is discouraging and punitive. The lack of provisions for young people results in either no opportunities for self-expression or unconstructive self-expression in non-legitimate ways. Social inequalities that young people experience in their lives have an enormous impact in their self-development and in their life prospects.

The workshop exposed how young people feel not respected, not able to participate, and rejected by society, as well as disconnected from those in authority. The message communicated to stakeholders was to involve young people in decision making processes (also facilitating bridges between local authorities and them), and be given responsibility in the organisation and delivery of initiatives that affect them directly (e.g. promotion of co-creation beyond participation). This would largely contribute to listening to their demands and to better understanding their needs. Practices presented in the workshop involve efforts made at a smaller or greater scale to engage young people in society and to fulfil specific needs, based on the city context.

The initiatives aimed at addressing the key causes of inequalities like facilitating access to jobs and housing or improving employability (education, training) seemed to reflect best their experiences from the 'objective' perspective. On the other hand, many of the practices are aimed to tackle the symptoms of inequalities, such as a lack of opportunities to meet or to perform valuable leisure activities. Whilst these may appear superficial because they do not address the root of the problems in a direct way, they are very much enjoyed by young people and often represent necessary steps for further actions which are more clearly targeted to the causes of inequalities. In this sense, practices linked to creative and media are much appreciated and sometimes they are possible to feed into empowerment and civic engagement, which also reflects the experiences and needs of young people too.

Concerning organisational issues, some participants expressed that, whilst it was interesting to have a session for stakeholders to meet during the session of young people, a more structured session would have contributed to maximise discussions and exchanges. Also, once the session

with stakeholders finished, some participants expressed that they would have enjoyed more time for discussion in a joint session with young people, policy-makers and the consortium to exchange final opinions.

The weeks after the workshop were devoted to establish negotiations with the respective cities and explore the feasibility of implementing pilot actions. In this next phase, it was particularly important to identify and test the working ingredients and success factors playing a role in each of the initiatives.

In general terms, from the description of the practices, some of the success factors that played a role in many social innovations had to do with issues of agency (tailoring and involvement of young people), the approach to enhance skills and abilities of youngsters, and the revitalisation of urban spaces in decay towards new uses. Once pilots were implemented, the description of the practices from the Menu was also of use towards the analysis of case studies.

## 5. Complete Menu of Innovative Practices

The next section includes a general overview of the 45 practices by policy areas and dimensions of social innovation, the ten summary tables by city and the description of practices with fiches, following the colour associated to each city, ordered alphabetically.

### ATHENS:

Municipal Remedial Teaching Centre  
Local Bazaar- Products Exchange Event  
Social Grocery  
TOPEKO  
Municipal Vegetable Garden

### BARCELONA:

Educational Demos  
Energy Control  
Forn de Teatre Pa' Tothom  
Kasal de Joves de Roquetes  
Masoveria Urbana

### BIRMINGHAM:

Beatfrecks  
The Loft  
Midland Heart Housing Association: Back on Track  
Dolce Lounge  
Little Miss Creative

### KRAKOW:

Mistrzejowice (Youth District Council)  
Mój trener (My sports instructor)  
Free tuition for the pupils in the neighbourhood Rząka (Therapeutic class); Mistrzejowice (Integration class)  
Volleyball Academy of Krakow

### MALMÖ:

Multisectoral learning  
Brightful

### ROTTERDAM:

Buzinezzclub  
Challenge Sports  
Own Strength Conferences

### SOFIA:

Health and Social Community Centre  
Legalization of Roma Homes  
New Chance for Success

**5.1 Overview of Social Innovation Practices in 10 “CITISPYCE cities” across Europe**

S.I. DIMENSIONS	AREAS				
	Economy and employment	Education, training and new technologies	Social services and health	Welfare Housing	Sports, creative arts and leisure
Bridging social and urban distances	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Local Bazaar (Athens)</li> <li>2. Complex approach to employment of Roma (Brno)</li> <li>3. Ethnic Friendly Employer (Brno)</li> <li>4. Back on Track (B’ham)</li> <li>5. Youth Employment Agency (H’burg)</li> <li>6. TOPEKO (Athens)</li> <li>7. Learning by working (Brno)</li> <li>8. Youth Jobcentre (Hamburg)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peer education (Krakow)</li> <li>2. Cultural-Bus (H’burg)</li> <li>3. Remedial Teaching Center (Athens)</li> <li>4. Gendalos (Brno)</li> <li>5. Mentoring for Refugees (H’burg)</li> <li>6. AOL Project (Hamburg)</li> <li>7. Therapeutic class (Krakow)</li> <li>8. Chitalishte (Sofia)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Etam (Vce)</li> <li>2. Health and Social Community centre (Sofia)</li> <li>3. Social Grocery (Athens)</li> <li>4. Health Mediators (Sofia)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Masoveria urbana (Bcn)</li> <li>2. AOL Project (Hamburg)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My sports instructor (Krakow)</li> <li>2. Challenge Sports (R’dam)</li> </ol>
Recognition and visibility		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Peer education (Krakow)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. ComuniCare (Vce)</li> <li>2. Energy control (Bcn)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Legislation of Roma homes (Sofia)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Forn Pa Tothom (Bcn)</li> <li>2. The Loft (B’ham)</li> <li>3. Educational Demos - TEB (Bcn)</li> </ol>

			3. Health Mediators (Sofia)		4. Chitalishte (Sofia)
Empowerment and trust	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Buzinezz Club (R'dam)</li> <li>2. Ethnic Friendly Employer (Brno)</li> <li>3. Mentoring for Refugees (H'burg)</li> <li>4. Brightful (Malmö)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Educational Demos (Bcn)</li> <li>2. Youth Counter (R'dam)</li> <li>3. New Chance for Success (Sofia)</li> <li>4. Back on Track (B'ham)</li> <li>5. Use of social media (H'burg)</li> <li>6. Brightful (Malmö)</li> <li>7. Own Strength Conferences (R'dam)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Community Lab (Vce)</li> <li>2. Youth District Council (Krakow)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Marghera libera e pensante (Venice)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Forn Pa Tothom (Bcn)</li> <li>2. Cultural-Bus (H'burg)</li> <li>3. CommuniCare (Venice)</li> </ol>
<b>AREAS</b> <b>S.I.</b> <b>DIMEN-</b> <b>SIONS</b>	Economy and employment	Education, training and new technologies	Welfare		Sports, creative arts and leisure
Engagement and civil participation	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Municipal Vegetable Garden (Athens)</li> <li>2. Through Community Work (Brno)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Gendalos (Brno)</li> <li>2. BeatFreaks (B'ham)</li> <li>3. Multisectoral learning (Malmö)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Etam (Vce)</li> <li>2. Community Lab (Vce)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Masoveria urbana (Bcn)</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kasal de Joves de Roquetes (Bcn)</li> <li>2. Volleyball Academy (Krakow)</li> </ol>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Youth District Council (Krakow)</li> <li>4. Own Strength Conferences (R'dam)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Cricket Club (Venice)</li> <li>4. Marghera libera e pensante (Venice)</li> </ul>
Gender and kinship	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dolce Lounge (B'ham)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Health and Social Community centre (Sofia)</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Dolce Lounge (B'ham)</li> <li>2. Little Miss Creative (B'ham)</li> </ul>

**5.2 Tables by city**

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Athens	<b>Municipal Remedial Teaching Centre</b>	<p>It is a municipal service in Elefsina that aims at providing remedial teaching to local children in the primary and secondary education level.</p> <p>This service offers substantial support to students whose families face financial difficulties and therefore, cannot afford private remedial teaching centres.</p>	Top down	Bridging Social and Urban Distances	It took 1 year to organise because of extreme difficulties encountered with other stakeholders. The service started purely on a voluntary basis and it continues like that with success.
	<b>Social Grocery</b>	Municipal service in Elefsina aiming to provide food and basic commodities to citizens with low income (e.g. unemployed, registered immigrants and people with disabilities etc.)	Top down	Bridging Social and Urban Distances	It took 2-3 months to organise the service and it is now operating since 2012. The budget for this year was 150.000 EUR which was allocated based on the needs of the municipality and the number of beneficiaries.

<p><b>Local Bazaar-Product Exchange Event</b></p>		<p>This event is a municipal initiative that promoted the exchange of goods among citizens of Elefsina. It takes place twice a month (Sundays). The participants can exchange or donate their things without involving any money in the transaction. There are no limitations as far as the categories of products that can be exchanged (e.g. paintings, clothes, toys, mobile phones, etc.).</p>	<p>Top down/ bottom up  (Municipal initiative managed by a network of volunteers).</p>	<p>Engagement and Civil Participation</p>	<p>Supported by volunteers - no budget</p>
<p><b>TOPEKO (Local actions for vulnerable groups)</b></p>		<p>TOPEKO programs ‘Local actions for vulnerable groups’ is a state initiative that aims to address local needs focusing on social integration. Therefore, it aims to mobilize local government in order to ensure the creation of jobs and professional training for vulnerable groups of people (e.g. long-term unemployed, immigrants, etc.). Re-integration in the labour market is achieved by providing three options/orientations to beneficiaries: a) Business development – self-employed status, b) Employment- employee status or c) Social</p>	<p>Top down</p>	<p>Bridging Social and Urban Distances</p>	<p>Project duration 2012-2014. The budget is 390.000 for the whole consortium with 80 beneficiaries</p>

		<p>Cooperative Enterprise (SCE) – establishment of a Social Cooperative Enterprise. TOPEKO program in the area of Elefsina is focused on waste management and reuse/resale of products.</p>			
	<p><b>Municipal Vegetable Garden</b></p>	<p>The Municipal Vegetable Garden is a private initiative in the area of Elefsina originating from a non- governmental organization, called EPEKA. This initiative aims at the social reintegration of people facing financial difficulties through their active engagement with the vegetable garden. Furthermore, young unemployed people (up to 30 years old) were employed to organise and support and this service (1 social worker, 1 agriculturist and 1 janitor).</p>	<p>Bottom up</p>	<p>Bridging Social and Urban Distances</p>	<p>Operating since 2012</p>

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Barcelona	<b>Educational Demos in the youth organisation TEB</b>	TEB is an organisation that works in issues of social innovation, new technologies and young people. The project called 'Educational Demos' is focused on the elaboration of rap and hip hop compositions related to the defense of human rights. Youngsters are involved from the beginning by choosing the topic to the end composing the rhymes and lyrics, recording and producing videos, and performing in concerts.	Bottom-up	Bridging social and urban distances; Empowerment and trust; promotion of social participation, defense of human rights, training, and engagement with new technologies in topics related to social inequalities from the experiences of young people from deprived areas.	Requirements for transferring: a recording studio for producing the lyrics, video cameras to film the productions, a technician in charge of the technical work of recording, editing and production and a youth worker in charge of bringing together the youngsters. In terms of budget, it varies a lot depending on the quality of the audio and video production (e.g. use of mobile phones, low-cost microphones and cameras, or rehearsal studio of more quality), plus the hiring of one or two people depending on the skills of the person and scope of the project.
	<b>Energy Control</b>	Pioneer project aimed at providing information on drugs consumption to reduce the related risks. It is implemented in the party scene on a peer-to-peer basis going away from the prohibitionist approach.	Bottom-up	Risk-reduction approach to drugs consumption, peer-to peer basis, actions implemented directly in the party scene.	Requirements for transferring: creation of information leaflets, drug-checking services (can vary from low-cost to more expensive analytical tools), young volunteers to offer advice in the spaces related to the party scene among young people, political support and a facilitating legal framework.
	<b>Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom</b>	Organisation that works with the Theatre of the Oppressed and young people at risk of	Bottom-up	Empowerment and trust;	Requirements for transferring: experienced practitioner in the field of the theatre of the

		social exclusion with a political commitment linked to the defense of human rights and fight against social exclusion.		Recognition and visibility of social inequalities and concerns affecting young people.	oppressed and a group of young people willing to learn this artistic discipline. In terms of timing it could be implemented within few months and with a low budget.
	<b>Kasal de Joves de Roquetes (Youth Centre)</b>	Public youth centre which is managed under the ‘citizens’ management’ model with various initiatives addressed at young people. It is a space of socialisation, development of skills and abilities and engagement in collective issues affecting the neighbourhood.	Bottom-up	Contribution to the “normalisation” of activities conducted by young people, sometimes on the edge of legality; alternative ways of leisure not related to consumption; promotion of a sense of identity favouring mutual trust; citizens’ management	Requirements for transferring: the existence of a group of young people willing to manage a centre targeted to young people, a public facility devoted to this, coordination between the youth association and the city hall, and initial funding. In terms of timing, it would probably need at least one year to launch it.
	<b>Masoveria urbana</b>	Alternative of housing based on private agreements between the landlord and the tenants to renew and maintain a house originally in bad conditions and be exempted of renting for the period of time tenants live in.	Bottom-up	Bridging social and urban distances; Recognition and visibility	Requirements for transferring: availability of empty houses and landlords willing to establish an agreement with a group of tenants. In terms of budget and funding (how much to invest in material and renewing the house, and how long it could take), it depends on the housing conditions, the availability of human resources and the specific project of tenants (how they would like to renew it).

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Birmingham	Beatfreeks	Social enterprise providing leadership training and work experience to young creatives through putting them at the forefront of planning and delivery of a range of events which require interactive/creative facilitation. Young creatives are paid on a freelance basis from fees earned by the company for its different training and facilitation services. Company started by a young social entrepreneur a year ago. It is potentially self-sustaining with grant aid only required for development of new work strands. Minimal public investment.	Bottom-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bridging social and urban distances.</li> <li>-Empowerment and trust.</li> <li>-Engagement and civil participation</li> <li>-Improving employability and earning potential of young people</li> <li>-Building individual social and human capital</li> </ul>	What is needed: Creative arts practitioners/theatre company already working with young people. Links to young people interested in improving their chances of working in the arts/creative industries. Training from Beatfreeks re: recruitment of young creatives and leadership development methods, marketing and evaluation. Office and rehearsal area. Commissions from private/public sector to generate income to cover costs.
	The Loft Project	The aim is to help provide Creatives who train in Birmingham & the W Midlands with the opportunity to establish themselves as creative practitioners in the city-region. Makes use of a city centre space in an empty retail unit offered for 6 months. It provides pop-up exhibition space for young artists and also rents out desk space for those who want some kind of base from which to work and want to benefit from being part of an informal collective.	Bottom-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Recognition &amp; visibility</li> <li>-Bridging social and urban distances</li> <li>-Creating a platform where young people from different backgrounds benefit from mutual support.</li> <li>-Individual social capital</li> </ul>	What is needed: low cost/no cost space in central location or in local area for short term use. Funding or provision of space from public sector or NGO. Identification of young people with creative talent and potential to develop. A champion or organiser or manager of the space to select artists, market the space and the work of the collective.
			Major NGO – Housing Association supporting those who need help to live independently, including young		

	<b>Back on Track</b>	people, has created a different approach to making disadvantaged young people more employable. It provides work opportunities or apprenticeships with minimal conditions attached – ‘show enthusiasm and stick to the rules’. The aim is to make them ‘work ready’ It involves mentoring and peer mentoring as well as training for qualifications.	Top-down	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Empowerment &amp; trust.</li> <li>-Building individual social capital</li> <li>-Improving employability and earning capacity of young people</li> </ul>	to training and development of young people facing inequalities. Funding for training of trainers. Guidance from Project organisers on set up and implementation. Challenge will be to find work experience opportunities and gaining the trust of young people to engage.
	<b>Little Miss Creative</b>	A networking organisation founded by a young woman who, having experienced multiple disadvantages early in life, wanted to make a positive difference to the lives of other young women. The aim is to give a voice to young creative women, creating the next generation of free thinking female leaders that will inform and shape the future. It focuses on their personal and professional development using transformational learning. She draws on her personal experiences to act as a coach/mentor. The company is independent of public funding. It has built up a series of networking events held in a ‘safe space’ where young women feel at ease with sharing and exchanging feelings and ideas. She also runs a a marketing company, Creative High, providing graphic design, event management services nationally.	Bottom-up Individual initiative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recognition and visibility.</li> <li>Building individual social capital</li> <li>Empowerment and trust</li> <li>Encouraging engagement and participation in civil society</li> <li>Gender and kinship</li> </ul>	<p>This is very dependant upon one individual’s specific drive, commitment and personal experience. She could be a role model for other women facing seemingly intransigent disadvantages through a sharing of her ideas with such women in other parts of Europe.</p> <p>To facilitate the setting up of a self-help network for women would require a ‘safe space’ and a trusted intermediary.</p> <p>Costs would be for sending Little Miss Creative to talk to NGOs or individuals that support women facing multiple disadvantages.</p>
	<b>Dolce Lounge</b>	Coffee and dessert lounge in the city centre which offers a range of non-conventional trendy beverages like bubble tea, mocktails etc. Launched by 2 women from inner city BME community. Aims to emulate an Italian coffee house and provide a space for young BME women to network.	Bottom-up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Gender &amp; kinship</li> <li>Empowerment and trust</li> <li>Bridging social and urban distance</li> </ul>	Needs: low cost space and start up financing. Could be used to create ‘safe space’ for young BME women to meet and network in local areas. Could be organised as a collective or taken up by individual social entrepreneur.

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Brno	<b>Ethnic Friendly Employer Brand</b>	Development and spreading of the concept of Ethnic Friendly Employer among employers through the activities of certificating bodies (NHOs). Campaign aimed at employers to support the concept of equal approach (key tool are websites: <a href="http://www.ethnic-friendly.eu">www.ethnic-friendly.eu</a> ), campaign among the public against negative stereotypes of Roma	Top-down (and bottom up)  Mobilising the actors	-Bridging social inequalities  - Empowerment and trust	Possible in case of trustful NGO at the scene, established partnerships with employers, personnel capacity and some financial resources
	<b>Gendalos</b>	Financial support, pedagogical assistance including additional (home) teaching and language courses (professionals and volunteers are involved in this).  Fund established to provide financial support.	Top-down (and bottom up)  Mobilising the actor	-Bridging social inequalities: lack of human capital, unequal access to education	Budget and personal resources needed to run the Centre of Education, to provide coaching
	<b>Complex approach to employment of Roma (NGO IQ Roma services)</b>	'Triangle' of the mutually reinforcing projects/activities Project Ethnic Friendly Employer Brand	Top-down (and bottom up)	-Bridging social inequalities: combating discrimination  -Empowerment and trust	Possible in case of trustful NGO at the scene, established partnerships with employers, personnel capacity and some financial resources

		Activities of the Centre for Counselling and Employment of NGO IQ Roma service Media campaign directed at Roma community	Mobilising the actors	-Improving human capital, -Facilitating access to labour market	Special budget needed for the Centre for Counselling and Employment
	<b>Learning by working</b>	Counselling and diagnostic activities Job Club, Package of training activities for improving orientation in the labour market, job-search and job-retention, Active labour market policy measures applied  Co-operation with the employers, media campaign  Complexity of the approach, focus on most disadvantaged and individual/personal treatment represent the innovative aspects	Top-down	Bridging social inequalities: gaps in human and social capital addressed, improved access to employers	Budget is needed as well as experiences with the activities  NGO should be a key implementing actor (trust of the other actors as well as of a target group are needed)
	<b>Through Community Work</b>	Complex work with families: establishment of the community centre, expansion of individual and family counselling  Expansion of the services of Assistance of criminality prevention: innovative forms of case work like individual plans, including work rehabilitation Preventative programmes for children and youth  Continuous co-operation and transfer of good practice with Slovak partner	Top-down (and bottom up)  Mobilising the actors	Bridging social inequalities, empowerment and trust, discrimination  Symptoms like discouragement, lack of self-efficacy and social relations  gaps in social capital	Special budget needed for running the project, Experienced NGO, trustful  Personnel capacities needed  Political support by municipality needed (co-operation with various departments)

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Hamburg	Mentoring for refugees	Young Refugees in the transition phase between school and employment get a close counselling by students of social work from the Uni of applied Science Hamburg in cooperation with Professors and a partner NGO. The students (mentor) act as the refugees' companion for different life situations like tutorials, applying for a training place, dealing with official documents, organizing leisure activities and social networking. They even stay connected when the mentee found a training place.	Top down	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Employability</li> <li>-Bridging social distances</li> <li>-Empowerment, recognition</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NGO/stakeholder working with young refugees</li> <li>• NGO/stakeholder offering counseling and supervision for social workers</li> <li>• University with classes in migration/integration work</li> <li>• Group of students and refugees.</li> </ul>
	Cultural bus	The idea of this project is to get young refugees out of their daily "environment" and show them "how the city works". In this resource oriented approach, the language of origin serves as a support as classes about environment, politics, culture etc are held in their languages. The program will include city trips and site visits	Bottom up	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Bridging social distances</li> <li>-Empowerment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding: CITISPYCE and district administration and cooperation partners (companies etc)</li> <li>• Contact an NGO/stakeholder working with target group and has employees able to speak languages of origin of the target groups.</li> <li>• Find cooperation partners from public and private places or companies for support</li> <li>• Hire bus/bikes etc for city trips</li> </ul>
	Social media	Young people from disadvantaging backgrounds are often excluded from information and tutoring.	Bottom up		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individual strategy by young people will not need official counseling.</li> </ul>

		Social media can act as a tool which is easy and		-Bridging social	• Yet, teachers and official places can
City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Krakow	<b>Mistrzejowice (Youth District Council)</b>	This project is aimed at third graders in lower secondary schools and the first and second classes of higher secondary schools from the area of the fifteenth district of Mistrzejowice in Krakow. The main objective of the project is to develop qualities and values of self-governance among the youth, thereby shaping pro-civic behaviours, encourage positive attitudes towards the modern civil society, and responsibility for own needs	Rather top-down	Engagement and civil participation	The counsellor should be remunerated (several hours a month). It is essential to have the cooperation of at least one school and possibly the local district council. The syllabus needs to be prepared. As for timing all in all probably up to two months is needed to make it running.
	<b>Mój trener (My sports instructor)</b>	Multipurpose school playing fields for team games and tennis courts – program addressed to large district communities as an alternative form of leisure for teenagers in the available school sports facilities and multipurpose playing fields. Within the framework of the program, highly-qualified coaches teach sports and recreation.	Top-down	Recognition and visibility	Program can be transferred to all multifunctional courts in of cities which have them. Especially to cities/ districts where chil-dren and teenagers from social communities are en-dangered by social exclusion.

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Malmö	<b>ESF funded preparatory project</b>	<p>The aim is to create better conditions for multisectoral collaboration in order to prevent exclusion and to promote a socially sustainable society by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Testing the Penta Helix model as a basis for multisectoral collaboration to meet challenges both at a structural and individual level.</li> <li>-Creating multisectoral learning through a shared knowledge journey.</li> <li>-Creating a model for Civil Society (3.0) to enable it to act as an equal partner and become a co-creator of a sustainable society.</li> </ul>			<p>The initiative can be regarded as transferable as its two innovative twists – the multisectoral collaboration and the involvement of young people in the planning process – ought to be possible to replicate everywhere else in Europe. In contrast, the larger project which this preparatory project is supposed to lead to may not that easily be replicated across Europe, because it will have to take into consideration the causes of inequality operating in Malmö and Sweden, i.e. the specific national and local circumstances.</p>
	<b>Brightful</b>	<p>Brightful is an NGO-run project in Malmö, Sweden. The main aim of the project is to, by providing a number of different activities, help and motivate young women and men in believing in themselves and their ability to set (and reach) their own individual goals.</p> <p>Brightful strives to create a forum where young women and men are provided tools and support which will enable them to identify and set different</p>			<p>In order to transfer the project to another context a certain budget is needed (to pay for activities and a space where the activities can take place). Most important, however, is the engagement and involvement of different actors within the local community, being able to function as mentors to the young women and men taking part of the project.</p>

		goals for the future. Brightful offers different kinds of activities and the young women and men participating in the programme are also provided mentors, who coach the participants through the programme.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Rotterdam	<b>Buzinezzclub</b>	Stimulating and guiding unemployed young people from disadvantaged backgrounds to develop their own ambitions and competences into a business, job or education.	Top-down, social enterprise initiative	Using talents and ambitions in an entrepreneurial way, i.e. stimulate rather than discipline; empowerment and trust.	Required for transfer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Setting up project</li> <li>- Budget</li> <li>- Staff</li> <li>- Agreements with benefit agency about referral of clients</li> <li>- Method training</li> </ul>
	<b>Challenge Sports</b>	Using sports to teach young people social skills and help them find their way (back) into education or employment. These services are offered through a private company.  Top-sport athletes/martial arts/football players are motivators and teachers.	Top-down, social enterprise initiative	The approach is innovative mostly in the way participants are taught social skills, using sports and well-known sports(wo)men. It builds social capital and mainstream social values through sports. Bridging social distances.	Required for transfer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- setting up a project</li> <li>- budget</li> <li>- staff, especially top sports(wo)men</li> <li>- agreements with benefit agency</li> <li>- method training</li> </ul>
	<b>Own Strength Conferences</b>	An organised way to involve peoples social network in finding solutions for problems. The aim is for people to take responsibility and solve problems with the support of their social network. The approach is used a.o. for indebted people with multiple problems, for young people in youth care. An adapted version is	Bottom-up	Increasing personal capacity through strengthening ones social network (bridging).	Required for transfer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Enthusiastic, competent individuals</li> <li>- method training</li> </ul>

		used for improving social cohesion in neighbourhoods.		Bridging social distances, empowerment and trust.	
City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Sofia	<b>Health and Social Community Centre</b>	A NGO run facility providing consultations, life-skills training, health and social assistance to young families, young parents, children and young people at risk, and unemployed young people.	Bottom-up	-Bridging social and urban distances. -Empowerment and trust.	What is needed: long-term funding; appropriate facility; well-qualified staff to implement the programmes and provide services; support and cooperation of local authorities.
	<b>Legalization of Roma Homes</b>	Legal support, consultations, and advocacy to initiate legalisation procedures for illegally constructed dwellings in Roma settlements and neighbourhoods.	Bottom-up	-Recognition and visibility	What is needed: relevant legislation that makes it possible to apply for and obtain the necessary legal documents; political support and cooperation with the local and national authorities, personnel with legal background.
	<b>New Chance for Success</b>	Qualification courses for young people older than 16 who are illiterate or have poor reading and writing skills.	Top-down	-Empowerment and trust.	What is needed: political support and state funding; involvement of schools and teachers; participation of the Ministry of Education.
	<b>Health Mediators</b>	Providing information, assistance and support to people with limited or no access to the state health care	Bottom-up and top-down	Bridging social and urban distances.	What is needed: political support and state funding; trained personnel; cooperation with hospitals and other medical facilities.

		system; prevention programmes; health education; social work.		Empowerment and trust.	
	<b>Chitalishte (Community Centres)</b>	Local community centres provide educational, cultural and leisure possibilities to the young people.	Bottom-up and top-down.	Recognition and visibility	What is needed: funding, a suitable building and qualified personnel.

