



**Report on the Active Inclusion Learning Network:
Troubled Families Platform 2 Transnational Event
Brussels, 13 -14 November 2014**

Overview:

The event focussed on

- Anti-Social Behaviour
- Educational Problems
- Long-term unemployment/multi-generational unemployment and;
- Offenders' Families

22 experts, from 13 different nationalities, participated in the event. The event was hosted by ESF Flanders.

9 project partners also attended to facilitate and scribe the 2 sub-theme workshop groups. Dr Ioan Durnescu attended the event in the capacity of the researcher and moved between the workshops to observe. The Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion, who are evaluating the Network observed and invited feedback from delegates via a questionnaire.

Presentations were given by Craig Georgiou, Project Manager, Chris Holmes, Troubled Families Theme Lead for NOMS, Dr Ioan Durnescu on the Systematic review, and Marie-Anne Paraskevas from the European Commission about Social Inclusion.

Aim and format of the event

The aim of the event was to identify key points of the interventions which had been identified by previous analysis by an expert panel in the Platform Level 1 meetings.

On day one, interventions and experts were assigned to one of the two workshops according to their expertise; the Anti-Social Behaviour and Educational Problems workshop or the Long term / multi-generational unemployment and Offenders' Families' workshop. Participants had been sent the written overview and original questionnaire of each practice, and were asked to read these prior to the event.

The invited interventions presented their approach to their workshop. All participants were asked to draw upon their own experience and knowledge of best practice to draw out the key points for each practice using the four themes of:

- Innovation,
- Transferability,
- Learning and;
- Finance.

Unfortunately due to illness and other commitments, not all invited practices were able to attend. Those marked as ~~strikethrough~~ on the tables below did not attend.

The Anti-Social Behaviour and Educational Problems workshop was facilitated by Heather Law, Birmingham City Council, UK, and the scribe was Rhianon Williams, Ministry of Justice, Germany:

<u>Intervention name</u>	<u>Survey code</u>	<u>Country</u>
The Pathways Project	ASB5	UK
Choose your future	EP22	Poland
Progetto Re-start	ASB20	Italy
Europe value added training – EVAT	EP20	Northern Ireland
Meeting Place 2020	ASB19	Sweden
Aan de Slag	EP30	The Netherlands
Tomorrow's Women Wirral	ASB6	UK



The Long-term unemployment/multi-generational unemployment and Offenders' Families workshop was facilitated by Craig Georgiou, NOMS, UK, and the scribe was Giovanna Mangano, ISFOL, Italy :

<u>Intervention name</u>	<u>Survey code</u>	<u>Country</u>
WAW trajectory	MGU3	Belgium
Integrated outreach support	OF3	UK
Choices Plus	MGU29	Northern

		Ireland
Integration of the members of the family of high-quality social risk into the labour market'	OF9	Lithuania
Social Cooperative Enterprise - SCE "I Change"	MGU17	Greece
Family Space (Spazio Famiglia)	OF7	Romania
Restart 2 Transfer of Innovation Project	MGU25	Northern Ireland

On day 2, a plenary discussion was held where participants from both workshop groups were asked to discuss the key points from the four themes. This was facilitated by the lead and partners to allow discussion. A change was made to way this session was organised to better facilitate discussion and utilise expert knowledge. Whereas originally it had been planned to hold plenary discussions for each of the 4 themes in turn, it became apparent that this would be repetitive and time inefficient.

Instead the format was changed so that experts were invited to individually consider each of the four themes and to summarise their thoughts on a post it note. There then followed a facilitated plenary discussion where feedback from the post it notes was summarised into important factors. This was felt to have the advantage of better utilising the expertise and experience from all delegates across all interventions from both workshops.

For example, considering the Learning theme, important factors were identified as: provision of: a "safe place" and "soft / safe" practices; tailored / needs lead; involving service users; use of volunteers; evaluation; employer engagement; the importance of the whole family; and partnership / stakeholder involvement.





Overall the event appeared to prove successful with all the delegates networking and exchanging ideas on best practice with Troubled Families. It was felt that there was some overlap with the other two sub-themes of Disaffected Youth and Marginalised in Communities. However, this wasn't a bad thing as the interventions were created to fill a gap in society where help was needed and this does sometimes extend across a multi-layered approach, and as indicated in the systemic review, to some extent "Troubled Families" is a UK political construct, so some overlap across themes is expected. For example, a lot of interventions such as Aan De Slag were aimed at young people as was The Pathways Project because it is targeted at those still in school and these interventions aim to prevent or reduce the likelihood of family problems later on in life after leaving school.

Providing an opportunity for practitioners from the interventions to come together with other experts to discuss the innovative, transferability, funding sources and learning for each appeared to be a useful way of sharing experiences and learning. Feedback from some delegates suggested that they intended to contact each other to discuss details of how to implement certain aspects of interventions in other countries.

What worked well

Pre event information and organisation worked well as it meant that delegates came to the event with a clear expectation about what was expected of them, and how the event would run.

Format of the event. A flexible approach to day two was felt to have better utilised the expertise and experience from all delegates across all interventions from both workshops as described above.

What didn't work well

As described above not all invited interventions were able to attend.

Learning and suggested points for future PL2 events

It may be worth considering how / whether it is possible to reduce the likelihood of practices being unable to attend.