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Executive Summary

1.1 In July 2016, D2N2 commissioned S4W Ltd and Richmond Baxter Ltd to undertake research in order that they can better understand the economic and social impacts of emerging migrant communities across Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.

1.2 The study has used the following working definition to distinguish ‘emerging migrant communities’ from the wider subject of migration and established communities:

“People coming into the UK, who change the dynamics of a neighbourhood. This change may come about because of the scale of migration, language barriers, actual or perceived cultural differences to the establish community and no existing or at best a peripheral connection to a locality or social network.”

1.3 The study combined a literature review and review of available data at a sub-regional level, face-to-face interviews with key strategic partners, key voluntary and community sector organisations that work with emerging migrant communities and a survey of businesses and sub-regional community-based organisations.

1.4 Nationally, 13% of the population in 2011 Census were born outside of the UK, compared to 7.7% in the D2N2 area. Whilst the scale of migration has been less significant, it has been concentrated in parts of the sub-region, notably within urban areas, especially Nottingham and Derby where 58.1% of all non-UK born residents resided.

1.5 The range of nationalities moving into the area consists of over 100 countries. However, emerging migrant communities have largely been driven by economic migration from the EU Accession states, notably Poland and increasingly Romania and from geo-political tensions in the Middle East and North Africa driving individuals to seek asylum in the UK and across Europe. None of these communities are ‘new’ to the UK and the significance of long standing migration routes should not be downplayed and India and Pakistan remain in the Top 10 nations for National Insurance number registrations. Most migrants are of working age, with almost 70% being aged 16-64 years old, with almost a third being aged 16-24.

1.6 According to the Census, over a third of migrants had a level 4 qualification or above, a further quarter had level 1-3 qualifications and a further quarter had some other type of qualification. However, labour from new emerging communities and EU Accession States is generally geared to low or unskilled occupations, in stark contrast to immigration from the EU14, which is largely geared towards skilled jobs.

1.7 One of the major barriers to employment and progression for those migrants that are eligible to work is language skills. One in five non-UK born residents stated they had poor command of English, rising to one in four for individuals from EU Accession nations. Language tuition, where resources permit, remain a priority for these groups.
1.8 Within the current tight labour market, sub-regional business organisations have expressed concern on behalf of some of their members about the implications for future immigration policy and access to unskilled and highly skilled labour. Regional sectors that will be most affected include Agriculture and Food Manufacturing, Health and Social Care, Manufacturing and Construction.

1.9 Within Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire the employment rate for ‘White’ non-UK nationals is around 78% and for ‘Ethnic Minority’ non-UK nationals 56%. Despite some data confidence issues, it would appear that nationality is not as large a determinant of employment as ethnicity for both existing and migrant communities. Outside of language barriers, back to work and employment issues are similar for individuals from traditional migration routes.

1.10 Nationally, residents not born in the UK are more likely to start and run a business than residents born in the UK, with a working age self-employment rate of 10.3% compared to 10.1% (although this includes some sub-contracting in areas such as construction). Residents born in EU Accession countries have a particularly high self-employment rate of 15%. Business activity is often geared to the retail and catering sectors. Migrant businesses are often in sectors that are not eligible for public support; are unaware of the support; or the agencies that provide support are either unable or unsure if they can assist. There is clearly an opportunity to increase the volume and value of migrant businesses.

1.11 There were examples cited in the research of employers offering temporary, seasonal or unstable employment, and in some cases of illegal employment practices, although this is not deemed to be a common practice across most employers. Links to actions to tackle modern slavery have been identified within the report.

1.12 The study also looked to identify if new emerging migrant communities were displacing jobs and services from existing communities (including those that may have themselves once been migrants). Under a third of organisations surveyed felt this was the case. National studies are inconclusive and found it difficult to assess and quantify as to whether migrants displace employment opportunities or whether they have a major impact on wage levels. There was no direct evidence of this occurring at a sub-regional level.

1.13 With regards to services, it was access to services that was the issue, rather than specific provision for defined communities. Scale is not necessarily a determinant of need, although for many newer communities, community infrastructure and representation is still in its infancy.

1.14 Many migrants come from countries where there is no real culture of public services or a mistrust of them and generally are of working age, therefore less likely to need some services. Whilst there are a range of services for asylum seekers and refugees, many recent economic migrants were in employment and had little need to draw upon wider public services.
Cohesion issues were raised both by community organisations, service providers, employers and business organisations, with tensions identified in communities and also in the work place (which many employers felt unable to deal with effectively). There is a correlation between the areas that voted to leave the European Union and areas that have seen a rapid rate of change with regards to the visibility of migrants.

The study underlines the importance of new migrant communities forming part of wider equalities impact assessments, as ethnicity and gender appear to remain significant equalities challenges. It is also important that, where practical and possible, contracting and service delivery contributes to the generation of more robust data on the social and economic impact of migrant communities, the level of penetration of these services into the communities and identifies any additional barriers to participation.
2 **Scope and Background to the Study**

2.1 In July 2016, D2N2 commissioned S4W Ltd and Richmond Baxter Ltd to undertake research in order that they can better understand the economic and social impacts of emerging migrant communities across Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.

2.2 The research is intended to inform the Local Enterprise Partnership’s consideration of the role of emerging communities from the perspective of delivering the overarching objectives of its economic strategy, related programmes and partnership work.

2.3 The commission aimed to increase understanding of the nature and implications of significant recent changes to the diversity of local populations and workforces. This lack of understanding hindered proactive measures which might better support and utilise the latent potential of a largely young and new population and improve sub-regional business competitiveness.

2.4 In commissioning this research, D2N2 wished to understand the economic contribution of recent emerging communities and the wealth creation potential of future ones. Whilst social policy is not the primary agenda of D2N2, the partnership has a crucial role in improving skills and employability, key mechanisms for promoting inclusion. It was therefore important to understand both the training and employment needs of emerging communities, as well as the impact, if any, of recent migration on existing communities.

2.5 The key objectives of the study are highlighted below and can be classified as social cohesion aspects, labour market aspects, and enterprise and productivity aspects. These are addressed through each relevant chapter of the study:

- What are the favoured sectors and kinds of businesses the new and emerging minority communities are creating or are well placed/capable of creating?
- How do they differ from previous and established minority communities?
- What are the different skills sets that new migrants bring to develop novel goods and services that should be nurtured? Similarly do they have skills deficits?
- What and where are the gaps between the practical sustainable support needed and that available?
- What are the direct/indirect barriers for people from new and emerging communities being more engaged in skills and enterprise development?
- What is the economic impact of new and emerging minority communities on established migrant communities?
- What are the implications for the development and implementation of local growth strategies?
2.6 Since the tendering of this work, the UK elected to leave the EU, adding a third dimension. Our contact with recently arrived EU migrants and the organisations that work with them indicates that a number feel less certain about their futures and less welcome then they did previously. In this context the risk is that those most able to relocate, i.e. those with skills and abilities most in demand, might choose to do so, presenting both challenges and opportunities for the local economy.

2.7 To practically inform D2N2’s economic and employment programmes, this research has had to identify broad themes. Developing any public strategy or interventions at scale require policy makers to make generalisations, and where such activities consider issues of nationality and identity this can be perceived as stereotyping. We are keen to stress that this has not been our intent, that no group is truly homogenous and that the picture is incredibly complex and shifting.
3 Methodology

3.1 The research took place between August and December 2016, and comprised:


- A review of existing literature on migrant communities and their role in the local economy, including commentary on the local sub-area. This included studies and media commentary following the referendum.

- Engagement with sub-regional businesses and business representative bodies including the East Midlands Chamber, Federation of Small Businesses, First Enterprise and NBV Enterprise Agency.

- Stakeholder engagement with community/statutory organisations involved in supporting emerging communities using a range of employment, skills, social and wider inclusion activities. This was supplemented by an online survey completed by 29 third sector organisations, direct engagement with 14 organisations and findings from two recent studies undertaken by the consultants on refugees, asylum seekers\(^1\) and unemployment amongst non-UK born residents\(^2\).

3.2 The study was overseen by a steering group set up by D2N2 in partnership with Equality Challenge with members representing voluntary, community and social inclusion organisations across the area.

3.3 The practicalities of defining ‘emerging migrant communities’ can be problematic as some ethnic and national communities that are well established are seeing ongoing migration and some geographical areas are experiencing increasing numbers of migrants living in areas where there has been limited if any settlement previously.

3.4 The study has used the following working definition to distinguish ‘emerging migrant communities’ from the wider subject of migration and established communities:

“People coming into the UK, who change the dynamics of a neighbourhood. This change may come about because of the scale of migration, language barriers, actual or perceived cultural differences to the establish community and no existing or at best a peripheral connection to a locality or social network.”