City	Name of practice	Short description	Level	Dimensions of social innovation	Potential transferability (timing and financing)
Venice	<b>Community Lab</b>	<p>Method launched in 2012 in order to enhance and regenerate the policy process of the local welfare agenda, which was originally supposed to be participative (inspired to the idea of horizontal governance and active citizenship), but that actually was not as such. The main objective is to bring back society in the deliberative process, offering to all the participants (public/private actors, including citizens which have never been part of a deliberative process) a facilitating environment, where the concrete social cases and local issues are in the forefront.</p> <p>The method has been proposed by the region Emilia-Romagna as a test with the aim of eventually becoming the rule in the next years. In the past two years 18 territories have been trying the method.</p>	Top-down	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Empowerment and trust;</li> <li>-Engagement and civil participation</li> </ul>	<p>Timing: about 6 months</p> <p>Financing: for the transfer in one city approximately 5.000 euro</p>
	<b>Etam</b>	<p>Etam is a Social Inclusion Service of the Municipality of Venice (based in Marghera). It has two spheres of intervention: 1. Tackling deprivation and problems like prostitution and drug traffic using as much as possible street educators, i.e. going where the problem is, without waiting for the problem to come to its office; 2. Its effort is addressed to enhance social cohesion, i.e. supporting citizens in their requests to local administration, but also leading them from a complaining activity to actual proposals.</p>	Top-down	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Empowerment and trust;</li> <li>-Engagement and civil participation</li> </ul>	<p>Timing: about 6 months</p> <p>Financing: for the transfer in one city approximately 5.000 euro</p>
	<b>Venice Cricket club</b>	<p>Born in 2006: it is a sport association which promotes cricket (the favourite Bangladeshi sport) in Marghera.</p>	Bottom-up	Bridging social and urban distances	<p>Timing: more than 6 months</p> <p>Financing: about 5.000 euro</p>

		The Venice cricket club uses sport as a tool for social inclusion for young people – especially with immigrant origins, but not limited to them – for incorporating them into a broader network of relationships within the neighborhood, for providing them with an educational reference and support (when the family support is weak), for soliciting their individual and collective agency, for enabling them to make experiences and getting involved with activities and practices not just connected with sport.			
	<b>CommuniCare</b>	<p>Born in 2012 thanks to the commitment of some young people (more or less 10), mainly students in University of Venice. Before 2011 those young people were individually committed in voluntary activities mainly inside community for migrant unaccompanied minors.</p> <p>Currently the activities of CommuniCare cover 2 dimensions: 1) animation in the deprived Ca' Emiliani through laboratories, organization of dinners for the residents: therefore they aim to be an active presence and a reference point in particular for kids living there and for their families.</p> <p>2) giving support to ex migrant unaccompanied minors when they become 18 and are forced to leave the communities.</p>	Bottom-up	Bridging social and urban distances	<p>Timing: about 6 months</p> <p>Financing: not more than 1.000 euro</p>
	<b>Marghera libera e pensante (Commette of citizens in Marghera)</b>	Born in 2012, it is an informal citizens' committee which aims at the recovery of abandoned buildings and spaces and redevelopment of urban spaces in Marghera. It also aims to empower people giving them a voice about the perceived problems of the neighborhood. On the one hand the committee acts as an advocacy coalition signaling the problematic issues and how they can be effectively addressed; on the other the people of the committee are personally involved in doing	Bottom-up	Engagement and civil participation	<p>Timing: at least 6 months</p> <p>Funding: 1-2.000 euros</p>

		something even in a practical way (i.e. they organised a day of cleaning in a park and in an abandoned building).			
--	--	---	--	--	--

## References

- European Commission. 2013. "Social innovation research in the European Union. Approaches, findings and future directions. Policy Review".
- Gerometta, Julia, Hartmut Häussermann and Giulia Longo. 2005. "Social Innovation and Civil Society in Urban Governance: Strategies for an Inclusive City". *Urban Studies*, 42 (11): 2007–2021.
- Goldsmith Stephen. 2010. *The Power of Social Innovation. How Civic Entrepreneurs Ignite Community Networks for Good*. San Francisco, Jossey -Bass.
- Grisolia, Francesco and Emanuele Ferragina. 2015. "Social Innovation on the Rise: yet another buzzword in time of austerity?" *Salute e Società*, 1, p. 169-179.
- Güntner, Simon, Anne-Marie Gehrke and Louis-Henri Seukwa. 2014. "Local matters? Neighbourhoods and social infrastructure as spaces of reproducing, producing, mitigating or counteracting social inequalities in 10 European cities".
- Hubert, Agnès. 2010. *Empowering people, driving change: Social innovation in the European Union*. Available at: [http://www.net4society.eu/\\_media/Social\\_innovation\\_europe.pdf](http://www.net4society.eu/_media/Social_innovation_europe.pdf)
- Murray, Robin, Julie Caulier-Grice and Geoff Mulgan. 2010. *Open Book of Social Innovation*. The Young Foundation/NESTA.

## **Chapter 7: Implementation of pilot actions – Social innovation in Action**

Henk Spies  
Plus Confidence

### **1. Introduction**

This chapter deals with the way in which CITISPYCE partners built on the findings from previous phases of the work programme to test the success factors and transferability of innovative approaches from one local context to another. This was done by setting up a series of pilot projects within cities of consortium partners. In this first section, we will briefly sum up the most significant and relevant the conclusions from the earlier work and outline the place of the piloting phase in relation to the rest of the project. Before going into the selection of the pilots (Section 3), we will first examine social innovation more conceptually (Section 2). Sections 4 and 5, however, are the main parts of this chapter, dealing as they so with the implementation of the pilots and their central ideas, or logic. Table 4 provides a quick overview of their content. In Section 6 we reflect on our findings and draw some conclusions.

Whereas in the previous work the researchers from the consortium were leading, in the work on the Menu of Innovative Practices and especially the piloting stage, policy-makers took the lead, as the most important aspect is the setting up of new practices.

The development and implementation of pilot actions can be considered as an action-learning phase in CITISPYCE. Nine pilots were set up in our consortium cities to study social innovation in action. Social innovation is a diffuse concept, but in a very general sense it is looked at as a (potential) solution for pressing social problems. Research in the first 18 months or so of the project focused on social inequalities (“the problems” and their causes) on macro-, meso- and micro-levels; in policy frameworks and social structures, in the social

infrastructure of disadvantaged neighbourhoods in our cities, and in the experiences of young people.

In the base-line study, several perspectives on combating social exclusion among others were distinguished:

- social exclusion as an individual problem:
- the moral underclass perspective: moral education of “want-nots”
- a self-exclusion perspective: create a sense of belonging for “feel-nots”
- social exclusion as a problem of structure: redistribution of resources and opportunities for “have-nots”
- social exclusion as a problem of both structure and individual: social integration of “do-nots”

In the fieldwork at the city and neighbourhood level, three local perspectives on combating social exclusion were distinguished:

- Bridging social and physical distances (solution) to address social isolation (problem)
- ‘Communing’, developing new forms of togetherness (solutions) to tackle decay (problem)
- Developing trust, responsive communication, connectivity, interdependencies and diversity (solutions) to tackle exclusionary forms of servicing, ad-hoc and piecemeal policies (problem)

In the second fieldwork phase focusing on Young people’s voices, several forms of social exclusion were distinguished:

- Limited opportunities and retreat into familiar territory
- Limited opportunities for engagement and collectivity
- Discrimination
- Retrenchment of welfare services (benefits, education and training, housing)
- Loss of signposts
- Worries about the value of education
- Fatalism about life prospects and opportunities in the labour market

CITISPYCE is designed in a way that we can not only bring out patterns of (re)production of social inequalities on macro-, meso- and micro- levels, but can also bring out gaps between policies as they are ‘on paper’, as they play out in practice in disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and as they are experienced by young people. Part of the pilot approach was to create linkages between these levels, by creating opportunities for young people, local authorities and

organizations to get to know and get involved with each other; to both create new forms of ‘communing’ and ‘togetherness’, as well as invite them to step outside their comfort zones.

In Chapter 6, it can be seen that the focus shifted from social inequalities and patterns of reproduction, to social innovation and patterns of production of new structures, by making an inventory of socially innovative practices (SIPs) as selected by policy-makers and practitioners. The aim was not completeness, but diversity and a more general idea about the state of affairs in the different cities: what is going on, and what SIPs could be considered successful.

## 2. Social Innovation

In Chapter 6 social innovation was defined as practices that:

- i) meet new social needs or better meet the already existing ones of specific vulnerable groups like young people;
- ii) find new ways of meeting social needs which are more effective, efficient and/or sustainable than the alternatives;
- iii) empower people, allowing them to participate and increase their capabilities;
- iv) promote the awareness of rights and active citizenship;
- v) turn social challenges to opportunities; and
- vi) increase social capital, social trust and enhance society’s capacity to undertake actions at the local level<sup>2</sup>

This definition implies that we look at social innovation as context-dependent since it addresses social problems as they are experienced in a specific context, but in a new way in that specific context. What is new in one context, however, may be ‘old news’ or irrelevant in another context. We are not looking for things that we have not yet seen before, but rather

---

<sup>2</sup> In the CITISPYCE proposal, we have presented several different views on social innovation. Social innovation is described as “a way forward by providing new solutions to pressing social demands while making better use of available resources” (Empowering people, driving change. Social Innovation in the European Union, BEPA 2010). This definition seems to focus on new, more effective and efficient ways to address existing social demands. According to Social Innovation Europe, “Social innovation is about new ideas that work to address pressing unmet needs. We simply describe it as innovations that are both social in their ends and in their means. Social innovations are new ideas (products, services and models) that simultaneously meet social needs and create new social relationships or collaborations.” This definition seems to emphasize the social nature of the innovations we are looking at. It also draws attention to the relation of products, services and models to social needs – i.e. the subjective experience of social inequalities. In this view, strengthening of social ties, in some way or another, also seems to be a defining aspect of social innovation.

for new matches between local social needs and socially innovative practices that have not yet been tried in that specific context. Schematically: P + C → S → R. **P** Practice + **C** Context together can constitute a **S** Strategy that leads to a certain **R** Result. **S** should be repeatable.

‘Social innovation’ can be regarded as something in between ‘social invention’ (implying full, conscious agency) and ‘social development’ (implying less clear agency). Social development is something normally described from a bystander’s perspective, from the outside<sup>3</sup>. This means that there are aspects of social innovation that may not always be labelled as such (Moulaert et al., 2013, Chapter 1). Social invention and its inherent active agency is normally described from an insider’s perspective<sup>4</sup>. The piloting phase makes the turn from the former to the latter. The pilots that were carried out can be regarded as a form of action research or action learning, with active involvement from an insider’s perspective, and as an attempt to gain more insight into how social innovation works. In other words, as a more or less conscious attempt to set in motion social development. If we look at the study of social innovation as an attempt to gain more rational control over social development, the attempt may include several general approaches:

*Addressing the micro-level of individuals:* A pedagogical, or *learning* approach: building the personal strength and problem-solving capacity of disadvantaged people and the people who can help them. This can encompass strengthening resilience, developing competences, building social capital and networks, providing access to media and information resources, access to education and the labour market, support in how to start one’s own business (stimulating entrepreneurship), and so on.

*Addressing the meso-level ‘between’ people:* An approach of *creating conditions* that enable empowerment and strengthening of resilience, i.e. *giving space* to people and/or organizations, and *building trust and connections* between citizens, organizations and government, strengthening social ties and creating links between people that can enable them to support each other.

Part of ‘creation conditions’ could also be *protection*, for example, through minimizing unintended adverse effects of mainstream policies - social exclusion that results from the tightening of requirements attached to social welfare provisions that

---

<sup>3</sup> Compare the definition at the beginning of section 2. This is an outsider’s perspective, it is probably not what an actor would think or would say when asked to describe what he or she was doing.

<sup>4</sup> An inside perspective could be described in terms of an action plan: what, why, how, who, when.

seem to be a common response to the crisis in many EU countries (Loedemel and Moreira 2014).

***Addressing institutions and services:*** An approach aimed at *preserving services* in times of austerity. This approach addresses mostly the level of organization of services. In the delivery of services there is room for more effectiveness and efficiency, as generally a lot of time and energy is spent on eligibility, control and management issues (i.e. meeting tax payer's needs) rather than on achieving results (i.e. meeting pressing social needs).

***Addressing gaps in services:*** This approach can entail *setting up new services* through entrepreneurial activities, by NGOs or the public sector.

***Addressing the macro-level of allocation of resources (jobs, education, housing etc):*** This approach aims at new ways or forms of providing people with resources, e.g. through exchange and second hand markets, #daretoask (crowd mining for information, services or goods on twitter), or redistribution (e.g. basic income schemes, food bank).

***Addressing societal trends:*** Identifying and using technological and cultural developments to help change the way people communicate, exchange information and views, and create new meaning together (e.g. through social media, online communities etc).

These approaches are not mutually exclusive, and in practice can be combined. Social innovation can take place at several, interrelated levels: "bottom-up" participative actions to deal with a shared problem or social need at a local level; innovative responses to broader societal challenges from social actors for the greater good; and innovations in public governance to create conditions in which social innovation can flourish. The origins (i.e. agency) of social innovations can be located or projected at different levels: individual, social network, society; in the public sector or in civil society and NGOs. Different views contain normative aspects and implicit views of people.

In this chapter we use a broad perspective on social innovation, juxtaposing different views rather than choosing between them. Nine pilots were set up that differ in a lot of ways, but what they have in common is their aim to improve links between disadvantaged people's needs, strategies and resources on the one hand, and societal needs and resources on the other.

### 3. Selection of pilots

#### 3.1 Process

The selection of the pilots builds on the ‘menu of innovative practices’ described in Chapter 6. This Menu consists of 45 projects, initiatives and practices regarded as socially innovative by researchers and/or policy-makers in their respective contexts. These practices have been developed and fostered by local authorities and independent public institutions from the “top-down”, as well as by associations, grass-root organisations and groups of young people from a “bottom-up” perspective, and combinations of those, with varying degrees of organisation and different structures of governance. A description with fiches on all practices was sent to stakeholders prior to an interactive Workshop.

The Workshop was held in Krakow on the 19<sup>th</sup> of September 2014 as part of WP5, to present a selection of socially innovative practices (SIPs) and discuss these with policy-makers and young people from the ten cities involved in CITISPYCE. The selection of the SIPs included in the menu, as well as the selection of SIPs presented at the Workshop, was made in consultation between researchers, policy-makers and young people from each city. The Workshop was set up as a market place, where ‘sellers’ (SIPs selected and invited by the consortium partners) and ‘buyers’ (policy makers, NGOs, research institutes involved in the consortium, and interested in setting up and running a pilot in their city) could develop pilot ideas together.

Setting up a pilot could consist of:

- a transfer of an innovative practice from one location to another, with adaptation to a different local context;
- the development of a new initiative based on opportunities identified in field work, and informed by good practices from other cities;
- adding new elements to already existing initiatives, informed by good practices from other cities.

Whatever choice was made to arrive at a pilot, every pilot had to provide a pilot-plan following a checklist. In the checklist perceived success factors or ‘working ingredients’ were especially important, in order to be able to relate what is being done to the production and reproduction of social inequalities described in earlier work packages.

The transfer of innovative approaches from one city to another could be aided by:

- exchange meetings between practitioners from both ‘sending’ and ‘receiving’ cities, through a study visit to the ‘original’ SIP and/or inviting ‘original’ experts to aid in the setting up of a similar practice in a new city;
- providing more elaborate method descriptions than provided in the fiches of WP5 (either already existing descriptions or new descriptions made by researchers from the ‘sending’ city);
- expert consultation from consortium-coordinators.

The preparation phase for the pilots lasted from October to December 2014, following up on the intentions expressed at the Workshop in Krakow, linking up partners and actors, developing a format for pilot plans and for reporting in cooperation between WP6 and WP7 leaders, exchange visits, establishing cooperations and pilot plans being written. On 5<sup>th</sup> December most pilot plans were sent to the coordinator. As December, with its holidays and end-of-year business, is not a good period for starting new pilots, early January was set as the starting date for the pilots, and the rest of December was used for further fine-tuning and preparation.

### **3.2 Expressions of interest and final selection**

The selection of pilots consisted of several steps:

- initial expression of interest at the Workshop in Krakow;
- further discussion within each city, establishing cooperation;
- exchange between cities to fine-tune the transfer of a SIP
- final selection and pilot plan.

In the stakeholders meeting in Krakow, policy makers and young people presented an expression of interest in possible pilots. This may at least partially reflect the extent to which SIPs were successful in ‘selling’ themselves and generating enthusiasm about their approaches and central ideas. The pilots finally chosen differ considerably from these initial expressions of interest (see Table 1). There seem to be several reasons for this. Firstly, following the Krakow Workshop there was further discussion and thought regarding the selection of the pilots in several cities. This is reported in progress updates from Athens, Brno, Krakow, Birmingham and Rotterdam.

Secondly, opinions, enthusiasm and intentions are only the first step towards putting something into practice. Other factors are also important: the feasibility of a pilot within the time and budget constraints, the possibility of establishing cooperation with an NGO, existing policies and projects that already cover part of what an innovative practice intends, the needs of an area, a possibility (or lack thereof) for upscaling. (see Table 1).

Thirdly, the additional possibilities and resources that CITISPYCE was able to provide made some pilots possible that would otherwise might not have been. Further exchanges, and an invitation (e.g. by Birmingham) to some interested partners (e.g. Krakow and Venice) to further discuss the design and content of an intend pilot inspired by ‘Beatfreeks’, has shaped these pilots in a way that normally, without such an arena, may not have happened.

For these reasons, the inclusion of a piloting phase in the research design seems to provide valuable insights and opportunities.

<b>Table 1: selection of pilots</b>			
<b>City</b>	<b>Interested in</b>	<b>Pilot selection and idea</b>	<b>Reasons for (change of) choice</b>
Athens	-The Loft and Beatfreeks, irmingham - Theatre of the Oppressed, Barcelona	Transfer and adaptation of The Loft project from Birmingham. Shelter of ideas – The Loft. Use temporary space for meetings, exchanging ideas and enhancing	There was not yet something like The Loft project in the district; it fits the needs of the area, seemed flexible to adjust, and fits within the budget and time constraints for the
Birmingham	- Buzinezzclub, Rotterdam - Local Bazaar, Athens - Theatre of the Oppressed, Barcelona	Transfer of the community market project from Athens: Local Bazaar. Organize a market for exchange of used goods, where young people can meet and make new	Already many policies in place in education and employment; wish to try something new to develop social capital. This pilot lies within municipal authority, possibility for
Brno	- Educational Demos, Barcelona - Refugee project Hamburg - Buzinezzclub and Challenge Sport, Rotterdam	Transfer of Educational Demos from Barcelona. Recording studio. Give young Roma musicians the opportunity to record and distribute their music.	There are already policies in place in education, (self)employment, sport and so on, but little to develop cultural activities. Roma people like music and dance.
Hamburg	- Welcome tours - Roma project, Sofia - Challenge Sport, Rotterdam	Pilot based on own fieldwork: Welcome tours for refugees (Moin Moin, Hamburg). Awareness and access to cultural opportunities in their city	Pilot came out of fieldwork in WP3 and 4

Krakow	Challenge Sport, Rotterdam	Transfer from Beatfreeks, combined with fieldwork and existing policies: Hidden Wings. Discovering inner potential. Activity workshops for lower-secondary school pupils by older	Too little time to implement Challenge Sport, no existing infrastructure could be used. Beatfreeks could be linked to an existing NGO in the district.
Malmö	No initial interest	Pilot that links to other project: Multisectoral learning. Bringing in young people already involved in planning phase of new policies	Choice was made prior to Krakow meeting. Opportunity to start pilot earlier.
Rotterdam	Interested in exchange with Malmö on developing integrated, preventive policies	Pilot based on fieldwork combined with existing policies. Integrated intake and diagnosis. Develop a single intake for young people in need of support, to prevent drop out and identify gaps in services.	Budget cuts and trend towards evidence-based working, little opportunity for mainstreaming of new initiatives. Lots of initiatives were already tried. Hence pilot linked to existing policy
Sofia	IQ Roma Service, Brno	Transfer of IQ Roma Service from Brno. Integrated approach for Roma youth. Improve employability and job-openings for young Roma	Opportunity to use experiences and example from a city with a similar target group. There is a gap in employment services for Roma.
Venice	Theatre of the oppressed and Educational Demos, Barcelona	Transfer of Beatfreeks from Birmingham. Show and tell. Organise virtual spaces and a public event for expression.	Budget cuts, no opportunities to involve city. Small scale pilot using contacts from WP3 and WP4.

All cities except Barcelona sent in a pilot plan, which means nine pilots were set up. In the project plan 7-12 pilots were foreseen. The initial interests as expressed in the Workshop, and the pilots finally chosen, are summed up in Table 1. Barcelona did not run a pilot itself (this was accounted for in the allocation of resources in the consortium), but contributed as a ‘sending’ city to the implementation of the pilot in Brno.

### 3.3 Reflections on the selection of pilots and lessons to be learned

This selection of pilots was the outcome of a process of deliberate consideration involving policy makers, young people and researchers. SIPs that raised some initial interest regarding their ‘operational principle’ were not always feasible within the constraints of the pilots in regard to time, budgets and existing local infrastructure.

These nine pilots are not necessarily already social innovations in themselves, and not all are in the area of education and employment, as aimed for in the CITISPYCE project plan. The pilots can, however, be considered to contain interesting and promising seeds for social

innovations. Some pilots may prepare the ground for further initiatives in education and employment: on an individual level, by developing social capital and resilience of young people that may improve their readiness for work; or at the level of governance by providing insights into how processes of developing social innovations can work.

There are several reasons mentioned why these pilots have been chosen and not others:

In some cases, there are already a lot of policies/initiatives in place for education and employment. These policy areas are generally more strictly regulated than, for example, activities in young people's spare time. New initiatives may conflict with some existing policies. In some cities, municipal authority over policies in education and employment is limited, and there is little perspective for mainstreaming of new initiatives in these areas. These reasons are mentioned in progress reports from Birmingham, Brno and Rotterdam. Conversely, in Sofia there are already services for Roma in several areas, but not as yet in employment.

Additionally, some CITISPYCE partners have contacts in culture and media (e.g. Aston University), and municipalities are partly involved through different departments (e.g. employment in Malmö, social development and youth in Rotterdam, integration of newcomers in Hamburg, welfare and sports in Krakow), which leads to some differing 'natural' opportunities for pilots.

Although it was not possible to control the selection of pilots from a research perspective, there seems to be a good variation in a number of dimensions. Some are transferred from one city to another, others are developed on the basis of local opportunities; some are designed more "top-down", others more "bottom-up"; some are run by NGOs, some by municipalities; some emphasize training and competence development in innovative ways, others emphasize offering opportunities, co-creation and using and building on young people's ambitions, building social networks and strengthening communities; some use traditional printed media to reach young people, others (also) rely on social media and websites; some target a specific group (e.g. refugees, Roma, artists), others aim at excluded young people more generally.

The most important broad conclusions we can draw are (1) that an entrepreneurial presentation of SIPs through pitching and showing what might be possible to achieve (as done at the stakeholders meeting in Krakow) can create enthusiasm and interest, and (2) that windows of opportunity play an important role in the matching of SIPs and local social needs,

and that institutional and organizational contexts play an important role in considerations for starting a specific pilot. The feasibility of a pilot in the local organizational and institutional context, and within the limited time frame, seem to be more important than considerations about target groups, which social needs to address, and what innovative ideas are central to a pilot.

#### **4. Implementation of pilots**

The implementation of the pilots faced challenges in two main areas: (1) establishing a working relationship (mutual commitment) with participants that includes the intended success factors, and (2) how a pilot establishes a position in the institutional field of existing (and partly competing) organizations, and establishes cooperation with other organizations. We will go into the first issue – the extent to which intended success factors have been implemented – in the next section. As an introduction, Table 4 provides an overview of the nature of the nine pilots and gives an idea of their content.

##### **4.1 Progress made**

The pilots reached different stages of development (see Table 2) over the period of time allocated. These differences can be attributed to several factors. First of all, some pilots (Malmö and to some extent Hamburg) started early with their preparation and could go into their main activities sooner than other pilots.

More importantly, though, seems to be effect of the involvement of public administrations on the speed of implementation. Municipalities often have time-consuming policy processes, or maybe better put: have policy processes with a dynamic timeframe of their own (e.g. Birmingham, Rotterdam). In the latter case the decision for this particular pilot was made later in the process, and the plan was adjusted in the implementation stage in order to provide a better link to the existing policy process. Also, establishing a formal cooperation in some cases required a tendering procedure to contract an NGO to run a pilot. In Brno this has been time-consuming, and further delay was caused by reconstruction in the premises selected for running the pilot. By contrast, this took little time in Krakow, since an NGO was involved with which the municipality already had a formal cooperation. The pilot in Sofia required an extensive preparation with exchange visits with Brno.

<b>Table 2: progress in implementation</b>		
<b>City</b>	<b>Delivery</b>	<b>Extend to which pilot has been implemented according to plan*</b>
Athens	NGO in cooperation with City	successfully implemented in process and content
Birmingham	City	delayed, not very successful main activity
Brno	NGO through University	still in preparation phase, but aims still partly realized
Hamburg	University	implemented according to plan, too little time to fully realize ambitions
Krakow	NGO through city	successfully implemented in process and content
Malmö	NGO in cooperation with University of Malmö	mostly successful implementation process
Rotterdam	City	delayed, change of plan and successfully implemented
Sofia	NGO direct	successfully implemented in process and content
Venice	NGO direct	successfully implemented in process and content

\* Implementation within time frame for WP6: December 2014 – April 2015

## **4.2 Actors**

In the implementation of the pilots, a distinction can be made with regard to the collective actors initiating or supporting initiatives for/of young people. In some cases initiative or support comes from the public sector, in some cases from the private sector (NGOs, social enterprises), and in some cases from relatively independent public institutions such as schools and universities (compare John Wilkins, cited in Lévesque 2013, in: Mouleart et al., 2013).

Although the aim of CITISPYCE was to identify innovative practices of young people themselves, and try to support these practices in order to see how far these could be developed into social innovations, this has happened only to a limited extent. In Hamburg a refugee whom the researchers met in previous fieldwork, helped design and implement the pilot. Young people were involved in setting up the pilots in Athens, Malmö and Venice as well, but not in the sense that these pilots were linked to existing innovative practices of young people themselves. The fieldwork for WP4 did not bring out as many innovative practices of young people as hoped for. It did, however, bring out some socially innovative entrepreneurial initiatives of young people, such as Beatfrecks, The Loft, and the Buzinezzclub, some of which have been adopted, adapted and implemented by actors in other cities.

Researchers in most cases had an active role in setting up the pilots, bringing people together, involving stakeholders and so on. In Athens, Hamburg, Malmö, Rotterdam, and Venice researchers also had an active role in organizing and carrying out activities.

In all pilots, organizations were engaged to organize and scale-up activities. These organizations range from local authorities (public sector) to independent public institutions (universities), to NGOs (private sector).

From one view, organizations in the private sector can be considered to be the most promising engines of innovation, and vehicles for grass roots initiatives. From another view, independent institutions can take on an advocacy role for groups who lack the resources and power to push things through themselves. And from yet another view, public administrations, through New Public Management as well as partnership-approaches, can aim for innovation in public services with a wide reach (Mouleart et al 2013, Ch.2). In CITISPYCE, local authorities initiated three out of the nine pilots (Birmingham, Krakow, Rotterdam), NGOs four (Athens, Malmö, Sofia, Venice), and universities (independent public institutions; Brno, Hamburg) the remaining two.

The pilots in Birmingham and Rotterdam experienced considerable delays. Slow bureaucracy is one of the explanations given for this: “(..) difficulties in connecting with and winning the active support of appropriate level staff in other departments of the City Council (...)”. More generally, issues that can be identified that prevent a smooth implementation, are:

- ***Internal barriers in the municipality*** between policymakers and practitioners in different departments. Within municipalities there is more than one department involved in tackling school drop-out, youth unemployment and social inclusion.
- ***Different policy silos within the municipality***. Each has a different focus and communicates partly different messages to partners and to young people (e.g. prevention of school drop-out and social exclusion versus prevention of people entering the benefit system). In addition, there seems to be some distance between policy makers and practitioners.
- ***Institutional aversion to risk***. For example, in the Birmingham pilot there were concerns expressed about the reputation of the City Council if activities undertaken during the swap-trade event (Bazaar) were outside the law, e.g. if

someone were to offer stolen goods for sale on City Council owned property and at a City Council run event. In the Rotterdam pilot there was a reluctance from the public side to take up an offer from private partners, without an additional contract for these private partners, to start coaching young people with multiple problems in the four-week waiting period before they could become eligible for a social benefit and activation services. It seems that public officials were afraid this might be misused as a means to stimulate referral of these young people to the private organizations which had initially provided their services at no cost.

- ***Reluctance to consider collaboration/co-creation with external agencies.***

This was observed in the Birmingham pilot, where public officials seemed reluctant to use an external organization's connections to reach young people, preferring to rely on their own links. In the Rotterdam pilot, collaboration was an explicit aim, and also succeeded, although there was also a reluctance to involve external partners in some parts of the process.

- ***An emphasis on rules and regulations – on a 'rightfulness' perspective rather than effectiveness-perspective on new ideas.*** This is often seen as embodied by public officials, but the Rotterdam pilot shows that private partners initially were equally, or even more concerned with bureaucracy (policy processes, agreements, contracts and resources) around the initiative than the public sector.

In contrast, the implementation of the pilot in Krakow ran smoothly. The already existing cooperation with an NGO was an important factor in deciding on this specific pilot. The smooth implementation according to plan shows that if cooperation can be worked out, the implementation and impact of an initiative can benefit from the active involvement of a public administration.

To some extent, the pilots initiated by universities (independent public organizations) in Brno and Hamburg met with barriers similar to municipalities. Bureaucracy around tendering procedures, in order to establish a formal cooperation with the delivering NGO, prevented a quick implementation of the pilot in Brno. Thanks to support from the city district which

quickly rented the NGO a location to run the pilot for a symbolic rent, however, it was possible for preparations involving young people in planning the project to get underway. By contrast, the planned activities in Hamburg had already been carried out. Nevertheless, establishing a position for the pilot amongst other organizations that were also active within refugee communities, and establishing cooperation, has been a challenge. In this case lack of time to build trust was a problem, in particular with the young people themselves. There were also some bureaucratic issues identified that prevent flexible solutions (such as the need to have a bank account to join a sports association, which makes it very difficult for young newcomers to access such facilities) and this became a small but significant factor later.

Pilots initiated by NGOs have also faced difficulties in implementation. In Athens a lot of time has been spent on involving the municipality. The implementation of the pilot depended to a large extent on its support, in terms of providing a space. In relation to the implementation of the pilot, the active participation in meetings with participants and members of the City Council, the Mayor of Elefsina, the Deputy Mayor of Economics, and the Head of the Municipal Benefit Enterprise, and the Mayor of Elefsina, contributed considerably to bridging the gap between young people and authorities. There was even some discussion of the possible development of the idea of this pilot initiative into a social enterprise.

The reserved reception of this idea by local authorities led to disappointment and discouragement; not, however, to the point that the participants gave up because they continued to look for alternative ways to move forward. They subsequently, gained support from the Councillor responsible for Culture.

