

Paul Hamlyn
Foundation

Shared Ground Fund

Theory of Change

phf

About the authors

In May 2017, Paul Hamlyn Foundation appointed Sophie Ahmad and Shelley Dorrans as independent ‘Learning Partners’ to the Shared Ground Fund in order to produce an ongoing narrative and analysis about the operation of the Fund, and to support the Foundation to become a more informed, flexible and engaged funder. They have worked with us over the last eighteen months to help articulate our developing theory of change.

Sophie Ahmad works with organisations in the public and not for profit sectors to help them use evidence more effectively and to embed a learning culture. Before working independently, Sophie was Head of Research at OPM. She has also worked in academic publishing as a commissioning editor. Sophie is a qualified executive coach.

Shelley Dorrans is an independent researcher and evaluator. She has over 15 years’ experience of delivering projects across the public and voluntary sectors to support organisational decision making and change. Shelley previously held senior positions at research consultancies OPM and Blake Stevenson Ltd.

About this document

At Paul Hamlyn Foundation we are committed to continually improving our practice, so we can help the organisations we fund to have even greater, positive impact in their communities. In order to do this, it is really important that we regularly reflect on our approach and progress.

The Shared Ground Fund was established in 2015 to focus our funding in the areas of migration and integration. Paul Hamlyn Foundation has developed this theory of change to help reflect on, learn from, and improve work in these two interrelated fields. This document sets out the context for the Shared Ground Fund, the changes the Foundation hopes to see in the world, our view about how those changes might come about, the environmental factors that may affect this, and the specific contribution that the Foundation can make.

The Foundation will use this document to help review our work, with support from our recently appointed learning partner. This document will also be a stimulus for new and interesting conversations with our partners and we therefore hope it will support wider work and learning in the field.

Throughout this document, the Foundation sets out some of the major assumptions that underpin our approach.

This theory of change is a “live document” that will evolve over time as the Foundation learns more about the issues being tackled and our contribution to promoting change.

The importance of language is worth emphasising here. Recent media coverage has demonstrated how frequent use of the term “migrant” can be dehumanising – reducing a person’s identity to just one aspect of their current circumstances, or to a particular administrative status. Throughout this document we refer to “people who migrate”, recognising that we should describe individuals as people first, before referring to their experience of migration. At points, we talk about our “partners” as well as our “grantees”, reflecting the way in which this fund is operating to create common goals.

The Shared Ground Fund – An overview

Our vision

Staying safe

Young people who migrate can get support to address the barriers that affect their ability to thrive.

Living well together

Communities experiencing migration become stronger and more connected.

Our current themes and priorities

We are currently focused on the following **priorities**, which contribute to our four long-term objectives (above):

- Developing **inclusive cities** – supporting local leaders and coalitions of organisations to create tailored, holistic, place-based approaches to integration
- Increasing **provision of immigration advice** – creating and scaling new models of legal advice to resolve people’s status and prevent destitution
- Developing **pathways to settlement** – promoting simpler, shorter and more affordable routes to citizenship for children and young people who are born in the UK and who are long-resident here
- **Brexit and future immigration policy** – ensuring the settled status scheme is accessible to all and shaping a positive vision for immigration post-Brexit

We also have emerging clusters of work in the following areas:

- **Challenging the hostile environment** – taking action to end hostile environment policies that have proved to be unjust and ineffective
- **Immigration detention reform** – reducing the use of immigration detention and promoting more progressive alternatives
- **Labour rights and protection** – reducing the risk of exploitation among migrant workers and promoting integration through work.
- **Deepening collaboration and building new alliances** – as change requires us to pool insights and work together, within and beyond our sectors
- Supporting **leadership, especially of those with “lived experience”** – as change needs brave, skillful people who can inspire and support others
- **Communicating with and mobilising audiences beyond our “core base”** – as it is not enough to appeal just to those who already agree with us
- Taking action at the **appropriate geographical level** – as change requires action at national, regional and local level
- A **new approach to funding** – as change requires both more funders in this space, and deeper collaboration between them.

Our view of how change might come about

In our view, **achieving these long-term objectives and moving closer to our vision will require:**

- A **long-term commitment and a broad and flexible approach** – as the issues are unlikely to be solved quickly and the context is changing rapidly
- A focus on **systems change and learning** – as we need to make progress on many fronts and learn as we go, to achieve and sustain change
- **Deepening collaboration and building new alliances** – as change requires us to pool insights and work together, within and beyond our sectors
- Supporting **leadership, especially of those with “lived experience”** – as change needs brave, skillful people who can inspire and support others
- **Communicating with and mobilising audiences beyond our “core base”** – as it is not enough to appeal just to those who already agree with us
- Taking action at the **appropriate geographical level** – as change requires action at national, regional and local level
- A **new approach to funding** – as change requires both more funders in this space, and deeper collaboration between them.

The role we want to play

We feel **we are well placed to play the following roles in promoting positive change:**

- A **trusted partner and an “honest broker”** – bringing sector organisations and funders together, and extending links to the arts and youth sectors
- An **informed, but open-minded funder** – drawing on specialist expertise in migration to spot opportunities and add value to funded work
- A **champion of innovation and learning** – taking risks, supporting experimentation, and modelling a commitment to reflection and learning
- An **advocate for the involvement and leadership of those with “lived experience”** – using our funding and influence to encourage good practice.

The tools at our disposal

We have the following **tools at our disposal:**

- **Funding** – providing a flexible and bespoke mix of project, programme and core funds to specialist migration and integration organisations, funding “backbone” organisations in other parts of the voluntary sector, contributing to pooled funds where we share goals with other funders
- **“Grants-plus” support** – providing advice and support both from within the foundation and through sourcing external expertise to strengthen the organisations that we fund
- **Commissioning** – investing in research and evaluation, horizon-scans/think pieces, and development activities to address knowledge and skill gaps
- **Convening** – bringing our partners together to work on common agendas at our annual residential and thematic convenings.

The types of work we fund

We fund work that seeks to **achieve change in a variety of different ways**, and we actively **forge links between them** for maximum impact:

- **Services, advice and support** – high quality support that helps address barriers and prevent the harm and risks associated with insecure status
- **Service or system innovation** – development of new models of delivery to increase the quality, capacity and accessibility of services
- **Policy and research** – research and analysis to improve understanding of key issues and make the case for change in policy or legislation
- **Legal work and strategic litigation** – work that uses the law to achieve change through casework, test cases or judicial review
- **Leadership and activism** – support for established and emerging leaders, particularly those with lived experience
- **Community organising** – work that seeks to organise communities to challenge power structures and mobilise to achieve change
- **Alliance building and mobilisation** – building strategic alliances to take action on issues of mutual concern
- **Strategic communications** – supporting the communications capacity of the migration and integration sectors
- **The arts** – using the arts as a means for strategic communications and to reach new audiences.

The context for our work

The context for our work

The nature and scale of migration to the UK

The United Kingdom has been shaped by migration over many centuries. People have come here for a variety of reasons – to work, to study, to join family, and to flee persecution. They have built new lives for themselves and, in turn, have contributed greatly to society, culture and economic life. Our own founder, Paul Hamlyn, fled Nazi Germany with his family in 1933, and went on to build a hugely successful publishing business. The foundation he created in 1987 has supported many organisations to address inequality and lack of opportunity so that more people can realise their full potential.

Net migration to the UK increased substantially from 1997, driven by economic opportunities in an increasingly globalised economy, ties within migrant communities, the impact of specific migration policies, and EU expansion (Migration Observatory 2014). It reached +336,000 in the year ending March 2015, although more recent data for the year to September 2017 show the numbers have fallen to +244,000, as fewer EU citizens have been coming to the UK following the EU referendum (ONS 2018).

By the time of the last Census in 2011, 19.5% of people identified with an ethnic group other than White British (ONS 2011). More recent data show that one in seven of the usually resident population of the UK were born abroad, and one in 11 have non-British nationality. As the White British population continues to shrink and age, increases in these population groups have been driving an overall increase in the size of the UK population (ONS 2017). Figures suggest the UK is on course to become one of the most diverse countries in the world.

Since 1997, new arrivals have come from an increasingly wide range of countries. People from the Commonwealth (with historic ties to the UK as a result of its colonial past) have been joined by those from Central and Eastern Europe, Africa, the Far and Middle East, Latin America, and the countries of the former Soviet Union (IPPR 2014). Many people have settled in urban areas, in particular, London and the West Midlands. However, newcomers from Europe, especially from Eastern European countries, have been less likely to settle in these areas. Refugees have also been increasingly

dispersed around the UK. As a consequence, many places previously untouched by migration now host significant migrant communities, and some urban areas are now home to residents from many different countries, a phenomenon that has been termed “super-diversity” (Vertovec 2007). While many people have settled permanently, others continue to move between their country of origin, the UK, and other destinations in search of fresh opportunities (Finch et al 2009).

Methodological issues and a lack of data on who leaves the UK make it difficult to accurately determine the numbers of refugee and asylum seekers in the country. UNHCR figures from 2016 indicate that there were 117,176 refugees, 34,445 pending asylum cases, and 60 stateless people in the UK (UNHCR 2017).

By definition it is difficult to measure the scale of irregular or undocumented migration. The most recent research estimates that 618,000 irregular migrants were living in the UK at the end of 2007 (Gordon et al 2009). An estimated 120,000 of these people were aged under 18. Figures from 2016 suggest that 11,700 people are living in modern slavery in the UK (Global Slavery Index 2016).