\(^1\) Asylum Seeker and Refugee Needs Assessment; Richmond Baxter Ltd for the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Refugee Forum and the British Red Cross; December 2016

\(^2\) Towards Work - learning from best practice. Findings from community and partner consultation, and previous programmes; Richmond Baxter Ltd for Groundwork; March 2016
3.5 The study has encountered three challenges. The first was the rapidly changing context of migration post-EU referendum. The likelihood of changes in policy was known from the outset and recommendations are framed in light of this. It is not the intent of the study to make recommendations to D2N2 and partners about influencing national immigration policy, but to identify how partners can respond locally to support new migrant communities and how these communities can have a stronger impact on sub-regional productivity and economic growth.

3.6 The second challenge was the lack of detailed, timely and/or accurate primary and secondary data sources. Much data is not available at local geographical levels (or is insufficiently reliable or has been anonymised) and therefore can only provide an indicative local view. Significant emphasis had to be placed upon the 2011 Census, which is already aged and has been overtaken by the speed of change in migration patterns. This issue was known at the start of the research and reflected in the methodology that endeavours to provide a comprehensive picture from multiple sources, with key themes corroborated by local stakeholder interviews.

3.7 The study found tentative evidence that this situation is improving. Local groups and partnerships are reviewing administrative sources (e.g. health records and School Censuses) set up to monitor more established areas of interest, namely ethnicity (but not nationality). Changes are, however, in their infancy and not happening consistently across the area.

3.8 The third challenge has been related to how openly people are prepared to talk about an issue that has received considerable media and political attention, which has frequently painted migration as a problem and migrant workers in a far from positive light. Many community organisations have been happy to contribute to the debate around this study, seeing it as a positive opportunity to influence policy and highlight opportunities and challenges. However, the business community have largely been uncomfortable with the subject matter, either not wishing to engage in interviews or the widely circulated survey, discussed matters ‘off the record’ or would only discuss broad themes relating to future migration policy.

3.9 As a result of this lack of formal local business input into the study, qualitative findings have been cross-referenced with national or regional studies that drew from larger samples.

3.10 To gauge the views of organisations that work directly with new emerging communities, a total of 27 organisations from the voluntary, community and statutory sectors completed an online survey. This was augmented by the 14 aforementioned one-to-one interviews and prior research.
3.11 Organisations completing the survey represented the following geographical areas:

Table 3.1: Areas serviced by Voluntary and Community Organisations (%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Service Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Derby City</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derbyshire</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham City</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottinghamshire</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outside of the DfE area</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Emerging Migrant Communities Organisation Survey (2016)

3.12 The survey results above demonstrate a good spread of organisations across the four top tier Authority areas. The “other” category was largely specific wards, areas or districts within a specific Local Authority area.
4 **Migration - A UK Context**

4.1 Of the 54 million people usually resident\(^3\) within England and Wales in 2011, 7.1 million or 13% were born outside the UK. In 2001 this was 9 per cent (4.6 million). **Around half residing in England and Wales (3.8 million) arrived in the UK between 2001 and 2011.**

4.2 **Europe provided the largest cohort of migrants in the period 2001-11.** 47.6% of these were from EU Accession states. The most common non-UK countries of birth for usual residents of England and Wales were India, Poland and Pakistan. Poland showed a nine-fold rise over the last decade. **As at 2011, 83.5% of all usual residents born in EU Accession states had arrived in the preceding decade.**

4.3 ONS Long-term Migration and Migration Quarterly reports indicate a continuing upward growth in European migration into the UK since 2011, with a commensurate general downward trend from elsewhere in the world. ONS estimate that net EU migration to the UK stood at 190,000 for the year ending June 2016, but spiked by a further 49,000 in the following quarter, attributed to concerns that the vote to leave the EU may limit future numbers.

4.4 **All parts of the globe contributed to the growing diversity** of England and Wales. 40% of total migration during 2001-11 was from Europe and a third from the Middle East and Asia.

4.5 The most common reasons people migrated to the UK in 2015 were ‘work-related’ and study\(^4\). These were significantly skewed by the intention of EU citizens to work – more non-EU citizens reported coming to study than work.

4.6 59.8% of all those over the age over 16, who arrived between 2001 and 2011 were either employed or self-employed. 5.1% are registered unemployed but actively seeking work. 20.7% are undertaking either full or part-time studies. The employment aspirations of the remaining 14.4% are unclear, but the data indicates are that **85.6% are in work, actively seeking work or studying.**

---

\(^3\) Anyone born outside the UK who has stayed or intends to stay for three months or more, but less than a year

\(^4\) ONS International Long-Term Migration estimates based mainly on data from the International Passenger Survey (IPS)
5 Evidence Base of Emerging Communities in D2N2 Area

5.1 The following analysis is derived from the most relevant published national data sources. Caveats regarding the timeliness and quality are noted in Section 3 – Methodology. Data tables are provided to accompany this report, and include further information on data limitations and uses, along with a wider set of available data submitted as an appendix to the main report.

Scale of migration

5.2 The 2011 Census provides a snapshot of usual residents\(^5\) who were born outside the UK. Of the 2.1 million living in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire as usual residents a significant majority (92.3%) were born in the UK. Around 162,000 (7.7%) were born overseas.

Chart 5.1: Country of Birth of Usual Residents, D2N2, 2011

![Chart showing country of birth](chart.png)

Source: Census 2011

5.3 A significant proportion of these migrants will be long established, although national data suggests as many as half could have settled between 2001 and 2011. And much has happened since. Whilst many EU Accession state migrants will be captured in these numbers, by no means all are, and the information pre-dates asylum seeking associated with the Arab Spring (see below).

\(^5\) Usual residents include anyone who, on census day, was in the UK and had stayed or intended to stay for 12 months or more, or who had a permanent UK address and was outside the UK and intended to stay away for less than 12 months. Usual residents comprise the base for the main outputs of the 2011 Census.
5.4 As the focus of this study is on emerging communities it is, arguably, more useful to consider potential change in any given year. A number of sources exist.

- In the year preceding the 2011 Census 15,246 migrants moved from outside the UK to Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.
- In 2013-14 12,036 overseas nationals registered for a National Insurance number (NINo) in D2N2. In 2014/15 there were 15,534 and in 2015/16 16,263 (more typical of levels seen a decade earlier).
- In 2015/16 a total of 1,712 asylum seekers we receiving support in the area. Note only around 2 in 5 typically get granted right to remain on their first application, and given the small scale are considered separately.

5.5 The above data overlaps, has omissions (e.g. children from NINo statistics) and critically, there is limited reliable information of off-flows or subsequent movement within the UK. It is impossible to provide a definitive number of recent migrants, much less whether these represent established or new communities. Given the above, and historic Census data, our best estimate is in the region of 8-10,000 per annum and who intend to stay for some time, but this should be treated with extreme caution as new migrant communities do not necessarily stay in the same place they originally settled and it is anticipated many leave the South East/London to settle in the rest of the UK.

5.6 In addition to emerging communities, there are more transient migration patterns.

- According to the Higher Education Statistical Agency, in 2014-15 there were 12,000 non-domicile students studying at local higher education institutions.
- The last Census reported 5,541 short-term residents, some of whom would also have been studying.

Origins

5.7 The new migration flows comprise people from across the globe. As identified below, many are from traditional routes and joining established communities.

- The 2011 Census usual residents born outside the UK comprised
- Nearly 61,000 (2.8%) born in other EU countries (including more than 9,000 from Ireland and nearly 33,000 from EU Accession states)
- Around 102,000 born in non-EU countries (4.8% of the population)

Whilst migration from EU Accession states has been significant, these new communities are by no means the sole source.

---

6 Defined as Section 95 support, and so excludes destitute asylum seekers
7 Anyone born outside the UK who has stayed or intends to stay for three months or more, but less than a year
5.8 NINo data provides more detail. The 16,263 who registered in 2015/16 originated from 103 different countries. 71.9% came from 10 countries, all European with the exception of India and Pakistan which remain significant migration routes. The African nations with more than 100 registrations were Nigeria (ranked 12\textsuperscript{th}), Sudan (20\textsuperscript{th}) and Eritrea (27th)

**Table 5.1: NINo Registrations by Overseas Nationals by Most Prevalent Nationalities, D2N2, 2015/16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>% of All Registrations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>4,344</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>3,301</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Top 10 Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,683</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>71.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All Registrations</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,263</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: DWP NINo Registrations to Overseas Nationals, 2016.

5.9 Slovakia and Pakistan feature amongst the top 10 in D2N2, but not the UK as a whole. Portugal and France were in the top 10 in the UK, but not D2N2, possibly reflecting the relatively small agricultural sector.

5.10 The statistical patterns of migration were also acknowledged by organisations working on the ground with emerging communities. The organisations identified the following emerging migration trends.

