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South Yorkshire services working with Roma

Services reported working with Roma in South Yorkshire

- Roma employed: 46
- Roma-specific projects: 22
- Total: 66

Service delivery location

- Sheffield: 35
- Rotherham: 10
- Doncaster: 6
- Barnsley: 13

Service sectors

- Private
- Third sector
- Statutory

Most common area of work: Children and young people

Roma priorities:
- Employment and family

Roma service users

- 100+: Roma seen by the busiest service each week
- Slovak: Top Roma nationality seen by services
- 10+: Roma presence in South Yorkshire
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1. Introduction

1.1 Aims and purpose of this project

Migrant Roma are one of the newest communities in South Yorkshire. Important work is already being done in some local areas to explore what this means and respond to the needs of whole communities where new arrivals are making their home. Migration Yorkshire has led a short project to bring policy makers, Roma, non-Roma people and organisations together to share information and discuss what’s working and what isn’t. We also explored what still needs to be done to reduce the exclusion of Roma populations and to foster positive integration across South Yorkshire communities.

The main purpose of this project was to identify a range of interventions to tackle Roma exclusion in South Yorkshire. This was achieved by working with Roma communities and Roma support organisations to do the following:

- Understand needs, map existing services and service gaps, identify duplication and overlap
- Support, consult and work with Roma to determine the best approach for future work (including identifying priority needs, actions, scale and delivery location)
- Co-produce and plan a potential delivery model, service interventions and partnership requirements for delivery.

These aims were achieved through the following activities:

- Mapping of services for Roma in South Yorkshire, identifying gaps and overlaps
- Directly working with Roma, including running focus groups with Roma, and involving them in all aspects of the project
- Holding events to engage services and Roma including a large South Yorkshire event at the beginning of the project, and two meetings in each of the four local authority areas of Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield.

1.2 The structure of this report

This report is the third in a series of reports for the South Yorkshire Roma project (listed on the back page of this report). This report maps and analyses existing service provision for Roma across South Yorkshire as a whole, and presents a set of recommendations for working with Roma in South Yorkshire in the future.

The remainder of Section 1 gives further details about the context of this work, the approach to undertaking this project, and the methodology employed in the research elements. Section 2 gives an overview of existing service provision for Roma across South Yorkshire, highlighting the similarities and differences in approaches to working with Roma between the constituent parts of South Yorkshire. It also acknowledges and discusses some of the practical challenges encountered in this kind of work (in Section 2.4). It concludes by presenting a proposal for future work with Roma in South Yorkshire based on this mapping and the views of services and Roma communities, brought together in nine key recommendations. Section 3 draws together the conclusions and recommendations of the project as a whole.
1.3 Background and context

This project was initiated because of a lack of clear, coordinated interventions in place to achieve Roma inclusion in South Yorkshire, and an under-developed Roma-led community organisation sector. This situation was being exacerbated by increasing need among Roma communities, while simultaneously the resources available to local support services to respond and improve Roma inclusion in local areas were diminishing.

Roma migration to South Yorkshire began before the enlargement of the EU in 2004 but became the main focus of press and political comments in 2013, following statements by former Home Secretary and local MP David Blunkett on local tensions prompted by the arrival of Slovak Roma migrants in the Page Hall area of Sheffield.

While Sheffield continues to be a focus for a national Roma debate and is believed to have one of the highest concentrations of Roma in the UK, other parts of South Yorkshire have also been subject to media scrutiny in recent years due to the growing numbers and concentrations of Roma in the Eastwood and Hexthorpe areas of Rotherham and Doncaster respectively. This has taken place in a politically sensitive context, with growing local support for right-wing organisations in some areas.

In addition, Rotherham has been subject to intense scrutiny in recent years in relation to cases of child sexual exploitation and trafficking, most infamously in the 2014 Jay report. While this issue was not exclusively related to Roma communities, these underlying concerns have deeply affected the context of work with vulnerable communities in Rotherham, including Roma.

Research at a national level as well as local to South Yorkshire, including from Migration Yorkshire’s Roma SOURCE and Roma MATRIX projects, have provided evidence of Roma marginalisation in the UK. They have shown that poverty is a central, recurring aspect of

---

Roma exclusion, exacerbated by lack of fluency in English, poor education, restricted access to public services and wider opportunities, and limited integration in local communities.

In the past few years there have been indications of effective interventions in addressing Roma exclusion in South Yorkshire, but local policy and practice in relation to Roma integration has developed in a fairly piecemeal, uncoordinated fashion. Rather than supporting Roma integration in the context of longer-term, strategic plans, services have had to deal with immediate needs in the context of the number and pace of Roma arrivals in certain neighbourhoods.