Public attitudes to immigration

Across the country, many individuals and communities have worked hard to create a welcoming environment for newcomers. At national level, evidence suggests that racial prejudice has been declining (Ford 2014), especially among the young and in urban areas (Sabater and Finney 2014). Levels of interpersonal trust have also remained stable during the recent period of high immigration (Clery and Stockdale 2009). However, despite these positive trends, the backdrop is of increasingly vocal public concern about the pace and scale of immigration, linked to concerns about jobs, wages, pressures on public services and wider social change. Immigration has been described as a “crunch issue” for people who are unsettled by change, or feel their culture or identity is under threat (Pecorelli 2013). Much of this concern has been fuelled by the media. Reporting on migration has increased significantly since 2010, and coverage has very often (though not always) been hostile to more progressive policies (Migration Observatory 2016). Recent evidence suggests that 60% of people now

want to see immigration levels reduced (Ipsos Mori 2017). Concerns about immigration were highlighted in the polarised public debate and media coverage surrounding the EU referendum. In the run up to, and immediately following, the referendum there was an increase in racially-motivated hate crime. There has also been an increase in Islamophobia, linked to recent terrorist attacks in Europe⁰¹. Recent evidence suggests the leave vote was primarily driven by anti-immigration views, which in turn are driven by underlying viewpoints in which diversity is not valued (Ipsos Mori 2017). Since the vote, on both sides of the debate, we have seen the development of an increasingly antagonistic public discourse with the vilification of anyone holding opposing views now commonplace, especially on social media. While there is some recent evidence (from February 2015-October 2016) that, overall, people have come to hold more favourable views towards immigration over the past few years (with 44% now feeling that the impact on Britain has been positive - Ipsos Mori 2018), it is still unclear whether this is a unique moment post-Brexit - based on an assumption of the departure from the EU leading to more control of migration policy - or the beginning of a longer term trend.

It is important to note that public attitudes do not always correspond neatly with “reality”. For example, while polling indicates that the public’s greatest concern in relation to immigration is about crime (above concerns about jobs, taxes and culture), evidence suggests the proportion of migrants in a population is unrelated to both violent and property crime (Migration Observatory 2013). Some commentators have suggested that it is population churn and change, rather than immigration per se, which has created the greatest challenge at local level (IPPR 2014).

⁰¹ – There were 80,393 offences recorded by the police in 2016/17 in which one or more hate crime strands were deemed to be a motivating factor. This was an increase of 29% over 2015/16 figures. Of this total, 78% involved race hate crimes. Although improvements in police recording explains some of this increase, part of it is due to a genuine increase in hate crime, particularly around the time of the EU Referendum, and following the Westminster Bridge terrorist attack in March 2017. Data on racially or religiously aggravated offenses (which unlike hate crime figures are available monthly) reveal “a clear spike in hate crime” from the start of the referendum campaign on 15th April to a peak in July, following the vote. Although levels declined in August, they remained at a higher level than before the referendum. Source: Hate Crime, England and Wales, 2016/17, Statistical Bulletin 17/17, 17th October 2017, Home Office.

Government responses to migration

Successive governments have responded in different ways to rising public concern about immigration and its impacts. Following the riots in Oldham, Burnley and Bradford in 2001, the Labour Government of 1997-2010 pursued a “community cohesion” agenda, cutting ethnic and nationality-specific funding and support, and promoting ethnically-mixed services. While the intention was positive, the cohesion agenda was undermined in some communities by its association with the Prevent programme, and by its overly transactional, target-driven approach to promoting positive relationships between different communities (IPPR 2014).

In contrast, the Coalition and subsequent Conservative Governments have focused almost entirely on reducing overall immigration. Since 2010, immigration policy has been officially driven by a goal to reduce (legal) net migration to “the tens of thousands” (Migration Observatory, 2014). Changes to the Immigration Rules in 2012 have made settling permanently in the UK much more difficult, and the Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment of Offenders Act (LAPSO) 2012 took almost all immigration cases out of the scope of legal aid - though it is worth noting that following a successful Judicial Review, immigration cases for unaccompanied and separated children have been bought back into the scope of legal aid.

“Governments have introduced increasingly restrictive measures to align the housing, welfare, health, and legal aid systems to create a ‘hostile environment’, with the aim of discouraging people with irregular immigration status from coming to the UK and from staying here.”

Within this context, particular attention has been given to the issue of irregular migration, which is thought to be especially unpopular with the public. Governments have introduced increasingly restrictive measures to align housing, welfare, health, and legal aid systems in order to create a “hostile environment”, with the

aim of discouraging people with irregular immigration status from coming to and staying in the UK (CCLC 2013). These developments have been accelerated with the Immigration Acts of 2014 and 2016. The 2016 Act introduced immigration controls to obtain driving licenses, bank accounts and privately rented accommodation. This has led to racial discrimination. It has also drawn a whole host of new actors (often reluctantly) into the policing of the immigration system, and has led to confusion among those delivering support services about what they can and cannot do to support people under the law. However, some commentators have argued that there is a “lack of empirical evidence demonstrating that access to services plays a determinant role in attracting migrants to the UK” (CCLC, 2013) or that cutting off services and support necessarily encourages return. As the forced removal of everyone with irregular immigration status is “an impossible task” (Sigona and Hughes, 2012), this leaves a growing group of people living in the UK in an ever more vulnerable position.

The impact of government policy on refugee and migrant communities

Some newcomers have successfully navigated these changes, protected by secure jobs and strong support networks. However, the “hostile environment” has led to considerable hardship for many refugees, asylum seekers and some new migrants, as well as some EU and British ethnic minority citizens who have been wrongly caught up in it. Street homelessness surveys now indicate that over half of the homeless population are foreign nationals or asylum seekers. Rates of mental and physical health problems are high among these groups. While migrant labour force participation overall is very high, refugees and some other specific groups of newcomers face significant barriers in accessing the labour market, and in certain economic sectors, exploitation and underemployment are common. It is common for some groups of newcomers to be politically marginalised and underrepresented in leadership positions. Some groups may be more vulnerable to particular forms of domestic abuse and sexual exploitation; for example, women are more likely to be survivors of gender-based violence, and may also be less likely to report this to the police if their immigration status

is insecure. This is a particular problem for those entering the UK on “tied” visas, e.g. spousal and domestic worker visas (see the Kalayaan organisation for more details).

“Both adults and children have been affected by large increases in application fees over the past few years, as the Government works towards an entirely ‘self-financing’ immigration system.”

Children and young people have been affected particularly harshly by recent changes in government policy. Although refugee and migrant children currently have the same entitlements as citizen children to compulsory education under UK law through primary healthcare and rights set out in the 1989 and 2004 Children Acts, these entitlements have not always been upheld in practice (CCLC 2013). Children and young people with “irregular” status, especially those who are unaccompanied, are in a particularly precarious position. Many are extremely vulnerable and unable to keep themselves safe (Skehan et al 2017). Children need assistance to address their legal status, or to consider leaving the UK, but sources of good quality, specialist support are scarce, and mainstream organisations are not often well enough equipped to help. Children in the care of their local authority have not always received the support they need. Although there are some routes to regularise children’s status, the process can be very lengthy and expensive (Finch 2013). Both adults and children have been affected by large increases in application fees over the past few years, as the Government works towards an entirely “self-financing” immigration system. Children and young people are also frequently disadvantaged by incorrect age assessments, high income thresholds for family migration, and, for undocumented young people, being unable to access higher education.

As well as leading to hardship in the short term, these developments have made it more difficult for refugees and other newcomers to integrate successfully into UK life in the longer term.

A renewed focus on integration?

As research by the Runnymede Trust has pointed out, there has been a considerable lack of clarity about what is meant by integration, who it's for, the barriers to achieving it, who is responsible, and how best to promote it. Nationally this confusion has been evident (until very recently) in the lack of a proactive, coherent, English or UK-wide strategy on integration and inclusion (in contrast to the situation in Wales and Scotland where the devolved administrations have set out policy frameworks in this area).

Recent Government policy on integration has also focused overwhelmingly on BME groups and, within this, on Muslims (especially women who are not working and don't speak English). Other groups who have been "left behind", such as young black men, white working class young men, and Gypsy and Roma people, have often been sidelined, reinforcing the idea that the integration agenda is concerned with mitigating the harm associated with particular "problematic" groups, rather than one that benefits society as a whole. Policy has also tended to focus on the issues of spatial segregation and lack of social mixing, often ignoring the fact that BME areas may be themselves hugely (and successfully) diverse (Catney 2015), or that income inequality and deprivation are actually stronger predictors of poor social cohesion than ethnic diversity (Laurence and Heath 2008, Sturgis et al 2013, Demireva and Heath 2017), and that austerity has been undermining the spaces where social mixing takes place, such as libraries, children's centres, parks and youth services. Recent policy has also tended to present integration as a one-way street, giving insufficient attention to the discrimination and racism that many people who migrate experience, as well as the other significant social, economic, and political barriers that prevent them from participating fully in society.

Cuts in resources for English for Speakers of Other Language (ESOL) classes, and the scrapping of the Migration Impact Fund, have also been indicative of a much more "hands-off", devolved approach to integration, forcing local areas to manage with little direction or support from the centre (IPPR 2014). As the All Parliamentary Group on Social Integration commented in their recent report, there has been a "tangled division of responsibility for integration

policy between central government departments and agencies (which) has been compounded by the lack of an agreed view as to the role of local government in this policy area (APPG 2017). While some local authorities have continued to prioritise integration and cohesion while pioneering interesting new approaches, many have been hampered by lack of resources; quality, up-to-date data on population change; and skills in mediating and alleviating community tensions (IPPR 2014).