- **Economic migrants** from Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Czech Republic, Slovakia, Baltic States, the Ukraine, Turkey, Mongolia (small numbers) and Roma communities (from a number of countries, with Romanian Roma most frequently cited)

- **Refugees and asylum seekers** were generally from Iraq, Iran, Sudan, Eritrea, Somalia, Syria, Libya and Afghanistan, but many other nationalities featured including Mali and Kenya

- Organisations also noted continuing inward migration from India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka

5.11 Most ‘emerging’ communities named were not ‘new’; movements began more than five years or longer ago. Some were perceived as emerging because of the pace of change (as opposed to numbers) in areas with relatively few non-UK born residents, or because of the dwindling size of previous communities, such as those arriving immediately post war.
5.12 **NINo registrations were higher than 10 years previously, but not significantly (+1,678).** Whilst the top 10 still comprised around 72% of all registrations, there has been some movement in these nationalities. In 2005/06 Polish adults comprised 43.5% of all registrations, the highest by a wide margin. **In 2015/16 Poles remained the largest majority group,** but by a smaller degree (26.7% of all registrations). Romanians moved to second highest with 20.3% and 69 times the number recorded a decade earlier.

5.13 **India and Pakistan remain in the top 10, as they did a decade ago.** Italy and Spain moved into the top 10, with large percentage increases, possibly reflecting economic conditions in these countries.

**Age**

5.14 **Most migrants arrive as young, working-age adults.** 68.8% of migrants arrived as 16-64 year olds (2011 Census statistics for all migrants). This rises to 78.4% for EU Accession state migrants.

5.15 The 16-24 year olds group represented the largest single cohort of all migrants (32.9%). The proportion arriving between 25 and 34 years reduces, and tapers significantly after that. Few people migrate after the age of 50, with only 0.5% of all migrants arriving aged 65 years or over. 31.4% arrived as children, but this is considered to overstate the most recent trends.

**Chart 5.2: Age of Arrival of All Migrants, D2N2, 2011**

[Bar chart showing age distribution of migrants]

Source: Census 2011
Destinations

5.16 Data indicates the highest proportion of migrants reside in urban areas. 91.3% of non-UK born usual residents lived in urban areas (2011 Census) compared to 8.7% in rural areas. The ratio of all residents was 80:20. Concentrations were greater for those born outside Europe (92.4% in urban areas).

5.17 **58.1% of non-UK born residents lived in the City of Nottingham or Derby** (19.5% and 13.9% of all usual residents), driven by both economic migration and asylum seekers. Broxtowe was home to the next highest proportion (7.7%), followed by Rushcliffe and Gedling. North East Derbyshire has the smallest proportion (2.4%) followed by Amber Valley, Ashfield and Bolsover (all 3.0%).

5.18 Data for the year prior to the Census shows a similar proportion in Nottingham and Derby (though much greater in Nottingham), with Broxtowe and Rushcliffe again 3rd and 4th. Mansfield and Newark and Sherwood had the next highest numbers and proportions. On average 59.8% belonged to ‘White’ ethnic groups, with only Nottingham (40.1%), Broxtowe (56.6%) and Derby (58.8%) being below average. In Amber Valley, Derbyshire Dales and Mansfield more than 90% migrating in the year prior were ‘White’.

5.19 **NiNo data corroborates Census findings to some extent** (with the caveat that people may then move on). Registrations within Nottingham and Derby combined have ranged between 57.4% and 68.0% every year since 2005/06. **Mansfield is also notable in that it has seen an increase** in NiNos, with 11.0% of all D2N2 registrations in 2015/16.

5.20 Availability of work (or perceived availability) is a significant driver. Those in higher professions and/or with higher qualifications are likely to have work (or study), but consultation with support organisations catering for recent migrants suggests that few secure employment in advance of relocating. Existing networks with family and friends, accessibility and availability and affordability of accommodation are also considerations.

5.21 Housing tenure may offer a predictor of where migrants move to, as few will be able to buy and/or wish to make such a commitment early on. National data shows that, perhaps unsurprisingly, **migrants are disproportionately reliant on private rented accommodation, or friends and family**. This trend has increased significantly for more recent arrivals. Migrants were less likely to be placed in social rented than the UK born population. It should be noted that the figures will reflect the younger than average nature of some migrant communities, the skew of migration to Greater London (with higher property values and a greater rental culture), and changes post-2011.
Table 5.2: Housing tenure of migrants born outside the UK, England and Wales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ownership or shared ownership %</th>
<th>Social rented %</th>
<th>Private rented or living rent-free %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UK-born</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Migration</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration 2001-11</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK Total</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2011 Census.

5.22 Recent migrants from the EU Accession states rely more upon the private rented sector or other informal arrangements more than any other cohort. This is perhaps not surprising given the types of occupations secured, likely pay levels and the more recent nature of the immigration.

Economic activity, employment and skills

5.23 The Annual Population Survey gives an indication of population and labour market characteristics. Whilst more up to date than the Census, the reliability is limited in this area. The latest estimates are that non-UK nationals account for 7.1% of D2N2’s working age population. Of those 68% are estimated to be employed or self-employed, 6% unemployed, but seeking employment and the remaining 26% are economically inactive (including students). With the heavy caveat that the data is subject to high confidence intervals, the employment rate of ‘White’ non-UK nationals is around 78% and for ‘Ethnic Minority’ non-UK nationals 56%.

5.24 For UK born 16-64 year olds the employment rate is currently 74% and the unemployment rate is lower. Data for England, which is more statistically reliable, shows a similar pattern—on average a ‘White’ adult is more likely to be employed than somebody of an ‘Ethnic Minority’, whether a UK national or not. In part the difference may be explained by the younger age profiles or migrants, but this is unlikely to be the sole reason.

5.25 National Census data provides further detail. Of migrants between 2001 and 2011 EU Accession states exhibited the second highest employment rates, after ‘Oceania’, and the highest self-employment rates. Recent EU Accession migrants of working age have a self-employment rate of 15%, compared to 10.1% for England and Wales as a whole. This may reflect an entrepreneurial culture—the Polish Ambassador has suggested as many as 22,000 businesses across the UK have been established by Poles. It may also reflect current employment practices. Stakeholder interviews identified use of sub-contracting in some industries (e.g. construction) and use of self-employment contracts by companies seeking a large, flexible workforce.

---

8 His Excellency Arkady Rzegocki, Polish Ambassador to the UK, in evidence to the Parliamentary EU Justice Sub-committee, October 2016
5.26 National data also gives an indication of occupation. Census data shows more recent migrants (residents born outside the UK who arrived between 2001 and 2011) secured employment across a wide range of occupations. Half of EU Accession state migrants were employed in low or unskilled occupations (‘Process, Plant and Machine Operatives’ and ‘Elementary Occupations’), compared to 29.7% of all overseas nationals. However, they were also over-represented in skilled trades. An above average proportion of African migrants were employed in ‘Caring, Leisure and Services Occupations’, and high proportions from the ‘Middle East and Asia’ and ‘Oceania and other’ in ‘Professional Occupations’.

Other characteristics

5.27 National data corroborates issues of language and qualifications identified from the qualitative research. The 2011 Census asked migrants to whom English was not the main language, what their proficiency was. 80.5% of respondents reported that they felt that they could speak English well, 16.9% ‘badly’ and 2.6% ‘not at all’. This indicates that, at any one time, a fifth could experience language barriers to education, training, employment and social support. More than a quarter of respondents from EU Accession states reported some level of difficulty.

5.28 Of those arriving in the UK between 2001 and 2011, and aged 16+, 37.3% had a Level 4 or higher qualification. 11.7% reported no qualifications and 26.4% had ‘other’ qualifications. This indicates the majority of migrants have some level of education and could contribute to the economy, but these may not readily map to established qualifications that employers recognise or meet local skills gaps.

Chart 5.3: Highest Qualifications of Migrants to the UK between 2001 and 2011

Source: 2011 Census

5.29 There was an above average proportion with no qualifications from the Middle East and Asia, EU Accession states and non-EU Europe. ‘Oceania’ had a markedly higher proportion with Level 4+.
Individuals from Antarctica and Oceania are recorded as a single group by ONS for statistical purposes.
6 Asylum seekers, refugees and students

6.1 Refugees represent small numbers compared to economic migrants and those moving to join families. They are considered here because of the increase in numbers, the different nationalities to economic migrants and the different challenges in becoming established citizens and accessing work (considered under section 8). Also, if numbers of economic migrants reduce in the future, this group will likely become a larger proportion of overall migration.