This lack of coordination has taken place in a context of reducing options to fund work to support Roma integration alongside increasing need. For example, many Traveller Education Support Services (central to initial management of Roma migration) within local authorities have been cut or absorbed within other teams following the national austerity drive. Specific funding streams to support new arrivals have been curtailed, such as the Migration Impacts Fund which ended prematurely in 2010, followed by changes to ESOL funding restricting free access to classes a few years later. Subsequent welfare restrictions (to Housing Benefit, Child Tax Credit, Child Benefit and Jobseeker’s Allowance, the introduction of the benefit cap and the minimum earning threshold) have had a disproportionate impact on Roma migrants, as many have seen their income being reduced dramatically and there are fewer services to turn to for help.

---

1.4 Research methods

Initial engagement with local services and Roma communities

Early work for this project involved developing relationships with service providers and Roma communities across South Yorkshire. As the regional strategic migration partnership, we already had many contacts from our existing broader work on migration across Yorkshire and Humber, and from the Roma SOURCE and Roma MATRIX projects we coordinated up to 2015. Staff from Migration Yorkshire approached, phoned and visited many of these contacts prior to the project events. This ensured that we had a good understanding of work being done with Roma, and alerted us to some of the more sensitive issues that might be difficult to elucidate in formal project events. This also led to further contacts with other organisations also working with Roma clients.

At the same time, three Roma champions were identified and recruited to the project through the University of Salford. These champions lived and worked in South Yorkshire. Their status as members of Roma communities enabled the project to engage with Roma throughout. The champions were heavily involved in the design of the focus group questions, and were responsible for recruitment and delivery of the focus groups in their respective geographical areas. They actively participated in the other project events, and also brought members of Roma communities to these events.

Project events and participants

The data for this project was collected using a variety of methods between May 2016 and January 2017: a 'launch event'; a survey of local services; local meetings; and, Roma-led focus groups. Roma from Slovak, Czech, Latvian and Romanian Roma communities in South Yorkshire have been present at each of these project events. In total, over 80 services and 79 individual Roma were involved in the project.

- Staff from local services and resident Roma came together to talk about Roma integration at the ‘launch event’ for this project. 82 people from across South Yorkshire attended representing almost 40 different organisations. 24 delegates were from the Roma community (some participants were both members of the Roma community and representing local organisations). The event included table discussions and a Roma community panel who answered questions from the delegates about how they could work better with Roma in South Yorkshire.

- 73 projects completed a survey of local services and projects working with Roma clients (in writing or over the phone) during the course of the project to help us to map service provision, duplication, gaps and priorities for action in South Yorkshire.

- Local meetings were held in Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield to discuss local service provision and local priorities. There were two meetings in each of the four local authority areas. Local meetings were attended by services, Roma champions and representatives from local Roma communities.

---

11 79 different Roma individuals were involved in the project. Some attended more than one event, but we have removed any double-counting from these figures.

12 In addition to the 82 local delegates, staff from Migration Yorkshire and the Big Lottery Fund were in attendance.
29 Roma participated in five focus groups that were facilitated by our Roma champions with at least one group in each of the four areas. Further details about participants and findings are provided in our companion report Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire.

This data was supplemented by information collected during desk research, including a literature search and online information about local service provision.

Further details about the service survey

From our initial exploratory work and links made throughout the project, we understood that a certain number of services were or might be engaging with Roma communities in South Yorkshire. In total, we approached nearly a hundred services to complete a survey. They included a mix of statutory, voluntary, and private sector organisations, and a mix of frontline providers and strategic staff. Local authority departments (housing, social care, GRT teams etc.) were treated as different services because of the size of the statutory sector and the varying remits of different council services.

73 survey responses were received, either in written form or over the phone. Most services confirmed they were currently engaging with Roma communities (some did not but wanted to, while a few had no plans to work with Roma clients at all). We did not gain sufficient information about some other services engaging with Roma (such as schools, foodbanks, GPs, jobcentres and provision of ESOL through JobCentrePlus) to include their details in this report. Indeed, many services simply did not know if they have Roma clients, either because they do not record client ethnicity, or staff knowledge about Roma may be non-existent. On occasions, organisations reported working with service users from countries beyond those most commonly identified among Roma in the region (Slovak, Czech, Latvian, Romanian and Polish), but it is not clear whether these clients were of Roma ethnicity or simply shared language or cultural traits and were thus seen as part of the same client group.