"Policy has also tended to focus on the issues of spatial segregation and lack of social mixing, often ignoring the fact that BME areas may be themselves hugely (and successfully) diverse, or that income inequality and deprivation are actually stronger predictors of poor social cohesion than ethnic diversity..."

In contrast to the rather confused and narrow approach to integration that has prevailed in Government until recently, research suggests integration happens across several different dimensions that are often interrelated. Ager and Strang's 2004 model (developed for refugees) suggests the following factors are required: markers and means (employment, housing, education, and health); social connections (social bridges, social bonds, and social links); facilitators (language and cultural knowledge, as well as safety and stability); and strong foundations (rights and citizenship). The Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe's 2012 Guidelines on Integration of Diverse Societies provide the following helpful definition of integration which reflects its multi-dimensional nature, describing it as a: "dynamic, multi-actor process of mutual engagement that facilitates effective participation by all members of a diverse society in the economic, political, social and cultural life, and fosters a shared and inclusive sense of belonging at national and local levels" (quoted in Broadhead 2017). Another helpful definition was set out in the recent GLA strategy on social integration, which defined this as: "the extent to which people positively interact and connect with

others who are different to themselves. It is determined by the level of equality between people, the nature of their relationships, and their degree of participation in the communities in which they live". (GLA 2017).

“The Organisation for Security and Cooperation provide the following helpful definition of integration, describing it as a: “dynamic, multi-actor process of mutual engagement that facilitates effective participation by all members of a diverse society in the economic, political, social and cultural life, and fosters a shared and inclusive sense of belonging at national and local levels.”

The GLA's new strategy reflects a more rounded conceptualisation of integration and focuses on four elements: relationships (promoting shared experiences at critical life stages and through the arts, culture and sport); participation (supporting active citizenship through volunteering, political education and citizenship ceremonies, and engagement of communities in the work of City Hall); equality (increasing employment rates for underrepresented BME groups, improving treatment of BME communities by the criminal justice system, supporting those with insecure status to access their legal rights to citizenship and residence, improving ESOL provision, overcoming digital exclusion, and increasing access to and use of green spaces); and evidence (improving London's evidence base to measure, evaluate, and share findings on the state of social integration).

In its recent Green Paper on Integrated Communities (MHCLG 2018), the Government outlines plans for a new national strategy for England. The Green Paper defines integrated communities as communities where people - whatever their background - live, work, learn and socialise together, based on shared rights, responsibilities and opportunities. However, it avoids reference to poverty, inequality, and the notion of civic participation. The Paper also continues to

emphasise issues of segregation (both residential and in schools), focuses heavily on the position of women from particular communities, and arguably places greater onus on newcomers to integrate rather than tackling the structural barriers that prevent integration. More positively - it includes commitments to a 'whole Government' approach. It also recognises the important role that local areas play in promoting integration, by announcing five new 'Integration Areas' that will work closely with Government to trial new approaches and share lessons with others.

The voluntary and community sector and its capacity to support refugees and migrants

The UK has one of the strongest and most active civil society sectors in the world, with many well-known humanitarian and human rights organisations established and based here, a talented pool of staff and volunteers, and strong networks. The migration sector benefits, in particular, from a group of highly skilled and committed immigration lawyers. However, research suggests that while the field of organisations supporting refugees and migrants in the UK is broad, it is also shallow. There are currently around 930 charities working with these groups, but less than one percent have a turnover of more than £1m, and less than 20 percent have a turnover above £100,000 (New Philanthropy Capital 2016). Many organisations operate only at local level and are focused purely on service delivery. There are few national organisations with a broader remit and the capacity and skills to communicate beyond their established base. Those that do exist are small compared to similar organisations in other fields, and are overwhelmingly focused on refugees, rather than other migrant groups. While there have been some successful campaigns on very specific issues in recent years, these structural factors have affected the sector's capacity to achieve a wider shift in policy or public attitudes, or protect hard won victories as seen with the re-emergence of the use of vouchers to support some asylum seekers after a successful campaign to restore cash support.

Organisations in the migration and integration sectors have continued to do their best to provide the support that is needed by newcomers and

in local communities. However, the sectors have never had secure or substantial funding, and have been hit hard by the reduction in government contracts and grants due to austerity and shifts in government policy. Many philanthropic funders have been reluctant to invest in this area, and those that are willing to do so are unable to make up for the shortfall in statutory funding. Research by our colleagues at Unbound Philanthropy suggests that most philanthropic funding comes from a small number of mostly generalist funders, who mainly focus on refugees. There is also considerable dispersal of this relatively modest funding, despite growing alignment and collaborative working among funders in the field. On occasion, there has been a focus by some funders on innovation, with less desire to fund established successful work.

“Organisations in the migration and integration sectors have continued to do their best to provide the support that is needed by newcomers and in local communities. However, the sectors have never had secure or substantial funding, and have been hit hard by the reduction in government contracts and grants due to austerity and shifts in government policy.”

In the face of increasing need and a decrease in funding, specialist support services have necessarily focused on those in the most severe and pressing need, but this has sometimes reinforced unhelpful public narratives about people who migrate as inherently “needy” or “lacking”, rather than individuals with assets, skills and plans for the future. While understandable, the sector’s tendency to focus on people from specific ethnic groups or nationalities - or with a particular immigration status - has led to further fragmentation. Specialist services have also struggled to formalise partnerships with mainstream services, which would facilitate a more strategic and joined up response to the extremely complex challenges relating to migration and integration. In part, this is due to a lack of knowledge and

understanding among mainstream statutory and voluntary services.

Despite this general picture, it is important to note that the sector looks quite different in the four nations. Scotland, for example, has a well-developed refugee sector, a national refugee integration strategy, a thriving philanthropic sector, greater statutory funding, and a more generous legal aid system. In contrast, the sector is less well developed and resourced in Wales and Northern Ireland (where organisations have traditionally focused largely on peace and reconciliation issues).

The so-called “refugee and migrant crisis” that has engulfed Europe since the Spring of 2015 has placed new and different stresses on support and advocacy groups, and has reinforced an unhelpful distinction between “deserving migrants” and “the rest” that fails to take account of the complex realities and capacities of people on the move. However, it has also led to the development of new refugee and migrant organisations, often driven by young people who are digitally savvy and pioneering new ways of doing things. Whilst our current exit from the EU has created a great deal more uncertainty for people coming to the UK, and for the migration and integration sectors, it also presents an opportunity to improve the existing system, as it becomes increasingly clear that continued immigration will be vital for the UK’s economic and political stability and success.

What is the
change we are
trying to achieve?

What is the change we are trying to achieve?

Our vision and objectives

We believe that migration is a normal part of life. It's a broad social phenomenon that affects people in different ways; it is a process, not an identity. We also believe in diverse societies. However, we believe that people are more likely to live well together if newcomers are welcomed, the impacts of population change are more actively managed, structural barriers to integration are addressed, and connections between communities are deepened.

We want to use our funding and our influence to help build greater "shared ground" between communities and a more socially just society, where everyone can participate, contribute, and reach their full potential. In particular, we want to see all young people, both those who have migrated to the UK and those who have always lived here (whatever their legal status), thrive and succeed in the UK.

Our Strategy, adopted in 2015, sets out a commitment to: "improve support for young people who migrate and strengthen integration so that communities can live well together". The Shared Ground Fund, created specifically for this purpose, has two overarching aims:

Staying Safe – young people who migrate can get help and support to address the barriers that affect their ability to achieve their potential and thrive

Living Well Together – communities experiencing migration become stronger and more connected

In relation to our second aim, living well together, our focus at PHF is on the successful integration of people who have migrated to the UK. However, we recognise the need to ensure that all groups, especially those who have been left behind (including people from the Gypsy and Roma communities, young black men, and young white working-class men, as well as new migrants), are supported to participate fully in society.