In Venice, involving local authorities has been experienced as a partly frustrating experience, in the sense that bureaucracy, difficulties in communicating and a lack of flexibility have slowed the organization of the pilot event. Nevertheless, other creative solutions were found. For example, because of difficulties in obtaining permits for the use of a public space (a park), a private location was arranged for the event. Eventually, the event was successful in involving a large number of young people, social organisations and associations and local institutions. This has led to the neighbourhood municipality issuing a public notice that provides financial remuneration for groups and associations of young people who will present recreational and cultural projects in the neighbourhoods and for young mediators-facilitators of youth events. In this case, an initiative developed in the private sector, once successful, was adopted by the public sector.

The Malmö pilot did not face comparable implementation challenges, as the University linked the pilot – involving young people already in the planning phase of new policies –to an ongoing cooperation with an NGO, to develop multisectoral collaboration.

Implementation issues regarding the internal workings of pilots are addressed in the next section. With regard to the organisation of the pilots, some general conclusions might be drawn from their experiences in implementation:

- Young social entrepreneurs (e.g. in Birmingham, Rotterdam) and young people with ideas (e.g. in Hamburg) in many cases are at the roots of socially innovative practices (SIPs). Many SIPs begin with the talents and capabilities of the people involved;
- According to the people involved, the active engagement and support of the public sector and its resources is an important success factor, or measure of success, in social innovation. From our pilots, this seems to be irrespective of which actor takes the initiative;
- Pilots initiated by NGOs have been more successfully implemented than pilots initiated by public administrations. Actor-ship, and relative independence of NGOs from public policy processes, may have something to do with this, but the smaller scale of the pilots may also be important.
- Rules and regulations seem to be a frustrating barrier for all actors. This is not, however, to be equated with the public sector as an actor. It is not only the public sector that reproduces these rules and regulations. The reason for this is that rules and regulations are also a resource, and rules and regulations can be point of access to these resources. In many cases, however, rules and regulations are a barrier, e.g. obtaining re-building permits for the location of Amaro Records in Brno; refugees in Hamburg not being allowed to open a bank account which prevents them from taking part in activities of sports associations; tendering procedures delaying the implementation of a pilot; difficulties in obtaining permits to organize activities in a park in Venice where young people hang out anyway; and so on.

- Successful implementation often depends on key individuals willing to take chances, for whom the goal is more important than avoiding risks, who inspire, have authority, and make things happen. This human factor seems to be more important than structures, plans and decisions. In several pilot reports there appear key individuals who make a difference, e.g. the involvement of a social worker/educator who had a good connection to many young people in Venice, and very experienced and highly rated trainers in Krakow.
- Successful implementation depends also on good, unselfish cooperation, involving and respecting everyone and every organization that can contribute something.

### **4.3 Top-down and bottom-up**

In addition to distinguishing public-private-independent organizations, a “top-down” versus a “bottom-up” approach can also be distinguished in implementation strategies. A “bottom-up” approach starts from initiatives by ‘participants’ themselves, and links resources and support to these own initiatives. A “top-down” strategy sets out an approach and programme and then recruits participants. Although these strategies can be easily associated with particular actors, this is not necessarily so. Also, in practice these strategies co-exist or alternate. In organising a particular activity there is always some turning point, where the development phase ends, and where involving people no longer means ‘thinking along’, but ‘participating in an activity’. In the Venice pilot there are two groups of participants described, a core group of young people involved in organising the event, and a group involved in (successful) word-of-mouth ‘marketing’. Although the turning point may be diffuse, the further into the process, as plans or activities have started to crystallize, the more ‘top-down’ a strategy normally becomes from the point of view of new participants entering later in the process. Alternatively, an idea can start “top-down”, but becomes ‘opened up’ and changed in the process, such as in the Rotterdam pilot. Here, the municipality wanted to develop a new integrated intake procedure for young people, but in the process the aim shifted towards establishing a more general public-private partnership. This is seen as a more effective way of organizing services, and a way to maintain the level of services, as much as possible, in times of austerity.

Table 3 contains an overview of participants, working principles, initial implementation strategies, and communication strategies of the pilots. In some instances traditional (printed) and more modern (website) media are ways to inform potential participants about the activities. In others, however, websites and social media are virtual spaces for young people to express themselves and communicate with each other. In the Venice pilot a ‘modern’ use of social media, in addition to word-of-mouth communication, was an important part of the implementation.

<b>Table 3: target groups, working principles and communication strategies</b>				
<b>City &amp; Pilot</b>	<b>Target group</b>	<b>Working principles Impact on Education &amp; Employment*</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Communication</b>
Athens Entrepreneurship artists	Specific: young artists/creatives. Open to the public	Connect people (network building) Develop knowledge Bridging between local authorities and young people <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Top-down & bottom-up	Printed media (flyers, posters) Website, Facebook
B’ham Local Bazaar	General: people in disadvantaged districts	Provide opportunities for low-budget trading Build community Develop competences <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Top-down	Printed media (flyers, posters) Social media Website
Brno Recording studio	Specific: Roma motivated to develop their own cultural strength	Offer opportunities Build network/community Develop competences <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Top-down	Social media (Facebook, website, group-sms system)
Hamburg Bus tours	Specific: young asylum seekers waiting for admission	Offer opportunities, open doors Broaden knowledge <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Bottom-up	Printed media (flyers, posters) Facebook

Krakow Discovering inner potential	General: lower secondary school pupils and older young people in disadvantaged city districts	Offer workshops Develop talents and competences <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Top-down	Printed media (flyers, posters) Website
Malmö Policy involvement	General: excluded young people	Involve young people as experts in policy design Bridging between young people and government structures <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Bottom-up	
R'dam Integrated intake	General: all young people requiring support in education and employment	Indirect: connect professionals from different organisations involved, develop integrated intake Make gaps in services visible <i>Direct impact on E&amp;E</i>	Top-down & bottom-up	
Sofia Integrated approach for Roma	Specific: Roma motivated and ready for work	Develop competences Gain trust from employers <i>Direct impact on E&amp;E</i>	Top-down	Printed media (flyers, posters) Website
Venice Space for expression	General: young people in disadvantaged districts who want to express themselves	Provide space (opportunity) Build community <i>Indirect impact on E&amp;E</i>	Bottom-up	Social media Website

\* direct impact means that the pilot directly addresses issues of education and employment, indirect can also be read as 'preparatory'.

#### 4.4 Transferability

Six of the pilots involved a transfer of SIPs from other consortium cities. The four pilots that made the most progress in implementing their plan, have all involved a transfer and exchange.

There are several factors that may contribute to this:

- more realistic planning, based on previous experiences elsewhere;
- inspiration from study visits;

- saving time by learning from experiences and the possibility to use tools already developed;
- feedback partner(s) to discuss problems;

These elements are all mentioned in pilot reports. Between these, exchange visits and meeting experienced and inspiring people and key individuals seem to be regarded as the most important.

On the other hand, the Birmingham report mentions that more openness for external ideas and support might have helped in the implementation of the pilot, and in that sense visiting the Local Bazaar in Athens might have helped – for inspiration and possibly team-building.

Activities undertaken in the transfer of the pilots in Athens, Birmingham, Brno, Krakow, Sofia and Venice are:

- Regular communication and producing a description of the SIP (Barcelona) for the receiving partner (Brno), and a study visit of young people and a youth worker from Brno to Barcelona to look at the ‘original’ SIP;
- Study visits from Krakow and Venice to Birmingham to look at Beatfreaks, and exchange ideas with the local experts of this SIP. A visit of the inspirational founder of Beatfreaks to Krakow and frequent contacts via social media with Venice;
- Expert visit from Birmingham to Athens to facilitate the transfer of The Loft.
- A study visit of experts from HESED, Sofia to IQ Roma Service in Brno to look at and learn from the original project in order to help set up a similar SIP in Sofia, and a return visit of practitioners/experts from IQ Roma Service.
- Several partners have consulted other partners, especially cities, for ideas and good practices in tackling issues in setting up their own pilots.

A transfer of a SIP from one context to another seems to be quite possible and effective. All transfers involved adaptation to the local context, in some cases more than others.

Elements that are mentioned in pilots as being transferred from elsewhere mostly have to do with the internal working of a SIP, and with an implementation strategy. For example, in the transfer of IQ Roma Service from Brno to Sofia, the innovative elements from the perspective of the receiving city are individual counselling, rather than general services, and a focus on employers as a second ‘target group’ of the approach.

What struck visitors from Venice most when visiting Beatfreaks was that staff meetings took less than 15 minutes, and the enthusiasm, creativity, fun, efficiency, respect and professionalism of the group. Elements that were transferred are: the continuous use of social networks to involve and give visibility to young people in the area; the formation of a small group of young people with different skills who helped to create the Project, coordinate activities and make decisions, and to organize an event that provides young people with a safe and comfortable space to meet in order to express themselves and to share their passions.

In Krakow the elements taken from Beatfreaks are a module on social media in the wider programme of workshops, a partnership-approach between young people and their tutors (doing *with* not *to*), and a final event that involves young people as well as their families and friends, key local stakeholders, and that is covered in the local media.

## **5. Central ideas: the logic of interventions**

The previous section focused on the implementation of the pilots in an organizational sense. This section concentrates on the implementation of intended internal success factors – the working ingredients of the approach – and establishing a working relation with young people as participants.

### **5.1 Central ideas and success factors in SIPs**

A central idea of CITISPYCE is to look at what young people in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in cities are doing that could be regarded as socially innovative. Then, to see if, how and to what extent policies or practices can be linked to them in order to stimulate self-efficacy. Involving young people in some way seems to be a central element in all pilots, although the way this is done (or envisaged) differs according to target groups, situations and local contexts. Most pilots seem to focus on issues such as strengthening self-confidence, social ties and community identity, using each other's talents and networks to create more opportunities, building social networks and so on – issues that are relevant for employment and education through developing social capital, resilience and readiness for work. With the exception of the Sofia and Rotterdam pilots, employment and education opportunities are not an immediate goal, however.

**Table 4: central ideas, aims and intended success factors of the pilots**

<b>City &amp; Delivering organisation</b>	<b>Title and idea</b>	<b>Aim</b>	<b>Intended success factors</b>	<b>Focus</b>
Athens NGO direct	Shelter of Ideas - The Loft. Use temporary space for meeting, exchanging ideas and enhancing entrepreneurship of artists	Strengthen cooperation between artists to create better opportunities	- Support from municipality - Provide an opportunity (space and support; space for interaction and workshops on entrepreneurship)	Competences (learning)
B'ham City	Local Bazaar. Organize a market for exchange of used goods, where young people can meet and connect with each other	- Organize local bazaar - Create new entrepreneurs - Provide new perspectives	- Bring people together and make them communicate (familiarise) - Create a new positive narrative - Connect young people to opportunities to work	Competences (learning)  Opportunities ('communing')
Bрно NGO subcontracted by university	Amaro Records recording studio. Give young Roma musicians the opportunity to record and distribute their music.	- Strengthen competences and network - Bridging the distance between majority and Roma minority - Offering opportunities	- Involving experienced musicians - Providing resource (studio and exposure) otherwise unavailable - Improving skills at the same time as developing social capital	Competences (learning)  Opportunities (resources)
Hamburg University of Applied Sciences & local social work administration	Welcome tours for refugees (moin moin Hamburg). Show them around 'their' city.	Increase self-sufficiency (knowledge and social capital) of young refugees	- Guides in own languages (bridge language barriers) - Motivate young refugees to take part - Commitment of local organizations and institutions to cooperate	Competences (learning) Opportunities (awareness/knowledge)
Krakow NGO subcontracted by city	Hidden Wings. Discovering inner potential. Activity workshops for lower-secondary school pupils, by older youth in the role of trainers.	- Strengthen soft skills and social networks - Develop entrepreneurial attitudes and internal locus of control	- Well prepared trainers (pedagogical skills, entrepreneurial attitude) - Broad stakeholder participation - Motivate young people to participate - Give feeling they participate in 'something special'	Competences (learning)

Malmö NGO direct	Multisectoral learning. Involving young people already in the planning phase of new policies	- Multisectoral collaboration - Learn about causes and effects of social inequality	Involve young people already in the planning phase Open agenda (not pre-set) Create mutual knowledge	Competences/ learning (knowledge)
Rotterdam City	Integrated intake and diagnosis. Develop a single intake for young people in need of support, to prevent drop out and identify gaps in services.	- Adequate support towards employment or education for every young person - Develop integrated intake and diagnosis	- Involve all stakeholders - Feedback loops	Allocation of support
Sofia NGO direct	Integrated approach for Roma youth. Improve employability and job-openings for young Roma	Improve employment prospects for Roma youth	- Develop relevant job skill training - Building trust with employers	Competences (learning)
Venice NGO direct	Show and tell. Organise virtual spaces and a public event for expression.	- Strengthen self-confidence - Develop competences	- Bring people together - Get people to get to know each other	Competences (learning) Opportunities (‘communing’)

### ***“Learning” approaches***

A central idea of almost all pilots, in addition to ‘involving young people’, is developing self-sufficiency (and/or self-efficacy) of young people. Doing and learning, and learning by doing, are important principles. In some cases the emphasis is more on tangible activities, and learning is thought of as a spin-off, as a natural consequence of giving space and bringing people together, letting them get them to know each other and each other’s talents (for example Birmingham). In other cases the emphasis is more on learning, and the activities are thought of as instrumental (for example Krakow and Hamburg). Some pilots seem to have taken the shape of action learning groups, where reflection and making new plans go hand-in- hand (for example Malmö and Rotterdam). In most cases coaching, actively facilitating, organising workshops (e.g. on entrepreneurship) and visits for participants, are part of the pilots. Combinations of doing and learning in meaningful activities, in all pilots, seem to be thought of as a way to create involvement.

In most pilot reports it is reported that participants have an ambition to sustain their activities, which indicates that involvement has been achieved.

In Athens, entrepreneurship workshops were added to the pilot, which contributed to participants developing an idea to form a social enterprise. In Venice, participants were challenged to think and plan for themselves in organising the event, through asking them questions: “Who should be involved? How? Do you know if other young people are interested? Where can the event take place? How can we promote it? What local services do you know?” Step-by-step, participants were given more responsibilities and autonomy, and challenged to take these up.

Part of the Sofia pilot is a counselling programme for young Roma that aims to develop their job skills. In the pilot it soon became clear that considerable attention needed to be devoted to learning time management. This is because participants who have never been employed before, or have been without jobs for a long time, often had little sense of timekeeping, and for them being half an hour or an hour late for an appointment was something normal. For other participants counselling focused solely on technical job skills. Most participants were enthusiastic about the sessions:

*“Here I discover and learn what I want. First I was not sure if I can go through with this, because I have never worked before. But then we made the test, and she showed me how to write an email on the computer and other things, and I realised that I can do this.”*

*“Even if nothing happens here, if I do not succeed in finding work here, what I learn here will be very useful for me wherever I go.”*

### ***Creating conditions: giving space, building trust and bridging***

Building trust requires respect for the interests, time and limits of young people. The use of the same communication tools (social media) can help to build a group identity. An important aim, and measure of involvement, is the extent to which participants feel ownership of the project or activity.

Creating involvement is also achieved through bridging, that is establishing natural “intergenerational” connections, for example in Krakow through leaders/tutors whom participants can relate to, identify with, and look-up to.

*“When I look at him [the tutor], when he’s doing things, it helps a lot, he’s an interesting person.”*

*“When I conduct a workshop, I try to do it the way it is done in the streets – older people teach younger generations, it’s a relay of generations. I have learned a lot from others, and then I saw how important it is to transfer experiences and knowledge.”*

And a participant: *“When we’ve learned something new, we would like to pass it on to others”.*

Involving experienced musicians is also an important element of the Brno pilot, and involving guides with more experience of living in Germany for young refugees is an important element in the Hamburg pilot.

In the pilot reports on Athens, Brno and Venice word-of-mouth and peer-to-peer communication is mentioned as an important success factor. Furthermore, in the reports on the pilots in Birmingham and Hamburg it is mentioned as something that has not yet sufficiently happened, and could contribute to the SIPs gaining more momentum.

Connecting young people to local authorities and other organizations that may be of use to them has been mentioned before (e.g. Malmö, Hamburg, Athens, Venice), and is also a way to build trust. This connection becomes stronger if there is something at stake. Almost all pilot reports mention shared decision making as a success factor in creating involvement, a sense of ownership and belonging. It requires that the people involved express their needs and share their difficulties, ask questions and listen, suggest possible solutions and build consensus.

In the Sofia pilot, building a connection with employers is an additional element, and considered to be a critical success factor. As participants are often not capable of approaching employers themselves through lack of experience and an adequate social network, the pilot aims to build a network of employers willing to engage with this target group. The fact that early into the pilot two participants were offered a job through this new network of employers generated a lot of interest from young people in participating – though in many cases still not enough to engage in the counselling programme.

A last success factor we would like to single out from the pilot reports is ‘time’. Several pilot reports mention that building trust in many cases takes more than one positive experience. For example, the Hamburg pilot experienced some difficulties in recruiting participants for the bus tours, even though in preparatory interviews many young refugees had indicated they

liked the idea. Coming from situations in which their basic trust may have been put to the test, it seems it is not so easy to restore. Trust is hard to gain, and easy to lose.

## **5.2 The balancing act of strengthening resilience, stimulating self-sufficiency and self- efficacy, building competences and social networks**

From the pilot descriptions it becomes evident that there are no simple recipes when it comes to strengthening resilience, building human capital, empowerment or whatever else we choose to call it. Even though a “bottom-up” approach, linking to young people’s own initiatives and interests, involving young people as much as possible in every step taken, and building a positive identity through ‘communing’, are, in a way, considered as ‘default-ingredients’ in stimulating social innovation, there do not seem to be any hard and fast rules. Depending on the context, a supportive approach may need to be alternated with a compensatory approach, an approach of giving space by a more ‘pedagogic’ or paternalistic approach. In short: the most important success factor is probably not a single method consisting of certain success factors as such, but professionalism and key individuals who do the right thing at the right moment. As a professional from Sofia put it, both the consultant and the participant are learning “*the proper steps of this dance*” and moving forwards towards the goal.

An important pitfall in any kind of support is that participants can become dependent upon it. Whilst knowing they have a trusted person to whom they can turn for help and advice can boost participants’ self-confidence, the main goal is to empower them to act independently and confidently.

The Venice report mentions a role change of the initiators in the course of the project. “*We tried to give some responsibilities and tasks to everyone in the group because we thought they were independent and would be able to perform these tasks by themselves. But this step was too early because they needed to develop their group identity and to have a coordinator to support their assignment. For example, we tried to give some tasks, but sometimes they forgot or did not do these. Therefore we changed our way of working and decided to support them and become a reference figure for them.*”

The balancing act of providing adequate support is a challenge both on the level of interaction between professionals and participants, as it is on the level of positioning a SIP regarding the target group it aims to support.

### 5.3 Different central ideas of pilots contain different – implicit – views of people

In some cases young people are thought of as entrepreneurial; as willing and able to recognize and use spaces and opportunities that are offered, or emerge, to good ends. It is assumed that offering space and opportunities will provide a way to overcome social inequalities. The ‘problem’ is mainly defined at the level of the social distribution of resources – a macro-level – assuming that young people’s disposition (micro-level) and social network (meso-level) will enable them to take advantage of opportunities that come along (for example Athens, Birmingham, Malmö).

Other pilots seem to be based on an implicit notion of resignation among young people in disadvantaged neighbourhoods. For example, through workshops in different cultural activities (for example Krakow and Brno) it is assumed that participants will revive their ambitions and hope, find new talents and develop competences, thereby recognizing and creating new opportunities for themselves for overcoming social inequalities.

In some pilots young people seem to be conceived of as lacking a supportive network and role models they can relate to. It is assumed that bringing people with similar interests together and provide them a space an opportunities, can help them develop a new, positive identity, that in turn will provide new ways to overcome social inequalities (for example Krakow, Brno, Athens, Hamburg).

Another implicit difference between pilots is a “top-down” or “bottom-up” approach. This applies to governance structures (see section 4.3), but also to the way young people are approached. In practice it will probably never be completely the one or the other, but there are different implicit assumptions about young people, their self-sufficiency and organisational abilities contained in both approaches. “Bottom-up” approaches, if taken to the extreme, rely on young people to know best what is good for them, and on their ability to realize these goals if given space. *Bottom-up approaches are based on a logic of developing what is already present: support through empowerment, giving space and providing opportunities.* “Top-down” approaches, on the other hand, assume that young people are not always or sufficiently able to see what is good for them, and not always able and sufficiently resourced to make that happen. *Top-down approaches are based on a logic of compensation: (temporarily) taking over the direction of the process through paternalism and/or advocacy.* In practice, of course, both approaches can alternate and there are different shades of grey in between black and

white. The most important challenge seems to be to find an adequate balance between these approaches.

We could look at the pilot in Venice as a typical example of a “bottom-up” approach, and the pilot in Sofia as a typical example of a “top-down” approach. Both pilots seem to be evaluated as largely positive by participants. An important difference seems to be that they address partly different target groups. Participants in the Sofia pilot had to learn how to use email, whereas participants in the Venice pilot were actively using social media, for example. A “bottom-up” approach assumes some competences on the part of participants, whereas a “top-down” approach is aimed at helping participants discover what could be possible, and what it would take to make it happen.

Different logics of intervention and different views of people can be put into a typology, juxtaposing different approaches to social innovation as adequate for different contexts and different ideal-types of young people. In operationalization there is normativity involved. The most important dimensions seem to be:

**Ambition**: aiming at integration into mainstream society through school/job versus resignation or aiming for ‘alternative’ integration. When talking about socially excluded young people, most of our social systems aim to get these young people into education or (low-skilled) jobs. Starting one’s own business is sometimes a possibility too, but this is generally not something that is actively promoted. Low-skilled work or running a business require different, sometimes even opposing competences, e.g. obedience versus waywardness. Entrepreneurial spirit can be put to use in socially acceptable ways, but also in socially unacceptable ways, as has become clear from

‘decay’ tendencies described in several WP3 and WP4 reports. This means that there may be a thin line, and a grey area, between social innovation through entrepreneurial initiatives and anti-social innovation through ‘criminal’ entrepreneurial initiatives. Law enforcement may be part of an approach.

‘Ambition’ can also be contrasted with ‘lack of ambition’, or resignation, which can result from social exclusion.

**Ability**: low versus high resilience, self-sufficiency and/or self-efficacy in taking care of one’s self and sustaining one’s livelihood. Of course this is partly context-dependent. We can make a distinction between general life-skills – basic competences

that are expected from citizens – and more specific skills, such as employee-skills, entrepreneurial skills, or specific job-skills. For the purpose of this typology we can probably limit ourselves to general abilities, such as planning ahead, bureaucratic competences, being able to recognize and communicate what one would need, and so on. Different approaches assume different levels of basic ability and knowledge from participants.

Another aspect of ability is one’s personal resources, not only ‘inside one’s self’, but also ‘outside one’s self’: one’s social network. Work Packages 3 and 4 have shown that a supportive social network can provide a lot of opportunities, and the lack of such support can be a severe hindrance toward social inclusion for young people.

**A suggested typology of logics of intervention and ideal-types of participants**

*Italic*: analytical dimensions

**Bold**: policies and interventions

Standard: type of person

*Ambition: integration into mainstream society through school/job*

<b>Learning and counselling; social capital; matching</b>	Motivated to integrate into mainstream society, but lacking competences and/or social network	Motivated and ready for a job without further support, but lacking opportunities	<b>Offering opportunities</b>
<i>Low ability and support</i>	Living day by day, opportunistically.		<i>High ability and support</i>
<b>Empowerment: developing ambition, competences and social network</b>	Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change	Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support	<b>Stimulating and enabling entrepreneurship; co-creation; ‘communing’</b>

*Resignation or aiming for ‘alternative’ integration*  
**law enforcement**

If there is a match between the logic of an approach and the ‘type’ of participants (regarding ambitions and abilities, including social network), we can expect the SIP to ‘work’, and we can expect a bottom-up approach (or: no need for paternalism). If there is a (partial) mismatch

between the logic of an approach and the ‘type of participants’, we can expect some tensions. From the SIP we can expect top-down elements (paternalism and/or advocacy) to enter into the approach. These can be productive but can also put the relationship to the test. From participants, if approached in a way that does not sufficiently link to their ambitions and abilities, either by going in a direction they do not (yet) want to go, by over-asking them with regard to their abilities or by taking over things they are able to handle themselves, we can expect resistance, withdrawal or passivity (learned helplessness).

Examples of friction between intentions and what actually happens are, obviously, also described in all pilot reports. For example, in the Malmö pilot, in some meetings young people were much quieter and less open than usual, as they felt they were being steered. *“The participants were mostly performers of a task we steered entirely and we felt they were not used to think aloud and talk about what they thought of their future”*. This comment mentions both a mismatch regarding ambitions between leaders and participants in that situation, and a perceived mismatch of ambitions – leaders asking participants to do something they were not used to [did not yet have the competence to]. *“There was too much focus on the outcomes, we wanted results, and I think that was wrong”*, one of the leaders said. This is an example of a mismatch of ambitions at a micro level of an interaction in a specific context.

An example of a mismatch in the positioning of a SIP could be what happened at one point in the Sofia pilot. The project targets young Roma who are motivated to integrate into mainstream society but in need of support. Attracted by the success of two participants getting a job early in the project, young people also came to the project who only wanted a job but did not want to put in any effort. In terms of the typology above, the project in its approach targets young people who can be placed in the upper left corner, but also attracted young people from the lower left corner, with a more opportunistic outlook on the world, living day by day and not very motivated to invest in long-term returns. Rather than individual counselling in a more formal setting, these latter youngsters might benefit from an approach such as Amaro Records in Brno, providing them with immediate quick-wins, or more informal outreach counselling, where social workers adapt to the culture and habits of participants rather than ask participants to adapt themselves to ‘middle-class’ ways of doing things.

An example of a mismatch at the level of the (original) pilot plan might be the Rotterdam pilot, where the original pilot plan may have been too ambitious and not have been sufficiently connected to the state of affairs in the ‘landscape of provisions’, but not yet

sufficiently linked to the mutual ambitions and abilities of organizations and the policy process at the time.

Restoring a match, by taking a step back and reaching a new (or renewed) consensus, can often put an initiative back on track. As all of these pilots also show, there are always second chances and perseverance may be the single most important success factor, as is explicitly or implicitly clear from all pilot reports.

An interesting case in this regard is also the Hamburg report. The bus tours target young refugees with often un-recognized competences. Facilitating them with a guide in their own language aims to ‘release’ these existing competences rather than to address them as poor-German speakers, thereby making them feel inferior and incompetent. In this sense, the logic of the SIP could be interpreted as positioned in the upper half of the typology – addressing people who are motivated to integrate into, for them, a new society. The pilot did experience difficulties in finding participants for the tours, however, even though many refugees had expressed interest in preceding interviews. The most important reasons for this seem to be a lack of trust and resignation, and possibly that young people through social media and the internet have already found their own resources. In other words: the project may need more time to (re-)develop young refugees’ hopes and ambitions before it can help to ‘set free’ their competences and abilities.

## **6. Reflections and general conclusions**

The most important conclusions we can draw from the nine pilots, seem to be:

- Young social entrepreneurs (e.g. in Birmingham, Rotterdam) and young people with ideas (e.g. in Hamburg) in many cases are at the root of socially innovative practices. Many socially innovative practices begin with talents and capabilities of the people involved.
- Windows of opportunity play an important role in the matching of SIPs and local social needs and in supporting individual initiatives in scaling up. The feasibility of a pilot in the local organizational and institutional context, policy framework and time frame, seems, in practice, to be more important than considerations about target groups, which social needs to address, and what innovative central ideas to pilot.

- According to the people involved, the involvement and active support of the public sector and its resources is an important success factor, or measure of success, in social innovation. From our pilots this seems to be irrespective of which actor takes the initiative.
- Pilots initiated by NGOs have been more successfully implemented than pilots initiated by public administrations. Actor-ship, and the relative independence of NGOs from public policy processes, may have something to do with this, but the smaller scale of the pilots may also be important.
- Rules and regulations seem to be a frustrating barrier for all actors. This is not to be equated with the public sector as an actor, however since it is not only the public sector that reproduces these rules and regulations. The reason for this is that rules and regulations are also a resource, and rules and regulations can be a point of access to these resources, and other actors 'play the game' to gain access to these resources. In many cases, however, rules and regulations are a barrier, e.g. obtaining re-building permits for the location of Amaro Records in Brno; refugees not being allowed to open a bank account which prevents them from taking part in activities of sports associations in Hamburg; tendering procedures delaying the implementation of a pilot; difficulties in obtaining permits to organize activities in a park where young people hang out anyway in Venice.
- Successful implementation often depends on key individuals willing to take chances and for whom the goal is more important than avoiding risks, who inspire, have authority, and make things happen. In several pilot reports there appear key individuals who make a difference, e.g. the involvement of a social worker/educator who had a good connection to many young people in Venice, and very experienced and highly rated trainers in Krakow.
- Successful implementation depends also on good, unselfish cooperation, involving and respecting everyone and every organization that can contribute something.
- Making use of experiences, good practices and inspiration from elsewhere seems to speed up the development of socially innovative practices (SIPs)

- A pedagogical approach of learning/teaching and a facilitating approach of building conditions through giving space, building trust, involving local authorities, employers and other organisations that young people are not familiar with, are important success factors, as are endurance and perseverance.
- “Bottom-up” and “top-down” approaches, supportive and compensatory approaches, can both be appropriate, depending on the context. The important success factor seems to be the ability of professionals to choose an adequate approach in every context, and flexibility with an eye to individual tailoring of activities.
- SIPs are effective when the ‘logic of their interventions’ matches the ambition and abilities of the young people they address, both in the positioning of a SIP in relation to its target group, as in what happens in the interaction between people (professionals and participants).