6.2 National data shows a year on year increase in the number of people seeking asylum since 2011 (coinciding with the Arab Spring). Numbers gaining refugee status, and so being able to remain and seek work, have also risen (peaking in 2014/15), a product of higher applications, Home Office measures to tackle a backlog of applications and higher ‘grant rates’ of people from Syria.

Chart 6.1: Change in UK asylum applications, decisions and grants, 2011-16

6.3 Local data is available for asylum seekers that cannot stay with family and friends and receive assistance with their housing (Section 95 support). In the D2N2 area 1,712 people were receiving support in 2015/16 compared to 1,040 in 2011/12.
6.4 The above chart also shows where asylum seekers were receiving this support. This is largely due to administrative arrangements; the Home Office have agreements with Nottingham and Derby to accommodate dispersed asylum seekers from places they arrive at and make an application. This is an approximation as some neighbouring councils enter into local agreements to also provide housing. This will also have changed in the last year as a new Vulnerable Person Resettlement Scheme (VPRS) was established to settle Syrians directly. A number of councils are taking part, although numbers are modest.

6.5 UK data gives an indication of nationality. In 2016 more than half of all applications came from six nationalities. The largest proportion came from Syrian, marginally (5,245 including VPRS), followed by Iran (4,910), Iraq, Pakistan, Eritrea, Afghanistan and Syria. As with NINos, a huge range of nationalities are evident in small numbers.
Students

6.6 Students were outside the scope of this review, and are arguably a community in their own right, rather than emerging communities likely to become established. However, from an economic strategy perspective, they are an important source of revenue, skills and innovation. From a community perspective, some will live in similar areas and similar tenures to recent arrivals.

6.7 In the academic year 2014-15, 12,000 Higher Education students were learning in the D2N2 area were from overseas (16.1% of all students - Higher Education Statistical Agency). Of these, 56% were undergraduates and 44% were undertaking post graduate studies. 60.4% of all overseas students were students at the University of Nottingham, representing 22.7% of that University’s student population. This is greater than the proportion at Nottingham Trent University (12.8%), the University of Derby (8.2%) and the rate for England (19.4%).
7 Economic & Business Aspects relating to Migrant Communities

7.1 Allowing or encouraging economic migration to fill gaps in the labour market has been a long standing post-war economic policy. UK migration policy with regards to the market labour over the past 15 years has generally been based upon visa-driven specialist recruitment for skilled staff from key nations and a wider labour market expansion through the Single Market (although many skilled posts have also been filled from EU countries).

7.2 Some of the growth in recent migrant communities (with regards to the pull of employment) in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire have been driven by:

- the right to work in the UK for those from EU Accession states looking for low or semi-skilled work to provide an increased income from their country of origin, such as Poland, Romania and Bulgaria
- skilled labour from other EU countries filling specific gaps in the labour market or following investment into the UK made by EU countries (examples include skilled engineers from France and Spain)
- skilled labour directly recruited from non-EU nations to fill specific posts within the labour market or organisations within Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire (such as the NHS, which recruits a large proportion of Doctors from the Indian Sub-Continent and nurses from South East Asia).

7.3 As identified in section 5, the numbers of migrants in the labour market is relatively small within Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire and some of the quoted figures with regards to nations of origin include individuals who may not have the right to work.

7.4 The impact of the EU referendum has had an unsettling effect on many businesses, especially those who employ large numbers of workers not born in the UK. According to research by the Chartered Institute for Personnel Development (CIPD), a total of 57% of their members employ migrant workers. This increases to 67% of their Public Sector members and 42% of their Voluntary Sector members. Micro businesses (with fewer than 10 staff) rarely employ migrant staff (13% of respondents), while 77% of the largest organisations record employing migrant labour\(^\text{10}\).

7.5 Conversely, the CIPD also found that businesses that were most likely to recruit migrant labour were also the businesses that were most likely to invest in work experience, internships and apprenticeships as part of their wider employment approaches.

---

\(^{10}\) The Growth of Labour: Assessing the Impact on the UK Labour Market (Sept 2014) CIPD (2014)
7.6 An increase in anti-migrant rhetoric, media reporting and an increase in hate crimes have made many businesses reticent to discuss issues relating to their experiences of migrant labour. Indeed a planned survey of businesses has returned a response rate too low to use in any meaningful way in this study and one to one discussions were largely ‘off the record’.

7.7 Interviews have been undertaken with the East Midlands Chamber of Commerce, the Federation of Small Businesses, NBV, First Enterprise Business Agency, a number of small organisations that work with businesses on issues of migration and rights to work and a number of businesses themselves (which have been anonymised for the purposes of the report). These included business representatives from sectors with a recent tradition of using migrant labour such as construction and health. It has also drawn from discussions with D2N2 and from primary data such as the Chamber Quarterly Economic Report and Parliamentary research papers.
8 Labour Market Considerations

8.1 Although an accurate assessment of the exact numbers of migrant workers in the Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire economy are almost impossible to calculate outside of a census year, the actual proportion of the labour force that was not born in the United Kingdom is relatively small. Some of the national messages about migrant labour are frequently skewed by the higher proportion of migrant labour in London and the South East.

8.2 Within the East Midlands Chamber’s Quarterly Economic Survey (June to September 2016), 24% of businesses increased their headcount, compared to a 9% decrease. Manufacturing in particular had seen an increase of 29% of businesses increasing their headcount. For the quarter ahead (September to December 2016) 29% of businesses expected to increase their headcount, with only 9% planning a decrease. A total of 57% of businesses that attempted to recruit experienced problems recruiting. With a D2N2 employment rate of 74.1% (ONS Annual Population Survey, June 2015 – June 2016) it is likely the labour market will continue to remain tight and unemployment has largely remained static since the referendum result.

8.3 Both the East Midlands Chamber of Commerce and the regional Federation of Small Businesses have expressed concern on behalf of some of their members about the implications of future immigration policy that may reduce access to the current pool of EU labour. However, there is by no means a consensus on this subject amongst businesses in the region and it would be inaccurate to imply there was. Both organisations felt the demand for overseas labour would remain at similar levels and in this context considered the priority to establish clarity on future immigration policy to enable planning.

8.4 Business organisations felt the sectors in the area most likely to be affected by a potential exit from the EU and potentially the wider Single Market would be Health, Social Care, Construction and Agriculture and Food Manufacturing. These are the sectors most dependent on current in-flows of migrant labour. According to the CIPD, nationally 74% of businesses engaged in accommodation, food services, arts and recreation employ migrant workers, 63% of wholesale and retail businesses and 58% of Education/training organisations employ migrants, while transport based businesses record 32%11. This suggests a difference between national data (warped by London and the South East) which suggests lower paid service and business to consumer sector jobs are most attractive for migrant labour and the picture in the East Midlands, where there is more emphasis on primary and secondary industries.

---

8.5 Businesses reported most of the positions undertaken by migrant workers were generally lower paid and less secure. According to the CIPD, median pay in 2014 for UK born workers was £10.63 per hour, compared to £7.50 per hour for workers from EU Accession states. Conversely workers from EU14\(^{12}\) nations had median pay of £12.68. Our research found this pay gap was probably not just confined to EU Accession state migrants\(^{13}\).

8.6 Community organisations reported those with little English (including some refugees and migrants joining more established communities) were heavily reliant on often large scale employers requiring unskilled or basic processing and plant labour. Examples in Derby include food processing and packing, and waste processing in Nottingham. Community organisations and migrants saw the value of such opportunities, felt there was a need for more such opportunities, and with employers who could accommodate new employees making cultural adjustments.

8.7 There had been examples given of European competitors or agencies offering migrants (especially those in highly skilled occupations) employment back in their countries of origin after the results of the referendum. This is compounded by the recent fall in the value of sterling and therefore any remuneration sent home.

8.8 Our engagement with community groups reported that these lower skilled migrants were the ones least likely to be able to or wish to relocate, given the better remuneration and opportunities in the UK. Businesses we interviewed confirmed this view, fearing loss of higher skilled staff more than lower skilled staff. Whilst against the grain of the general narrative about migrant labour, this appears the more imminent risk to labour market continuity, or greatest opportunity. This means that employment interventions could usefully focus on progression and not like for like replacement of vacancies.

8.9 If lower skilled employees choose and have the means to, or are required to emigrate in significant numbers, some employers will be hit disproportionately, but we heard of a demand for entry level opportunities for a range of economically inactive groups implying an alternative workforce is available. Existing programmes to enable and encourage people to access such work remain vital and may increase in importance.

8.10 Some employers are aware of their role in developing emerging migrant communities, with one regional hospital acknowledging it now annually recruits a large number of nurses from the Philippines. There have also been examples of where individual employers or sectors have been part of the drive for demographic change in the labour force, such as significant redistribution centres in areas such as Shirebrook. National research by the CIPD have found that 13% of members have undertaken recruitment campaigns in other EU countries and 7% have worked with recruitment consultancies within host EU countries\(^{14}\).