The services participating in the survey were organised geographically and put into tables, one each for Barnsley (Section 3.2), Doncaster (Section 4.2), Rotherham (Section 5.2) and Sheffield (Section 6.2). Within each geographical area, services were arranged in an approximate order that we understood to reflect the intensity of their work with Roma communities in their localities. The darkest shading at the start of each table suggests the greatest intensity of work with Roma, and fades down to no shading at the end of each table, which indicates services who do not currently work directly with Roma but want to. This relative ordering was determined by a combination of factors based on information provided about: the number or proportion of Roma service users, specific projects aiming to work directly with Roma communities, the reach of the service, the length and nature of their engagement with Roma, employment of Roma staff or providing volunteering opportunities for Roma, and apparent trust of Roma communities in these services.

The tables are intended to help the reader to quickly gauge which organisations work most closely with Roma in each area. They do not in any way evaluate the quality of services, nor are intended to suggest where funding should or should not be directed. The tables provide a picture of the activity with Roma in local areas, but they are not exhaustive. We included

---

13 A further focus group was undertaken with 10 Romanians who work in Goldthorpe, Barnsley, but none of these participants were prepared to identify themselves as Roma. We have therefore excluded this data from these totals.
information about services even where it was only a partial picture, so their impact might be greater than presented in this report.

Given the short-term nature of some projects, services and funding streams, the information presented here is a snapshot of activity during 2016; some of the information presented in this report may have subsequently changed.

Reflections on the data collection

The timing of the data collection phase had an important effect upon the research findings. While the launch event took place in May 2016, the other project events took place in the weeks and months after the EU referendum vote in the UK on 23 June 2016.

This issue was forefront particularly in the minds of those participating in the local meetings and focus groups. Brexit was a topic included in the question schedule at the request of the Roma champions. While this means that the focus groups were focused on the initial reaction of Roma and their experiences after the vote, it provides a unique insight into the immediate effects of this vote upon EU residents.

Recording data and analysis

Notes were taken at each event, including table discussions at the launch event and whole group discussions at each of the local meetings. These discussions all took place in English. Four of the focus groups were conducted in the first language of the participants and then translated an audio recording. The fifth focus group and the Roma community panel at the launch event were conducted in English. All these discussions were transcribed.

The event notes and transcriptions were then coded thematically, and a set of themes emerged from the data. These themes and broader findings from the research were shared at the second set of local meetings in order to ensure that they reflected understanding among both Roma and local services. The project findings were adjusted in light of this feedback.
2. South Yorkshire overview

2.1 Existing reports of Roma in South Yorkshire

Roma migrants from Eastern Europe have been arriving and settling in South Yorkshire for over 10 years, largely since the expansion of the EU in 2004. The first local and national reports confirming Roma migration to South Yorkshire were published around 2008/09, documenting arrivals in each local authority area. Roma communities became established noticeably in Rotherham and Sheffield, although smaller numbers also settled in Barnsley and Doncaster. While Slovak Roma arrivals seemed dominant in most of the region, Barnsley’s Roma population was primarily thought to be from Latvia and former Yugoslavia. Those early reports suggested that Roma migration to South Yorkshire began with a small number of Roma individuals who arrived in the UK as asylum seekers in the early 2000s. They were ‘dispersed’ through the asylum system to this area and settled here. After 2004 these Roma refugees were gradually joined by their families and friends, who now had the right to free movement as EU nationals, in a chain migration process.

With little history of migrant Roma coming from Central and Eastern Europe, the particular needs of Roma compared to other (non-Roma) EU migrants were only recognised gradually. Attempts to identify and record the numbers of Roma arriving and settling to the region were (and continue to be) imperfect. A combination of reliance upon National Insurance Numbers (NINos) and GP registrations, alongside some transience among new arrivals, meant that this challenging task could only result in local ‘guestimates’. Local services have conducted needs assessments and provide services despite these difficulties.

Early responses to Roma communities included statutory services (particularly schools and Traveller services) and the third sector. Their interventions focused largely on immediate needs – getting children into school, assistance in securing income, accommodation and GP registration – and responding to problems in neighbourhoods associated with the relatively large and unexpected influx of new communities into local areas. Over time, there have been a range of interventions targeting Roma communities to improve their health and social care, although there has been relatively little strategic planning directly targeting Roma. Instead, local areas have tended to develop broader community cohesion or new arrivals strategies, within which Roma might fall but may not be considered specifically.