The wider meaning of these conclusions for social problems as experienced by young people is not yet clear. This is partly because WP6 looks mostly at the implementation and process, and not at outcomes and results. The case studies of WP7 may shed more light on this. Partly it is also because young people are both viewed as ‘part of the problem’ (i.e. suffering social exclusion) and as ‘part of the solution’ (through own initiatives, resilience and entrepreneurial activities), and that, in fact, these different views may concern slightly different groups of young people rather than two sides of the same coin. In Section 2 several approaches to social innovation were distinguished: learning, creating conditions, preserving services, filling gaps, redistribution, which linked to social trends. These are not mutually exclusive, and in practice are often combined. All of these approaches have been part of the pilots, though some only marginally.

WP4 mentioned several problems experienced by young people, some of which are addressed by our pilots. On the micro-level of young people themselves, important problems that are distinguished are: fatalism about life prospects, opportunities in the labour market and the value of education. This fatalism can become a mechanism of (continued) self-exclusion. However, fatalism seems to be a somewhat one-dimensional description of reactions of young people to the experience of limited opportunities. Certainly not all young people participating in the pilots come across as fatalistic. For some young people -and this may be the most worrying group - resignation and passivity may be the dominant reaction. Others seem to be more

inclined to try to take their fate into their own hands and develop entrepreneurial or criminal activities or become radicalized. Social innovation that builds on people's own initiatives and resilience addresses the more entrepreneurial types – the lower right corner of the typology. It is not quite clear, however, how facilitating them can also help those for whom fatalism and self-exclusion has become part of the reproduction of their social exclusion, other than through a possible 'trickle-down effect'. On the other hand, social innovation that aims to do something about the most marginalized, often relies on a pedagogical approach that contains explicit or implicit paternalist elements that may be counterproductive for stimulating entrepreneurial activities of less fatalistic young people. The pilot reports mention withdrawal, passivity or resistance in specific interaction-contexts.

Some pilots have a more pedagogical approach (Krakow, Sofia), others a more facilitating approach (Brno, Venice), or a combination of both (Athens). All approaches, in their context, are reported to generate some enthusiasm among participants, and seem to restore some hope and ambition in them, although reportedly, as of yet, only to a limited extent in the area of education and employment. The question is whether or not these pilots address similar participants in different ways, or whether the diversity in approaches reflects diversity among their participants. We are inclined to assume the latter is at least partly true.

The important lesson seems to be that, rather than looking at social innovation as an independent dynamic process over time, it is essential to link continuously to the existing ambitions and abilities of participants, and that this can imply, at different points in time, or with different people, quite divergent approaches. With regard to fatalism, this means that either activities have to start from ambitions that *are* present, which may be free time activities rather than employment and education related activities (Krakow, Venice), or it means that more intensive guidance and workshops have to be offered, and small steps taken (Sofia, Athens).

Professionalism implies that we do not look at different approaches to social innovation as competing, but rather as complementary, and understanding when (context, target group) to use which; when to facilitate and support, when to take the lead or put limits, when to stimulate own ambitions and when to criticise/ask to reflect/stop.

It seems important to point out that the pedagogical approaches indicated here work from a different conception of people than the stimulus-response approach and the assumed *homo economicus* in many Neo-Liberal inspired policy measures.

On a meso-level of social network and neighbourhood, problems of young people that are mentioned in WP4 are a loss of signposts, retreat into familiar territory and limited opportunities for engagement and collectivity. In short, these problems are occasioned partly by circumstances, partly by their own retreat and their lack of a supportive social network which could provide a bridge to opportunities in education, employment, housing and so on. WP3 identified three main approaches to addressing these issues: bridging, communing and developing trust. These approaches can all be found in the pilots. Bridging especially, the familiarization of young people with authorities (e.g. Athens), employers (e.g. Sofia), associations and local services (e.g. Hamburg, Venice), seems to be an important success factor. Communing and developing trust may be regarded as pre-conditions for going outside one's comfort zone. Restoring a basic trust in authorities and communities through facilitating the building of a new collective identity, in a way, is only useful if the new confidence it provides is used for going beyond one's 'zones of familiarity' e.g. by being better prepared and more actively competing for jobs or education, or by developing one's own entrepreneurial activities. Connecting people outside their familiar territory can also help them and challenge them to take these steps.

Some pilot reports (Sofia, Krakow, Athens) explicitly mention the experiences of participants going outside their comfort-zones and the positive effect it has on them, in the sense of opening new perspectives they did not know existed. It is not yet clear to what extent this is a general experience of participants in other pilots.

It is important to add here that developing trust and communing can also be stepping stones into criminal activities or radicalization, depending on how and with whom the new collective identity is developed. For this reason bridging – engaging 'outside' people and organizations that are relevant for participants – may make a difference between developing social innovation and 'not so social' innovation.

On a macro-level, according to WP4, young people encounter especially limited opportunities in the labour market, discrimination and retrenchment of welfare services (benefits, education and training, housing). None of the pilots had redistribution as an explicit aim, although the Local Bazaar in Birmingham and involving young people already in the planning phase of new policies in Malmö could partly be regarded as such. The Local Bazaar is, among others, aimed at facilitating redistribution of second hand goods and services. There has been too limited experience in this pilot to say something about the potential of social innovation at a

macro-level of access to resources for breaking circles of social exclusion. The pilot in Malmö so far has mainly been described regarding the process, not yet the results. It would be interesting to see some case studies in this area, to see to what extent structures of opportunities can be directly addressed in innovative practices, and what effect this can have for the social exclusion of young people.

On an institutional level, social innovation can encompass preserving services in times of austerity, or setting up new services to fill gaps. This has been indirectly addressed in the Rotterdam pilot that was aimed at establishing a public-private partnership, as a more efficient way to organize and coordinate services as well as to further develop policies by giving more space to ‘frontline’ input – experiences of organizations in working with young people and their problems. Again, the pilot has not yet made enough progress to say something about tangible results. Process indicators such as the evaluation of participating professionals, and the consensus that has been reached about actions for improvement of services, indicate a positive effect.

Lastly, some pilots (Venice, Hamburg) made extensive use of social media in their communication. Using the same tools of communication (social media) is reported to help create a group identity. An important aspect is that social media allow for two-way communication.

In Section 2 we defined the study of social innovation as an attempt to gain more rational control over social development. The typology outlined in Section 5 aims to support people and organizations involved in socially innovative practices to choose an appropriate approach in different contexts.

This report gathers together findings from nine pilots undertaken in nine out of the ten cities in the ten countries where CITISPYCE partners are based. They are mostly taken from the Menu of 45 Innovative Practices (WP5) which drew on the identification of potentially innovative practices of and for young people facing inequalities in the preceding fieldwork phase. Although it was not possible to control the selection of pilots from a research perspective, there nevertheless seems to have been a diversity of approaches and intervention mechanisms which we have been able to test out – albeit on a limited scale and within relatively short time-frames. We have been able both to explore the attitudinal and operational factors which may be critical to their successful implementation and gain insights

into the key ingredients for a successful transfer of a socially innovative practice (SIP) from one context to another. In other words, we have fulfilled our aims which were to see what is going on in cities with regard to the development and implementation of innovative social practices of and for young people and what are the essential ingredients for the successful transfer of an initiative from one context to another. The Chapitre 8 (Work Package 7 report) will then go on to evaluate the SIPs we have identified in terms of their impact on the different types and levels of inequality still being experienced by many young people across Europe.

## References

BEPA. (2010). Empowering people, driving change. Social Innovation in the European Union, BEPA.

Lødemel, I. and A. Moreira (eds.). (2014). *Activation or Workfare? Governance and the Neo-Liberal Convergence*. New York, Oxford University Press.

Moulaert, F., D. MacCallum, A. Mehmood and A. Hamdouch. (2013). *The International Handbook on Social Innovation; Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*. Cheltenham, Edward Elgar.

## **Chapter 8: Assessing the impact of social innovations: 21 case studies in perspective**

Tomáš Sirovátka, Ondřej Hora, Jana Válková,

Masaryk University, Brno

### **1. Introduction: The position of Work Package 7 in the Citispyce project**

The objective of Work Package 7 (WP7) was to provide a repository of the innovative practices. Such an objective may be understood as one of the final outcomes of the Citispyce project.

WP 7 built on the previous work packages: in WP2 (Chapter 3) the causes and symptoms of inequalities affecting the youth in 10 cities at the national and city level were investigated, while in WP3 (Chapter 4) examined the dimensions of the inequalities and the social infrastructure which are responding to these dimensions in the excluded neighbourhoods. In WP4 (Chapter 5) the perceptions of the inequalities by young people themselves and their strategies to respond them were explored, with the emphasis on the innovative strategies. In WP5 (Chapter 6) the Menu of innovative practices and descriptions of the selected social innovations (30 cases in total) in 10 European cities were provided. In WP6 (Chapter 7) the pilot projects have been implemented, in which either the suitable practices were transferred from one city into another city, or some new practices or new elements of practices were implemented in one city.

WP7 (Chapter 8) provides case studies of these pilot projects as well of the other innovative practices which were identified in WP5. The objective of the WP7 was to provide the evidence on the design, implementation and outcomes of these innovative practices, while paying attention to their innovative elements as well as to their transferability. In this respect Citispyce enabled some kind of ‘experiment in vivo’. The practices from one city were transferred into other societal and implementation contexts. This way, their positive potentials were examined

in a creative way. The stakeholders who were involved in their transfer deliberately selected the practices when having to consider their potential positive effects, as well as necessary adaptations to the local conditions.

The next objective of WP7 was to present and discuss the Case Studies and the emerging policy implications (recommendations) thereof with EU stakeholders during an Evaluation Workshop held on 10 September 2015. This created a basis to formulate a list of possible recommendations.

The purpose of this report, therefore, was to frame the individual case studies within the context of Citispyce project, to explain the criteria for the selection of the innovative practices and the methodology and content of the case studies. Next, the key characteristics of the innovative practices were presented. Finally, it offers some reflections on how the innovative practices are addressing failures and gaps in the policies to address social inequalities in ten European cities and an assessment of the success factors of these innovative practices.

## **2. Case studies: innovative practices that have been assessed**

### **2.1 The selection**

The selection of case studies has followed two tracks: the first was the pilots. In this case, the stakeholders (municipalities, NGOs, and universities involved) discussed the Menu of Innovative Practices at the workshop in Krakow (September 2014) and after this, they implemented the selected pilots. Their selection has been underpinned by several criteria, the three most important, in combination are:

- Expected positive impacts on the inequalities the young people are facing
- Transferability considering the local contexts
- The costs (the project provided only very limited resources for implementation of the pilots).

Some partners implemented the practices seen in the other cities, while other partners like Malmö or Hamburg decided to implement some new practices which were developed by themselves.

The other track of the case study selection was the cases/practices already existing in the cities. In such a case, the three following criteria dominated:

- Expected, or the already envisaged, positive impacts of the practices
- Other positive devices like innovativeness, perceived transferability and reasonable costs
- Possibilities to carry the case study effectively.

In both cases the expected positive impacts, as well as innovativeness, were the most important perspectives. The partners were guided by the experience gained in the previous work packages which have identified the failures of existing policies and the needs of young people.

## **2.2 Clustering the innovative practices**

The case studies which are presented can be clustered from several perspectives. First, the possible logic of the clustering will be explained and then the classification of the case studies will be provided. In the final step a discussion on the success factors of the innovative practices follows.

During work on the Work Packages the following key perspectives which have been used in the evaluation of the practices/projects (see section on evaluation methodology) were distinguished:

- The logic of intervention: corresponding to/influenced by Integrative, Redistributive and Moral underclass discourses, this is to identify what causes of inequalities/exclusion seem to be addressed
- The dimensions of inequality identified with the help of the perceptions of young people: neglect, distance, lack of trust
- Area of intervention: employment (entrepreneurship as a part of it), education, recognition/empowerment, communing/sociability, participation and neighbourhood development
- Implementation mode/approach: Top-down, Bottom-up
- Target group in terms of typology of social innovation (which applies to both target groups and logics of intervention) based on two dimensions: ambition and ability
- Objectives of the intervention: increasing human and social capital (employability), supporting self-esteem, providing resources/opportunities, supporting processes, communing, sociability, engagement, trust. These can be linked to the typology of target groups.

The innovative practices which have been evaluated, however, have made these distinctions difficult to sustain. The logics of intervention often overlapped, as did the dimensions of

inequalities addressed or the areas of the intervention. Consequently, the top-down and bottom-up approaches were mostly difficult to disentangle, the target groups difficult to distinguish properly or different target groups were addressed. Finally, it was typical that there were several objectives of the interventions identified in one practice/project.

To sum up, the conclusion may be accepted that within the innovative practices that we are introducing here, the above distinctions are blurred: this is a key feature of the social innovations, reflecting the complexity of the inequalities, as well as the complexity of the innovative practices which are addressing them.

Second, thanks to this complexity, the innovative practices did pay attention to the aspects often neglected in the mainstream policies. They also contrast with the currently widespread MUD discourse<sup>5</sup> and the corresponding approach in mainstream policies which assumes that young people living in deprived neighbourhoods represent a problem themselves. Instead they are aiming to bridge distance, to provide recognition, build trust, offer engagement and empowerment to the neglected target groups like those who lose aspirations and aim at alternative solutions or they may even resign solutions. This all enabled us to use the knowledge of young people in the proper recognition of their problems and the causes of inequalities they are facing. Processes and approaches to young people play a key role, enabling the actors involved to facilitate/boost their individual and collective potential through active cooperation in addressing social inequalities in excluded neighbourhoods. Creativity and potentials of young people have the central role, similarly as social potential of the communities they are living in.

From the above reasons the overview/clustering of the innovative practices adopts two criteria: this is the area of the intervention as the first, and the origin of the practice/project (based on the domestic experience/field work or the practices transferred from the other city/country) as the second.

Although this seems to be quite a simple distinction, this leads us to the key lesson. Originally it was assumed that mainly employment and education oriented innovations would be in focus. It turned out that these practices or innovations proved to overlap with other more general aspects like recognition, empowerment, participation, self-esteem, trust and engagement. The latter aspects create the necessary preconditions for more specific employment and education oriented effects. This is because very often the young people who are living in the deprived

---

<sup>5</sup> The various discourses on social exclusion our studies have covered are discussed in the next section.

neighbourhoods are very often marginalised or excluded in several dimensions: economic, social, civic/political and spatial. In consequence they are losing trust, self-confidence, aspirations and motivation. Mainstream policies fail to recognise the above crucial aspects of social inclusion or assume that employment will be the solution to these problems. Consequently, mainstream policies are perceived by young people as oppressive and not very helpful, or insufficient.

Although there are typically several intervention areas addressed by each of the practices under study, it is possible with some simplification to cluster the case studies according the ‘main’ area addressed (see table below).

**Table1: map of the innovative practices**

<b>Area/ general aim</b>	<b>Employment</b>	<b>Entrepreneu rship</b>	<b>Education, development</b>	<b>Recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement, neighbourhood development</b>
<b>Pilot projects</b>	Integrated approach (Sofia, from Brno)	The Loft (Athens, from Birmingham)	Recording studio (Brno, from Barcelona)	Hidden Wings (Krakow, from Birmingham)  Beatfreaks (space to expression) (Venice, from Birmingham)  Moin Moin Hamburg - Welcome Tours for Refugees  Multisectoral cooperation (Malmö)

<b>Established innovative projects/practices</b>	Learning by working (Brno)	The Loft (Birmingham)	Educational Demos (Barcelona)	Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom (Barcelona)
	Youth Employment Agency (Hamburg)	Buzzinezzclub (Rotterdam)	Free Remedial Tutoring (Krakow)	Beatfreeks (Birmingham)
		Topeko (Athens)	Challenge Sports (Rotterdam)	Cricket Club (Venice)
			Health and Social Centre (Sofia)	Brightful (Malmö)
			The New Opportunity (Rotterdam)	

The distinction of the areas of innovative practices is not sharp: these areas often overlap since they are mutually interlinked and supportive. This is clearly the case, for example the practices like Multisectoral cooperation in Malmö, which follows both the aim of networking, engagement, democracy, as well as the aim of producing individual abilities, self-confidence and collective knowledge. Similarly, Welcome Tours for Refugees in Hamburg follow not only ‘bridging distance’ or ‘socialising’ objectives, but also the aim of providing knowledge about the city and society to refugees. Similarly The New Opportunity in Rotterdam aims to change ‘unhealthy thinking and unhealthy behaviour’ through motivation, empowerment and support as a pre-condition for individual development, education and employment, or the Loft in Athens which is not only concerned with entrepreneurship but also with empowerment, engagement, development and education – similar to other practices in employment, entrepreneurship and education areas, etc. etc. Some projects like The New Opportunity (Rotterdam) and others are dealing with fairly marginalised young people due to (self)-exclusion and problematic family/neighbourhood influences-conditions. This implies the need for quite complex approaches, concerned with the essential individual motivations, abilities and social relationships.

### 3. Theoretical underpinning of the case studies

The case studies are built on the results of the previous work packages. Work packages 2-4 focused on social inequalities and their causes on macro-, meso- and micro-levels. They have also analysed; the national and local policy frameworks and social infrastructure in

disadvantaged neighbourhoods, the experiences of young people concerning social inequalities and social infrastructures, their strategies within the role of the innovative practices.

The comparative WP2 report has distinguished several areas of inequalities which we have kept as the key areas of practices/pilots/projects. It also distinguished different ways of looking at (causes of) problems and solutions: RED discourse - redistribution perspective that focuses on have-nots; INT discourse - social integration perspective that focuses on do-nots; MUD discourse - a moral underclass perspective that deals with feel-nots who do not express the 'right' morals; and a fourth perspective that focuses on self-exclusion of want-nots (Stigendal, 2013).

In terms of causes of inequalities beyond the RED/INT/MUD approaches, it was distinguished what kind of causes the practices/projects address as they were identified throughout several WPs from different perspectives individual level (or actors' related) causes (lack of ambition (motivation), resignation/retreat, lack of self-efficacy, lack of abilities/skills, lack of social capital, trust, disengagement) and societal level causes (classified as structural, semiotic and material) such as labour market structures and the lack of employment opportunities, educational opportunities, communing opportunities, discrimination, including institutional discrimination, social isolation and concentration effect, cycle of disadvantage, intergenerational transmission of disadvantage, retrenchment of welfare service (neoliberal convergence) and financialisation/indebtedness and lack of resources (Stigendal, 2013, Hussain and Higson, 2014, Stigendal, 2015).

**BOX 1: Three discourses on social exclusion**

According to Levitas (1998, 2005) three discourses or “ideal types” of social exclusion may be distinguished which explain the causes of poverty and imply different solutions/policies.

**The redistributive discourse (RED)** recognises poverty and inequality as the major impediments of social inclusion. The policy implications include the necessity to provide adequate levels of income to those unable to work. Moreover, RED also addresses social, cultural and political participation as well as economic participation assuming that people, if provided with adequate resources, will use those resources towards social inclusion.

**The moral underclass discourse (MUD)** attributes social exclusion to the moral or behavioural deficiencies of the excluded. This viewpoint ignores structural factors in order to blame the excluded. The major policy implication is that the existence of welfare state benefits has caused a deviant behavioural response of choosing a life of dependency rather than the independence that paid employment provides. The major policy implication is that income support should be kept at low levels and conditional assuming that financial incentives will lead people in the “right” direction and that the “right morals” are a sufficient condition for inclusion.

**The social integrationist discourse (SID)** narrows the definition of social inclusion to participation in paid work. This approach which defines included (excluded) as in paid work (not in paid work) prevents consideration of inequality within the “included”. Both individual and society have a role in social exclusion/inclusion. Emphasis is put on active labour market policies and activation. There is no need for policies to address wages and working conditions or to inequalities between classes, genders or ethnic groups.

*Levitas, R. (1998, 2005) The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour, Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke.*

WP3 emphasised three local perspectives on combating social exclusion: Bridging social and physical distances (solution) to address social isolation (problem); ‘Communing’, developing new forms of togetherness (solutions) to tackle decay (problem); developing trust, responsive communication, connectivity, interdependencies and diversity (solutions) to tackle exclusionary forms of servicing, ad-hoc and piecemeal policies (problem), (Güntner et al., 2014).

In WP 5 social innovation was defined as practices that: i) meet new social needs or better meet the already existing ones of specific vulnerable groups like young people; ii) find new ways of meeting social needs which are more effective, efficient and/or sustainable than the alternatives; iii) empower people, allowing them to participate and increase their capabilities;

iv) promote the awareness of rights and active citizenship; v) turn social challenges to opportunities; and vi) increase social capital, social trust and enhance society’s capacity to undertake actions at the local level (Jubany, Güell, 2014).

Finally, WP 6 has brought a new typology of social innovations which was also incorporated into guidelines for WP 7 (Spies, 2015). If we consider this typology, we can recognise several options on how the practices/projects contribute to overcoming social inequalities: breaking fatalism, empowerment and developing ambition, learning (building capacity/ability), building social capital, offering opportunities for collective activities, better environment, education, work, housing, health care and services, stimulating, enabling co-creation, neighbourhood development.

**Figure 1: Typology of logics of intervention and ideal-types of participants**

*Italic*: analytical dimensions

**Bold**: policies and interventions

Standard: type of person

*Ambition: integration into mainstream society through school/job*

<p><b>Learning and counselling; social capital; matching</b></p> <p><i>Low ability and support</i></p>	<p>Motivated to integrate into mainstream society, but lacking competences and/or social network</p>	<p>Motivated and ready for a job without further support, but lacking opportunities</p>	<p><b>Offering opportunities</b></p>
<p><b>Empowerment: developing ambition, competences and social network</b></p>	<p>Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change</p>	<p>Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support</p>	<p><i>High ability and support</i></p> <p><b>Stimulating and enabling entrepreneurship; co-creation; ‘communing’</b></p>
<p><i>Resignation or aiming for ‘alternative’ integration</i></p> <p><b>law enforcement</b></p>			

Source: Spies, 2015

These above theoretical perspectives have been used in the case studies as analytical categories.

#### 4. Evaluation methodology

The case studies in fact represent ex-post evaluation studies which are focusing on the design of the practices/projects, their implementation and their outcomes/effects. The purpose is to provide a complex picture on; what were the objectives and key activities (modus operandi), what were the implementation conditions like resources needed and the actors involved, the implementation processes, and finally, the outcomes. The links between the design, implementation and outcomes are in focus. Lastly, the context in which the practices/projects were implemented is also analysed.

The methodology combines two approaches: theory driven evaluation and, as much as possible, alternative/practice driven evaluation.

##### **BOX 2: Two approaches to policy evaluation**

###### **Theory driven evaluation**

**Program theory:** stakeholders' implicit and explicit assumptions on what actions are required to solve the problem and why the problem will respond to the actions (Chen, 2005).

**Evaluation strategy:** Facilitating stakeholders to clarify contextual factors and mechanisms essential for their program's success.

Program theory serves as a conceptual framework for evaluating effectiveness.

**The conceptual framework** asks two general questions:

Why question: Why does the intervention affect the outcomes? (Change model)

How question: How are the contextual factors and program activities organized for implementing the intervention and supporting the change process? (Action model)

###### **An Alternative: Integrative Validity Model and "Bottom-Up" Approach**

**Viability Evaluation:** Assess the extent to which an intervention program is viable in the real world (e.g. practical, suitable, affordable, evaluable, helpful)

**Methodology:** Mixed methods (e.g. pretest-posttest, interviews, focus groups, survey)

Chen, H.T. 1990. *Theory-Driven Evaluations*. Sage.

Chen, H.T. 2005. *Practical Program Evaluation: assessing and improving program planning, implementation, and effectiveness*. Sage.

In the case of the pilots (practices transferred from one city to another city, or, in some cases new practices implemented thanks to Citispyce) it was the combination of the implementation/formative studies and, in some cases when the implementation has been almost fully accomplished, impact evaluation. When doing the evaluation, the emphasis was put on some key aspects like: innovativeness of the practice, the success factors and transferability.

In both cases, however, the time span provided for evaluation was quite short. In the case of pilots, they started in October 2014. The preparation stage took 3 months, then implementation phase followed, which means that the evaluation was possible during a period of at most 6 months if the implementation phase is included. This means that concerning outcomes/effects, the evidence is limited due to the short time horizon to follow them, considering that most of the effects expected like employability, educational and personal development, empowerment, sociability, trust and engagement are rather long-term/gradual effects.

Regarding the case studies of the already existing practices/projects, the time period provided for evaluation was even shorter, it did not include the implementation phase of the practices. In fact the evaluation period lasted from April to June 2015. This means that ex-post evaluation studies that were carried out very much depended on the existing evidence on the practices/projects. In some rare cases, the partners selected the practices/projects which have been implemented earlier with their direct participation or supervision (like Multisectoral cooperation project in Malmö) or they have had longer-term experience with it. In such cases the case studies are also partly based on longer-term observation.

The analysis was based on the combination of various sources of data: existing documents and statistics provided by the stakeholders, direct observations (especially important in the case of the pilots when the partners were often the implementing body/the principal), interviews with the stakeholders and participants, or focus groups in some cases. The results of the field work carried out in other work packages were also intensively exhausted: WP2 which addressed social inequalities and policies at the national and local level, WP 3 which addressed inequalities and social infrastructures in neighbourhoods, WP 4 which addressed the perception of inequalities and policies by young people in neighbourhoods, WP 5 which has identified the innovative practices in neighbourhoods, and WP 6 which evaluated the implementation of the pilots.

## 5. Key features of the innovative practices: an overview

### 5.1 Employment

#### Innovative Practice ‘Learning by Working’ (Brno)

##### *Social issued addressed*

The project *Learning by working* reacts to the position of Roma in the labour market from socially excluded neighbourhoods in the South Moravian region. Unemployment accompanied with very frequent problem of indebtedness of families is considered as the main factor contributing to the social exclusion of these people. The majority of the target group (estimated about 80%) have low qualification, poor professional record, poor competences to orientate in the labour market and suffer from employers’ discrimination. ESF funding enabled IQRS to increase the coverage – the major part of the estimated population in need was included.

actors	scale	goals/objectives	target group
NGO (ESF funded)	Large (700+ participants- 340 participants from Brno in 24 months)	Main goal: to raise the chances of a socially excluded group of Roma to get employed in the open labour market. Teach the target group to independently orientate in the labour market, apply for jobs and dispose of basic knowledge of the legal framework in labour law. Cooperation with employers and improve the target group’s image in the media through raising awareness of good practice examples Set up a long-term functioning system of cooperation among relevant institutions for Roma inclusion in the labour market.	- Young Roma from deprived neighbourhood  - Young mothers entering the labour market  - Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support;  - Motivated and ready for a job without further support.

##### *Activities*

The project represents a continuation of the complex approach by NGO *IQ Roma servis* in Brno in supporting the employment of Roma mostly living in deprived neighbourhoods, with emphasis on young Roma<sup>6</sup>. It effectively combines the focus both on the supply side (by supporting the competences of Roma by case work, counselling, job-mediation and training in job related competences) and demand side (by close cooperation with and intensive acquisitions among the employers) of the labour market. Also 9 re-qualification courses, 8 transport subsidies and 4 job subsidies (wage subsidy to employer) were provided to support project participants in Brno.

### ***Outcomes***

Following quantitative outcomes were identified after the project: 79 clients who lived in Brno and who had got support during the project found a job during the project, and 20 others between July 2014 and June 2015, this is 99 placed participants out of 340 (i.e. 29%). 38 clients who lived in Brno who were younger than 30 years and who had got support during the project found job during the project duration, 10 other after termination of the project, this is 48 out of 152 participants (i.e. 32%). 15 people were employed directly *due to project* without subsidy. Finally, 4 employers hired people from the project in Brno due to subsidies. We, however, need to note that the jobs were more often temporary, non-standard jobs – this corresponds to the fact that young Roma are attached to the secondary labour market, sometimes in the informal sector. The results are illustrated by interviews with three concrete participants in the report.

### ***Success factors***

Identified success factors in the project included a) ambitious objectives leading to higher capacity dedicated to the project, b) application of the case management approach (in fact non-existent in the Czech context of employment policies) based on the complex case-work, c) human capital (competences) quality of some of the social workers involved in the project, d) contracted employers at the beginning of the project being the most important partner. One key activity of the project was enlarging the network of employers willing to employ Roma.

---

<sup>6</sup> The project is based on the concept of case management – a model of complex work with the family with the aim to improve the social and economic situation of the target group – people in risk of social exclusion.

## **Innovative Practice ‘Transfer of an integrated approach for the improvement of employment prospects among Roma youth’ (Sofia: transfer from Brno, pilot)**

### ***Social issues addressed***

The project has been implemented in Fakulteta - the largest Roma neighbourhood in Sofia and the second largest in Bulgaria with a population of 35,000 people. The neighbourhood is perceived as a “hotbed of social problems, including devastating levels of unemployment, poverty, social exclusion”. There are no official statistical data about the unemployment rates in the neighbourhood, but experts estimate that close to 80% of residents are without legal employment (most of those who work are employed in grey economy).