We recognise that achieving the change we want to see in the world will depend not just on our own efforts but on the work of many others. It will also be contingent on developments in the external environment. For our part, we believe it

will require significant and sustained action in four interlinked domains:

- (i) Migration system reform
- (ii) Access to support services
- (iii) Civic participation
- (iv) Public narratives and perceptions of migration and integration

(i) Migration system reform

Over the last two decades, migration policy has become highly centralised and too often enforced in a way that harms and criminalises those who migrate. We want to promote a more humane policy and legal framework that is based on the principles of fairness, accessibility, due process, efficiency, equality and respect for human rights. We also want to promote a framework that is shaped and informed by a wider range of voices, and better reflects the multi-dimensional nature of migration and the different ways in which it impacts on life in the UK. Our change goals include:

- **An increase in legal pathways for people to come to the UK, in order to reduce dangerous and irregular routes and help keep people safe**
- **An end to the use of hostile environment policies as a tool of immigration control**
- **The creation of simpler, quicker and more affordable routes to citizenship, including greater recognition of birthright citizenship for all children born in the UK, and a reduction in Home Office fees**
- **Reforms to the immigration and asylum determination system so that it delivers quicker, fairer and better-quality decisions**

- **Minimal use of immigration detention, including introduction of a time limit and community-based alternatives to detention**
- **A reduction in the institutional, regulatory and legal barriers to successful reunion of refugee and migrant families**
- **A greater role for other government departments in the formulation of immigration policy, and closer alignment with related policy areas, especially with integration policy at the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) and industrial policy at the Department of Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy (BEIS)**
- **A policy framework that is informed by the views of those with “lived experience” of migration.**

(ii) Access to support services

While changes to immigration policy have increased people’s need for support, cuts to legal aid and to local authority and civil society funding over the past decade have reduced their ability to access it. We need to ensure that the immediate needs of new arrivals are met, while at the same time ensuring that everyone who migrates has the longer-term help and support they need to settle, integrate, thrive and contribute to life in the UK. Our change goals include:

- **Increased provision of high-quality legal advice and wider support for those in crisis, regardless of immigration status**
- **Increased provision of high-quality legal advice for young people to gain citizenship through the birthright or long-term resident route**
- **Increased knowledge about rights and entitlements among people who migrate to ensure they can access crisis and longer-term support with housing, welfare, education, employment and healthcare that will protect their wellbeing and support their integration**
- **Increased protections in the workplace to prevent vulnerable workers from being exploited and improve conditions for all workers**
- **Increased collaboration between mainstream agencies and specialist organisations to deliver inclusive, asset-based services that meet the varying needs of people who have migrated, both newly arrived and settled**
- **Stronger local infrastructure that is better able to manage changing demographics and the “churn” created by more transient migration.**

(iii) Civic participation

To support integration, people who migrate must be able to participate in the formal and informal structures and processes that affect their lives and shape their communities. In addition to tackling barriers to integration, participation creates opportunities to build bridges between communities and challenge negative perceptions of people who migrate. Devolution is reducing the distance between civil society and those in positions of power, and it is creating new opportunities for influence, participation, mobilisation and leadership. Our change goals include:

- **The creation of a clear policy framework for integration that ensures and enables cross-governmental working at a national level, and the development of leadership and action plans at local and sub-regional levels**
- **The creation of institutions, services and places that are focused on welcoming newcomers**
- **Increased opportunities for those who migrate to influence the decisions, policies, structures and services that affect them and their communities (including through responding to consultations, voting, standing as candidates in elections, and taking up other positions of responsibility e.g. as school governors, charity trustees, or magistrates)**
- **A greater role for people with “lived experience” of migration in leading and shaping organisations within the specialist migration sector**
- **The development of a strong and effective youth-led movement that can genuinely influence the policies and practices that prevent young people who migrate from leading full lives in the UK**

-
- **Civil society organisations, statutory services and communities working together to support settlement, deepen connections between people, and alleviate tensions when they occur. This includes deeper connections across the migration sector and with the human rights and race equality sectors, among others.**

(iv) Public narratives and perceptions of migration and integration

Negative public narratives about migration and integration have now become normalised and entrenched, and we would like to see greater public support for migration. We believe that the way people talk about migration and integration, and the framing of the debate in public discourse is important, as it either expands or restricts the “space” in which new solutions can be developed. Our change goals include:

- **A broader range of voices and perspectives reflected in media debates about migration and integration**
- **More productive and balanced public narratives that acknowledge the social, cultural and economic value that newcomers offer to the UK, as well as the challenges associated with migration and integration**
- **A shift in public narratives away from a focus largely on new arrivals in crisis situations to encompass the full range of reasons why people migrate, from forced displacement to economic migration, and everything in-between**
- **A specialist sector that is better equipped to communicate its arguments powerfully to new as well as established audiences, and to contribute its ideas for system reform.**

How do we think
this change might
come about?

How do we think this change might come about?

A long-term commitment, and a broad and flexible approach

We know it is not going to be easy to achieve the change we want to see in the world. Our aims put us at odds with the current direction of policy-making in the UK, and there is not yet sufficient pressure for change or clear enough leadership around which support can coalesce. Shifts in UK politics and policy, developments in the UK and global economy, and other world events could either support our objectives or push them further out of reach (see next chapter for more details). It therefore seems likely that achieving change will require efforts over many years, perhaps over a generation.

“We know it is not going to be easy to achieve the change we want to see in the world. Our aims put us at odds with the current direction of policy-making in the UK, and there is not yet sufficient pressure for change or clear enough leadership around which support can coalesce.”

We advocate taking a broad view of migration and integration. As the issues we have outlined in this document impact on different groups at different times and in different locations, we do not think it is feasible or advisable to define target groups of interest too closely in advance. As the context is rapidly changing, we also think it will be challenging to definitively identify what “good” or “better” looks like in five or even two years’ time; instead what is required is a commitment to some key values and principles that will allow partners to act quickly and flexibly in response to evolving circumstances.

Our assumption is that as the context is constantly evolving, a broad, flexible, and responsive approach will be required rather than one that attempts to specify change goals or target groups too tightly in advance.

A focus on systems change and learning

We advocate taking a “systems” approach to thinking about the complex change task we and our partners are engaged in. Despite growing interest in such approaches, there is still a lack of clarity about what exactly is meant by a “system” and “systems change” (Abercrombie et al 2015). We understand a system to be “a configuration of interacting, interdependent parts that are connected through a web of relationships, forming a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts” (Holland 1998).

Taking a systems approach leads us to a focus on the framework of law and policy that shapes migration and integration, the policies and behaviours of key institutions, public attitudes and social and cultural norms (which both drive and are driven by the media and politics), and the decisions and actions of people who migrate themselves (as central actors in the system). If our aim is transformation, rather than amelioration of the system’s most negative impacts, such an approach suggests that we need to understand the interrelationships and interactions between these different dimensions. This includes understanding how our own actions, as parties committed to positive change, impact on the system and may, in some cases, inadvertently reinforce existing structures (Senge 1990).

In Shared Ground, we tend to favour a “soft” systems approach, which recognises that, as a social construct, the boundaries of the system we are interested in will be hard to define (Chapman 2004). Rather than attempting to map our system comprehensively and definitively - which is likely to be unrealistic given that it shifts constantly as new events unfold and new actors enter the space - such an approach suggests we regard it primarily as a learning tool, which helps us to make sense of the world through a process of enquiry.

The specialist migration and integration sectors are often so busy “fire-fighting” that they have little time to reflect on how the whole system operates, why this might be, and what types of action may spark, reinforce, or help sustain change. We believe a focus on systemic change and learning to be a vital part of successful attempts at change. (Later in this document, we explain how we put these ideas into practice in our own work.)

Our assumption is that adopting a systems approach sheds new and helpful light on our change goals and how they might be progressed. We also assume that as our system is so complex and rapidly changing, no one actor will have access to the whole truth about it. Understanding our system will necessarily involve ongoing engagement with a variety of perspectives on it.

Deepening collaboration and building new alliances

Adopting a systems approach leads us to emphasise the central role of collaboration in achieving positive change. Collaboration is vital in pooling insights about how the system currently operates, exchanging perspectives on potential leverage points, lining up the full range of talents, skills and resources behind shared goals, and drawing on the widest possible set of networks to increase influencing opportunities. It also provides an opportunity to build mutual support and resilience among organisations engaged in work that can be challenging and difficult.

“Collaboration is vital in pooling insights about how the system currently operates, exchanging perspectives on potential leverage points, lining up the full range of talents, skills and resources behind shared goals, and drawing on the widest possible set of networks to increase influencing opportunities.”

Given the scale of the challenges we are facing, however, action by the specialist migration and integration sectors is unlikely to be sufficient. In our view, much greater effort is now required to form broader alliances for change by forging links with progressive groups, institutions and campaigns that are outside of the specialist sector but share the principles and values of social justice, human rights and equality that underpin its work. These new partners might include mainstream voluntary

and community organisations, faith organisations, universities and think tanks, unions, and sympathetic allies within the private and public sectors.

We appreciate that it will be difficult to create and sustain broader coalitions for change, not least because views about migration and integration, even within the specialist sector, are hugely varied. However, while we may not yet have a common vision of what we are all working towards, we have seen a greater degree of clarity and consensus beginning to emerge in our own work over the past few years about some of the things our partners want to change. We think the time is right to build on this emergent consensus and encourage a wider range of partners to think together - and more boldly - about what a better system might look like, and the progressive principles that underpin this.

Our assumption is that forging closer links between efforts to protect the rights of asylum seekers, refugees and other people who migrate, and wider campaigns for social justice, equality and respect, will help to progress our change goals. We assume that the lives of the groups we are concerned with will be improved if these values are upheld for everyone.

Supporting leadership, especially of those with “lived experience” of migration

In the academic literature there is a great deal of debate about the type and style of leadership that is required to bring about systems change. Many commentators argue that a more “distributed” style of leadership is required that sets overall direction and expected culture and behaviours, but which gives far greater licence to those at the “front line” to use their initiative, and to experiment and learn. Others emphasise the continuing importance of more traditional, “top-down” approaches to leadership.

In Shared Ground, we acknowledge the particular power of certain individuals and institutions in promoting change in our sectors. We need to encourage these leaders, from civil society, politics, and the public and private sectors, to be brave enough to stand up and put forward a more balanced view of migration that opens up space for better quality debate. However, we also acknowledge the importance of encouraging leadership at all levels in the system, within communities and institutions at local, regional and national levels.

We feel particularly strongly that efforts designed to transform the migration and integration system need to involve and be led by those with “lived experience” of migration. For too long, policy-making and implementation have taken little account of their experiences, and the specialist support sector itself has also failed to take their involvement sufficiently seriously despite progress in promoting involvement in other parts of the voluntary sector. We believe that young people who have experienced migration have a particularly important role to play in leading change. We are keen to see the development of a strong and effective youth-led movement that can genuinely influence the policies and practices that prevent young people who migrate from leading full lives in the UK.