---

\(^{12}\) The EU14 are the member countries of the EU (before 2004): Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden

\(^{13}\) The Growth of Labour: Assessing the Impact on the UK Labour Market (2014) CIPD

\(^{14}\) Spring 2014 and Summer 2014 Labour Market Outlook LMO surveys (2014) CIPD
8.11 Other employers relying on specialist skills of migrant labour also cited the importance of flexibility, for example in the construction industry. This is sometimes described as work ethic. In practice this can mean willingness to work long shifts, weekends and relocate across the country – arguably more practical for young males without local family responsibilities.

**Case Study: Health and Social Care Sector in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire**

Health and Social Care is a sector that uses migrant labour to fills skills shortages and employment gaps at both the high and low skills segments of employment.

The NHS in the region has a long standing history of recruiting qualified nursing staff from Asia, particularly the Indian sub-continent, the Philippines and Zimbabwe where training approaches and standards are very similar to the UK. A World Economic Forum report states a third of Filipino workers in the UK work in Healthcare. There are also large staff cohorts from Spain and Portugal (HCHS employment data 2016). Whilst only a relatively small proportion of EU migrant labour is deployed in the health (2.3% in the East Midlands), BREXIT, linked to changes to wider visa processes, creates some uncertainty around the continuing availability of this labour force to plug current (and future) gaps in the labour force.

Employment is also forecast to rise in the social care sector across the D2N2 area as the population ages. A recent survey of social care providers across Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire identified a third of businesses had critical staff recruitment and retention issues and some businesses had 25% of their workforce from EU accession countries, with many businesses seeing this as a growing proportion of their workforce.

8.12 Discussion with representative bodies and with individual businesses also suggested that freedom of movement of labour had allowed some businesses to circumvent visa requirements for posts previously filled by non-EU workers. This was particularly relevant in the engineering and manufacturing sectors, with examples of recruitment to skilled posts from France and Spain. Cited examples included a food and drink manufacturer who recruited professional skilled labour from overseas and a construction firm who recruited 20% of its workforce from Poland.

8.13 On balance, businesses are concerned about Brexit’s impact on trade, and how immigration policy per se may affect their ability to fill skills shortages. The issue of nationality and type of community is specific to individual businesses.

**Labour Market Failure**

8.14 There has been much recent press coverage about abuse of migrant labour. The research found a range of practices, and it is important to distinguish between the legal (but potentially perceived as unethical) and the illegal.
8.15 At the extreme end, there is a growing body of evidence on modern slavery and trafficking, which according to the International Labour Organisation is the **fastest growing criminal activity in the world**. Where local networks have been created to understand emerging communities, this has primarily been in response to cohesion or criminal justice agendas. Much of the examples centred around labour provided from overseas, linked to a promise of work and accommodation. This transpires to be forced labour, with minimal wages being largely subsumed by inflated prices for sub-standard or unsafe accommodation. Intermediaries act as the link between jobs exploitive employers cannot fill and accommodation landlords cannot let, charging both parties.

8.16 During the research process, we heard of examples of people being coerced into working long hours for little or no money car washing, as car park attendants and in restaurants. Some employees are dismissed, having worked for a number of months without being paid, only to be replaced by a new group.

8.17 Incidences of exploitation must be reported through the National Referral Mechanism. The Notinghamshire Police and Crime Needs Assessment 2016 analyses the scale of referral by County area in 2014/15. This suggests that in 2014/15 Nottinghamshire made slightly below two referrals per 100,000 head of population, while Derbyshire made slightly over two. The highest reported numbers were for Cambridgeshire and West Yorkshire which reported approximately 9/100,000 people. At present there are 16 agencies/employers registered with the Gangmaster’s Licencing Authority based in Derbyshire and 24 in Nottinghamshire.

8.18 The issue was identified as significant enough for the Derbyshire Police Service to pilot in 2015 a special project, ‘Advenus’ intended to support victims and pursue perpetrators. That pilot proved successful and has subsequently been mainstreamed into ongoing policing activity. Both sub-regional police services recognise, and echo Government calls regarding the need for multi-agency and multi-sector responses to the issue.

8.19 The Derby and Derbyshire Modern Slavery Partnership was established in 2015 with the aim of disrupting trafficking and modern day slavery through extensive outreach and education activity across four strategic themes in line with Governments Modern Slavery Strategy:

- Pursue the perpetrators of this crime
- Prevent people engaging in this activity
- Protect vulnerable people from exploitation
- Prepare appropriate victim identification and support mechanisms to reduce the harm caused.

---

Activity to date includes:

- Establishment of a multi-agency tactical intelligence group
- Development of a referral pathway to assist professionals working with victims
- Progressing a Modern Slavery Assessment for Derby and Derbyshire
- Developing awareness raising events and materials
- Commissioning directly support for the victims of modern slavery and exploitation.

8.20 Since August 2016, Nottinghamshire’s Safer Nottinghamshire Board has begun to explore in detail how partners can work individually and collectively to tackle the issues around modern slavery. Key themes have commonality with those being developed in Derbyshire and scope exists for LEP level strategic approaches.

8.21 It should be stressed that these issues are not specific to Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire, and the full extent of the issue is unknown, locally and nationally. It is unlikely D2N2 engages with such businesses, but partners may unknowingly use these in their supply chains and such illegal practices are putting legitimate businesses at a competitive disadvantage.

8.22 Both businesses and community groups raised the issue of zero hour’s contracts and classifying agency or flexible labour as self-employed. Some community organisations felt individuals with limited English and / or little knowledge of employment rights were unwittingly being exploited. Many business owners that employed overseas labour felt nervous about the wider rhetoric in the press and statements made by government ministers and others. They feared they may be singled out for undertaking negative practices, when their view was they were just running and managing their businesses in line with all relevant employment legislation and were paying UK taxes.

8.23 Whilst potentially permitted, such practices may not support D2N2’s objective of ‘good growth’ where they limit stable opportunities for skills development, progression and productivity growth.

8.24 Through their representative bodies, many businesses were reporting rising tensions between indigenous and overseas labour forces. Many had welfare concerns over their non-UK born workforce amid rising community tensions outside of the workplace. Community organisations shared this view, citing examples of tensions between different EU groups on the shop floor, particularly where one nationality dominated supervisory roles. All parties agreed business owners and managers would benefit from being better equipped or having support to deal with such issues.
9 Enterprise and Business Development

9.1 There is very limited hard evidence as to types of businesses being set up by new migrant communities, therefore the issue has been discussed at length with both business agencies and wider support agencies. According to the Global Entrepreneurship Monitor (GEM) survey, migrants are three times more likely than UK residents to start a new business. Around 15% of migrants in 2015 were involved in starting a business, compared to just 6.1% of the indigenous UK population. The report suggested one in seven new businesses started in the UK are set up by migrant entrepreneurs (although this includes Tier 1 visa applications that are specifically geared towards entrepreneurs).

9.2 As identified in section 5.25, according to the 2011 Census, 14.4% of recent EU Accession migrants were self-employed. It is unknown as to whether this rate has increased or decreased since this point. This compares to 8.8% of usual residents aged 16-64.

9.3 Whilst some of this cohort will be running a business, it may also be an early reflection of the growing trend of sub-contracting in some industries (e.g. construction) and use of self-employment contracts by companies seeking a large, flexible workforce. There is no way of distinguishing this from the source data.

9.4 Anecdotal evidence points to a concentration of business starts in the service sector, particularly businesses geared towards servicing needs or market gaps within their own communities. There is an emphasis on the retail and catering sector.

9.5 In discussion with business and enterprise agencies, community based organisations and wider businesses, it is clear there is a gap in enterprise development services for those individuals from new emerging communities, both from EU nations and others.

9.6 Whilst eligible for many enterprise development programmes, many individuals from emerging communities do not come forward to engage on these programmes. Frequently, businesses are in areas such as retail and catering that are not always eligible to receive support, particularly from EU supported programmes. Lack of awareness, cultural barriers (e.g. a culture of not seeking support or working with ‘authorities’) and language barriers were cited as other reasons.

9.7 There is also some potential for misunderstanding of individual’s right to work for business support agencies that are not geared up to deal with the complexities of employment law and self-employment. Part of the Tier 1 visa process means immigrant entrepreneurs using this route cannot access public funds.
10 Community Cohesion and Engagement

10.1 A total of **83% of community organisations felt that new migrant communities were having a positive impact on their local and wider economy**, which is understandable given the nature of the work these organisations are undertaking. Some of the comments on the impact on the local economy are highlighted below.

“Migrant workers are generally anxious to find work. They are often prepared to undertake tasks and roles that other may shun.”

“They contribute taxes and National Insurance (payments). They also bring diversity in cultures.”