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
Implementing NGO (HESED) + Project owner - NGO (IQRS)	Small (18)	<i>Main goal: to increase the capacity of young Roma to find and retain employment.</i>  Build and strengthen the job orientation, job search and job retention skills (soft skills) of young Roma;  Decrease negative attitudes of employers towards hiring Roma and build a network of employers open to hiring them.	Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support.

### ***Activities***

The project is transferred from Brno and needed in initial phase an adaptation to local conditions (exchange visits of teams from IQRS and HESED). It has included 3 key activities: (1) individual employment counselling with Roma youth, (2) creation of a database for young Roma people (14-29 years old) in need of support for finding employment, and (3) search for suitable employers for Roma youth.

### ***Outcomes***

The objectives set in the project plan were accomplished. The total number of participants who have started with the consultations reached 13 (target 10). However, 5 participants stopped visiting the consultation sessions soon after the first few appointments. The remaining 8 participants visited the sessions regularly and appeared very motivated. Further, 26 companies (target 20) were contacted in order to create a network employers willing to employ Roma. Special attention has been paid to companies with a strong CSR programme and which are

socially active. 2 employers offered a job to project participants and hired 3 of them. One of these two employers later recommended HESED as a reliable organization to a colleague in the clothes sector, who was ready to hire another participant. By the end of the pilot project, 29 suitable job advertisements were found and posted on the board in the Health and Social Centre in Fakulteta (target was 35) and 60 young Roma job seekers were recorded in the database.

### ***Success factors***

Following success factors were identified: a) successful adaptation of social innovative practices from Brno to the context and needs of Roma youth in Sofia, b) development of relevant job skills for Roma youth through the design and implementation of a pilot counselling programme, which can be successfully expanded and replicated, c) development of trust between Roma youth and the HESED team based on mutual respect and helpful support, and d) building of a trustful relationship between a network of employers and HESED who act as a bridge between employers and Roma workers.

### **Innovative practice: Jugendberufsagentur JBA/Youth Employment Agency YEA: “Nobody should be lost” (Hamburg)**

#### ***Social issues addressed***

Problems occurring in the transition from school to employment like job orientation, problems in school, individual and personal issues that lead to training scheme careers or unemployment; a prolonged process of becoming socially and financially independent; many young people get ‘lost’ after school; competition for jobs gets more difficult in the region of Hamburg. Around 1/3 of the young people leaving school at lower secondary level do not directly enter a regular vocational education training/VET, but instead have to follow preparation school schemes because of missing “VET entry maturity”. For these young people the state offers a vast number of measures in a transition system that runs parallel to the VET market. These placements lead to rather low official youth unemployment rates for Germany, which can be seen as inaccurate because many of these preparation measures are neither real jobs nor do they lead to proper VET certificates (only prolonging transition period without providing better chances in the labour market).

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
National level scheme. State actors, district, municipality as principal (several dept.) + NGOs, schools.	Large (thousands during a year)	<p>Assist young people with a seamless transition into education, independency and employment.</p> <p>Fight youth unemployment while reducing the number of training scheme careers, lead to shorter paths to secure independence</p> <p>Secure a labour force for future.</p> <p>Bundle the services for young people more effectively and efficiently.</p>	<p>Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support;</p> <p>Motivated and ready for a job without further support;</p> <p>Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support;</p> <p>Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change;</p>

### ***Activities***

YEA is a “one-stop-shop” with officers from different departments and organizations working together in one place and hand-in-hand on each “case”. It is connecting the wide spread responsibilities and resources concerning the work with young people and offer a “one-stop-shop” around all the services for the specific needs of young people U25 years for their transition into education and the labour market through a coordinated approach of career guidance, apprenticeships, job placement and social counselling in order to bundle the services for them more effectively. Responsibilities and contributions of the actors:

Jobcentre JC Team U 25: Job placement, Case management, Counselling at home

Employment Agency AA: Counselling for Job/profession and apprenticeship, outreach services

District administration for social services: Youth welfare services

The authority for school and vocational education (BSB/HIBB): job orientation and outreach services

BASFI (Authority for Employment, Social affairs, Families and Integration) coordination and job counselling.

***Outcomes***

The number of school leavers who directly start a VET since the first survey in the school year 2011/12

2012: 1,338 (of 5,307 school leavers or 25.2%)

2013: 1,443 (of 3,731 school leavers or 38.7%)

2014: 1,893 (of 5,059 school leavers or 37.4%).

The Senate points out that this can be seen as a first success of a more cohesive cooperation between schools and YEA. However, there is still potential as the same amount of people who enter a VET still enter into preparation schemes (2014: 37.4% vs. 37.8%).

***Success factors***

Internal: cooperation between providers is improved and communication is faster and easier, understanding of each other's tasks and hand-in-hand approach.

External: one-stop-shop approach, easier to access by clients and surrounding social workers etc., clear and transparent approach, clients already reached during school, more people make a better and faster transition into employment or VET.

**5.2 Entrepreneurship****Innovative Practice 'The Loft' (Birmingham)*****Social issued addressed***

Birmingham is one of the UK's most deprived cities. The performance of the local economy, swingeing cuts in public sector spending with its disproportionate effect on Birmingham City Council and very high unemployment are the backdrop to the way young people of all backgrounds experience their lives in Birmingham. Many of these young people were – and still are - concentrated in areas of high deprivation close to the city centre and former industrial areas. There is a climate of uncertainty amongst many young people.

actors	scale	goals/objectives	target group
NGO	Middle (86 participant s)	Offering opportunities to showcase work, to build networks and to generate business. Empowerment: developing ambition, self-belief, competences and social networks; social capital. Improving employability; Building relationships with cultural, educational and other organisations. Bridging gaps between disadvantaged young people and local government (City Council). Brokering between the arts and the community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Young people – in the creative industries – graduating from University but unaware of pathways or lacking networks to support their career in the creative industries.</li> <li>- Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support;</li> <li>- Motivated to integrate into mainstream society but in need of support, guidance and recognition to build self-esteem;</li> </ul>

### *Activities*

‘The Loft’ is a project aimed at aiding Birmingham’s aspiring creative and designers to work and exhibit in an affordable central location within the city centre. Most of the young people have had experience or (higher) qualifications in the arts or creative programmes. The Loft is primarily aimed at developing skills (exhibition and curation, events management, pitching, networking) and giving exposure and opportunity. The Loft opened space for the young creatives to develop their own work with support sessions and weekly meetings where young people could show their current work / project and receive feedback from their peers. The Loft provided workspace for 86 young people and held over 15 exhibitions. Artists also provided art drawing courses for people outside the Loft and created some art materials for other events outside the Loft.

### *Outcomes*

It is important to note that young people in The Loft were not paid by The Loft, nor were they formally ‘working for’ The Loft. Although the Loft enabled young people to have a collective sense of support and togetherness, individuals were using the space to pursue their own careers and goals. According to young artists participating, the Loft helped them to build self-belief and confidence. Some funding was obtained by some artists / creatives through their involvement in the Loft. In this sense the goal of the Loft was accomplished by improving

capacity of young artist to self-employment in the Art. The existence of the Loft was limited by the fixed period with free renting and the planned demolition of the building.

### ***Success factors***

Main success factors are: a) affordable city centre work-spaces for artists and other people in the creative industries. This includes dimensions of immediacy, accessibility, quality and affordability of the space. The space was funded by The Square (gave space rent-free) and it allowed affordable prices for young artists, b) mutual learning between young artists, c) targeting to young people who are otherwise somehow neglected. The Loft is an example of a pop-up that enables the central role of young people in directing their own futures and successfully improving their employability.

### **Innovative Practice “Shelter of Ideas-The Loft” (Athens: transfer from Birmingham, pilot)**

#### ***Social issues addressed***

Although the Municipality of Elefsina has a robust framework of social services, unemployment and especially unemployment of young people is a huge issue in the area. In addition, as there are no youth social policies in the area or services targeting young people, this practice is considered to be a novel approach to engage young artists, allow them to liaise with local authorities and provide them with opportunities to promote their skills and competences.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGO (Family and Childcare Centre) + State-Municipality + Aston University + “The Loft” in Birmingham	Small (8-16)	Provide a place where young artists can meet, exchange ideas, identify their needs, network and display their art work.  Enhance social entrepreneurship through counselling and business coaching and/or liaising young participants with the Municipality (consultation sessions regarding artistic and cultural activities).	Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support.

### ***Activities***

Activities can be divided into two main categories: a) Information/Dissemination & Declaration of Interest Activities (through social media, internet, leaflets); and b) Activities with Young People based on their needs: meetings, creation of website to promote art work of participants, training on entrepreneurship & coaching, business planning for the creation of a social enterprise, meetings with successful entrepreneurs, consultation sessions of the participants with the Municipality.

### ***Outcomes***

The pilot activity managed to achieve the following positive outcomes:

- Liaison with local authorities
- Motivation and empowerment: the need for co-creation was met and addressed
- Entrepreneurship and innovative practices – sustainability of the group
- Team spirit: Change in the way of thinking. In the beginning there were two subgroups which managed to co-exist and become unanimous.

Furthermore, the benefits that participants can identify from the pilot project are: a) at individual level, the knowledge that they accumulated on entrepreneurship and their liaison and networking with the local authorities and b) at professional level, networking, entrepreneurship activities and potential collaborations both as a group and individually.

### ***Success factors***

Following critical success factors were defined: a) the commitment of staff members and the fact that they all share the same philosophy which motivates them to work efficiently, empower and support beneficiaries and provide the best possible outcome, b) the profile of the target group, their genuine interest and willingness helped to take this pilot project a step further by discussing initiatives for promoting a sustainability plan, c) successful adjustment of the practice to the needs of the local people, and d) the provision of space by local authorities and their willingness to accept the implementation of this practice and host it in their premises.

## **Innovative Practice ‘Buzinezzclub Rotterdam’**

***Social issued addressed***

The Buzinezzclub addresses the unemployment of young people with few chances on the labour market. It is a private, for profit, initiative aimed at developing entrepreneurship among young people on social assistance by broadening their network and their skills. In short the main goals are to contribute to: a) young people setting up and maintaining a business, following education or having a job and, b) young people moving out of social assistance (a lasting decrease in social assistance expenditure on the target group). The program is quasi mandatory for young social assistance claimants (in cooperation with Youth Counter) and it is based on Social Impact Bond (SIB - PPP).

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
Municipality + Private agency (project commissioned) + NGO, volunteers	Middle twice a year 40 participants	<p>Fight inequality in chances/ deprivation and promote socioeconomic mobility.</p> <p>Objectives: to foster an entrepreneurial spirit among young jobless people in Rotterdam (aged 18-27); to activate young people, stimulate a different mind-set; reduce the duration of dependence on social assistance or help young people to remain out of social assistance; to create a financial return on investment.</p>	<p>- Young unemployed (social assistance claimants) without basic qualifications.</p> <p>- Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support;</p> <p>- Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support: young people with the dream of setting up a business.</p> <p><i>Also working with those:</i></p> <p>- Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change.</p>

***Activities***

The program lasts 6 months, six days a week. The club members can choose between entrepreneurship, finding a job or returning to school with implied differences in part of the content and of the nature of the support they receive. Other important aspects include creating of the business plan, personal coaching and advising and workshops using of group dynamics. The approach to members is member centred, individual and contextual (solving other members’ problems). The programme requires the active and self-styled involvement of the participants.

### ***Outcomes***

Since 2009, more than 400 young people participated in the Rotterdam programme of the Buzinezzclub. According to Buzinezzclub, the placement of participants in the Rotterdam programme (i.e. people finishing the programme) included: 5-10% took follow up steps to start a business/company (next to job/education), 40% found a job, 20% continued in education (data from 2013). The data about leaving social assistance varied substantially between 40 to 80 percent (see evaluation report). The data for 2013 showed 6-7 months save on social assistance.

### ***Success factors***

The general conclusion is that the critical success factors are: a) connection with the motivation and character trait/personality of young people is the key to success, b) positive, individualised support, aiming at fostering an entrepreneurial attitude and related changes in behaviour - creating a safe environment, allowing people to make mistakes, helping people to explore and reconsider their dreams are essential elements of this approach, c) connections with the regional business community are crucial, d) members are active ambassadors for new members, e) long-term orientation: investing in long lasting relationships and networks.

From the interviews with participants, the following success factors emerge: a) it is a group intervention, with a positive and activating tailor made approach, b) there is individual coaching available and personal problems can be solved, c) participants become a member of a team that will not let them down, d) the members feel part of an informal mutual support network, e) members know that they can receive further support in the future from the Buzinezzclub staff and volunteers, f) members are being introduced into a professional network with people they normally would not meet.

### **Innovative Practice ‘TOPEKO’ (Athens)**

#### ***Social issues addressed***

The project aims to tackle unemployment in vulnerable groups of people in the area of Elefsina and at the same time create new jobs in growing sectors of industry, such as alternative waste management, reuse and resale of products. Emphasis is also placed on entrepreneurship opportunities in alternative waste management for the beneficiaries of the programme.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
Private sector (Consulting Company, NGOs, Professional Association), Public Enterprise, Vocational Education Training Centre, Municipality	Middle (80)	Multifaceted support of the unemployed (through training and counselling), in an integrative manner before the founding of their enterprises (Social Cooperative Enterprise): by placing them in jobs in dynamic sectors of the local economy (such as the social economy and the green economy) on the basis of identified development needs in the area of Elefsina.	Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change; Other: unemployed and vulnerable groups of people in the area of Elefsina.

### ***Activities***

Key components of the successful implementation of the programme is the counselling aimed at psychosocial support and social integration of beneficiaries and the training actions, which involve:

- Training on alternative waste management, repair, reuse and recycling of products and materials (72 hours theory and 24 hours practice).
- Training in basic principles of individual and social entrepreneurship development (35 hours theory and 12 hours practice).

Further actions also took place: expert analysis of the local labour market, networking of beneficiaries with businesses, psychosocial counselling, consulting aimed at employability, training in business plan preparation and ongoing consultations for newly established enterprises.

### ***Outcomes***

As relates to the creation of social enterprises, 60 out of 80 beneficiaries in the project were promoted in the creation of 9 social enterprises (KOINSEP). All beneficiaries were supported during the foundation process. So far 4 social enterprises out of 9 are established. Two more social enterprises are still expected to be established. The number of employed beneficiaries is still significantly below the target (20 from 80 beneficiaries). This figure is, however, expected

to increase in the coming months with the recruitment of unemployed people from the newly established social enterprises.

### ***Success factors***

The key success factor of the TOPEKO programme is the careful design prior to the implementation and the good collaboration private sector, cooperatives with extensive expertise and public bodies who played an important role in the intervention area (such as the Municipality of Elefsina, the Municipal Public Benefit Enterprise and PASEPPE). From the beginning the project an effort was made to establish a good coordination of actions and an effective cooperation between all actors.

## **5.3 Education and personal development**

### **Innovative Practice Recording Studio “Amaro Records” (Brno: transfer from Barcelona, pilot)**

#### ***Social issued addressed***

Disadvantages in access to education, jobs and housing and discrimination by the majority, including institutional discrimination, seem to be the most important cause of inequalities in Cejl and Husovice. The project wants to engage young people who are motivated and have the necessary abilities but in general face discrimination (in education, or labour market entry) or who lack opportunities for further engagement (in music – commercial studios financially inaccessible). While Roma people are often perceived negatively by the majority in the Czech Republic, they are still appraised for their musical skills.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGO (+ university, municipality)	Small (up to 20 participants)	Providing opportunities for young Roma (e.g. to record music, get publicity etc.) Raising human capital (skills) and social capital of young Roma musicians, their empowerment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Young Roma with music related talents</li> <li>- Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support;</li> <li>- Motivated and ready for a job without further support;</li> <li>- Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support.</li> </ul>

#### ***Activities***

Recording studio *Amaro Records* implemented in Cejl neighbourhood is a socially innovative practice transferred from Barcelona (original project called Educational Demos). The main idea of the project is to provide an opportunity for young people from excluded neighbourhoods to express through music, to provide space for learning and improvement in music making and other skills and to empower and engage young people. The project is aiming to rebuild the space of a gambling bar into music recording studio<sup>7</sup>. Young Roma can improve their musical (and other) skills in the studio (e.g. due to support of an experienced musician). They can meet other people; find new contacts, cooperation etc.

### ***Outcomes***

During the period evaluated by the project the studio wasn't open but music equipment was installed in other provisional space. About 40 people somehow participated in the project. There were 9 people recording music in studio (3 bands and 2 solo players). 16 songs were recorded or prepared for recording and young Roma performed on 4 public events and community activities. Young Roma and their music instructor noted the strengthening of young Roma' music competences. Several project members stated that they had found the public to be supportive of the project. This can be evidenced by attendance and reaction of public on various music public events.

### ***Success factors***

Success factors in this project include: a) suitability of the project for the Brno context and young Roma culture, b) human capital (high music and composing skills) and motivation of music instructor, who is key person for the studio, c) cooperation of the stakeholders (e.g. community space of recording studio rented for a symbolic price, the role of external experts volunteering for the project to help with very costly and highly skilled work on reconstruction studies and projects).

## **Innovative Practice 'Educational Demos' (Barcelona)**

---

<sup>7</sup> The project focuses on lowering barriers for community participation (community centre instead of formal social service, while it still can serve as a gate to social services).

***Social issued addressed***

Raval is a deprived neighbourhood which faces social inequalities to a larger extent in comparison to the city average. During the fieldwork phase, it was revealed that some of TEB (NGO) users have pressures to work and contribute to the family income (with the consequences this may have, such as interruptions in education or low school performance). These youngsters have often experienced stories of stigmatisation at school, or even in other NGOs, due to their low school performance or bad behaviour. Others are migrating to other EU countries (e.g. south-Asian groups to the UK), or going back to their home countries (mostly in Latin America). The lack of employment has not enabled the renewal of residence permits, which has brought about the fall into irregularity (undocumented) and denied access to basic needs.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGO (+ municipality)	Small (16 participants)	To identify individual and social needs faced by young people and address them through the project.  Raising awareness of duties as citizens and of values like equality of opportunities, inter-culturality, non-discrimination and the promotion of active citizenship.  To train people on new technologies	- Young people living in Raval (often of migrant background)  - They come from different backgrounds and may have different aspirations;  - Some of them may be motivated for integration into mainstream society, but in need of support;  - others may be aiming for alternative ways to get ahead, but do not necessarily have 'sufficient competences', and at the same time could adopt an attitude to live day by day, opportunistically.

***Activities***

The project 'Educational Demos' embraces two groups of youngsters who are engaged in the defence of human rights and are acquiring professional, social and educational skills that may use in the near future in their jobs and personal lives. It did not want to be just a group of friends who sang hip hop together, but a wider platform for youngsters to deliver a message to the society through hip hop. This is where human rights became a fundamental ingredient of the

project. It is an educational project before the musical one. The project includes e.g. rhymes workshop, elaboration of video clips, dissemination and participation in community activities.

### ***Outcomes***

The evaluation of the outcomes is based on interviews with program staff and program participants. The youngsters have acquired knowledge on human rights and are more aware of social and political issues going on (greater capacity of criticism); they are more capable of commanding new technologies; they have gained social skills (capacity of social relationships, expressivity); they have dug into the culture of hip hop and rap; and specific individual needs have been addressed redirecting them to the most appropriate channels, when necessary. In terms of literacy skills and expressivity, they make great progress.

### ***Success factors***

Following success factors are present in the project: a) the provision of capabilities, social skills and empowerment are considered to be key elements to change patterns of inequalities, b) enthusiasm and motivation of young people and stakeholders (towards music, hip hop) - young people feel quite engaged with the project. The power of making decisions is one of the success factors of the project, as they feel valued and the results of the project depend on them, c) The project is based on mutual respect and makes use of references (the oldest serve as good models for the youngest), d) counting on existing infrastructures (recording studio), e) cooperation and networking at the ground level is perceived to be important to maximise resources at the neighbourhood and city level and organise joint activities. Recognition of good performance from institutions seems also important in this respect.

## **Innovative Practice ‘Free remedial tutoring for young people with learning deficits’**

**(Krakow)**

### ***Social issued addressed***

The sources and reasons for unjust inequalities are rooted in the social and material well-being of families whose children benefit from remedial tutoring. The main causes of underperformance of pupils who participate in the initiative, as identified by the organiser, include single-parent families or the poor economic situation of numerous local families, which forces one or both parents to work abroad. As a result, the charges are insufficiently supervised

at this early stage of their education when young people need special assistance in order to develop good habits associated with regular work and responsibility.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGO (+ young people themselves)	Middle (50 beneficiaries, 10 tutors, growing to 120 beneficiaries, 80 tutors)	<p>Equalize educational opportunities and thus to combat social inequalities. To fill gaps in the knowledge and possibly the social skills needed by beneficiaries in order to continue to make effective use of the educational system.</p> <p>To develop a sense of satisfaction from helping others, and being responsible for them, in young people who are in the role of tutors;</p> <p>Tutoring may contribute to raising the profile and creating a more positive perception of the school (building trust).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Vulnerable children</li> <li>- Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support.</li> <li>- Tutors</li> </ul>

### ***Activities***

Pupils from families that are either incomplete or fail to recognise the importance of education, have an opportunity to take advantage of an educational offer so far reserved for those who achieve better learning outcomes. The practice coordinated by the Salesian School Complex consists in free tutoring provided by school students to younger pupils who reside in the district of Mistrzejowice. It was inspired by the experience of the Salesian Movement of Concern for the Youth (SALTROM). In practice, it consists in tutoring young people by their older colleagues – usually, tertiary school students tutor secondary school pupils, whereas the latter tutor young people attending local elementary schools. This generates tangible benefits for the school's students – tutors – in the form of development of their social competences and a measurable increase in opportunities both educational and on the labour market<sup>8</sup>. Tutoring

<sup>8</sup> Equally important aim, according to the practice organisers, is the development of pro-social attitudes of tutors as well as developing their skills in the area of working with young people. It also contributes to their self-esteem and confidence.

often takes place in blocks of two kinds of subjects, (Polish and Mathematics). It takes place once a week in 2 x 45 minute blocks with a 5 minute break.

### ***Outcomes***

The absolutely fundamental objective, to which all individual measures are subordinated, is to improve educational outcomes in the context of subjects in which students or their caregivers report problems. According to the practice organiser, evaluations of its effectiveness reach him through various channels, but he does not elaborate on this issue. The outcome evidence in the report is anecdotal: in several cases mentioned in the report the children participating in the project improved their performance in school (from half year to full year grades). In at least some cases the children or the tutors finished their current level of education and continued to higher level of education.

### ***Success factors***

In the opinion of the participants surveyed, remedial tutoring services are of a high quality. According to the organisers of the practice, the key success factors include the human factor, temporal and spatial factors. The selection of capable tutors can contribute to this. The organisers point out to the need to evoke the belief in the tutors that they are doing something important and useful in the people involved in the practice (to support internal motivation of the tutors). Certainly, the peer support mechanism applied in the practice under consideration – the tutor is not a teacher or specialist hired on market-based principles, but a person of a similar age and often lives on the same estate – contributes to the establishment and development of local social networks, which may pay off in the future in terms of reduced likelihood or intensity of inequality.

## **Innovative Practice ‘Challenge Sports’ (Rotterdam)**

### ***Social issues addressed***

The project is targeted at young unemployed people - young men, girls and young mothers - with multiple problems, in most cases with a background of social deprivation and family problems, who in many cases are or have been in contact with social help and/or the police. It is not aimed at young people who are not self-sufficient at all (have no income, very problematic debts, no housing) or who are in need of a lot of care, since people should be able to return to or start with education and/or work within 3-6 months.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
Municipality Youth Centre + Private agency (project commissioned)	Large (450 per year, 275 cases paid)	Helping young people to develop the necessary attitude and skills to obtain and keep in education or employment.  To direct them towards school or work within a short period of time (3-6 months).  Building social capital and mainstream social values (sports are an essential part of the training).	Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support;  Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change.

### ***Activities***

The project activities include: (1) sports, (2) group training (behaviour, presentation & communication skills, intakes for schools, job application, resume-writing, career orientation, money management, life style/health etc.) and (3) individual support (personal plans, depts.).

The programme has several phases: diagnosis (2 weeks), training programme (3 to 6 months, however also sometimes shorter, until the start of new education or employment), after care (coaching up to 12 months).

### ***Outcomes***

The project results show that around half of the participants are placed in school or employment in a year and almost one third of participants fail the programme.

### ***Effectiveness percentages 2014***

Total Started	315	100%
Total Placements <sup>9</sup>	168 (136 school, 32 job)	53%
Total in pathway end of year	50	16%
Total Rejects and dropouts	97	31%

<sup>9</sup> Estimation.

***Success factors***

Perceived success factors are: a) the use of ‘authoritative’ role models to which young people look up, b) the fact that sports contributes to better health, self-confidence and a day-night rhythm better adapted to the world of work, c) tailoring the delivering organisation to the demands and needs of the municipality – ability to handle large number of participants, d) 20 years of experience in training and coaching young unemployed people – thorough knowledge of the target group, e) well-organised primary process (intake, start-up of pathway).

**Innovative Practice ‘The Health and Social Centre’ (Sofia)*****Social issues addressed***

The Health and Social Centre (HSC) is an establishment representing a new kind of social infrastructure in Bulgaria pioneering an entirely new approach to dealing with one of the most pressing problems – the deepening social-economic marginalisation and exclusion of the Roma community. The HSC operates in the Sofia neighbourhood of Fakulteta with 35,000 Roma residents. The Centre tries to alleviate the following interrelated problems: long-term unemployment; early school dropout; high levels of risky behaviour among youth; health problems, including high infant mortality rates and infectious diseases; high risk of institutionalisation of abandoned children; polluted ghettos creating health and environmental risks.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGO (ESF funded)	Middle-large (35 staff)	To provide an integrated approach for addressing numerous interconnected problems of the Roma community:  Suitable infrastructure based in a Roma neighbourhood: provision of complementary community-based services;  Human resources development of Roma community.	Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support; Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support; Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change.

***Activities***

Health and Social Centre wants to reach the above mentioned goals through various activities - early child development and education; prevention of the institutionalisation of children at risk; after school tutoring and extracurricular activities, life skills training, employment support; health promotion and family planning; prevention of infectious diseases; violence prevention programme; drug use prevention programmes; gender equality, promotion of tolerance and non-discrimination.

### ***Outcomes***

During the past three years, the following number of users has participated in different programmes and services provided by the HSC:

1. Early childhood development for children 0-3 and parental skills training for pregnant women and mothers of children 0-3 years old: 270 mothers and about 540 children.
2. Pre-school and early childhood development programme for children 4-5 years old and parental skills for their parents: 90 children and 180 parents.
3. After school programme: 60 school age children.
4. Life skills training for children 9-18 (using different methodologies for the different age groups): 288 children and youngsters.
5. Clients, receiving administrative support, short consultations or other services: 1,260

### ***Success factors***

Following success factors were identified: a) high flexibility of staff to accommodate the users, b) special focus on young children and their parents, c) systematic refusal of MUD discourse, d) provision of reliable and good quality services and building trust in the community, e) the integrated approach to solving the problem of Roma marginalisation, f) the inclusion of properly trained people from the target group, g) and the physical presence of the Centre inside the Roma neighbourhood.

## **Innovative Practice ‘The New Opportunity’ (Rotterdam, pilot)**

### ***Social issues addressed***

The project works for the city of Rotterdam and national government and targets individual young unemployed men, always indicated as ‘multi-problem’ and in many cases with a criminal background. It is also targeted at young men with urgent needs who are not self-sufficient. It wants to break the circle of self-exclusion, in which approximately 2000-5000 multi-problem young men in Rotterdam between 18-27 are trapped by altering the dynamic, changeable factors behind the (delinquent) behaviour of the participants like practical problems, social and psychological problems, addictions, lack of education, lack of ‘labour-identity’ (specific and general (communication and relation) skills to function in a job), lack of motivation, meaning giving, lack of identity.

actors	scale	goals/objectives	target group
Municipality (TNO team) and partners: Youz (care), employers/employment offices and schools	Large (340 per year)	To change ‘unhealthy thinking and unhealthy behaviour’. Working in a both holistic/systematic and pragmatic way to address various needs: practical problems, social and psychological problems, addictions, lack of education, lack of ‘labour-identity’ (specific and general (communication and relation), skills to function in a job, lack of motivation, meaning giving, lack of identity.	Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change;  Multi-problem young men, often very low education, high levels of (hidden) psychiatric or addiction problems, large proportion with a criminal record.

### *Activities*

The New Opportunity is a day (treatment) centre for young men (18-27) without work, education or regular activities. Its participants are young adult males facing problems in different aspects of life and who have almost always been involved in criminal activities in the past.

Intensive (4-6 months) programme in day centre containing:

- intake/introduction phase: motivation & stabilisation (1 month)
- transformation & socialisation phase (1-4 months)
- outflow/placement phase: finding and keeping a job or a place at school (1-3 months)
- after care

Multi-modular day programme:

- cooking (breakfast and lunch), sports, culture.
- education & behavioural training
- working on Personal Development Plan with personal coaching
- individual assistance from social worker
- job training

### ***Outcomes***

From 208 new starts of the programme in 2014 there were 124 positive outflows (work, education, special care). Indications from the crime and safety field that those participants who were involved in criminal activities, do reduce these activities considerably once they join. TNO claims to influence the lives of at least 500 young people from the target group (potential and ex-participants included), including positive impacts on health and on lives of family members.