We assume that positive change will come about when people with lived experience are leading that change and their voices are at the forefront of public debate. We assume that if change processes are to be considered legitimate, and to benefit from the full range of perspectives, talents and skills available, individual organisations and sector collaborations need to recognise the assets of people who migrate and encourage and support their involvement and leadership at all levels.

Communicating with and mobilising audiences beyond the “core base”

In addition to drawing on support from our allies in other sectors, we need to appeal to a wider group within the general public. Polling and analysis suggests that public opinion is polarised by education, age, contact with people who have migrated, and location (urban or otherwise), with around a quarter of the population broadly supportive of immigration and diversity, and a quarter firmly hostile. This leaves a sizeable segment, often referred to as the “anxious middle”, who may have concerns about immigration, particularly regarding the pace of cultural change and economic security (Hope not Hate 2017), but who may be open to engaging with our arguments.

Recent polling suggests that young people hold much more progressive views about immigration (Hope not Hate 2017), and that the views of those who are “most open” to immigration are the most stable over time (Ipsos Mori 2017), findings that offer real hope for the future. However, both the Brexit

referendum result and recent debates about “fake news” - both here and in the US - reinforce the need to find new and more powerful ways of presenting our arguments if we want to broaden our base.

“Recent polling suggests that young people hold much more progressive views about immigration (Hope not Hate 2017), and that the views of those who are “most open” to immigration are the most stable over time (Ipsos Mori 2017), findings that offer real hope for the future.”

While acting on the basis of high quality, robust evidence is essential, we cannot disregard the fact that many people are now sourcing their information in completely new ways and are deeply distrustful of traditional “experts”. As a sector, we need to understand how to harness the power of alternative media, and how to wisely deploy emotion, as well as facts and evidence, in support of our objectives.

At PHF we believe the arts can have a particularly powerful, transformative effect in challenging the status quo and can help to “reframe” hostile and polarised debates about migration. By influencing emotions, connections, learning and values, the arts can help us appreciate other people’s perspectives, reduce bias, stimulate empathy and grow kindness (People United 2017). Research supported by our partner, Unbound Philanthropy, also suggests that popular culture can also be a powerful vehicle to promote social justice narratives to mainstream audiences (Sachrajda with Peach 2017). The campaign for LGBTQ rights in the UK and Ireland is a good example of where cultural shifts have played an important role in achieving wider change. While the research warns that there can be challenges in generating creative content that is catalysed by a cause (rather than artistic merit or commercial viability), it suggests popular culture can support positive change via: representation (depictions of different groups that build tolerance and understanding); authenticity (boosting credible, authentic voices who are willing

to speak out in support of social justice issues); normalisation (ensuring messages become ingrained and embedded in the social realm); narrative (use of stories that offer opportunities to educate and empathise); novelty (generating material that feels fresh and appeals to trendsetters); and relationships (building sustained partnerships between creatives and organisations working to promote social change).

As highlighted at the start of this document, we also need to recognise the power and importance of the language we use in strategic communications. Terms such as “integration” and “cohesion” can mean different things to different people, and they can feel “cold” or overly academic. Excessive use of the term “migrant” can be dehumanising. Referring to “migrant communities” can imply that communities are homogenous, and that all people from the same country of origin will necessarily identify with others from the same background (when belonging is, in reality, much more complex and nuanced). In deploying language and making our arguments to a wider set of audiences, we also need to avoid making unhelpful distinctions between “good” and “bad” migrants; the reality of people’s lives, and the factors which compel people to move, are much more complex than this.

Our assumption is that it is possible to build public support for communities that are welcoming to all and where everyone can thrive, and to develop an immigration system that treats people fairly and with dignity and respect while commanding public confidence and consent. We assume that doing so will require efforts to find new and more compelling ways of expressing our goals that are meaningful to the general public and to partners beyond our specialist sectors.

Taking action at both the national and local level

Immigration policy in the UK is highly centralised and, until recently, it seemed that opportunities for significant change at national level were very limited. The recent Windrush scandal and a legislative reset moment after Brexit appear to offer new opportunities for influencing at national level, and together with our partners in the sector we are reflecting on how to capitalise on this moment to further our shared change goals.

However, with a government that continues to be committed to reducing net migration to the tens of thousands, it seems inadvisable for the sector to focus on national influencing strategies alone. We believe there is great potential in exploring how positive change can be supported at local and sub-regional level, particularly in urban areas, where increasing proportions of the UK population now live, where newcomers overwhelmingly tend to settle, and where attitudes to migration tend to be more positive.

Local areas have powers over aspects of policy that have important implications for integration, such as skills, employment, housing and planning, community safety, economic development and regeneration. They have also, since the Lyons Review, had a broader role in “place-shaping” – making “creative use of powers and influence to promote the general wellbeing of a community and its citizens”, including by helping to shape local identity (Lyons 2007). The research that originally informed our Fund suggested that there is potential to forge new identities connected to place and built around a shared commitment to preserve “public things” of value – institutions and services that the public cherishes. These are likely to look different in different places but could include the public realm of town centres and parks, libraries and institutions such as schools and the NHS (IPPR 2014).

We have seen in London how the Mayor’s leadership has been critical in developing a more positive public debate about immigration. The recent appointment of a Deputy Mayor with a focus on social integration, social mobility and community engagement, and the release of the new GLA social integration strategy, are designed to ensure that City Hall’s work across a number of policy areas supports this agenda. As highlighted above, the new Green Paper on Integrated Communities also recognises the central importance of local action.

Internationally, there has been increasing interest in place- and city-based working with, for example, the Intercultural Cities programme in Europe, and the Welcoming America programme in the US. We believe there is much that the UK could learn from the experience of cities that have participated in these and other similar programmes. A review of experience to date, commissioned to support our own cities programme, highlights some of the critical ingredients

of such initiatives including: providing welcome and civic orientation activities; promoting access to services and equal opportunities; developing skills in mediation and conflict resolution; developing inclusive city narratives; capitalising on the moment of citizenship as an opportunity to encourage a sense of belonging; harnessing the power of business to support inclusive employment practices and entrepreneurship; investing in ESOL that supports social contact and civic orientation as well as high quality language tuition; supporting intercultural spaces; and investing in data and evidence (Broadhead 2017).

The introduction of the new Metro Mayors offers opportunities to build on such initiatives in major urban areas outside London, especially where local populations hold more progressive views. Devolution deals create opportunities to harness the further education, skills and employment agendas to provide more welcoming environments for newcomers. New thinking in relation to industrial strategy also creates opportunities to frame the newcomer population as an asset that will help drive more inclusive growth, not just a problem to be managed.

Our assumption is that, with support from local leaders, there are opportunities to build local movements for change, supported by new collaborations of organisations working together, across sectors, in support of common goals. As a “microcosm” for change, city and sub-regional level working also offers an opportunity to explore how interconnected strands of work (on service delivery, campaigning, advocacy and public narratives) come together and reinforce each other.

A new approach to funding

Finally, we think that funders have an important role to play in creating change, by encouraging learning and collaboration, creating a space for the organisations they fund to stand back from their day-to-day work and consider how they can act more strategically, and by sharing intelligence, and pooling and aligning their funds where appropriate.

The campaign for equal marriage in the US has shown the difference funder collaboratives can make by supporting movement leaders to come together

and commit to shared change goals (Wolfson 2015), and by building collective knowledge through convening, amplifying impact through coordination of activity and spend, and encouraging a focus on learning and evaluation (Vega 2015).

“We think that funders have an important role to play in creating change, by encouraging learning and collaboration, creating a space for the organisations they fund to stand back from their day-to-day work and consider how they can act more strategically, and by sharing intelligence, and pooling and aligning their funds where appropriate.”

In the future, it is our sense that funders will need to find new ways to work that maintain accountability and sound stewardship of funds while allowing them to act more swiftly and flexibly in response to emerging events. An approach in which strategy is formed once every three years and is then implemented as planned is unlikely to work in an era of constant and rapid change (Mintzberg 1994). Funders may need to ensure that they build in sufficient challenge to avoid the risks of “group think” that can set in when like-minded people and organisations work together for extended periods of time. In addition, they may need to explore new ways of evidencing their impact, as it seems likely it will become increasingly difficult to isolate the distinct contribution of each funder to change initiatives as collaboration deepens.

Our assumption is that, as well as having more funders active in this space, deeper funder collaboration will improve the prospects of positive change. We also assume that the potential risks associated with partnership working between funders - for example additional bureaucracy, slow decision-making, and “group think” - can be minimised with sufficient care and attention.

What contextual factors might affect this change?

What contextual factors might affect this change?

The coming years are likely to be defined by continuing instability and uncertainty. Developments in politics, law and policy, the economy, society, and technology will impact on the situation for people who migrate and the ability of the Foundation and partners to meet shared change goals. It seems likely that the most significant developments will relate to the UK's decision to leave the European Union.

Politics

In politics, the EU referendum in 2016 and the general elections of 2015 and 2017 produced results that were unexpected by many. In the two elections, the long-term trend of fragmentation, in which support for the two main parties was declining, was reversed. Developments in world and domestic politics have spurred new interest in politics, especially among the young.

Migration has become one of the most salient issues in a political environment that is increasingly polarised. However, with the current hung parliament, the space for backbenchers and the Lords to exert their influence is greater than it has been for some time.