“Recent migrant communities....(are) mainly.....people who are economically inactive so may get a skewed view”

“Migrant communities are impacting in terms of a wider availability of food from different countries, as well as sharing customs with their new communities.”

“In Shirebrook, through Sports Direct, many Polish individuals and families have come to work there. Some have gone on to other things and Polish businesses have opened to serve the new community.”

10.2 There is a widespread view that, **for those out of work, many have a strong desire to work and be a ‘productive’ member of society.** For some nationalities this is, particularly for men, deeply rooted in cultures of status being associated from work. For many asylum seekers, unable to work until granted a successful application, there is intense frustration and boredom, a period of sometimes a decade or more where skills diminish, and mental health issues can set in. In this respect, these frustrations and consequences are similar to other excluded, out-of-work groups.

10.3 However, a range of wider community challenges were also identified by stakeholders, which is well summed up by the quote below.

“Where thousands of migrants have come to an area without the local community having any participation in the process there are bound to be issues of community cohesion”.

10.4 Many organisations acknowledged there were issues and tensions relating to housing availability, and the perception that migrants and asylum seekers somehow ‘jumped the queue’, and created a **lack of school places and pressures on local services** such as GPs and the wider NHS. Stakeholders also acknowledged there are cultural issues around fly-tipping, anti-social drinking and crime and disorder.
10.5 There is also a general perception amongst stakeholders that migrant communities have tended not to integrate socially (at least in the earlier months and years) with indigenous communities and there is more to achieve in this field, particularly in breaking down language and cultural barriers. This is in-keeping with some findings of the recent Casey Review\textsuperscript{16}, which considered opportunity and integration amongst a broader range of deprived and isolated communities including more established ones. Some asylum seekers and refugees were keen to integrate and share their cultures, but were hindered by lack of transport or money. Little was mentioned about displacement of services from other migrant communities.

10.6 On balance, community and statutory consultees viewed that the mix of cultures is a major positive for the area, providing new services, food, retail and opportunities for the local population as a whole. Whilst there are identified social issues, new migrant communities have breathed life into parts of the sub-regions urban areas that were suffering urban decay and rapid turnaround in population.

\textsuperscript{16} The Casey Review. A review into opportunity and integration; Casey DBE CB, Dame Louise; December 2016
11 Displacement from Existing Migrant Communities

11.1 As identified in chart 11.1 below, just under a third (31.8\%) of organisations completing the survey felt that new migrant communities were displacing jobs and services from existing communities (who may themselves also be of migrant origin).

Chart 11.1: Do you feel new migrant communities have displaced jobs and services from existing communities (who themselves may also be of migrant origin)?

11.2 Generally respondents felt the jobs taken by members of new migrant communities were lower paid and concentrated in sectors such as agriculture, manufacturing and the personal services sector, thus there was only limited, if any displacement from indigenous employees/job seekers. This is a similar view to those portrayed within business organisations. Higher skilled jobs have generally been recruited from non-accession EU states.

11.3 Some of the comments received in relation to economic displacement are highlighted below.

“Although Derby is a high skilled City there are still many jobs which White British individuals are not keen to take on and certainly not at minimum wage. In Derbyshire as a whole specific examples would include Eastern European workers picking potatoes, strawberries etc. Because new migrant communities are low skilled we do not see them as a serious threat in terms of employment in the local area.”

“Some employment agencies recruit eastern European workers only - which definitely places existing communities at a disadvantage. Displacement is created by the employers of migrants - not the migrants themselves!”

“some of.....this is more down to the continual movement of the local population who come and go (from Hyson Green) with new migrants back filling roles that previous migrants have moved on from.”
“I do not feel this is really an issue as many migrants are working in low skilled, long hours and low paid work, which many British people reject thinking they are better off on benefits. Many migrants are much harder working and therefore employers are increasingly employing from migrant communities as they are more reliable than UK Nationals.”

“Migrants were encouraged to come in and take low paying zero hours jobs with little or no benefits. They may have impacted on health and education services but at the same time they have ensured that the businesses they work for have stayed in the area which brings other benefits to the local economy”.

“Those requiring less academic skills and long term experience such as hospitality. Also traditional more skilled trades such as in construction. The effect is more of wage deflation than reducing the number of jobs available.”

“The Easter European migrants usually do a job that other communities do not want to do.”

11.4 Levels of employment and wage displacement are not fully understood at a national level either. This remains a contentious issue (and in line with much research into labour migrant, even less understood at a sub-regional level). A joint Home Office/BIS review in 2014 is inconclusive on the benefits/issues relating to migration on domestic economic and social variables\(^\text{17}\). It theorises national income should increase as a result of the additional skills within the economy and it should result in lower price inflation.

11.5 Generally, business/employment bodies such as the CBI and CIPD believe there has been limited, if any impact on wage rates or labour displacement due to new waves of migration, citing the high employment levels and low unemployment levels and businesses difficulties in attracting UK born workers to certain positions. Nationally, CIPD research suggested that only 6% of businesses would respond by increasing pay and conditions of employment is the EU labour pool were not available in the future\(^\text{18}\).

11.6 However, due to range of factors, the skills levels of immigrant labour is not fully utilised in the UK economy and the influx of migrant labour at the lower end of the jobs market may have a negative impact on wages for unskilled workers. If this process has been occurring in the UK labour market, it has also coincided with national policies around the Minimum Wage and subsequently the National Living Wage. Any displacement impacts are very difficult to assess and calculate.

\(^{17}\) Impacts of Migration on UK Native Employment: An analytical review of the evidence (2014) BIS/Home Office

11.7 Perhaps of more relevance is the Resolution Foundation study.

The Resolution Foundation conducted research to understand the impact of place on the EU referendum outcome, drawing on a range of socio-economic data. They used regression analysis to isolate the key drivers of voting behaviour. They concluded that economics mattered, but was by no means the only consideration.

The strongest drivers were:

- Long established living standard differences, shown for example by a strong relationship with employment rates and home ownership, but not recent changes in pay (this challenges the view that Brexit was a reaction to a post financial crisis squeeze)
- Degrees, in turn an indicator of economic and cultural characteristics, with lower leave votes in areas where higher proportions were educated to NVQ4 or above (areas with a large current student population were also more likely to vote remain)
- Feelings of cohesion within the local area, which also helps to explain some regional differences (note the data available was older than other sources)
- The pace of change in migration since 2004 - importantly the level of migration didn’t seem to impact results, helping to explain why areas with relatively small non-UK born residents saw strong leave votes

There is tentative evidence to suggest these findings are valid within the D2N2 area. A review of similar datasets showed some of the highest leave votes were in areas with the smallest proportions of non-UK born residents, and with lower qualification and employment rates. Nottingham was a notable exception to this pattern, possibly explained by high concentrations of students who displayed different voting patterns.

The Resolution Foundation concluded that policy makers ‘repairing an apparently divided nation’ should focus on improving people’s living standards, addressing concerns about the appropriate pace of migration and making areas more cohesive.

11.8 The relationship between leave votes in areas with longer term economic disadvantage and increased pace of change in migration (even in areas of low absolute numbers) suggests perception may be as important a factor as reality.
12 **Services for Emerging Migrant Communities**

12.1 Organisations that completed the survey were asked what types of services they offered to emerging and new migrant communities. There has been a broad range of service offers already identified in the sub-region, with health and wellbeing, education and training and employment advice most frequently cited.

Chart 12.1: Services delivered to emerging migrant communities across Derbyshire/Nottinghamshire by type (%)

Source: Emerging Migrant Communities Organisation Survey (2016)

12.2 Some gaps in services were also identified. **Many organisations commented that it is access to services that is frequently the issue** (standard services open to everyone) **rather than necessarily the provision of services.** Also, some services may only serve one nationality or neighbourhood (improving accessibility for a specific group, but not others.) Whilst there are established networks to support asylum seekers and refugees, it appears **community infrastructure for emerging communities is more likely to develop if there is a critical mass** (from previous migration waves, e.g. Polish or large recent numbers e.g Romanian) or where criminal or safeguarding issues arise.

12.3 It was also noted that migrants suffer from the same decline in public services that affect everyone, such as an under-supply of housing and unscrupulous landlords, healthcare and education and training. Timing has also been critical. Many Polish migrants arrived before more stringent welfare rules were put in place. Later Romanian arrivals have not had the same safety net.
12.4 Developing language skills and ESOL were especially commented upon as gaps in provision, both in terms of supporting migrants to better integrate into their host communities and wider society, but also to support their employability and ability to progress in the labour market. Investment in improved language skills/provision also has the potential to relieve pressure on other services by for example reducing translation costs, and avoiding misunderstanding that might result in needless workplace and community based costs (e.g. fly tipping). Some asylum seekers and refugees were concerned tuition tended to be conversational, and that they couldn’t develop to the level needed for work. Even with greater provision, there will still be barriers to overcome. Many economic migrants work long hours or are in physical jobs, so would find it hard to engage in a formal post-work training programme. There is clearly a role to engage employers in the process.