### ***Success factors***

The connection with neighbourhood and youth workers is important because it opens the way to find and attract people who are motivated to start with the programme. The connection with these community workers is also essential to keep track of people and assist them if needed, once the programme has ended.

Additional funding and knowledge from the private sector in the outflow-phase: charities, individual employers, churches.

Specialised care offered at the TNO-centre on mental health and addiction problems lowers the threshold for the participants to seek help. TNO is using a realistic, systematic and grounded approach to reach its goals. Some vital elements – e.g. its ‘pedagogic climate’ and the use of motivational interviewing and behavioural therapy - are evidence based.

The amount of time and energy that is and can be devoted to directing people towards jobs and schools or specialised care and to ‘keep in touch’ with them over a long period of time (2 years).

## **5.4 Recognition, trust, empowerment, neighbourhood development**

## **Innovative Practice Beatfreaks (Birmingham)**

### ***Social issues addressed***

Birmingham is one of the youngest cities for its size in Europe and also a very diverse city with both long established minority ethnic communities and, in recent years, growing numbers of newly arrived migrants from more than 180 countries. In addition, Birmingham is one of the UK's most deprived cities, ranking as the 9th most deprived out of the 354 authorities in England<sup>10</sup>. The project tries to tackle structural causes of inequalities (high levels of unemployment and the lack of employment and training opportunities; poor levels of educational attainment; cutbacks in social welfare support) as well as individual causes (lack of social and emotional competences; lack of self-confidence and self-belief; poor motivation/fatalism; lack of positive personal support structures arising from family, community or peer networks; distrust of and distance from those with power).

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target groups</b>
NGO + partners (theatre, Arts centre)	Middle (150 + 45 volunteers)	<p>To help young people develop skills, resources, networks and confidence which will improve their employability and readiness for self-employment.</p> <p>To develop people and spaces through creativity. More equipped, engaged, and empowered young people able to apply their creativity to affect personal and social change.</p>	<p>Aiming for 'alternative' ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support;</p> <p>Motivated to integrate into mainstream society but in need of support;</p> <p>Other: Lacking social competences and networks.</p>

### ***Activities***

The activities broadly fall under one or more of the following three categories: (1) in-house training to develop personal, social and emotional resilience, social competences (e.g. leadership, self-confidence, self-esteem and teamwork) and transferable skills (e.g. project design & management, marketing and communications including web design and social

<sup>10</sup> Based on the UK Index of Multiple Deprivation.

media), these are all learnt ‘on-the-job’, (2) engagement/outreach arts-based activities co-created between Beatfrecks’ ‘own’ young people and young people attracted to their programmes in Poetry, Music, Dance, Media and Leadership & Enterprise, (3) facilitation of youth engagement activities for other agencies and organisations drawing on the resources of its in-house team of young people who develop and deliver an appropriate project plan.

### ***Outcomes***

Beatfrecks has contributed to the development of skills and competences of the project participants to the point that they are able to earn money from their creative practice and move towards self-sufficiency. Already 150 young people had become paid sessional facilitators for Beatfrecks’ projects and programmes as well as undertaking other freelance work. We understand that up to 40% of these young people had been assisted by Beatfrecks to register with HMRC (Her Majesty’s Customs and Revenue) indicating that they were earning money from their creative practice and needed to register for tax purposes. Two former apprentices had been taken on as paid employees of the company itself.

### ***Success factors***

Critical success factors seen from the founder’s perspective are: a) the approach to engaging with young people – ie everything is based on doing things **with** and not **to** young people, b) an open approach which enables Beatfrecks to meet individual needs and see them progress re: competences and/or skills, and c) enabling individuals to access employment through the skills development and networking activities of Beatfrecks.

## **Innovative Practice ‘Hidden Wings’ (Krakow: transfer from Birmingham, pilot)**

### ***Social issues addressed***

Young people in Nowa Huta exhibit low level of formal education, exclusion from broader society, low self-esteem, taking part in activities of socially excluded groups or general inertia, low level of entrepreneurial skills, being persons with low support and, in general, with low abilities (or abilities that are not perceived highly by society) or not using their actual potential. There is a lack of access to cultural and social events for socially excluded young people.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
---------------	--------------	-------------------------	---------------------

NGO + partners (theatre, municipality, university)	Middle (76 + 6 trainers)	<p>To provide local Krakow youth with the possibility of building niche competences and utilizing them in order to achieve success in a broader social context.</p> <p>Enhancing sense of agency and internal locus of control; increasing self-esteem; supporting social involvement and team-work competences.</p> <p>Group related aims: building networks and collective spaces, empowering, integrating into wider society (convincing the public that there exists potential in excluded youth), and improving visibility.</p>	<p>Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change;</p> <p>Motivated to integrate into mainstream society but in need of support.</p>
--	--------------------------	--	--

### ***Activities***

Ukryte Skrzydła (Hidden Wings) Foundation is organizing workshops, recruiting and helping trainers, organizing the final event in cooperation with the other partners. Several components of the workshops include: breakdance lessons, music lessons, Muay-thai workshop, graffiti workshops, theatre lessons, leadership-media skills building. Preparing beneficiaries for a show during which acquired abilities and skills will be presented.

### ***Outcomes***

The activities referred to above involved 70 young people from the area of Nowa Huta risk of social exclusion. Each workshop was held for 2 hours per week each, with a total of 216 contact hours. In the case of this project social network building plays a key role - contacts reached during workshops could help in the future in getting a job / better paid jobs. This is also the aspect of the project which is rated the highest by beneficiaries asked about private and general usefulness of activities. The long-term benefits of the project for the reduction of social disparities and the positive effects of educating young people were identified in interviews. Short-term positive outcomes include: persuading young people to participate in alternative ways of spending free time rather than sit idly in their backyard, increased motivation to do something, building self-confidence, social skills and social capital. Subjective evaluation of the project by the participants of the Social Media module is as follows: overall rating high or very high, appreciation of new contacts, willingness to work together, and atmosphere of the project, high ratings of the offer, organization and attractiveness of the programme.

***Success factors***

The key project success factors include the following: internal factors - well prepared trainers, broad stakeholder participation, securing engagement of the participants, building a feeling of participation in an extraordinary undertaking; external - securing financial and infrastructural resource. Evaluation activities carried out by the CUE team clearly show that all the above elements were present and significantly contributed to the positive reception of the project.

**Innovative Practice ‘Creativity, art and sport for young people empowerment (Beatfrecks)’ (Venice: transfer from Birmingham, pilot)*****Social issues addressed***

There are several problems addressed: widespread drug dependence and trafficking. Adult unemployment and young people’s working poor are other problems. There are few places where young people can go, meet and do things together, unless they are part of a formal organization/association with a specific goal. The main problems in this respect have been the amount of bureaucracy for doing everything and the offices' way of dealing with young people.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
University/ Citistryce team (+ municipality)	Small (40-50)	To strengthen the communication, connection and networking among young people, the public services and the various associations engaged in youth issues/policies/interventions and to offer opportunities;  Building a virtual and actual space where young people could express themselves, their skills and abilities.	“Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support” and “Living day by day opportunistically”; Something in between.

***Activities***

The project creates a virtual and actual space where young people could express themselves, their skills and abilities; organizing (together with young people) an event where they can perform their skills, such as art, music, sport, theatre, photo. Preparing them (through meetings

of small groups with facilitators) for this event by developing together with them their competences.

### ***Outcomes***

The pilot is currently finished with the final event. The output of the project has been the realization of an event where young people show their talents and express themselves in a wide sense. The effect is the birth of new networks among young people and a new enthusiasm about doing something together which relates to their passions. Few weeks after the final event Venice Municipality published a bid (called Incubox) which intends to hire 3 facilitators for working with young people in a way very similar Citispyce pilot style. What is lacking – and what the pilot has been addressed- is attention towards young people in a “grey zone” which we think are a large proportion in Mestre.

### ***Success factors***

There are the following success factors identified: 1) young people’s concrete engagement finalized to find a chance and a channel for expressing themselves and feeling part of a group with the same aim 2) shortening the distance and in part filling the gap between those young people and the public stakeholder 3) building of an informal network composed of many local associations which deal with art, music and sport and where many young people can be found.

The pilot could be easily transferred and implemented by local public and private stakeholders. The best solution could maybe be a private-public partnership: private associations and organizations -such as those involved in the pilot- could lead the project organizing themselves in a network, while public stakeholders could have a facilitating role.

## **Innovative Practice ‘Moin Moin Hamburg – Welcome Tours for Refugees’ (Pilot)**

### ***Social issued addressed***

Young adult refugees without a residence permit often live in public refugee shelters for years. They are isolated from the surrounding world (move around in a very limited environment outside their shelter), and have little social contact or access to cultural and social services in

the city. The consequences are a prolonging of the integration process and of language learning, and often a feeling of hopelessness.

actors	scale	goals/objectives	target group
University (Citispyce team), cooperation municipality	Small (25)	<p>Main goal: social and cultural integration of young refugees.</p> <p>Objectives: aiming at the gap between informal qualifications plus abilities at the time of arrival and a long-term formal integration process. Better knowledge about the city to move around more easily outside the shelter and through that get involved in (social) activities. Better knowledge about possibilities. Empowerment to make better use of own abilities, avoidance of infantilization, improvement of language skills.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Young refugees between 18-26 who are ready to actively look for chances in their new city and use the opportunity to integrate and find their own path.</li> <li>- often people with problematic legal status and low German language skills</li> </ul>

### *Activities*

The pilot project Moin Moin Hamburg aimed to bring young refugees of 18-30 years in contact with everyday relevant cultural activities, thus contributing to social and cultural integration. From February to April, several activities were offered for this group in Hamburg (cultural and leisure activities such as city tours, model train world, sports, library, language exchange offers, training counselling). The tours were accompanied by an Arabic speaking person. Through the project the young people get into contact with their environment and society. They are able to improve their language skills and gain access to cultural and social activities.

### *Outcomes*

The services (the tours) were not as good as intended due to the lack of sponsors and NGOs offers. When approached, many organisations showed interest in engaging in some way but they lack adequate internal structures to welcome a new target group. The interest of refugees in the tour was low. Nine people took part in the tours and five people were directed to other activities. Each tour was attended by 2-4 people. The rate of drop-outs/one-time visitors was

relatively high. Despite the limited scope of the project there was some positive feedback from participants about gaining knowledge about the system, getting in contact with their neighbourhood and the wider city and breaking from stressful day-to-day experiences in the shelters.

### ***Success factors***

The idea to take the people out from the shelter instead of bringing the activities to them is innovative because almost all other existing initiatives organise activities (language courses, dance groups, coffee and conversation groups etc.) which are “camp based”, while many people wish to get out and get to know their surroundings. This idea, however, did not really help to motivate the refugees in practice. During the pilot it has been found out that many actors are willing to cooperate and to offer services for the target group but a sustainable framework and structural support are missing.

### **Innovative Practice ‘Multisectoral cooperation for social sustainability’ (Malmö, pilot)**

#### ***Social issues addressed***

The idea of the project was to arrange a multisectoral collaboration in order to discuss societal problems and how multisectoral collaboration could be an innovative contribution to solving these problems. According to the project, the main societal problem is unemployment. The underlying structural causes of “individual unemployment” are considered to be of special concern for the project. The proposal of the project describes how new societal challenges, such as “social exclusion and segregation” demand new solutions.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGOs, municipality, county, public sector, university, private	Middle (growing)  Aspiration for further ESF funding	The original aim: identifying and creating cross-sector collaboration to address the underlying structural causes of individual unemployment.  To build the knowledge alliance, by including young people in order to create a potential contribution of a multitude of perspectives regarding causes and solutions to the societal problem of social exclusion.	Involving actors from different societal sectors, also including young people from different parts of the city.

		An overlying aim: to plan and prepare the full-scale action project proposal to the ESF.	
--	--	--	--

### ***Activities***

The activities in the project have been done within two tracks; within a “Development group” and also within a “Youth involvement process”. The core of each track has been a number of workshops on different themes, connected to the societal problem of social exclusion and to multisectoral cooperation. The Development group gathered and discussed causes and symptoms of unemployment and broadly social exclusion with the aim to develop knowledge about social exclusion and to test the pent-helix model of cooperation. The Youth involvement process engaged 11 youngsters in the discussions about problems faced by young people.

### ***Outcomes***

The project help generate understanding and knowledge about social exclusion (and related policy fields) faced by young people in Malmö. The Development group discussed the role of welfare state and civil society in tackling social exclusion, unemployment and potential-oriented approach whereas young people oriented more on burning problems – access to housing or valuable education that helps finding a job. The results of these working groups have become a basis for a newly drafted project for ESF call.

### ***Success factors***

The lessons learned from the process in terms of flexibility and willingness to adapt are crucial for setting up the full-scale project. The success factors include: a) creating a relationship of mutual trust with young people in order to make the group sustain, b) setting-up cautious rules to make everyone included in the process of knowledge development.

## **Innovative practice Forn de Teatre Pa’ Tothom (Barcelona)**

### ***Social issues addressed***

The problems addressed are that young people in Raval are heavily oppressed and marginalized by society. Touristic and urban development pressures have caused the neighbourhood to lose leisure spaces for those living in Raval, to the point that certain infrastructures are only accessible to young people if they go to a sports club or through the youth centres; these

limitations in turn push youngsters to either go to other neighbourhoods in order to use sport facilities or to stay on Raval's streets, which then causes animosity with police.

The aims of the project are: to provide young people who are facing problems with tools that help them to talk about them and analyse them. Thus participatory theatre becomes an alternative way of learning values, and a medium which allows for the exchange of experiences and the dissemination of ideas, facilitate contact between young people in an environment different from school and family.

actors	scale	goals/objectives	target group
NGO	Small (18)	<p>Learning and defence of human rights, as well as raising awareness of duties as citizens and of values such as equal opportunity, inter-culturality, non-discrimination and the promotion of an active citizenship.</p> <p>To promote theatre as an educational tool for young people, as a channel of social transformation and as a space for alternative leisure.</p> <p>To identify individual and social needs faced by young people and address them through this educational project, further activities of the organisation and/or redirect them to the most appropriate actors (e.g. social services, centre of information and assistance for youth).</p>	<p>They come from different backgrounds and may have different aspirations;</p> <p>Some of them may be motivated for integration into mainstream society, but in need of support;</p> <p>others may be aiming for alternative ways to get ahead, but do not necessarily have 'sufficient competences', and at the same time could adopt an attitude to live day by day, opportunistically.</p>

### *Activities*

The organisation Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom provides 2-year-courses in Drama and Theatre of Social Intervention as well as workshops, intensive courses and apprenticeships to all people who want to be actors, but also to those who want to develop social projects such as community actions. The school has recently started to offer training courses in Theatre for School Instructors. Pa'Tothom organises an International Meeting of Theatre and Education, with seven editions thus far, and with the participation of prominent theatre professionals and other

organisations. The organisation also aids the publishing and translation of books related to the Theatre of the Oppressed. They also organise workshops in public schools of disadvantaged areas, Theatre Forum and workshops in prisons, with drug addicts, mentally handicapped people, etc. Pa'Tothom also organises conferences, exhibitions, concerts, readings, etc.

Within the specific project with young people, they devote one school year to undertake three main activities: 3 months to foster group's cohesion, 3 months of improvisation exercises of and 3 months to create a theatre play. At the end of the course (in June), the youngsters travel to France or Germany to show their piece of theatre in an international festival.

### ***Outcomes***

The outcomes as confirmed in the interviews were that youngsters have acquired knowledge about human rights and have an increased awareness of socio-political issues affecting them and their neighbourhood. They also have greater abilities for critical thinking and a more active role in the community. Further education outcomes like language skills, expressiveness, writing and staging of theatrical plays and finally gaining social networks and social capital.

### ***Success factors***

The success factors consist from internal factors like the overall philosophy implemented by committed personnel and methods of operation based on trust and self-confidence, young people's motivation and interest in theatre thanks to the organisation's reputation, and counting with infrastructure. This project is a good example of social intervention with a bottom-up attitude in direct opposition to a normative and patronising approach. It takes place at the local level - it is very much connected to the immediate realities of the neighbourhood. Drivers for implementation were as follows: the project counts with the organisation's infrastructure, recognition from institutions for their efforts and their merit, ample media coverage of the project, which in turn has consolidated its presence and scope, enthusiasm and motivation among young people and stakeholders.

## **Innovative Practice 'Venezia Cricket Club'**

### ***Social issues addressed***

The problem addressed is that particularly vulnerable subjects – such as young people of immigrant origin, often alone in the immigration context, with small social and relational capital and often with a distant family because they are engaged in extended work-shifts – can

get involved in risky activities and illegality, or not so much a constructive use of their time, skills and passions. The project aims to use sport as a tool for education and social inclusion. But also as a resource which provides young people some job opportunities: 1) exploiting the social capital of the Italian founders of the association; 2) making it possible for children to attend courses that will provide certifications and credentials (referee, coach, scorer, first aid, etc.) that can be spent in the labour market (cricket leagues and championship, schools, etc.); 3) increasing the organizational and managerial skills of the young players learning, so, to manage by their own the team activities (budget, travels, corporate management, etc.).

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
Private residents/N GO (+ municipality)	Small (30)	Networking youth realities and associations in Mestre in order to reduce physical distances between them and to offer opportunities;  Building a virtual and actual space where young people could express themselves, their skills and abilities; organizing (together with young people) an event where they can performing their skills, such as art, music, sport, theatre, photography.	Motivated for integration into mainstream society but in need of support;  Aiming for 'alternative' ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support.

### ***Activities***

There are about 25 participants (some of them are both players and trainers), two or three training days a week from autumn season to summer season and an official match every week from spring season to summer season. The innovative aspect is the self-management nature of the team, the active and bottom up involvement of all the members of the team in every activity – organizational and co-decision – of the association acting as a form of empowerment, engagement, training, part-time employment. At the same time, the Venezia Cricket Team, is embedded with the social services network within the neighbourhoods to “give hospitality” to the young people targeted by the social services projects that want to make these young people play their social re-integration experience through sports.

### ***Outcomes***

Positive outcomes of the project has been that cricket has been a driving force for the wider integration and inclusion of the entire Bangladeshi community; the common use of the Italian language, creation of a kind of “every-day multiculturalism” in the neighbourhood.

### ***Success factors***

The following success factors have been identified: internal factors such as the social capital-networks of the founder that facilitated the implementation of the practice; the wider overall philosophy of the project that fits with the neighbourhood background and with the target group needs and skills. Finally external factors, such as the strong sense of community and the tradition of strong engagement of the citizens towards the common good of Mestre and Marghera. The pilot could easily be transferred and implemented by local stakeholders, both public and private. The best solution could maybe be a private-public partnership: private associations and organizations could lead the project, while public stakeholder (first of all, the municipal social services) could have a facilitating role.

### **Innovative Practice ‘Brightful’ (Malmö)**

#### ***Social issues addressed***

Brightful responds to a lack of self-confidence and constructive role models among young people, particularly in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in the city. In a city characterized by high levels of child poverty and youth unemployment, this project aims to increase the young people’s potential in a longer perspective, in contrast to other initiatives aiming them help in finding job. The guiding principle behind the work is to provide structured meeting opportunities for young people, where they can articulate and discover means of reaching their personal goals.

<b>actors</b>	<b>scale</b>	<b>goals/objectives</b>	<b>target group</b>
NGO (+municipality, schools)	Middle (140)	Main aim: by providing different activities, help and motivate young women and men in believing in themselves and their ability to set (and reach) their own individual goals.	Aiming for ‘alternative’ ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support.

### ***Activities***

Brightful offers different activities, coaching and workshops on specific topics where the participants meet different organizations, schools and entrepreneurs from their local context. The participants are given the chance to discuss different issues such as equality, self-esteem, job and educational opportunities. Girls and boys (lower-secondary school students) participating in the programme are provided mentors from a somewhat older age group, who coach the participants through the programme. The mentors are young adults who are either working, studying or in other ways engaged in fulfilling their own goals. These mentors serve as role models for the younger group. Mentors and younger schools students gather monthly for structured activities with knowledge and experience sharing. In these activities the distinction between mentors and “adepts” is intentionally blurred. Both groups basically get the same thing out of the activities, which is one of Brightful’s characteristics, separating them from other comparable programmes. Brightful cooperates with schools, NGOs, entrepreneurs and other local actors.

### ***Outcomes***

The project advances the kind of qualities in young persons that could be seen as precondition for further advancement in education or work, or, more generally, in entering adulthood as a self-reliant person. These qualities are to do with meaning-making and identity building. Brightful is in a process of upscaling and transfer e.g. by creating a new and expanded handbook that could help others set up activities in other places – in major cities as well as in smaller towns. It is the Brightful *ideas* and *methods* that they aim to spread geographically.

### ***Success factors***

The most significant success factors for the project we see the degree of participation, self-governing and engagement of young people.

## **6. Assessment of the innovative practices in perspective**

The case studies could not be designed to provide the solid ‘contra-factual’ assessment of the innovative practices. Rather they aim to put the practices into the national contexts, to identify their innovative features in terms of addressing; the needs of young people, the approaches to young people, the outcomes/effects to the extent these are available, the success factors

regarding their implementation and outcomes, and finally considering transferability. By doing this, the *blackbox* is open and the links between the design, implementation and outcomes are possible to understand.

### **6.1 Addressing the key dimensions of inequalities**

The social innovative practices have addressed several causes and symptoms of inequalities (the above categories are overlapping), often multiple inequalities, faced by young people in deprived neighbourhoods.

Regarding the societal (macro- and meso-level) causes and symptoms these are the following: changing economic structures in the city/neighbourhood, high levels of unemployment and precarious/poor quality employment, discrimination and stigmatisation in all life domains, unequal opportunities and access to institutions which are channelling life chances – education, labour market and housing at the first place, material deprivation and indebtedness, distance and isolation in the deprived neighbourhoods, ghettoization/gentrification, exposure to crime and addictions, vicious circle of deprivation/exclusion.

Regarding micro-level causes and symptoms of inequalities these consist in poor education, lack of social competences and skills, deficient language and communication skills, lack of social and cultural capital, low self-esteem, lack of trust to institutions and wider society, low perception of their rights, low motivation and sometimes resignation, lack of labour/carrier identity, social and psychological problems, lack of life-meaning, low level of the individual and social resilience, self-exclusion. In addition, some are living in broken or dysfunctional families and lack support both from family and neighbourhood.

And finally, deficient social infrastructures and policies are reflected in innovative practices as well, both in terms of service provision (e.g. Topeko, Beatfreaks, Hidden Wings, Learning by working etc.) and policy learning (e.g. Multisectoral cooperation).

The innovative practices are addressing more often the symptoms than the causes of these inequalities. This is understandable since they represent above all the means to help young people to cope with the consequences of the inequalities in their lives. Besides, the local level innovative practices lack the power/capacity to change the structures of the economy, labour market segmentation, widespread discrimination practices and similar. Nevertheless, they are changing to some extent the landscape of the policies addressing the symptoms and causes of inequalities.

Most importantly, the innovative practices react on the gaps and failures in the policies and social infrastructures available to young people in the deprived neighbourhoods. These may be summarised as follows: first, either completely lacking or (due to welfare state cuts) reduced social infrastructures in the deprived neighbourhoods, typically lacking spaces and opportunities for social, and cultural life, communing and self-expression. Second, apparent lack or poor capacity and quality of broader range social services, including employment services, housing, quality schools, health care, community social work. Third, the approach prevailing in the practice of the public institutions dealing with young people is not appropriate. Service providers/frontline workers do not take needs and abilities of young people into consideration sufficiently. The reason is partly the widespread bureaucracy and rigidity but mainly the policy approach underpinned with MUD discourse aiming at rapid activation by conditionality and enforcement with use of negative sanctions. In this approach currently work-first approach prevails or in the worst case workfare (Loedemel and Moreira, 2014). Such an approach represents an obstacle to build preconditions for the effective social inclusion in most of the dimensions, like the individual, neighbourhood, group, social and civic/political dimensions. This approach is accompanied by non-recognition of young peoples' voices, lack of their participation in policy making and co-determination of the measures. Hence young people are losing trust into institutions, feel distanced, oppressed and alienate to them.

The case studies document that the important device of the innovative practices is that they address the dimensions of inequalities or social exclusion which are rather neglected in mainstream policies. Their approach reflects the dimensions as distinguished by Percy-Smith (2000:9): typically, the practices are unique in that they address neighbourhood, individual, spatial and group dimensions, often in a combination with political/civic and social dimensions, symbolic/discursive dimension in addition. More generally, self-confidence, creativity, empowerment, sociability, trust and engagement are strongly supported through innovative approaches. The practices take into account the widespread feeling of the 'heteronomy of life' (Berger, 1965) on the site of young people living in the excluded neighbourhoods, leading to low aspirations and disengagement, and a lack of trust. The 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 partnership principle is the norm/quality standard. Young people are sometimes becoming a partners in policy making process.

In these aspects the innovative practices are providing alternative models of policy approach to the prevailing mainstream policies. Such alternatives can slowly influence a shift policy agenda by changing policy discourses, and ‘mindsets’ of the policy makers, young people and the public. This way they are addressing one of the most important causes of inequalities which is the inadequacy in the approach of social policies addressing young people. The findings of the outcomes of the practices/projects confirm that the above concerns of the practices help to appropriately address the needs of young people.

## **6.2 Success factors**

The case studies identified the success factors of the implementation of the innovative practices (see the previous section). We summarise them in brief below (as they are presented in the case studies). We admit that the assessment is provided at different levels of abstraction. The aim is to get rather a wide picture (i.e. diversity of practices, diversity of analyses) than a focused analytical grid.

Summing up the above insights into the success factors of the innovative practices, the following conclusions may be adopted:

In all areas, the importance of the internal success factors clearly prevail over the external factors. The internal success factors include both practice/project design and practice/project implementation which are of equal significance. Regarding project design, two aspects which lie at the core of the philosophy (programme theory) underpinning these practices/projects seem to be the most important; the first one being the strong focus not only on the needs of the participants, but also on their potentials. A highly individualised approach is consequently a norm, based on the mutual recognition, involvement, cooperation and empowerment as the principles of action. In many cases the projects are aimed at topics in which the young people are themselves highly interested. This strengthens the inner motivation of young people through their interests.

Social work becomes crucial at the levels of individual, group and community work. The second aspect (closely associated with the first) is that the method, process and approach, matters the most. The method of operation consists of cooperation, co-determination, empowerment and partnership. With some exaggeration, one may say that “the helpless are turning to those who are helping others”. This means that the design of the practice/project and the implementation process are merging. This is typical feature for bottom-up practices.

Nevertheless, regarding implementation as such, the following success factors are important: the abilities of the principal actor (typically project leader, implementing body, mostly NGOs) like human and social capital, networks, experiences, highly committed and competent staff or volunteers. Associated devices are good management of the implementation process and competence in situational leadership (Hersey and Blanchard, 2007). Some projects aim to create infrastructure for young people while supporting their role as principal agents (entrepreneurs) of their lives (see e.g. Loft project, Amaro records project).

The principal actors, for example, have to be adaptive and flexible in several respects. Concerning the transfer of the pilots, the partners in the roles of project leaders were able, and creative enough, to adapt the practices born in a different national context into their own national/city contexts. When doing that they have respected the ideas behind the practice as most important (such as the overall philosophy and approach), while the concrete methods or processes may be different and adapted to the local conditions. Similarly, they were flexible in their reaction to the needs of young people as well as to the implementation conditions. Hence they were able to overcome the emerging obstacles during the process of pilot implementation.

The external success factors appear to be less decisive. Nevertheless, three factors were identified as important. The first one was the network mode of governance, or the existing cooperation networks like cooperative relationships between NGOs, municipalities, business sectors, universities, etc. However, this was very much influenced by the already established social capital and networks of the principal (internal success factor) and/or by the ability of the principal to find the partners and to establish networks.

The other facilitating factor was the community/neighbourhood social capital and social potential. The third facilitating factor were the financial resources provided (for example, financing through European funds was very helpful) or some infrastructures provided (for example space for the activities provided free of charge by a municipality). The financial and personnel resources were more important in the case of larger projects which have combined several time consuming (professionalised) activities necessary to achieve the outcomes. Typically, it is the case of employment oriented practices/projects like TOPEKO in Athens, Buzzinezzclub in Rotterdam, Youth Employment Agency in Hamburg or Learning by Working in Brno.

In conclusion, it was apparent that the success factors are very closely associated with the aims and principles of the practices/projects. The practices are striving to bridge social distance,

increase trust and built community by recognition, potential oriented approach, empowerment, partnership and co-determination. Thus their aims are overlapping with their operational principles and methods.<sup>11</sup> Most notably, strong central ideas informed by the above aims and principles, are the most important success factor for Socially Innovative Practices. These central ideas can be adapted to different local contexts as our pilots show.

---

<sup>11</sup> We, however admit, that do not have clear evidence that these success factors also apply to target groups characterised by strong mechanisms of self-exclusion or those who lack resources.

## References

Berger, P. 1963. *Invitation into sociology: A humanistic perspective*. Bantam: Doubleday Dell Publishing group Inc.