Law and policy

Developments in law and public policy continue to be dominated by Brexit, with the transfer of European law into British law occupying almost the entire legislative agenda.

Recent Government announcements suggest that EU citizens who arrive before the end of the transition period (31 December 2020) will be able to apply for settled status, as will their family members. The Government's proposed registration system also aims to be straightforward for applicants. However, there are concerns that capacity gaps in the advice sector will mean some people (such as children, the elderly, low income groups, those that are poorly educated and people who do not speak English well) will be left unsupported. There are also concerns about the capacity of the Home Office to process the 3.8 million applications likely to be received, which could lead to an increase in irregular status.

The features of a post-Brexit immigration system are likely to be considered in a White Paper, whose publication date is unknown, but will likely follow the publication of the Migration Advisory Committee

on Economic Migration's (the "MAC") report in September 2018. Previously asked to focus on a narrow set of issues, the MAC is now likely to consider post-Brexit immigration policy as a whole. Other developments, including the Legal Aid Review (report due Summer 2018), the second independent review into the welfare in detention of vulnerable persons (by Stephen Shaw published in July 2018) and the Law Commission Review of Immigration Rules (report due Autumn 2018), are likely to have important implications for the change goals we are working towards.

The economy

Brexit also brings with it considerable economic uncertainty, coming off the back of years of stagnant productivity gains.

Although employment rates in the UK are currently high, wage growth remains low for the majority of people. The UK continues to have a very high level of inequality compared to other developed countries as noted by The Equality Trust.

Major changes to the economy, especially to low income sectors, are also on the horizon, with possible increases in the number of people working in the "gig economy", the rise of automation, increases in employer costs (e.g. with an uprating in the National Living Wage), and a reduction in skilled and unskilled labour from the EU. These developments are likely to affect living conditions for people who have migrated to the UK. They will also shape attitudes to these groups among the wider population, who will be affected too.

Social life and attitudes

In terms of social life and attitudes, it seems likely that the trend over the past ten years towards more liberal attitudes to race, gender, disability and LGBTQ issues will continue. As highlighted earlier, research

suggests young people hold generally more liberal views (British Social Attitudes 34 2017).

There is some recent evidence (from February 2015-October 2016) that, overall, people have come to hold more favourable views towards immigration over the past few years, with 44% now feeling that the impact on Britain has been positive (Ipsos Mori 2018). Recent media coverage of the problems experienced by some of the Windrush generation may succeed in generating support for wider groups of people affected by the “hostile environment” policy. However, attempts to build solidarity in a society marked by high rates of income inequality are likely to prove challenging, and will not be helped by narratives about “deserving” and “undeserving” groups of migrants, which still dominate public debate.

As the population continues to age, there are increasing concerns about how the costs of social care will be met, as well as the implications for the labour market, particularly in parts of the UK with a declining working-age population.

Issues of inter-generational equity continue to be raised by an increasingly assertive “Millennial” generation, who feel their life chances have been affected by poor decisions made by preceding generations.

Technology and media

We are likely to see continuing fragmentation of media institutions, as technological developments continue apace. These changes are having important implications for how voluntary and community sector organisations campaign, advocate and mobilise to achieve change.

Young people using social media have been at the forefront of social movements to raise awareness of gender equality, such as #MeToo and #TimesUp. These campaigns, and others like them, are likely to have important implications for charities’ internal policies and procedures (for example relating to safeguarding and whistle-blowing), as well as how funders assess applications and support organisations.

Recent legal changes around the safeguarding of personal data are also likely to have a significant impact on how charities operate.

Civil society

Despite recovery to pre-recession funding levels for larger charities (NCVO Almanac 2018), austerity has hit the voluntary sector hard and continues to have an impact, particularly on the smaller organisations that generally make up the migration sector.

The funding and financing environment that supports the work of the voluntary and community sector has also changed significantly in recent times. For example, charities’ income from government in the form of grants has declined, whilst contract income has increased. Resources for advocacy, collaboration, business development and other core functions have become increasingly scarce, yet these are critical to a thriving civil society. At the same time, the Lobbying Act has had an adverse impact on the sector’s voice and confidence to campaign.

A further risk comes from the regular, and sometimes substantial, change in strategy at many of the mostly large, generalist funders that invest in migration. This can put the funding for refugee and migration issues under immediate threat, or subsume it under broader funding themes where it may be under threat in future, as priorities change. Among the smaller number of funders that have specialist staff or dedicated funding streams, a continued focus on migration can be dependent on individual staff championing the issue internally. It is therefore reliant on them not moving on.

What role should
we play and what
tools are at our
disposal?

What role should we play and what tools are at our disposal?

We recognise that our change goals are ambitious. As we have stated above, achieving them will require action by many different parties, acting both independently and in partnership. We know that our own efforts at PHF will only ever be a small part of this overall picture. With a limited amount of financial resource and staff time, we also know that we need to focus our efforts. We aspire to be:

A trusted partner and an “honest broker”

In Shared Ground, we want to be a trusted partner to the migration and integration sectors. We believe we are in a position to act as an “honest broker”, bringing civil society organisations and funders together to explore common agendas and pursue shared goals. We know this brokerage role can sometimes be hard for sector organisations to play themselves, since relationships are inevitably shaped by a degree of competition as well as a desire to collaborate. We want to help create the space for more creative, productive conversations that lead to new solutions. We also want to help build a sense of solidarity and support among our partners. The annual residential we host for the organisations we fund and our key partners is unique in the migration and integration sectors in the UK and Europe, and an important example of how we bring people together to help build more effective and resilient coalitions for change. Our membership of various funder and sector networks - including ones focused on undocumented children and young people and on supporting EU citizens post-Brexit - is another example of the way in which we share insights, encourage collaboration and contribute to the work of our partners and other funders.

“We want to help create the space for more creative, productive conversations that lead to new solutions.”

Our position as a major funder of the arts, and of work with young people more generally, means we are well placed to help extend coalitions beyond the specialist migration and integration sectors. Through individual introductions, seminars and other events and meetings, we help to foster new connections between specialist organisations

and mainstream voluntary and community organisations, research organisations, and other partners. Over time, we hope this will help create a stronger, more diverse, and more stable eco-system of organisations interested in and committed to these issues.

Our assumption is that the inevitable power dynamics involved in funder-grantee relationships can be managed sufficiently well that they do not impede us from taking on this “honest broker” role. We also assume that PHF’s reputation and wider networks mean we are well placed to help forge new alliances and generate support for our change goals among a broader constituency.

An informed and open-minded funder

In all our work, we strive to be proactive; instigating new initiatives where we feel there is an important gap or need that is not currently being met. Within the Foundation, the Shared Ground team’s specialist skills and knowledge in migration and integration allow us to spot emerging issues and take early action.

This Theory of Change sets out our current sense of what needs to change, and the approach we will take to encouraging this. However, we appreciate that the issues we are working on are complex and multi-faceted, and our view of the world is necessarily limited. We are committed to continually refreshing our understanding through dialogue with our partners and people with direct experience of migration, challenge from our colleagues at PHF and our learning partner, and invitations to others to come to us with their own ideas and challenge our thinking.

Our assumption is that our team’s insights into issues of migration and integration allows us to spot opportunities more quickly and make

a stronger contribution to the quality of funded work. At the same time, we assume that the way we work builds in sufficient opportunities for challenge, so that our ideas are constantly re-evaluated.

A supporter of innovation and learning

As an independent foundation, we are in a privileged position to be able to fund some of the more challenging, sensitive and risky work that is critically important, but which might not otherwise attract wide support. Our commitment to supporting children and young people who are undocumented and our work exploring alternatives to detention are good examples of this.

“As an independent foundation, we are in a privileged position to be able to fund some of the more challenging, sensitive and risky work that is critically important, but which might not otherwise attract wide support.”

Austerity and a rapidly changing context mean we need to experiment and innovate. We want to be bold in our approach and promote the development of novel and more effective ways of doing things. However, we are not interested in innovation for the sake of it. We know there are some things that already work; they just haven't attracted sufficient support to grow or be sustained, or they need further testing to adapt them to new contexts. As well as helping to develop new models, we want to help scale initiatives and spread good practice.

We are committed to monitoring and evaluating the impact of our work. We fund external evaluations where we feel a new project or initiative may generate learning of particularly wide applicability to our Fund or the sectors in which we work. We also provide a range of support to help the organisations we fund to evaluate their own work. For example, all Explore and Test grants at PHF are able to access some

external consultancy time to help them identify the best way to evaluate their work. At Fund level, we have recently appointed a learning partner to help us review how we operate and the difference this is making. We know that change is not always linear, and we are committed to finding ways to capture the unexpected and to review things retrospectively, when they can sometimes look quite different.

Our assumption is that the issues we are working on are so complex and fast moving that adopting a learning approach is essential, and that by modeling good practice in this respect we can inspire and support our partners to do the same.

An advocate for the involvement and leadership of people with “lived experience”

In all our work, we are committed to promoting the assets and capabilities of people with “lived experience” of migration, especially young people, as the group most affected by the current system and with the greatest potential to help transform it. We are determined to use our resources and our influence to promote good practice in involvement, and to encourage the next generation of leaders from migrant communities to step forward.

We think a range of interventions are needed to create pathways for leadership in the sector's operations, campaigns and governance. We feel we can make a contribution by considering support for those that work at the front line of service delivery as a component of our grant making, strengthening the infrastructure within which new leaders operate by providing core funding where possible, and creating space for learning and reflection for new and established leaders through retreats, action-learning, and training opportunities.