12.5 Interviewees noted that scope exists to extend and customise employment support services for different cultures and languages, but felt this would be limited due to the financial constraints facing the third and public sector, reduced funding for skills and business support and reduced funding for language classes. Despite this they strongly concurred that:

- Employment support needs have strong similarities to other excluded groups
- Support should be designed to be culturally appropriate
- Activities need to be tailored and geared to distance from the labour market

12.6 On the supply side therefore, organisations felt that this would typically span English language skills, administrative support (e.g. citizenship tests, registering for National Insurance, setting up a bank account), pre-employment support (e.g. work placements to become accustomed to UK work expectations, volunteering), CV writing (including verifying /evidencing qualifications), job searches and help with applications. Benefits advice was also a well cited area of under-supply. The demand side would require employers and providers of volunteering opportunities that understand cultural differences. This might point to some knowledge sharing or awareness raising intervention.

12.7 Interviewees also noted that the size of a group or speed of arrival is not the main predictor of level of need and intervention. Factors including language, education, reason for coming to the UK, disadvantage, lack of established networks and infrastructure and cultural norms were all regarded as determinants of need. Our analysis and consultation with businesses and community organisations identified a range of sub-sets of emerging communities, each with differing needs, as follows:
Table 8.1: Labour Market Subsets of Emerging Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Subset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>Entrepreneurs and small business owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>High and medium skilled, in employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>Lower skilled, but in stable employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>Low skilled, seasonal or temporary employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>Any of the above but under-employed due to recognition of qualifications, language or other barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Economic Migrant</td>
<td>Unemployed including due to recognition of qualifications, language or other barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Informal / illegal economy</td>
<td>Economic migrants working in the informal economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Informal / illegal economy</td>
<td>Illegally exploited individuals, sometimes trafficked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Displaced</td>
<td>Recently securing refugee status, now able to work in the UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Displaced</td>
<td>Asylum seekers awaiting a decision, able to volunteer or study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Primarily in the UK to study, typically in higher education and who may or may not be in work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Identifying and Supporting Future New Communities

12.8 Support organisations recognise that they need to be proactive in engaging people, but also available to react to individual calls for help. They report that because many recent emerging communities have been economic migrants (rather than displaced) there have been fewer reasons and requirements for them to make contact with local service providers. When they do encounter services, is it more likely the driver will be in response to social rather than economic reasons. As mentioned in the Methodology section, administrative databases have been of limited use in helping support organisations to understand recent changes to migrant communities.

12.9 There is no one public/third sector model of working with and supporting emerging communities within D2N2. There are grant-funded VCS consortia, informal and formal networks. Organisations reported several ways in which they had proactively contacted emerging communities across the D2N2 area including:

- by piggy-backing on services that migrants actively seek out (e.g. access to school places)
- via VCS organisations linked to an established community from a previous wave
- community protection teams and networks where issues of vulnerability, cohesion, ASB or illegal practices arise
12.10 Methods included trying to identify community leaders, or individuals willing to champion the importance of working with local services (often not the cultural norm), and then running events as a precursor for provision of direct support. Organisations reported that members of new economic migrant communities can be well-connected to each other, both electronically and physically. Many have established social media groups, and word of mouth is a powerful tool for raising awareness and sharing knowledge.
13 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

13.1 We have structured our conclusions around the initial questions that were highlighted within the scope of the study, as identified in section 2. A number of the issues that we have identified in our conclusions have implications for a wide range of organisations, including national government. However, our recommendations focus on the role of D2N2 LEP, working in partnership with others, to promote economic growth and enable communities to share in the benefits of growth. D2N2 LEP has no role in national immigration policy or national regulations about eligibility for support but LEPs do have a strategic role locally in the co-ordination of access to business support, a strategic influencer of skills and employment support provision with a particularly direct role in relation to the European Social Fund and as a partnership of local public, private and third sector organisations.

13.2 We conclude that many in migrant communities face similar issues and challenges to those in established and indigenous communities, with access to support potentially complicated by language and cultural factors. This report therefore concentrates on measures to support migrant communities to play a full role in supporting economic growth and for the benefits of that growth to be shared across all communities.

*What are the characteristics of new and emerging communities, and how do they differ from previous and established minority communities?*

13.3 The majority of new arrivals are economic migrants. Many come from traditional migration routes and join an established minority community in the UK. Economic migrants from what we might term ‘emerging communities’ are from EU Accession states or other parts of Europe. Whilst these communities are for the time being growing, migration began more than five years ago so arguably these aren’t new. The largest numbers are in Nottingham, Derby and Mansfield. Despite smaller numbers of migrants in other areas of D2N2, the speed of local increase in the migrant population, in the context of limited previous migration and often longstanding economic disadvantage, has resulted in a visible change for those communities and created risks to local cohesion.

13.4 By and large, the majority are looking after themselves. They may have untapped entrepreneurial spirit, be under-employed or they may wish to improve their English, but on the whole they enjoy relatively high employment rates. They typically don’t actively seek support (over and above essential or universal services, e.g. schools, health) so contact and awareness has tended to be on the back of an individual’s crisis or at emerging cohesion issues at a community level. There are notable exceptions, considered below.

13.5 As well as economic migrants, there are ‘emerging communities’ of asylum seekers (able to volunteer and learn if opportunities exist) and refugees (entitled to seek work) predominantly from the Middle East, Asia and Africa. These are highly concentrated in Nottingham and Derby.
13.6  Migration from the EU has led to a change in the ethnicity of migrants, many of whom are now white. However, these migrants do not originate from countries with the same strong English language tradition (such as migration from the Commonwealth nations)

*What are the favoured sectors and kinds of businesses the new and emerging minority communities are creating or are well placed/capable of creating?*

13.7  Whilst most incoming migrants are seeking employment, a relatively large proportion (compared to UK nationals) have set up their own businesses, most commonly in the retail and catering sectors and frequently aimed at serving the needs of their own communities. As mentioned above, language can be a major barrier to both employment and starting and running a business.

13.8  The research has identified that a broad number of recent migrants into the region are well educated and often highly skilled, yet frequently work in the low-skilled/low paid sectors. It is the demand for low-skilled/low-paid labour, rather than the industry per se, that has driven much employment. There may be scope to explore how these skills can be better utilised both in terms of employment progression and enterprise.

*What new or different skills sets do new migrants bring that could be nurtured to develop novel goods and services? Similarly, do they have skills deficits?*

13.9  For the purpose of access and progressing in employment, language skills are critical, and an area in keeping with D2N2’s core remit. This could be beneficial if offered to those in work, but in low skilled or unstable employment due to language barriers. This would need to be delivered flexibly in a way which meets the needs of those working long or unsociable hours.

13.10  Support to develop English language skills can help members of migrant communities to unlock latent economically valuable skills and progress in the workplace, enable access to ‘mainstream’ community and business support services and promote better integration with existing communities. This requires a range and type of English language provision that goes beyond ‘conversational’ English, although this can be a useful ‘first step’ towards integration in the workplace and community to include ‘functional’ English language skills.

13.11  D2N2 LEP recognises that there is well regarded and flexible existing English Language and preparation for work provision, but language skills remain an identified barrier to economic participation and progression and community integration. Moreover, ONS identifies that a higher proportion of migrants from EU accession states have language challenges than the overall foreign-born population. There is scope to do more to tackle these language barriers.
Recommendation 1
D2N2 LEP should work with local partners, employers, FE Colleges and skills and training providers to promote greater delivery of and access to functional English language training that meets the needs of employers and supports migrants to engage and progress within the workplace. The support must be designed to be delivered effectively to new migrant communities that may work long hours in physically demanding jobs and reside in dispersed locations beyond the Cities. This should inform future commissioning by D2N2 LEP and partners, particularly D2N2’s ESF funded inclusion and skills development work.

What and where are the gaps between the practical sustainable support needed and that available?

13.12 Within the emerging migrant communities, there are patterns of disadvantage. The size of a community isn’t a reliable indicator of support needs (in fact, scale can bring benefits of social and community networks and infrastructure). Disadvantage is a more important aspect, with unemployment reflecting education, language, awareness of rights, but also culture and possibly prejudice. Those from nationalities that joined the EU after welfare support was scaled back have not enjoyed the same safety nets.

13.13 Because asylum seekers arrive in need, there is more developed infrastructure, but a lack of funded language tuition, meaningful activity while waiting for a decision and support tailing off once a decision is made meaning new refugees also face significant barriers to employment.