Güntner, S., Gehrke, A.-M., Seukwa, L.-H. 2014. *Local matters? Neighbourhoods and social infrastructure as spaces of reproducing, producing, mitigating or counteracting social inequalities in 10 European cities*. Citispyce Work Package 3 Fieldwork I: Final Comparative Report.

Hersey, P., Blanchard, K.H. and Johnson, D.E. 2007. 9th Ed. *Management of Organizational Behavior: Leading Human Resources*. Prentice Hall.

Hussain, A., Higson, H. 2014. WP4 *Comparative Report of "Fieldwork II"*. Citispyce.

Jubany, O., Güell, B. 2014. *Menu of Social Innovation Practices & Interim Workshop Report*. Citispyce.

Loedemel and Moreira. 2014. *Activation or Workfare? Governance and the Neo-Liberal Convergence*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Percy-Smith, J. (ed.). 2000. *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion: Towards Inclusion?* Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia.

Spies, H. 2015. *Work Package 6 Comparative report. Social innovation in action*. Citispyce project.

Stigendal, M. 2013. *CAUSES OF INEQUALITY AFFECTING YOUNG PEOPLE IN 10 EUROPEAN CITIES* . Citispyce Baseline and comparative report.

Stigendal, M. 2015. *CAUSES OF INEQUALITY AND THE PROSPECTS OF COMBATTING THEM* . Citispyce report.

**Annex: the list of the case studies on innovative practices****Athens**

- 1 The Loft – Shelter of Ideas
- 2 Topeco

**Barcelona**

- 3 Educational Demos
- 4 Forn Teatre Pa' Tothom

**Birmingham**

- 5 Beatfreaks
- 6 The Loft

**Brno**

- 7 Learning by Working
- 8 Recording Studio

**Hamburg**

- 9 Moin, moin Hamburg
- 10 Youth Employment Agency

**Krakow**

- 11 Free Remedial Tutoring
- 12 Hidden Wings

**Malmö**

- 13 Brightful
- 14 Multisectoral cooperation

**Rotterdam**

- 15 Buzinezzclub
- 16 Challenge Sports
- 17 The New Opportunity

**Sofia**

- 18 Health and Social Centre
- 19 Integrated Approach

**Venice**

- 20 Beatfreaks
- 21 Cricket Club

## **Chapter 9: Policy Issues and Preliminary Recommendations**

Tomáš Sirovátka, Jana Válková

Masaryk University

### **1. Introduction**

The Citispyce project aims to identify the potential of social innovation to improve the situation of young people facing multiple social inequalities and living in excluded neighbourhoods in ten European cities. This work builds on the previous work packages, especially Work package 5 (Chapter 6) in which a selection of socially innovative practices of and for young people was made and Work package 6 (Chapter 7) during which some of these innovative practices – both new project ideas and practices from other cities – were implemented/transferred from one local context to another.

The objective of Work package 7 (Chapter 8) was to provide evidence on the design, implementation and outcomes of these innovative practices, while paying attention to their ability to address the causes of inequalities, their innovative elements, as well as to their transferability. In this respect Citispyce enabled some kind of ‘experiment in vivo’. The practices from one city were transferred into other societal and implementation contexts (WP6).

In this way, their positive potentials were examined in a creative way. The stakeholders who were involved in their transfer deliberately selected the practices because of their potential positive effects, as well as necessary adaptations to the local conditions and time frames.

The case studies were presented and emerging policy implications discussed with stakeholders from the European Commission and other interested partners at a workshop held on September 10 2015 in Brussels. This has enabled us to formulate a list of possible recommendations for future policy making.

In this chapter we first explain how the social innovative practices (SIPs) address the causes and symptoms of social inequalities and which target groups of young people take part in these

practices. Next, we explain the success factors identified in these practices. Lastly, a draft list of policy recommendations is presented.

## **2. Addressing the causes and symptoms of inequalities**

The Citispyce project has highlighted that the interactions of societal level and individual level causes of inequalities are affecting young people disproportionately within the economic crisis. In particular, five overlapping processes play a role<sup>12</sup>: the first one is the growing financialisation of the economies (expansion of financial assets and activities, dependent upon consumer-led booms based on credit) bringing increasing risks and economic imbalances. Young people in deprived neighbourhoods are affected by economic deprivation, indebtedness, poor access to education, jobs, housing, communing opportunities.

The second is increasing labour market segmentation, dualisation and exclusionary tendencies in labour markets where young people are disproportionately affected by unemployment, precariousness and low quality of jobs available, and 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.

The third one is the retrenchment of the welfare state/cuts in welfare benefits and services, and/or lacking social infrastructures and support to young people at the national and municipal level, de-commodification in terms of marketization and privatisation of public services, to the greater disadvantage of young people.

The fourth one is the neoliberal 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, which is also communicated to them – demonstrating ‘othering’ as an exclusionary mechanism. In some countries young people do not have sufficient rights or guarantees in several areas or their rights become unfairly conditional while opportunities for them are narrowing. Nor have they any possibility to influence policies, separated as they are from the policy making process, while policymakers neglect their needs and perceive them as “a problem.” This goes together with less protection by welfare state arrangements but more enforcement - sticks rather than carrots.

---

<sup>12</sup> This was recognised both in recent literature on this topic and in empirical findings from field research in deprived neighbourhoods, and supported by statistical data by Eurostat.. Compare also Stigendal (2013, 2015).

Fifthly, in most cities disadvantaged young people are often concentrated in the neighbourhoods where these causes accumulate and where social and economic infrastructures are poor or completely lacking, The cumulated problems are neglected by the policies. Young people lack a supportive environment and social network(s), or put differently: live in a social environment that partly encourages 'negative' alternative choices.

At the neighbourhood level young people feel neglected, distanced/separated/isolated, distrusted (they also lack trust in institutions), feel powerless and frustrated, lacking a sense of belonging. The risks of disengagement and further social exclusion are increasingly accompanied by the tendencies to self-exclusion in some groups of young people.<sup>13</sup> The societal level causes overlap with the individual level causes of inequalities, such as the lack of skills and work experience and lack of social capital and intensify them (a spiral of precariousness). More importantly, not only the individual deficits of young people play a role in this respect, but also the 'individual deficits' of the policymakers, which, however, have an institutional and ideological background. They are encouraged in the social and organisational environment in which they work. The apparent inability of the policy makers (who are often 'locked' in the MUD discourse and work-first/workfare approach) to recognise the very causes of inequalities and neglect of the needs of young people represents a crucial policy challenge.

The symptoms and consequences of inequalities at the individual, community and societal level (such as lower social competences, social distance, lack of trust, disengagement and various forms of social exclusion) overlap with the causes within the 'spiral of precariousness'.

The innovative practices we have identified address both the societal and individual level causes of inequalities and/or the symptoms and consequences, as well as the intermediary level of the social environment and social network.

We understand social innovation practices (SIPs) to be those practices which i) meet new social needs or better meet the already existing ones of specific vulnerable groups like young people; ii) find new ways of meeting social needs which are more effective, efficient and/or sustainable than the alternatives; iii) empower people, allowing them to participate and increase their capabilities; iv) promote the awareness of rights and options for their active agency; v) turn social challenges to opportunities; and vi) increase social capital, social trust and enhance society's capacity to undertake actions at the local level.<sup>14</sup> The capacity to fulfil some of these

---

<sup>13</sup> See also Güntner et al. (2014) and Hussain and Higson (2014).

<sup>14</sup> Jubany and Güell (2014).

conditions stems from the understanding of the causes of inequalities in their national and local contexts.

## **2.1 The societal level causes (structural, semiotic, material)**

In the case of small scale or even middle scale initiatives by young people themselves, or other actors who are not ‘formally empowered’, but close to young people such as NGOs or charities, it is not in the power of the actors to change substantially the structures of social inequalities. Nevertheless, these innovative practices are taking the societal level causes of inequalities into consideration and are addressing them in several respects (see also Stigendal 2015).

First, these practices adopt a potential-oriented view of young people which means that young people are seen and approached as potentials. This is not only for solving their own problems; at the same time they develop the potential (ambitions and abilities) of other young people in deprived neighbourhoods to respond to the causes and/or the consequences of inequalities.

Secondly, they use views, experiences and cultural expressions of young people in order to reinforce knowledge on the causes and consequences of inequalities. Young people are also encouraged to express injustices they are facing and enabled/empowered to become critical citizens with a wish to be politically engaged. New views, knowledge and discourses about the causes of inequalities are thus produced by young people themselves and the causes of inequalities are challenged by them,

Thirdly, they attempt to change (at least partially), the patterns of the causes in several respects. For example, employers and business sector are involved in practices, in order to alleviate the impacts of widespread discrimination, at least within specific segments of the labour market (cooperating employers).

Fourth, new opportunities for personal development and education are being promoted in situations where the mainstream policies do not provide them, or communing/sociability opportunities are provided when public spaces are not (or do not appear to be) available for this purpose.

Fifth, they are using the potential of young people to advantage in enabling them to learn and grow on the job, to participate in meaningful economic activities and accessing better quality jobs.

Sixth, new networks of actors are established, or multi-sectoral cooperation developed in order to address the structural problems: this increases their capacity to combat social exclusion.

Seventh, holistic measures are being adopted. These include those which tackle material forms of the causes of inequalities like providing social infrastructures in the deprived neighbourhoods and spaces, opportunities for communing, socialising.

Overall, there is a change in policy approach which recognises the causes of inequalities affecting young people and their needs, taking their positive potential into consideration and enabling their active participation in policy making.

In the case of large scale practices, underpinned with sufficient resources, the range of opportunities offered in order to overcome societal inequalities is broader, which includes also the provision of job or training opportunities. On the other hand, there are clear limitations regarding the capacity of these social innovative practices to change the structures of inequalities which are embedded in labour market structures or in welfare state/mainstream policies objectives and design. In the latter respect, however, the innovative practices and/or the principles which underpin them could serve as 'policy models' or 'policy guidelines' for broader (mainstream) public policy reforms, even when introduced at the local level as 'incremental policy reforms'.

## **2.2 The individual level causes (actors-related causes)**

The individual level causes of inequalities are addressed more extensively and intensively. Most often, the social innovation practices are developing supporting abilities, competences, capabilities of young people or developing their ambitions, self-efficacy, and creativity. They empower them and/or they offer opportunities in order to alleviate/overcome their individual deficits regarding ambitions, competences, creativity. They also develop communing, sociability, social networks, social capital/social potential in neighbourhoods, trust in institutions and active civic participation.

The case studies indicate that an important device of the innovative practices is that they address the dimensions of social exclusion which are rather neglected in mainstream policies. Their approach reflects most of the dimensions as distinguished by Percy-Smith (2000:9): typically, 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 such innovative approaches. The practices take into account the widespread

feeling of the ‘heteronomy of life’ (Berger, 1965) on the site of young people living in the excluded neighbourhoods, leading to low aspirations and disengagement, and a lack of trust.

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.

In this way, young people are supported in many respects more effectively than mainstream policies aspire to do or succeed in doing. This is an important pre-condition for effective social inclusion in the case of young people who are seeking 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 (see next section). These two groups are typically hard to address in mainstream policies or they are addressed through mainstream policies which focus on external motivation (inspired by MUD discourse) rather than internal motivation.

### **2.3 The target groups involved**

Similarly, as socially innovative practices addressed various causes and symptoms of inequalities they involved various groups of young people and individuals, even those neglected in mainstream policies. Whilst it may be problematic to categorise young people, their variety implied that SIPs were dealing with a variety or complexity of their particular needs (the logic of intervention). Consequently, the interventions addressed different needs of young people with use by different measures; in many cases (SIPs) there was an overlap of the logics of intervention due to the complexity of needs of the young people concerned. A typology below offers a possible scheme for analysing the relationship between intervention and those targeted (their needs).

#### ***Scheme 1: Typology of logics of intervention and ideal-types of participants***

*Italic*: analytical dimensions

**Bold**: policies and interventions

Standard: type of person

*Ambition: integration into mainstream society through school/job*

<p><b>Learning and counselling; social capital; matching</b></p> <p><i>Low ability and support</i></p>	<p>Motivated to integrate into mainstream society, but lacking competences and/or social network</p>	<p>Motivated and ready for a job without further support, but lacking opportunities</p>	<p><b>Offering opportunities</b></p> <p><i>High ability and support</i></p>
<p><b>Empowerment: developing ambition, competences and social network</b></p>	<p>Living day by day, opportunistically. Given up hope and lacking competences, social support and motivation to change</p>	<p>Aiming for 'alternative' ways to get ahead, with sufficient competences and/or social support</p>	<p><b>Stimulating and enabling entrepreneurship; co-creation; 'communing'</b></p>

*Resignation or aiming for 'alternative' integration*

**law enforcement**

Source: Spies (2015)

What may be considered as a specific feature of the SIPs studied is that they included a wide variety of young people. These included the two groups placed in the two bottom segments of the scheme – such groups are poorly targeted in mainstream policies or the policies are ineffective. The main difference is that SIPs address these groups not through a MUD-approach of discipline and structure, as mainstream policies do, but use an empowerment approach: find and build internal motivation.

### 3. The success factors in brief

The following criteria were used to assess the success of the SIPs as a result of an analysis of the pilots:

*Implementation:* implementation of the activities of the practice was consistent with the objectives. Obstacles to implementation or difficulties were solved and did not significantly impede implementation.

*Outcomes:* goal achievement and/or other positive outcomes. These were identified in three respects. First, addressing and meeting the needs of young people (improved access to employment, education, motivation, abilities, personal development, empowerment, trust and community building, engagement). Secondly, increased capacity of the actors (young people

included) to act and cooperate. Thirdly, challenging and changing the causes of inequalities. Both objective and subjective indications of the outcomes were employed.

In all areas, the importance of the internal success factors clearly prevail over the external factors.

### **3.1 The internal success factors**

The internal success factors include both practice/project design and practice/project implementation which are of equal significance. Regarding project design two aspects which are at the core of the philosophy (programme theory) underpinning these practices/project appear to be the most important.

The first one is the strong focus not only on the needs of the participants, but also on their potential. Recognition and respect of young people's interests is often a starting point. A highly individualised approach is consequently a norm, based on mutual recognition, involvement, cooperation and empowerment as the principles of action. The second aspect (closely associated with the first) is that the method, process and approach matter the most. The method of operation consists of cooperation, co-determination, empowerment and partnership.

Most notably a strong central idea informed by the above principles, is the most important success factor for Socially Innovative Practices. These central ideas can be adapted to different local contexts as our pilots show. Also, process and content often merge. Within these central ideas there is a strong focus on the extent to which there is a match between views of young people embedded in policies/interventions/practices and young people's own perceptions. How can what is offered be better tailored to what is required to fulfil needs or to realise potentials of young people?

### **3.2 The external success factors**

Three factors were identified as important. The first one was the **network mode of governance**, or the existing cooperation networks like cooperative relationships between NGOs, municipalities, business sectors, universities, etc. This was very much influenced, however, by the already established social capital and networks of the principal actor (internal success factor) and/or by the ability of the principal to find the partners and to establish networks.

The second facilitating factor was the already **existing community/neighbourhood social capital and social potential**.<sup>15</sup> In addition, sometimes, particularly in relation to the pilot projects, it was the window of opportunity (e.g. political feasibility) of the practice in the local context that were important for the choice of our pilot SIPs.

The third facilitating factor was **the financial resources provided** (for example, financing through European funds was very helpful) or some infrastructures provided (for example space for the activities provided free of charge by a municipality). The financial and personnel resources were more important in the case of larger projects which have combined several time-consuming (professionalised) activities necessary to achieve the outcomes.

#### **4. The innovative practices in contexts**

In Annex I, the innovative practices are presented within their policy contexts in the cities and countries. The already existing policies are identified as well as their gaps and failures. Based on this, the individual recommendations are formulated for each case study.

#### **5. Preliminary Recommendations**

These recommendations emerge from the case studies on 21 Social Innovative Practices which have been carried out in or are connected to the deprived neighbourhoods used in our fieldwork in ten cities across ten European countries. This work was underpinned by more than 600 interviews and 26 focus groups with the young people living there as well as with the interviews with policy makers and stakeholders from the cities and neighbourhoods and mapping social infrastructures and policy processes in the neighbourhoods. Recommendations are emerging from the confrontations of the causes and symptoms addressed by the innovative practices, the gaps and failures of the already existing mainstream policies, mechanisms of change and success factors identified in evaluation case studies of the innovative practices.

**The key issues** are as follows:

- (1) Young people in deprived neighbourhoods of the European cities often lack access to the measures which could help them effectively. If they are addressed by mainstream

---

<sup>15</sup> At the same time, in several cases building community social potential was also also a part of the internal logic of intervention,

policies, the provided support is conditional, accompanied with disciplining requirements, forcing them towards jobs of poor quality or workfare schemes.

- (2) Young people themselves are rarely directly involved in the 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 they intend. Paternalism 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.
- (3) Briefly, a **change in paradigm** is needed in order to suppress the principles of conditionality and enforcement. Young people need to be involved instead, 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 community, thus involving them much more in designing the policies addressed to them. Education, employability and employment measures represent the next step towards this.
- (4) The related problem is **stimulating and measuring "good policy making"** in so-called "evidence based policy making". Indications of empowerment, trust, personal and community development, participation, civic engagement are not considered to be a part of evaluation indicators of policies/projects. Similarly, as job quality is not assessed by job placement indicators as long as more easily available indicators are used, this is often misleading when assessing the real effectiveness of the policies implemented. Mismatches in targeting appropriate measures to the specific target groups lead to resistance and drop-out. These effects could be used as indicators.
- (5) Of course, such a policy message represents a **serious policy challenge**, especially for national and local governments and requires probably systemic policy changes in most countries.
- (6) The change of paradigm, approach and philosophy represents a systemic change which is not so 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. Accomplishment of this knowledge requires giving young people voice and

participation in policy making. This aspect is in several ways included in the following set of recommendations.

- (7) The other way in which the paradigmatic change may happen is the incremental implementation of the socially innovative practices and their upscaling, leading to the adoption of their principles in mainstream policies. This way the new approaches may become more widespread practice since the young people feedback to these policies and their positive impacts on young people and more general social benefits can work in favour of these practices. Social innovative practices are emerging as a mixture of bottom-up and top-down approaches.
- (8) Both mechanisms of the gradual and incremental changes can during time lead to the paradigmatic change (Streeck and Thelen, 2005) or third order change (Hall 1993).
- (9) Although the recommendations are addressing the national, regional and municipality levels of governance such changes could be extensively promoted and supported by the Commission among other through the conditions attached to relevant grant programmes and financial instruments.

It should be understood that the evidence from the project Citispyce can provide a guidance to policy makers on how to address social inequalities only to a limited extent, considering the intrinsic complexity of social inequalities in contemporary societies of the EU. The social innovative practices identified, mostly small scale practices, do not address all of these inequalities. Nevertheless they illustrate how it might be possible to address them and how young and other actors sometimes do address them. Such a finding can be understood as a message about the need for the more systematic change in policies and a challenge for politics.

### **5.1 General policy recommendations**

- (1) It is **useful to combine 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.

*For example social innovative practices (SIPs) like Forn de Teatre Pa' Tothom (Barcelona), Venezia Cricket Club, Brightful in Molmo or Moin Moin in Hamburg have*

*established important pre-conditions for bringing young people into networks of social and employment services which they may need (for more information on SIPs see Annex).*

- (2) At the same time it is necessary to establish a **coherent policy framework and stable social infrastructures in deprived neighbourhoods**. The social infrastructures need to be sufficiently financed, street-level oriented and open to bottom-up approaches.

*Several SIPs like Health Care Centre in Sofia, Educational Demos in Barcelona, Amaro Records in Brno, The Loft in Birmingham and Athens start with providing young people the space to socialize or basic, easily accessible social infrastructure.*

Multi-sectoral policy coordination at the city (municipality) level is necessary for improvement everywhere. The multi-sectoral, complex approach in creating conditions for improvement – social inclusion may also require addressing criminality and ‘bad role models’ (beneficial for high trust, low tolerance policy).

*The multi-sectoral and complex approach is seen in several SIPs, good example are Multisectoral cooperation in Malmö or The New Opportunity in Rotterdam.*

- (3) It is appropriate to use the **innovative (even spontaneous) practices as models for large scale practices** (their principles, objectives and approach). Replacing conditionality and enforcement to work principles by empowerment, cooperation and trust building **and strengthening communities and bridging are success factors that may need different operationalisations depending on context and ‘type’ of young people**.

*It was the case of large scale national practice Youth Employment Centre in Hamburg.*

- (4) Innovative practices (or better, the innovative ideas and approaches) **can be transferred 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 as - **underlying success factors**. Success factors are (a.o.) building trust and trustworthiness, strengthening communities and positive identity, and bridging (familiarisation).

*This has been documented in all pilots: Beatfreaks has been successfully transferred from Birmingham to Venice and Krakow, The Loft has been transferred from*

*Birmingham to Athens, Educational Demos has been transferred from Barcelona to Brno and Learning by Working has been transferred from Brno to Sofia.*

- (5) 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 a player. 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.

*In most of SIPs the key role has been taken by NGOs helping to disadvantaged youth in the disadvantaged neighbourhoods. Broad coalitions have been established in most of the SIPs, in particular Youth Employment Agency in Hamburg, TOPECO in Athens or Buzinezzclub in Rotterdam are good examples. On the other hand in small scale SIPs single citizens of informal groups played crucial role (Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom in Barcelona, Beatfreaks (Birmingham, Athens)).*

- (6) **More focus on the needs of young people** is required: programmes should be designed with their active participation and at least with a view to their ambitions and abilities. The civic and political representations of young people are important and should be given a **greater voice** in order the appropriate knowledge of the causes of their problems would be achieved. This may be very helpful for policy makers to understand and address better the causes of inequalities and problems of young people.

*Focus on needs of young people has been a typical most important innovative feature of all socially innovative practices. At the same time, many of them promoted their active participation: Beatfreaks in Birmingham, Athens and Krakow, Forn de Teatre Pa'Tothom in Barcelona, Educational Demos in Barcelona, Amaro Records in Brno and other.*

**Forming knowledge alliances with young people** is one of the effective innovative practices in this respect to provide direct evidence from young people's lives to policy makers and allow for knowledgeable policy making where young people's voices will be heard and considered.

*Multisectoral cooperation project in Malmo represents best example followed by Brightful in Malmo and Free Remedial Tutoring in Krakow or Challenge Sports in Rotterdam.*

- (7) **ESF funding is very useful** and helps in many cases to overcome a lack of resources for successful run and up-scaling of the innovative practices. It is sometimes **however used to** fund standard policy actions/instruments too (such as active labour market policies) substituting national investment into these services and thus diminishes the potential funding for social innovations.

*ESF funding has been used in case of Learning by Working in Brno, Integrated Approach in Sofia, Health care Centre in Sofia, TOPECO in Athens.*

- (8) In some countries, where more **effective public administration** is available, as in Sweden, Germany, the Netherlands or UK, broad partnerships/coalitions and good public management create **favourable pre-conditions for social innovative practices** to be implemented even on a larger scale.

*These implications have been noticed in several SIPs like Youth Employment Centre in Hamburg, Brightful or Multi-sectoral cooperation in Malmo, Beatfrecks in Birmingham or Rotterdam Challenge Sports.*

- (9) Coordinator's role is necessary – it is best if it is done by municipal/local administration. The mix between top-down and bottom-up approach is beneficial.

*The positive examples may be seen in Multisectoral cooperation project in Malmo or The New Opportunity in Rotterdam, however, in most of the practices municipalities played crucial role (see Annex).*

The role of **personalities and their individual commitment**, competences, or trustworthy and competent NGOs appear to be also important factors in enabling potential social innovative practices both to start up and to grow. Such actors should be recognised and **supported by public administration bodies**.

*NGOs and personalities involved in them played the role of principal agent in many SIPs. In particular, SIPs like Learning by Working or Amaro Records in Brno, Integrated Approach or Health Care Centre in Sofia, Hidden Wings or Free Remedial Tutoring in Krakow, Cricket Club in Venice and other prove their indispensable role, especially, when public administration is failing to play coordination role.*

**The European Commission** could increase support to NGOs to ensure sustainability and allow for up-scaling of the socially innovative practices (SIPs) at the local level. It can also

support an impact of SIPs on mainstream policies by adding conditions to such policies, e.g. Youth Guarantee schemes which:

- (a) require that they include the principles of empowerment and partnership
- (b) offer services tailor-made and suitable to ambitions and abilities of participants rather than assume these; not base them on a ‘view of people’, but on actual people, empirically. Young people can have different stances towards inclusion/exclusion, or towards (in)equalities for that matter which need to be taken into consideration.
- (c) prioritise projects which combine general individual and social development with employment and education objectives
- (d) attempt to establish more appropriate assessment standards/indicators which capture better the qualities of ‘good policy making’ which includes drop out and resistance as indicators for the quality of the match between people and services/offers. The lived experience of young people should be also taken into consideration in order to capture the social added value and assess the effectiveness of the measures.

## 5.2 Specific policy recommendations

In the following part, we are suggesting specific policy recommendations in three policy areas.

### 5.2.1 Employment & Entrepreneurship

**Changing the principles of activation:** substitute conditionality requirements with effectiveness requirements – both on an individual level and on an organisational level. This implies more room for professional discretion based on social work approaches, less focus on efficiency through competition (marketization), more focus on effectiveness through needs-oriented and continuous performance of the institutions involved.

*In general, social exclusion is a symptom of the failures of the three institutions: the market (economic processes combined with societal processes increase social inequalities), the welfare state (lack of solidarity and/or mechanisms of promoting solidarity) and the family (lack of capacity/ability to counteract these effects) and finally, due to lack of individual competences. Neglect of the principles of solidarity, fraternity, communing, human and social rights and equality in opportunities in*

*mainstream policies seems to be on increase. Increased conditionality of services and benefits associated with the 'activation' policies enforced through rigid bureaucratic rules damages mutual trust and respect between young people and public administrations. The sanctions that follow the refusal to accept an offer have a dampening effect and fail to motivate young people, especially when the offer is not a meaningful opportunity for them.*

**Increasing the numbers and percentages of disadvantaged youth** in the ALMP programmes (ESF projects included) while targeting the programmes at those who really need them. To focus the programmes even more on deprived neighbourhoods.<sup>16</sup>

*In Central Eastern European countries and some Southern European countries active labour market policies are not much developed to address effectively the magnitude of the unemployment problem or the intensity/concentration of unemployment in specific groups of young people like Roma or immigrants. Welfare state cuts also restrict support to employment of the vulnerable groups in other countries (like in the Netherlands or UK).*

**Preparing specific youth employment policies, better tailored programmes and ESF projects aimed specifically at supporting disadvantaged target groups of young people;** provide more individualised treatment with special focus on needs of young people in transition to the labour market. Capacity and trained staff for individualised support is a pre-condition, as well as including in-depth socio-educational counselling. Case management requires more and competent staff. The role of NGOs is also essential in this respect and should be promoted. All these pre-conditions deserve more support.<sup>17</sup>

*There is weak capacity for case-work and tailored services, especially in the deprived neighbourhoods (in some cases, such services are completely missing). Often, the involvement of NGOs helps in this respect but their role is still not sufficiently appreciated. Similarly, commitment and capacity for in-depth socio-educational*

---

<sup>16</sup> See also par. 18 of the Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).

<sup>17</sup> See also point 1. on page 3 of the Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).

*counselling is not sufficient, even in countries where Active labour market policies (ALMPs) are more advanced.*

*Exclusionary tendencies of increasingly restrictive welfare regimes are emerging, followed by considerable creaming-off. Some groups like young Roma are heavily under-represented in mainstream ALMP policies. There is poor access of excluded youth to standard instruments of ALMP – due to conditional offers and selectively provided information about opportunities. Mis-targeting occurs due to badly predefined/followed aims.*

**Developing an employer-approach specific for ‘hard to place’ and discriminated target group** (individual job-hunting starting with young person, not with collecting vacancies). Public-private partnership/pacts with the employers are needed. The role of municipalities/cities should be enhanced as they can promote cooperation with employers.

*Ethnic discrimination in the labour market as well as a lack of individual employability assets in the case of disadvantaged young people are ineffectively addressed.*

*The demand side of the labour market is often forgotten. The actions to build an inclusive labour market are missing. Efforts of the cities or public employment services to promote cooperation with the employers are not sufficient.*

**Improving coordination between employment and other services for young people:** this should not be only in front-end of the delivery (one-stop-shops), but also in the back-office (coordinated strategy/actions). Informal one-stop shops connected to the various initiatives of young people represent another form of advancement. Better signposting should be provided to young people at local level and outreach services should be strengthened – the role of NGOs turns out to be key.<sup>18</sup>

**Developing longitudinal client monitoring** (city-wide, coordinated by local authorities) where possible: at least in countries with sufficient administrative capacity.

---

<sup>18</sup> See also par. Point 9. on page 4 of the Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).