Our assumption is that we can use our power, influence and resources as a funder to support the next generation of leaders from migrant communities, and to promote good practice in involvement. We assume that this will be regarded as a legitimate and helpful intervention by our partners.

Funding – a flexible and bespoke approach

We strive to be as flexible as possible in our approach to funding, using our resources to help strengthen the financial health and longer-term strategic capability of the organisations we work with. While our preference is for core or programme funding, we recognise that smaller, project-focused funding can be valuable in testing and demonstrating the effectiveness of a particular approach and in leveraging further resource.

As well as funding organisations in the specialist migration and integration sectors that meet our criteria, we invest in “backbone” organisations. These are often larger, mainstream organisations in the wider voluntary sector eco-system, that are well placed to partner with and offer support to specialist organisations that may be smaller and more fragile.

In addition to directly funding work ourselves, we contribute to a number of pooled funds, where we share goals with other funders. We may also fund sector bodies to distribute resources to other organisations. While we may have less of a direct say in how funds are allocated under these models, they offer the potential to amplify the impact of work by increasing the pool of available funds, bringing new skills and insights to the grant-making process, and extending networks and relationships to ensure that those receiving funds are not just the “usual suspects”.

We are clear that our funding cannot fill the gap left by the withdrawal of statutory funding.

Our assumption is that a bespoke and flexible approach to funding will help ensure the success of individual projects and programmes, while also contributing to the longer-term financial health and sustainability of the organisations we support. We also assume that deploying a range of grant-making models will enable us to amplify the impact of our work and extend its reach.

Making the most of our resources

We seek to be an engaged funder. We know that non-monetary assistance in the shape of expertise, influence, sharing practice or brokering relationships with others can, where appropriate, provide additional value to our funding relationships. Although more time and resource intensive, we believe that this “engaged” style of funding offers the best chance for organisations’ work to succeed and have a positive impact (Cairns and Buckley 2012). It allows us to get to know an organisation properly and, alongside funds, offer the right kind of tailored support to help them be successful. Working in this way also maximises opportunities for us, and our partners, to learn from the work we fund.

“We seek to be an engaged funder. We know that non-monetary assistance in the shape of expertise, influence, sharing practice or brokering relationships with others can, where appropriate, provide additional value to our funding relationships.”

Our Explore and Test grants are one route for us to develop new relationships with organisations that we don’t currently know well. We anticipate that in some cases that these relationships will evolve and deepen over time.

The kinds of “grants-plus” support we currently offer to organisations includes: advice or problem-solving support from our Shared Ground team, e.g. on strategy, fundraising, monitoring and evaluation, governance, or recruitment; brokering relationships with potential partners and professional advisors; and participation in our annual residential and other seminars and convened meetings. We are always keen to hear suggestions from our partners about other types of support they would find useful.

We recognise that trying to do new things is difficult and funded work will not always turn out as anticipated. While mindful of the typical dynamics involved in funding relationships, we are committed to creating

supportive, honest and open relationships in which challenges and failures as well as opportunities and successes can be embraced as opportunities to learn.

Our assumption is that the “grants-plus” relationship is experienced as helpful rather than another burden on the organisations we fund. We assume this helps to ensure the success of each individual project or programme we fund, makes a contribution to the health and sustainability of the organisations we support, and helps us and our partners understand more about how to achieve our shared change goals.

Commissioning – using our insights and resources to address knowledge and skill gaps

Through our commissioning activities, we aim to address important gaps in evidence and knowledge about migration and integration and to support the organisations we fund, and our funder partners, to use evidence and marshal arguments more effectively in support of change.

We are mindful of the risks of creating an “echo chamber”, whereby the same evidence and “accepted truths” get recycled and remain unchallenged, time and time again. We aim to improve the quality of evidence in this area by working with some of the country’s leading research units and agencies. We invest in research and evaluation, horizon-scans and think pieces, and in various leadership development activities (see above) to try to ensure practice in the sector benefits from cutting-edge thinking and up-to-date evidence.

We recognise that some organisations in the specialist migration and integration sectors are highly skilled at carrying out research, and already play a very important role in building the evidence base. However, we know that many organisations - especially those that are smaller and focused on front-line service delivery - are under so much pressure that they have limited time to engage with new evidence and consider the implications for their work.

Our assumption is that, as informed funders who work closely with our partners, we are well placed to identify knowledge and skill gaps and find

appropriate ways of addressing them, drawing on our networks in the policy and academic research and consultancy communities.

Convening – bringing our partners together to address common agendas

We pursue a range of different approaches to working with the organisations we fund, including through bilateral relationships, hosting and facilitating cohorts of organisations to work together where they have an obvious shared agenda, and supporting organisations in a particular locality to develop their own “place-based” solutions. The most appropriate approach will depend on the particular set of issues we are tackling.

In some of our priority areas (see next chapter), we convene groups of organisations ourselves. In other cases, we fund independent “learning partners” to do so, or we support sector bodies to play this convening role themselves.

We recognise that our partners are already part of numerous other sector networks and we try to add value to these, rather than duplicating conversations that are already happening elsewhere.

Our assumption is that providing opportunities for our partners to come together builds trust between organisations, adds value to their individual work and helps identify and progress shared agendas. We assume that the way we pick issues on which to convene, and our approach to convening, supports and adds values to existing sector networks.

The types of work we fund – a broad, diverse and interconnected portfolio

We believe it is important for us to invest in different types of work on different topics. This is because the system in which we operate is complex and constantly changing, and it is difficult to predict in advance where the spark for change will come from. We also need to keep the pressure up at various points across our “system” if progress is to be scaled and sustained.

It is important to us to support both direct work with individuals and communities, and work designed to influence policy, the law and public opinion. While we are aiming, ultimately, for systemic change, we feel we have a moral imperative to respond to pressing human needs. Our direct work also lends legitimacy to and helps inform our wider work.

Across our portfolio, we currently fund the following types of work:

- **Services, advice and support** – high quality support that helps people overcome barriers and prevent the harm and risks associated with insecure status
- **Service or system innovation** – new models of delivery and evidence on effectiveness that can increase the quality, capacity and accessibility of services
- **Policy or research** – research and analysis to improve understanding of key issues and make the case for change in policy or legislation
- **Legal work and strategic litigation** – use of the law to achieve change through casework, test cases or judicial review
- **Leadership and activism** – support for established and emerging leaders - particularly those with “lived experience” - to play a more effective role in social change
- **Community organising** – support for communities to challenge power structures and organise to achieve change
- **Alliance building and mobilisation** – building strategic alliances to take action on issues at local, regional and national level
- **Strategic communications** – work that supports the communications capacity of the migration and integration sectors and helps to frame messages to reach new and broader audiences
- **The arts** – work that uses the arts as a vehicle for strategic communications and social change.

We think these different strands of work need to inform each other to be impactful. At times we fund individual organisations to do more than one type of work, so these links can be made within the same organisation. In other cases, we support organisations to work together across organisational boundaries to create linkages and synergies between different types of work.

As well as funding work that deploys a range of different change mechanisms, we fund work on a range of substantive topics or themes. In line with the principles outlined in this document, and as an open grants programme, we try not to specify these topics too closely in advance. However, inevitably some thematic clusters have begun to emerge over time. Some of these we are now proactively pursuing as priorities. (See the next chapter for more details).

We are clear that there are some topics that are highly relevant to our change goals, but where we are unlikely to develop clusters of work because other funders are already doing excellent work, and/or we lack the specialist skills to do this well. Work on human trafficking would be one such example.

“Our assumption is that funding a diverse range of interconnected work will have a greater overall impact than a more targeted approach that focuses on just one strand or another.”

Our assumption is that funding a diverse range of interconnected work will have a greater overall impact than a more targeted approach that focuses on just one strand or another. We also assume that our efforts to make connections between different types of work add value to, rather than over-complicate, individual projects and programmes. As a team that is informed by our regular engagement with our partners, we assume we have correctly identified the most appropriate priority areas to focus on.

Our current priorities

Our current priorities

The change goals outlined in the second chapter of this document (relating to migration system reform, access to support services, civic participation, and public perceptions of migration and integration) are high-level and long-term objectives. Beneath these, sit a number of more specific areas of work that contribute to these long-term objectives, but form the focus for our efforts on a day-to-day basis.

As outlined in the previous chapter, given the complexity of the system in which we are operating and the pace at which it is changing, and as an open grants programme that is responsive to our partners' ideas, we try not to specify priority themes or topics too closely in advance. However, since the Fund began in 2015, some clear thematic clusters of work have begun to emerge. Some of these we are now proactively pursuing as priorities for our grant-making, convening and influencing activities:

Our current priorities are:

Developing inclusive cities and institutions

Supporting leaders and coalitions of organisations to create tailored, place-based approaches to integration that fit with and add value to other local and organisational plans and policies

Increasing provision of immigration advice

Developing and scaling new models of advice to help ensure everyone who needs it has access to high-quality legal advice to resolve their status and unlock wider support that prevents destitution

Developing pathways to settlement

Helping to promote simpler, shorter and more affordable routes to citizenship for children and young people who are born in the UK and who are long-resident here

Brexit and future immigration policy

Working to ensure the settled status scheme is accessible to all, and supporting the sector to map out a positive vision for immigration post-Brexit.