13.14 ‘Back to work’ barriers (language, evidencing qualifications, confidence) and interventions (volunteering, cv writing, work placements etc) are similar issues for new residents from traditional migration routes and for those not joining established communities. The key difference is that culturally specific organisations may not exist, or be in their infancy.

Recommendation 2
Those delivering ‘mainstream’ business or community support programmes or services should ensure that they are accessible to all potential beneficiaries, including members of migrant communities. They should employ robust equalities and diversity practices and demonstrate cultural awareness in delivery. This requirement should be part of D2N2 and partner contracting, where appropriate. D2N2 and partners should monitor the equalities performance of contracted provision and, where practicable, support excellent performance and reach.

13.15 Where large employers have sizeable migrant workforces, tensions can arise on the shop floor. Employers are increasingly unsure how to address cohesion issues in the workplace.
**Recommendation 3**

D2N2 and partners should consider how business support services, particularly leadership and management training, can support employers to effectively manage culturally diverse workforces, manage potential workplace tensions and promote effective utilisation of the skills of a culturally diverse workforce.

**What are the direct/indirect barriers for people from new and emerging communities being more engaged in skills and enterprise development?**

13.16 In addition to the language and employability barriers mentioned above, there are groups of economic migrants who face additional disadvantage; those subject to illegal practices and those in temporary or unstable employment. Both Police and Crime Commissioners have partnership-led modern slavery programmes.

**Recommendation 4**

Illegal and exploitative working practices, particularly practices of ‘modern slavery’, not only harm the workers involved but they also undermine the competitiveness of D2N2 businesses that ‘play by the rules’. Whilst D2N2 LEP and partners do not have a direct role in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire police’s ‘anti-slavery’ programmes, partners and the Police should work together to promote business awareness through their supply chains and also through organisations that work with potentially vulnerable communities.

13.17 Engagement in business start-up and skills programmes is part of the wider issue of encouraging migrant communities to access public services. These services already exist, but there is generally low up-take from migrants. Some providers and programmes have complex rules and requirements relating to non-UK residents and some staff are unsure of how this applies to potential clients.

13.18 Many individuals within emerging migrant communities, both economic migrants and here for other reasons, are highly skilled individuals and have a good level of education and qualifications. These qualifications are often not recognised in the UK. There may be scope to support the conversion of qualifications to support workforce progression when the long-term future of economic migrants currently in the UK is clear.

**What is the economic impact of new and emerging minority communities on established migrant communities?**

13.19 We heard little evidence that there is a major displacement of services or jobs from established migrant communities. New migrants often take on the roles that were initially common in previous waves of migration. There is no consensus about the impact on wage rates and increases in economic migration from the EU has coincided with both the introduction of a National Minimum Wage and subsequent National Living Wage.
13.20 All communities are seeing reductions in service provision as public spending reduces. There is anecdotal evidence that emerging migrant communities may be avoiding services they are entitled to for cultural reasons, have limited knowledge of what is available or are in employment and generally looking after their own needs.

**What are the implications for the development and implementation of local growth strategies?**

13.21 Migration policies have largely driven competitiveness through an expansion of the labour market. In the future, especially as the UK seems likely to leave the EU Single Market, the opportunities to drive competitiveness through an expanding labour market appear much more uncertain. This may lead to businesses accelerating adoption of less labour-intensive approaches (especially in lower skilled occupations) to deliver their growth aspirations.

13.22 Some businesses and sectors (notably agriculture, food and drink manufacturing and some specific sub-sets of construction and health) have built a heavy reliance on overseas migrant labour and may be significantly affected by any changes to EU Single Market membership or changes to immigration policy.

13.23 As previously mentioned, there may be a wider role in growth strategies to support sustainable and productive growth and reward good practices in employment and the creation of permanent employment opportunities.

13.24 Ultimately, the study underlines the importance of new migrant communities forming part of, not superseding, a wider equality impact assessment; as ethnicity and gender remain significant equalities challenges.

13.25 One of the running themes through this study has been the lack of appropriate local data on the role of emerging communities within the D2N2 economic area. This has previously hindered effective policy making (and not just in the spheres of economic development and inclusion) and service delivery. It is also important as national data and research on new migrant communities often do not reflect local experiences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Recommendation 5</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are considerable uncertainties about the economic impact of Brexit and UK’s future immigration policy. D2N2 and partners should continue to actively monitor the local economy and labour market using not only data but through dialogue with employers and community groups to maintain a qualitative understanding of labour market issues; including labour market equality. D2N2 and partners should use this intelligence to inform skills and employment strategies and delivery programmes. In particular, supporting in-work progression of all workers, including migrant workers, can help employers to gain a more productive workforce and mitigate employers reported fears around future difficulties in retaining and attracting higher skilled workers from the European Union.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13.26 Whilst national research reports and business views are generally positive about the overall economic impact of migrant labour, there are mixed views about the local ‘impact’ of new migrant communities and any ‘displacement’ effect on local services and employment opportunities for existing communities. Indeed, some communities whilst having comparatively low levels of non-indigenous populations have experienced a rapid increase in migrant communities in recent years. As stated previously, the speed of increase in the context of limited previous migration has resulted in a visible change for existing communities, which, in some areas, presents challenges of cultural cohesion and integration alongside long-standing economic disadvantage. This presents a challenge for D2N2’s long standing ambition to enable all communities to participate in and benefit from economic growth.

**Recommendation 6**

In developing strategies and delivery programmes, particularly those using European Social Fund monies, D2N2 and partners should consider how social cohesion and long-standing economic disadvantage can be effectively addressed in local areas, particularly those with recent rapid expansion in migrant communities.
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Old Bolsover Town Council
Nottingham Arimathea Trust
Near Neighbours
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Kenning Park Community Group
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Appendix B: Key Datasets

Datasets, their source and notes on statistical methods and limitations have been provided to accompany this report.

The data pack contents are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Geography</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth of usual residents</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth - urban and rural characteristics</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE, upper tier authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK born residents by district</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE, district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration from outside the UK in year prior to the Census</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE, district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth of short-term residents</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity of short-term residents</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHeo registrations to adult overseas nationals entering the UK</td>
<td>NHeo Registrations</td>
<td>2006-07 &amp; 2015-16</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHeo Registrations by geographic sub-groups, over time</td>
<td>NHeo Registrations</td>
<td>2006-07 &amp; 2015-16</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working age population and employment rates of non-UK nationals</td>
<td>Annual Population Survey</td>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>CORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Countries with highest number of applications for asylum in the UK</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Years to June 2015 &amp; 2016</td>
<td>UK only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK asylum applications and initial decisions</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Years to June 2015 &amp; 2016</td>
<td>UK only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in the rise of supported asylum seekers, by district</td>
<td>Home Office</td>
<td>Years to June 2015 &amp; 2016</td>
<td>CORE, district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education students by domicile</td>
<td>HESA</td>
<td>Academic year 2014-15</td>
<td>University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at arrival by area of birth of all migrants</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>CORE, England &amp; Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency in English by area of birth</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic activity and inactivity by area of birth</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation by area of birth of all migrants</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>April 2011</td>
<td>England &amp; Wales</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Equality Challenge

This report has been commissioned by D2N2 as a follow up to the challenge presented in the ‘Minorities, the Way Forward’ report published by Equality Challenge, in 2015.

Equality Challenge is a partnership providing a new approach to the social and economic difficulties faced by new arrival, minority ethnic and disadvantaged communities. Its mission is to progress the social and economic standing of people from areas of disadvantage and ethnic minority communities, joining and contributing to their efforts through enterprise, job creation, skills development and social support programs in D2N2. It aims to challenge the social and economic imbalance that exists and was created through exclusion and discrimination.

It is a solution orientated partnership that acknowledges that the solutions to the problems faced by the communities they represent must come from within the communities themselves. Its aims to achieve this by:
- Creating meaningful and sustainable employment opportunities for those furthest removed from the jobs market
- Tackling discrimination and advocating on behalf of new arrival, minority ethnic and disadvantaged communities
- Encouraging enterprise and skills development as a means to overcome poverty
- Promoting factors that encourage social inclusion

Equality Challenge comprises:
1. City College Nottingham
2. PATRA inc ACDA
3. First Enterprise Business Agency
4. NG7 Training, Employment & Advice
5. Communities Inc
6. Jobs, Employment & Training,
7. Central Education and Training
8. Derby Women's Centre.

Equality Challenge is based at City College Nottingham, Carlton Road, Nottingham NG3 2NR.

The Partnership Lead for Equality Challenge is Hassan Ahmed who also chaired the Steering Group for this report on behalf of D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership. He can be contacted at hassan@ccn.ac.uk or 0785000914

www.equalitychallenge.co.uk