*There is a general lack of recognition of the multiple barriers/problems, as well as of the positive potentials of young people, accompanied by a lack of understanding of different cultures of young people, in particular ethnic/migrant minorities.*

*There is a lack of financial and emotional support from the local community, city and economy to young people, in setting up their own practice to maintain their individuality and independence. Serious gaps exist in the communication between young people and local government. Other gaps are identified in the co-ordination of employment and other services for young people: youth departments work separately with employment, education, etc.*

*Young people often feel disconnected with one-stop-shops given the fragmented approach that they encounter there. The services are brought to one place but the policies stay fragmented which is a key limitation to satisfactory provision of services that would make sense of life situations of excluded youth.*

**More opportunities/programmes for alternative pathways into economic activity,** for those young people who have “alternative ambitions” (e.g. arts, media, entrepreneurial) – not aiming to “discipline” them into the soft-skills demands of low-skilled manual labour, but stimulating them to develop the soft skills required for other (entrepreneurial) economic activities (social economy is also suitable option). Young people, however, lack experiences and should be given coaching and mentoring.<sup>19</sup>

*Many young people are not ready for a job and thus the Youth Guarantee does not always work for them. Young people often do not feel these measures could bring about change. This is often also due to enormous workload and sometimes poor competences of frontline workers who may lack appropriate mentoring skills to build relationships with young people. This may lead to them offering opportunities that are not meaningful or of a suitable quality to the young persons involved. At the same time, the problem with outreach to those furthest from the labour market seems quite significant. In addition, there is the continuing problem of cooperation among public employment services, municipalities, and other actors – NGOs, employers or young people themselves.*

---

<sup>19</sup> See also point 14. on page 4 of the Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).

**Focussing on small scale pilot initiatives** (like The Loft) to see how such innovations can 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.<sup>20</sup> They can serve as **pilots that can then be scaled up, but also as the principal way of working for young people with alternative ambitions.**

*The lack of support (from official services, etc.) for alternative employment pathways (e.g. arts-based experiences) to assist young people not only with personal development and the acquisition of social competences but the skills and knowledge to become self-employed .*

**Better coordination at central/state level** in order to reconcile the aims of different policies and to interrelate different policy levels and scale initiatives and programmes within the appropriate timeframe.

*Social protection systems do not recognise young people as a specific target group within certain life situations which carry special risks. Some of the support schemes are not applicable to them and if so, they are offered services targeting adults and not specifically youth. (e.g. standard ALMPs).*

**The European Commission** could support the above recommendations by promoting the principles of action suggested in sufficient size, better targeting and emphasizing the focus on the needs of young people in the schemes which provide funding. Also, the capacities of the implementing bodies need to be supported as well as involvement of NGOs. In particular, the bottom-up alternative pathways to employment deserve more support. The Youth Guarantee could take these suggestions on board and emphasise the partnership principle more strongly, in order to achieve better outreach.

---

<sup>20</sup> See also point 19. on page 4 of the Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).

### 5.2.2 Education and development

**Systematically apply the principles of inclusive education and equal opportunities**, recognising the specific needs of young people at risk of social exclusion. Tools of inclusive education should be mainstreamed in classroom education. This represents in particular a big systemic challenge in post-communist countries but also in South European countries.

*Basic youth policies are still deficient in most of countries in tackling key needs of young people in deprived neighbourhoods related to the labour market, education or housing. The gap is bigger in post-communist countries and also in South European countries.*

*In general welfare state cuts affected also education with the effect that the structural inequalities in education have been reinforced.*

*In education systems, ethnic minorities and migrants are often channelled to low level education tracks segregated from mainstream education, perceived by young people as poor and stigmatising. There is poor capacity in the system for inclusive education and specific educational needs of young people at risk of social exclusion are not recognised.*

**Support more general personal development of young people**, especially when not ready for formal education and/or employment. At the same time there should be improved specifying of target groups and/or possibilities for individual support.<sup>21</sup>

*There is a lack of acknowledgement of the role of informal education by official authorities as well as a lack of opportunities for informal education: acquiring social and cultural competences and skills.*

**Provide more support to youth organisations providing non-formal education** to young people at risk of social exclusion in order to increase their capabilities, self-confidence and engagement in society. There is a need to support new models of education where the relationship of authority is based on mutual respect and makes use of the references (the older/more experienced serve as good models for the younger) –

---

<sup>21</sup> See also point 15. on page 4 of the Council Recommendation of 22 April 2013 on establishing a Youth Guarantee (2013/C 120/01).

peer-to-peer learning. This is also a way how to draw on young people's experiences, support their self-expression and get use of their knowledge.

*NGOs are trying to fill in the gaps, especially in informal education but they lack resources for wider coverage and/or organizational and promotional help from the part of municipality.*

**Empower local communities by introducing more open governance mechanisms;** minimizing restrictions on providing public education by NGOs and parents' associations. Bridge symbolic and spatial divides, creating trust and encouraging participation of excluded youth by establishing community centres that provide integrated and culturally tailored services (Roma neighbourhoods are the most important case).

*If informal education/personal development is supported by municipalities in some countries, referral of young people by youth counters seems not very targeted, while there is a great diversity of participants (broad target group). The opportunities for tailoring services are heavily limited. In some countries and cities infrastructures like community centres are lacking.*

**Implement longitudinal client monitoring** - city-wide, coordinated by local authorities where possible - at least in countries with sufficient administrative capacity.

*No longitudinal follow-up of the participants in the programmes is in place. Often, in the case of disadvantaged young people at risk of social exclusion, it is difficult to show cost-effectiveness as returns are mostly outside benefits and employment (safety, crime reduction and less use of care services). This is typical in the case of most of the young people not in employment or education (NEETs).*

**The European Commission** could support more inclusive education projects/initiatives and require systemic changes in the national educational systems under the principle of anti-discrimination. More support should be provided to projects focused on general personal development and non-formal education of disadvantaged youth in need of it. More support could be provided to implementing longitudinal client monitoring at city level or by NGOs and other stakeholders dealing with them.

### 5.2.3 Recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement, and neighbourhood development

**Introducing a more community-focused model of policy-making** combined with the provision of more individualized treatment; development of community and individual based social work, combined with various social services to young people.

*Exclusionary tendencies of increasingly restrictive welfare regimes; cutbacks in support services for young people; tendencies to blame individuals for their excluded position.*

*Labour market policies based on the increasing conditionality of support to young unemployed; work-first strategies neglecting social, cultural and personal/identity dimensions of labour market inclusion.*

**Identifying and supporting the actors who recognise the problems** and potentials, and an adequate approach (i.e. little resistance and drop out) **of young people** in disadvantaged neighbourhoods and of diverse cultures; they may succeed in winning legitimacy among young people, including those who distrust the public institutions.

*Distancing between disadvantaged young people and institutions; strong bureaucratisation of the institutions with regard to young people; lack of trust and legitimacy of public institutions in the eyes of young people which represent key obstacles to social inclusion.*

**Encouraging and supporting local projects specifically aiming at recognition, empowerment, trust, engagement, bridging, communing, and neighbourhood development** and linking them to larger scale programmes for providing opportunities in education and employment.

**Facilitating increased transnational learning** and transfer of knowledge through Erasmus+ by simplifying the application procedures for micro-organisations.

*The lack of support (from official programmes, services, etc.) for alternative employment pathways - a lack of alternative routes to assist young people in personal development and gaining access to training or self-employment.*

*Temporary or time-limited nature of functioning of both public- and NGO-led initiatives (financing and organization distributed on annual basis).*

**Cutting red tape in the legal provisions governing local grant competitions** for NGOs; long/mid-term contracting of services to private sector (for-profit, non-profit).

**Simplifying compliance and reporting requirements for EU funding instruments** such as ESF and EASI in order to make it easier for small-scale organisations working at the 'grass-roots' with the hard to reach to access financial support. Flat rate funding and easier frameworks could be recommended.

*Failure of locally provided public services to respond to the changing needs and problems of the young people. Rather, the provision of services conditioned on "adaptive, conforming, submissive behaviour" prevails.*

**Increasing use of knowledge alliances, also including young people**, when shaping policy and projects aiming to combat social exclusion.

*Although a number of policy measures connected to labour market, education and area development have been launched in some countries, few of these have incorporated young people in the discussion about causes and solutions to social exclusion.*

**The European Commission** could support more community-focused projects, long-term contracting to the private sector, NGOs working with young people in particular. It could simplify application and financing rules for grass roots initiatives, transnational learning programmes like Erasmus+; support more knowledge alliances of young people and public sector bodies and other forms of including young people into policy making. In fact, involvement of young people in designing programmes for them might be made mandatory for relevant ESF measures.

## References

Berger, P. 1963. *Invitation into sociology: A humanistic perspective*. Bantam: Doubleday Dell Publishing group Inc.

Güntner, S., Gehrke, A.-M., Seukwa, L.-H. 2014. *Local matters? Neighbourhoods and social infrastructure as spaces of reproducing, producing, mitigating or counteracting social inequalities in 10 European cities*. Citispyce Work Package 3 Fieldwork I: Final Comparative Report.

Hall, P. 1993. Policy Paradigms, Social Learning, and the State: The Case of Economic Policymaking in Britain. *Comparative Politics*, Vol. 25, No. 3 (Apr., 1993), pp. 275-296.

Hussain, A., Higson, H. 2014. WP4 *Comparative Report of "Fieldwork II"*. Citispyce.

Jubany, O., Güell, B. 2014. *Menu of Social Innovation Practices & Interim Workshop Report*. Citispyce.

Loedemel and Moreira. 2014. *Activation or Workfare? Governance and the Neo-Liberal Convergence*. USA: Oxford University Press.

Percy-Smith, J. (ed.). 2000. *Policy Responses to Social Exclusion: Towards Inclusion?* Open University Press, Buckingham, Philadelphia.

Spies, H. 2015. *Work Package 6 Comparative report. Social innovation in action*. Citispyce project.

Stigendal, M. 2013. *CAUSES OF INEQUALITY AFFECTING YOUNG PEOPLE IN 10 EUROPEAN CITIES*. Citispyce Baseline and comparative report.

Stigendal, M. 2015. *CAUSES OF INEQUALITY AND THE PROSPECTS OF COMBATTING THEM*. Citispyce report.

Streeck, W. And Thelen, K. 2005. *Beyond Continuity: Institutional Change in Advanced Political Economies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

## ANNEX I - Scheme: the clusters of the innovative practices

### POLICY AREA: EMPLOYMENT

#### 1. Top-down practices, highly formalised, in some cases inspired by bottom-up practices/models

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Integrated approach to employment of Roma</b>  <b>PILOT</b> (Sofia from Brno – Learning by working)	Transfer of know-how and practice from Brno; training and counselling to improve professional competencies; labour market orientation; matching with employers.	Over two thirds of the young Roma (under 30) in Bulgaria have never had a job; labour market discrimination, economic crisis, inadequate education and skills, social isolation, distrust and discouragement; very modest share of GDP spent for social protection (17.4%) and only 0.09% for ALMP.	Unemployed young Roma practically excluded from ALMP; discouraged and distrustful towards official institutions; ethnic discrimination on the labour market. Low level of education and competences; lack of skills to look and apply for a job and to communicate with employers.	Bring vocational training, professional orientation and employment counselling inside the deprived neighbourhoods; reducing unemployment among young Roma only possible if undertaken as an inseparable part of a comprehensive integrated strategy for overcoming the multiple inequalities; employers have to be stimulated to employ qualified young Roma.
<b>Learning by working (Brno)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Provision of training, improving professional competencies, labour market orientation, involvement of employers, matching, placing clients in subsidised jobs	Existing active labour market policy works with the same instruments - training, raising professional competencies, matching, subsidised workplaces. Poor capacity for case-work and for tailored programmes and services. Creaming-off effects documented. Some ESF projects provide better quality and targeting.	Poor access of excluded youth to standard instruments of ALMP - conditional offers, selectively provided information about opportunities	Raise the share of disadvantaged youth in the ALMP programmes and ESF projects, prepare ESF projects specifically supporting this target group; provide individualised treatment; address multiple barriers including labour demand side.

## 2. Top-down practices, highly formalised, incorporating bottom-up elements

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Youth Employment Agency (Hamburg)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Bundle services more effectively and efficiently. Create a one-stop-shop including approaching services.	Reorganisation of already existing services for ALMP. Erase double-structures, insufficient capacity for in-depth socio-educational counselling.	Many young people enter the transition system and have prolonged and unsustainable transition to adulthood/labour market	Low-threshold and in-depth socio-educational counselling missing in new services: but trustful and personal contact to counsellor and social worker is crucial for young people

## POLICY AREA: ENTREPRENEURSHIP

### 1. Bottom-up practices, originally rather informal, spontaneous, and later formalized

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>The Loft (Birmingham)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Providing physical, affordable, quality and immediate space in the city centre for young creatives / artists. Giving visibility and exposure for young people's work. Through establishing networks, this gave young people the opportunity to develop skills in exhibiting, curation and pitching for a commission. The Loft	Exclusionary tendencies of increasingly restrictive welfare regimes; Increasing conditions imposed on young people seeking support to access the labour market/training. This does not consider alternative and non-traditional pathways.	Lack of financial and emotional support off local community, city and economy. Lack of support from the local / city council - support in setting up their own practice to maintain individuality and their dreams in the arts and creative industries. The Loft identified wider and national issues relating to differences between the educational and career pathways of young creatives, versus young people schooled in more traditional vocations and degree pathways	To focus on case studies like The Loft to see how innovations from the pop-up addresses and supports alternative employment pathways and approaches (e.g. arts-based experiences) to assist young people in personal development, acquiring of social competences and skills, and increasing employability.

	<p>opened space for the young creatives to develop their own work with support sessions and weekly meetings where young people could show their current work / project and receive feedback from their peers.</p>		<p>(maths, English, sciences, law, etc.). The lack of support (from official services, etc.) for alternative employment pathways meant that there was a lack of alternative approaches (e.g. arts-based experiences) to assist young people in personal development and the acquisition of social competences and skills.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

**2. Mixed practices: implementation top-down but boosting bottom-up practices**

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<p><b>The Loft</b>  <b>PILOT</b> (Athens - Elefsina from Birmingham)</p>	<p>Provision of a space for young participants to meet; engaging young people in a meaningful and creative activity that can provide a productive 'way out', particularly to unemployed young people; training to enhance entrepreneurship; creation of communication channels through the implementation of consultation sessions in the effort to bridge the gap between young</p>	<p>Bottom up approach transferred from Birmingham, with the collaboration of the local government that provided space to host the meetings and supported the pilot activity. Although the municipality has a robust framework of social services and a cultural centre addressing to all citizens in the area, there were no such activities addressing to young people.</p>	<p>Gap in the communication between young people and local government, lack of a local policy targeting and motivating young people by enabling novel approaches.  Not enough opportunities for young people to pursue 'alternative' pathways to social integration (?)</p>	<p>Design and implementation of 'out of the box' initiatives at local level, targeting young people; adoption of a multifaceted approach to tackle existing problems. Encourage bottom up efforts towards the initiation of effective youth policies and social cohesion at local level where results and outcomes are more visible and promising.</p>

	people and local government.			
--	------------------------------	--	--	--

### 3. Top-down practices, more formalised, in some cases inspired by bottom-up practices/models

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>TOPEKO (Athens - Elefsina)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Provision of training and counselling; improving professional competencies; consulting aimed at employability and employment of beneficiaries; enhancing entrepreneurship; networking between beneficiaries, employers and public actors.	TOPEKO programs 'Local actions for vulnerable groups' is a state initiative that aims to address local needs focusing on social integration of vulnerable groups of people. It aims to mobilize local authorities in order to ensure the creation of jobs and professional training for vulnerable groups of people	Poor access of vulnerable groups of people in the labour market.	1. Better coordination at central/state level so that different actions and programs to be interrelated within the appropriate timeframe 2. Ongoing external evaluation (by an external evaluator) throughout the course of the project in order to suggest improvements at central level during implementation stage and prior to the end of the program.

### 4. Top-down practices, highly formalised, incorporating bottom-up elements

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Buzinezzclub (Rotterdam)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Personal coaching & group counselling focused on developing personal development and business plans Establishing networks within business communities; Long	Many well developed provisions and a intensive NEET-policy (outreaching) prior to economic crisis. From 2011 on heavy budget cuts on activation policies (-60% by 2015). Restructuring of provisions into a "landscape of provisions" with four main streams: back to school,	Financial agreement puts an incentive on municipality to send young people with 'heavier' problems than the Buzinezzclub is set up for.	Use intervention for intended target group (better targeting), develop longitudinal client monitoring (city-wide/youth counter).  Entrepreneurship is not an obtainable goal for most participants. Rather: 'entrepreneur of their own life' to be priority.

	term coaching from volunteers	preparation for return to school, into employment, care.  Contradiction between the emphasis on own motivation and the direction of young people, and top-down guiding them into pre-set routes.		
--	-------------------------------	--	--	--

## POLICY AREA: EDUCATION and DEVELOPMENT

### 1. Bottom-up practices, originally rather informal, spontaneous, later formalized

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Educational Demos (Barcelona)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Training on new technologies, literacy and expressivity skills, civil participation and engagement in socio-political issues, empowering young people	On the one hand, investment in basic youth policies (to the detriment of affirmative youth policies focused on peripheral aspects), prioritising youth emancipation and active participation. On the other hand, educational policies are also too focused on formal education.	On the one hand, basic youth policies are still deficient in tackling key needs related to the labour market, education or housing. In the field of education, non-institutional actors like NGOs are trying to fill in this gap. On the other hand, formal education does not acknowledge enough the role of non-formal education and it does not address the specific needs and problems of young people at risk of social exclusion, often related to family issues, or prepare them to continue education or access to labour market. Youth organisations try to fill in this gap through non-formal education programmes, but lack resources for a wider coverage.	More support to youth organisations providing non-formal education to youngsters at risk of social exclusion in order to increase their capabilities, self-confidence and engagement in society through activities where their experiences and skills become highly valued.

## 2. Mixed practices: implementation top-down but boosting bottom-up practices

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Amaro Records</b>  <b>PILOT</b> (Educational Demos from Barcelona to Brno)	<p>Providing opportunities to development and communing, self-expression. Learning and training in music making. Offers an alternative way to get ahead to those who are struggling to find employment with no success and might perceive music making as a valuable alternative to spend time and to possibly earn money.</p> <p>Making creative achievement transparent to the wider public.</p>	<p>There are large gaps in municipality services for young people: this concerns even very basic services like housing, education (formal, informal) employment services.</p> <p>Low opportunities for personal development. Specific services addressing their interests, communing and leisure/cultural activities are provided effectively by pro-Roma NGOs, however inefficient in accessibility and variety.</p> <p>These opportunities are very much needed considering lower efficacy of family support.</p>	<p>Young Roma do not have any other suitable place where they can record music, recording equipment is too expensive to buy. Lack of opportunities for personal development. Neglect to interests of young Roma and lack of trust between public administration and young Roma.</p> <p>Lack of resources for similar 'small projects', beyond the standardised educational pathways.</p>	<p>More support to NGOs in order they could develop similar 'small scale' initiatives which may increase personal development of young Roma, increase both their capabilities and self-confidence and engagement in society through activities where their experiences and skills become highly valued.</p>

## 3. Top-down practices, more formalised, in some cases inspired by bottom-up practices/models

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Free remedial tutoring (Krakow)</b>	<p>Provision of tutoring for young people with learning deficits</p> <p>- an education programme as well as a</p>	<p>Some similar programmes systematically introduced in elementary and lower-secondary schools (integration classes), underutilization of pupils competences and willingness to</p>	<p>Educational 'rat race' leaves behind those who are not able to pay for educational tutoring; systematic offer for excluded youth perceived as of low quality</p>	<p>Empowering local communities by introducing more open governance mechanisms; minimizing restrictions of providing public education by NGOs and parents' associations; approaching systematically the problem of balancing</p>

Fieldwork case study	values change programme	offer tutoring by most public schools	and stigmatizing; segregation of pupils by system of public education, leading to exacerbation of inequalities and of problems of pupils with learning deficits; low capabilities and incentives for public schools to develop integration class	district lower secondary schools and schools admitting on a merit basis; stronger benefits for public schools which conduct integration classes.
<b>Social and Health Centre (Sofia)</b> Fieldwork case study	Breaking the vicious circle of poverty and social isolation through educational support, life skills learning, professional orientation and employment support, family planning, health education, promotion of gender equality.	Socially and economically deprived neighbourhood with practically no social infrastructure. State institutions inefficient and/or disinterested to implement effective policies. NGOs trying to fill the gap, but there is a problem of sustainability and financing.	Poor access of excluded Roma youth to standard instruments of welfare state, distrust towards official institutions, very limited access to information and opportunities.	Bridging symbolic and spatial divides, creating trust and encouraging participation of excluded youth by establishing community centres that provide integrated and culturally tailored services inside the Roma neighbourhoods; Inclusion and active participation of well-trained and motivated young people from the community.

#### 4. Top-down practices, highly formalised, incorporating bottom-up elements

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Challenge Sports (Rotterdam)</b> Fieldwork case study	Sports for fostering a healthy life style, group training (behaviour, presentation & communication skills, intakes for schools, job application, resume-writing, etc.),	Many well developed provisions and an intensive NEET-policy (outreaching) prior to economic crisis. From 2011 on heavy budget cuts on activation policies (-60% by 2015). Restructuring of provisions into a "landscape of provisions" with four main streams: back to school,	Very diverse participants (broad target group), referral of young people by youth counter seems not very targeted, no longitudinal following of participants; limited opportunities for tailoring services.	Specify a more specific target group or more possibilities for individual support, longitudinal client monitoring.

	individual support (plans, debts).	preparation for return to school, into employment, care.	Contradiction between emphases on own motivation and direction of young people, and top-down guiding them into pre-set routes.	
<b>The New Opportunity (Rotterdam) PILOT</b> (own original project)	<p>Intensive (4-6 months) programme in day centre containing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• intake/introduction phase: motivation &amp; stabilisation (1 month)</li> <li>• transformation &amp; socialisation phase (1-4 months)</li> <li>• outflow/placement phase: finding and keeping a job or a place at school (1-3 months)</li> <li>• after care</li> </ul> <p>Multi-modular day programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cooking (breakfast and lunch), sports, culture.</li> <li>• education &amp; behavioural training</li> <li>• working on Personal Development Plan with personal coaching</li> <li>• individual assistance from social worker • job training.</li> </ul>	<p>Many well developed provisions and a intensive NEET-policy (outreaching) prior to economic crisis. From 2011 on heavy budget cuts on activation policies (-60% by 2015). Restructuring of provisions into a "landscape of provisions" with four main streams: back to school, preparation for return to school, into employment, care.</p> <p>Contradiction between emphases on own motivation and direction of young people, and top-down guiding them into pre-set routes.</p>	<p>Difficult to get participants into employment, difficult to show cost-effectiveness as returns are mostly outside benefits and employment (safety, crime reduction and less use of care services)</p>	<p>Investigate/show cost-effectiveness, develop employer-approach specific for this target group (individual job-hunting starting with young person, not with collecting vacancies).</p>

## POLICY AREA: RECOGNITION, EMPOWERMENT, TRUST, ENGAGEMENT, NEIGHBOURHOOD DEVELOPMENT

### 1. Bottom-up practices, originally rather informal, spontaneous, later formalized

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Beatfrees (Birmingham)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Based on a co-creation approach where young people are encouraged to develop skills, networks and personal competences within a supportive community of like-minded peers	Exclusionary tendencies of increasingly restrictive welfare regimes; labour market policies increasing conditionality of support to young unemployed; cutbacks in support services for young people;	Tendency of employment programmes/services to focus on the least disadvantaged; lack of signposting re: opportunities; distancing between disadvantaged yp and institutions; The lack of support (from official programmes, services, etc.) for alternative employment pathways means a lack of alternative routes to assist young people in personal development and gaining access to training or self-employment.	Simplify compliance and reporting requirements for EU funding instruments such as ESF and EASI in order to make it easier for small-scale organisations working at the 'grass-roots' with the hard to reach to access financial support. Simplify the compliance and reporting requirements for charitable associations working with young people furthest from the labour market. Facilitate increased transnational learning and transfer of knowledge through Erasmus+ by simplifying the application procedures for micro-organisations.
<b>Teatre Pa Tothom (Barcelona)</b>  Fieldwork case study	Allowing young people to express their needs and concerns, nourishment of critical thinking, encouragement of active political participation and citizenship, learning	On the one hand, investment in basic youth policies (to the detriment of affirmative youth policies focused on peripheric aspects), prioritising youth emancipation and active participation. On the other hand, educational policies are also too focused on formal education.	On the one hand, basic youth policies are still deficient in tackling key needs related to the labour market, education or housing. In the field of education, non-institutional actors like NGOs are trying to fill in this gap. On the other hand, formal education does not acknowledge enough the role of non-formal education and it does not address the specific needs and problems of young people at risk of	More support to youth organisations providing non-formal education to youngsters at risk of social exclusion in order to increase their capabilities, self-confidence and engagement in society through activities where their experiences and skills become highly valued.

	of their own and others' cultures.		social exclusion, often related to family issues, or prepare them to continue education or access to labour market. Youth organisations try to fill in this gap through non-formal education programmes, but lack resources for a wider coverage.	
<b>Cricket Club (Venice)</b>  Fieldwork case study	To create a self-managed Cricket team linked to all the other (formal and informal) social realities in the neighbourhoods.	Strong cut of the resources for the local welfare and commissioning of the City Council. At the same time, long tradition of citizens' committees and associations and bottom-up activism due to the strong sense of community and the tradition of strong engagement of the citizens towards the common good of Mestre and Marghera	Distrust of the local population towards immigrants and young people of immigrant origin. Distrust of the migrant population towards the native population initiatives. Self-segregations propensity of a part of the Bangladeshi community associations. Distrust of youth in institutions and strong bureaucratization of the institutions with respect to activities for young people.	Prepare ESF and/or local projects specifically supporting this practice/project from the material and economic point of view.

## 2. Mixed practices: implementation top-down but boosting bottom-up practices

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Beatfreeks</b>  <b>PILOT</b> (Venice from Birmingham)	To create a virtual and actual space where young people could express themselves, their skills and abilities; organizing (together with young people) an event where they can perform their	Strong cut of the resources for the local welfare and commissioning of the City Council. At the same time, long tradition of citizens' committees and associations and bottom-up activism due to the strong sense of community and the tradition of strong engagement of the	Distance between young people and local government/municipality. Distrust of youth in institutions and strong bureaucratization of the institutions with respect to activities for young people. Scarce information about opportunities for young people.	Generally, simplify the bureaucratic processes that provide access to public resources for young people

	skills, such as art, music, sport, theatre, photo.	citizens towards the common good of Mestre and Marghera.		
<b>Hidden Wings</b> <b>PILOT</b> (Beatfrecks - Krakow from Birmingham)	Provision of training, counselling, mentoring, building/improving competences, building intra and intergenerational networks	Public policies geared towards training competences are given stronger emphasis nowadays. Cooperation with NGOs in reaching public goals encouraged.	Still not enough exploitation of the possibility of cooperation between public authorities and NGOs vis a vis contracting services to the private sector. Failure of locally provided public services to respond to the changing needs and problems of the population. Provision of training/services conditioned on "good behaviour". Temporariness of functioning of both public- and NGO-led initiatives (financing and organization distributed on annual basis); low awareness and responsiveness of public authorities to local, sub-urban problems (also due to weak district authorities)	Introducing more community-based model of transferring cultural patterns may prove to be an interesting and effective idea; provision of more individualized treatment; cutting red tape in the legal provisions governing local grant competitions for NGOs; long/mid-term contracting of services to private sector; empowerment of district authorities
<b>Multisectoral cooperation (Malmo)</b> <b>PILOT</b> (own original project)	Involving actors from different societal sectors, also including young people from different parts of the city, in joint discussions about problems and solutions connected to social exclusion.  By doing this, young people are given influence where it means something, positive potentials of young	Young people in Malmö are facing multiple challenges. During the last decades, a number of policy measures connected to labour market, education and area development has been launched.	That the project is driven by an NGO (Save the children), has been a virtue in the development of the project. At the other hand, the structures that the project aims to change are in the hands of the municipal authorities.  Few or none of numerous measures have incorporated young people in the discussion about causes and solutions to social exclusion.	Increased use of knowledge alliances, also including young people, when forming policy and projects aiming to combat social exclusion.

	people are built on and different competences that young people have are taken care of.		There might be a challenge that an NGO constitutes the content of a project that is to be implemented by municipal actors.	
<b>Brightful (Malmo)</b> Fieldwork case study	Provision of coaching and organising workshops with different actors, like schools, trade and industry, NGOs. Discussions about equal opportunities, self-esteem, jobs and education.	There are organisations with similar aims - often inside a closed community based on religion or ethnicity. Brightful is open for all students in the school regardless.	Vulnerable as it is very person dependent. Small scaled (2 schools/areas) hard to monitor results and effects.	Support this kind of activities (like Brightful) with money, free travel inside the city, snacks at meetings and let the project continue its good work.

### 3. Top-down practices, more formalised, in some cases inspired by bottom-up practices/models

Practice	Mechanisms of change	Policy context	Policy failures and gaps	Recommendations
<b>Tours for refugees (Hamburg) PILOT</b> (original own project)	Interviewing target group and asses their needs and interests. Involve organisations and build network for access to activities. Touring with young refugees across city, bridging gaps.	Provision of access to the city and organisations.  Insufficient capacity of networks/organisations that offer access.	Many actors are willing to cooperate for network but sustainable framework and structural support are missing.  Insufficient capacity of networks/organisations that offer access.	Helpful if policy makers and large organisations would create frameworks which enable small initiatives (and target group) easy access and sustainable conditions for support.