In addition to these priorities, we are keeping a “watching brief” on a number of other thematic areas in which we have emerging clusters of work. These include:

Challenging the “hostile environment”

Supporting sector organisations to forge new alliances and mobilise communities against “hostile environment” policies

Immigration detention reform

Supporting sector organisations to work more effectively together to campaign and influence government policy in this area

Building bridges to the race equality and human rights sector

Helping to forge connections between organisations in the specialist migration and integration sectors and those in the race equality and human rights sectors in order to ensure that issues relating to refugees, asylum-seekers and other groups of people who have migrated are included in wider change processes

Labour rights and protection

Working to reduce the risk of exploitation among migrant workers, promote work as a route to integration, and ensure that issues relating to migration and integration are considered as part of wider debates on economic opportunity, austerity, and the changing nature of work.

Shared Ground Fund: Theory in Practice

Developing inclusive cities and institutions

Context

Since the mid-2000s, the UK government has framed migration as a problem to be reduced by decoupling immigration from settlement and curbing the rights for people who enter and remain in the UK. Integration debates focused on concerns about parallel lives with no national framework for integration provided. This led to a considerable lack of clarity about what is meant by integration, who it is for, and how it might contribute to more connected communities. Despite this challenge at a national level, some city leaders have promoted successful approaches to integration that we and others can learn from and scale up.

Priority aim of PHF

Our aim is to support leaders within city administrations and other public institutions to develop inclusive narratives and tailored, place-based approaches to integration that translate into inclusive policies in coalition with civil society.

Grants made (totalling £980,000 September 2015 – September 2018)

We have supported a range of interventions which include: support for civil society to make public services more inclusive, using community networks to help community members navigate and access support services; direct work with the leadership of a cluster of cities to develop integration action plans embedded in local policies; research that makes the case for further investment in integration and explores how to build an integration-friendly approach into the government's wider policy-making agenda; the development of integration indicators so local authorities are better able to measure the success of integration programmes; and secondments of staff from civil society organisations into city administrations to provide technical expertise and shape city responses to migration and integration.

Commissions to build evidence and learning (totalling £119,000 April 2016 – September 2018)

We have commissioned: independent Learning Partners to capture learning from and inform an initiative that brings together a number of independent foundations, the Mayor of London and the Greater London Authority to advance the shared goals of encouraging active citizenship and integration in London; research on London identities and what might be done to forge a stronger sense of shared civic identities; and independent research to support a group of city administrations to explore how city regions can ensure that migration and integration are managed for the benefit of all.

Convening

We bring all organisations we fund together on an annual basis to share analysis, build trust and align work on common goals. In addition, we convene partner organisations working on this topic every quarter to share learning and reflect on successes and challenges of individual approaches, and identify opportunities for collaborative work. We have also brought together city officials, think tanks and funders for informal discussion exploring the role of migration and integration in supporting inclusive growth.

Influencing

The policy environment has begun to shift in the past year, with the Government and the Mayor of London publishing social integration policy papers, both of which helpfully frame social integration as being about the participation of all communities rather than explicitly focusing on the integration of any particular group (or just about migrant communities explicitly). Learning from funding in this area over the past two years informed PHF's response to the Government's green paper. Civil society secondments into the GLA informed the Mayor of London's social integration policy and the importance of securing citizenship for young Londoners.

Increasing the provision of immigration advice

Context

While changes to immigration policy have increased people's need for support, cuts to legal aid and to local authority and civil society funding over the past decade have significantly reduced the provision of immigration advice across the UK. Current levels of the need for free immigration advice far outstrips supply, particularly for more complex immigration cases. Remaining coverage is patchy, with 'advice deserts', as few specialist agencies have survived, and those that continue to operate are structurally quite fragile as they depend largely on reduced local authority funding and on income from the Legal Aid Agency - for the areas of law that are still funded by legal aid.

Priority aim of PHF

Our aim is to develop and scale new models of advice to help ensure everyone who needs it has access to high-quality legal advice to resolve their status and unlock wider support that prevents destitution.

Grants made (totalling £1,842,500 September 2015 – September 2018)

Our funding in this area include supporting a well-established advice agency to establish a new office in Birmingham; contribution to a pooled fund which supports pre-litigation research; training and capacity development for frontline advice organisations across England enabling them to provide immigration advice; the development of a network of London organisations providing immigration advice to facilitate improved signposting and referral pathways, including through the development of new tech solutions; the development of a pro-bono scheme which trains lawyers to provide free legal representation for children and young people; the establishment in the UK of a European scheme which uses volunteer researchers to support protection claims; and the support for a cluster of organisations working with local authorities to test different models of early intervention to support young people in care with insecure immigration status.

Commissions to build evidence and learning (totalling £145,500 April 2016 – September 2018)

The commissioning of: research to draw learning from the various models of immigration advice provision that are being used by organisations funded by PHF and our partner Trust for London, including generating a typology of different models, and identifying learning about the effectiveness of their particular elements; an evaluation to understand the impact of approaches taken by a range of projects working with local authorities to secure better outcomes for young people with insecure immigration status who are in transition to, and receiving, leaving care services; and a case study outlining how strategic litigation can be a tool for social change.

Convening

We support partner organisations involved in commissioned research and evaluation processes to come together as a peer network in order to shape research and generate learning across the various models being explored.

Influencing

Following the re-introduction of immigration legal aid for separated and unaccompanied children, PHF made two small grants to Islington Law Centre and The Children Society to take part in negotiations around the drafting of the relevant Statutory Instrument to bring this decision into effect.

Developing pathways to settlement

Context	An estimated 120,000 children are settled in the UK, but lack the legal status that would enable them to fulfil their full potential. Many experience barriers to health, education, work and social welfare, and require assistance to address their legal status. However, sources of specialist support are scarce, and mainstream organisations are not equipped to help, a situation exacerbated by cuts to legal aid for immigration work in 2013. There are routes in to regular status, but the process can be lengthy and expensive.
Priority aim of PHF	We want to help promote simpler, shorter and more affordable routes to citizenship for children and young people who are born in the UK and who are long-term residents here.
Grants made (totalling £761,000 September 2015 – September 2018)	Since 2011, PHF has taken a particular interest in the lives of young people who lack permanent status in the UK, and we have funded a range of new approaches to improving the lives of these young people in partnership with Unbound Philanthropy, a collaboration that still continues. Over the past three years, our funding has included: specialist advice, casework and strategic litigation to enable children and young people to register as British citizens; support for a major policy organisation to provide capacity building, legal research and policy analysis to help the wider sector to advocate and promote legal routes to permanent status; and organising and advocacy work led by young people with lived experience of the issue, including training to help them engage with the media.
Commissions to build evidence and learning (totalling £35,000 April 2016 – September 2018)	We have commissioned a range of activities including: a briefing paper on options for improving the speed and accessibility of citizenship and naturalisation processes for long-term residents; an exercise to map services available to young people who lack permanent status in two regions, followed by a series of roundtables with local providers to explore gaps in provision; and message-testing of campaign goals with new audiences, to inform sector communications.
Convening	Our approach to convening is particularly well established in this area. Partner organisations come together on a quarterly basis to share analysis and update on each other's work and progress towards shared goals. Meetings are interspersed with monthly phone calls, as well as impromptu gatherings in response to emerging opportunities or on particular themes. In addition to convening partners ourselves, on occasion we have also supported convening led by our partners, for example, by contributing towards the costs of parliamentary events they have hosted.
Influencing	Our influencing work includes: direct engagement with the Home Office to discuss the challenges faced by young people who are long-term residents in the UK but lack settled status; commissioning public affairs in a capacity to coordinate and enhance the work of those seeking to influence parliamentary work; and acting in an advisory capacity to other funder initiatives.

Brexit and future immigration policy

Context

Over the last two decades, migration policy has become highly centralised and too often enforced in a way that harms and criminalises those who migrate. Brexit offers a “legislative reset” moment, with new potential opportunities to influence the future immigration system. At the same time, there is considerable risk to rights as European law is transferred into British law, a change subject to limited oversight. Brexit also poses a risk for EU citizens wishing to secure their future status in the UK, particularly vulnerable groups who may experience barriers in applying for settled status.

Priority aim of PHF

We are working to ensure the settled status scheme is accessible to all, and to support the sector in mapping out a positive vision for immigration post-Brexit.

Grants made (totalling £876,500 September 2015 – September 2018)

We have invested in: building the policy and communications capacity of the migration sector, alongside supporting sector coalitions advocating for progressive policy change; research that sets out potential reforms to the immigration and asylum appeals system, and seeks to inform the design of the settled status process; and the largest yet public consultation on immigration, to understand what the British public thinks about immigration and the kind of policy framework they would like to see in future, in order to take this information to UK decision-makers.

Commissions to build evidence and learning (totalling £40,000 April 2016 – September 2018)

Given the uncertainty about what a future migration system might look like post-Brexit, we have supported key sector leaders to set out their vision and share this with politicians across the political spectrum.

Convening

We have convened funders to explore the advice needs of EU nationals once the UK leaves the European Union, with a particular focus on vulnerable groups that are likely to be excluded from the registration process for settled status.

Influencing

With a new immigration system expected as a result of Brexit - and an immigration white paper and bill expected in the immediate future - the migration sector will have many influencing opportunities in the months ahead. We have supported young people who will have to navigate the settled status scheme to have their voices heard and set out their vision of a post-Brexit UK. We have also built the capacity of the migration sector to be able to respond to and influence the upcoming legislative process.