Community tensions were perhaps inevitable in the context of diminishing resources available to public services, a continual national programme of welfare restrictions affecting EU migrants, and new arrivals settling in the poorer and more marginalised areas of South Yorkshire. The main issues seemed to be related to low level of anti-social behaviour, rubbish and overcrowding. This led to introduction of selective licencing schemes between 2014 and 2015 in three areas where Roma were known to live: Page Hall and Fir Vale in Sheffield, Eastwood in Rotherham, and Hexthorpe in Doncaster. Roma exclusion has to some extent been exacerbated by the EU referendum in June 2016 that was followed by a subsequent spike in hate crime incidents.

2.2 Current service provision for, or accessed by, Roma

This project identified 66 services currently or recently working with Roma communities in South Yorkshire. Information about these services was illustrated in the infographic on page 4. Most services work in just one of the four areas of Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield, but a small number work across multiple areas.

A further 13 services are interested or even applying for funding to work with Roma communities in their localities, or want to engage with Roma communities more meaningfully by extending their work to other parts of South Yorkshire. This includes South Yorkshire-wide services such as the police, which seem to have better engagement with Roma communities in some areas than others.

Some overall patterns for South Yorkshire are highlighted in the following sections.

Service provision by geography and sector

Sheffield has the largest number and variety of services available to Roma communities in South Yorkshire (based on the information gathered for this project) with 35 services currently engaging with Roma. This is followed by Rotherham with 16 services, Doncaster with 13 and Barnsley having 6 services. This distribution is illustrated in Figure 1.

Figure 1: The distribution of services known to be working with Roma in South Yorkshire

Nearly 40% of these identified services are based in the three localities which are thought to be the areas with the highest concentration of Roma: Page Hall (Sheffield), Eastwood (Rotherham) and Hexthorpe (Doncaster).

The difference between the number of services identified in each area partially reflects the size of the general population, as well as the estimated size of the Roma population in each area. It may also reflect the political pressure upon Sheffield to target Roma communities for support following intense media coverage of Page Hall. Finally, it is important to note

17 The number of services in Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield total 70, rather than the 66 total provided above. This is because they double count services that work in more than one location.
that we were able to gather information on a large number of schools in Sheffield with Roma pupils (9) compared with other parts of South Yorkshire, which may reflect engagement by Sheffield’s children, young people and families service with this project. This can be seen more clearly in Figure 2, which breaks down service provision by sector type.

Figure 2: Types of services supporting Roma clients, by location and sector

![Bar Chart](image)

Figure 2 also highlights the significant role of both statutory and voluntary sectors in providing services to Roma. There are similar numbers of services provided by each sector in Barnsley, Doncaster and Rotherham. However, Figure 2 only reflects service delivery rather than funding arrangements. Funding can be complex and at times involve statutory bodies commissioning voluntary sector delivery, partnership arrangements and match funding. Therefore it is difficult to fully describe which organisations are involved in the provision of services to Roma.

Children and advice as priorities in service provision

There is a focus on children and youth (under the age of 25) as project beneficiaries across South Yorkshire, with approximately 36 services engaging with this group. Many of these services are schools or children’s centres with substantial numbers of Roma children; Roma account for over half of all pupils on some school rolls. Other services for young people are frequently delivered by the third sector, some of which were developed in response to seeing Roma playing on the streets or not being in mainstream educational provision.

Advice is the second most common area of work with Roma communities. Fewer services provide advice, but tend to have relatively large numbers of Roma service users. Approximately 10 services are known to be engaged in this type of work, with three services seeing over 100 Roma clients each week. Advice is usually provided in the form of pre-booked appointments or drop-in sessions, with some limited outreach. Inquiries tend to cover benefits, schools, utilities, local authorities, employers etc.
A clear relationship between locality, trust and engagement

The busiest services do not always have the most expertise, appropriate skills and resources to respond to the specific needs of Roma clients. For example, some advice services do not have sufficient levels of advice accreditation or the latest information to be able to support Roma who have queries regarding their immigration status and rights as EU nationals.

Community-based services are often popular and become the first point of contact for Roma. They are often seen as more approachable and available than other organisations. These popular services tend to be located in the areas with the highest concentration of Roma and often have Roma staff or volunteers. This is seen as an important factor in initial engagement and building trust between a service and Roma communities. Using Roma staff or volunteers is a technique employed by a large number of organisations (except in Barnsley), as shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3: Roma staff known to be volunteering or employed, by location

Organisations which are trusted by Roma seem to have more success in approaching more sensitive subjects, such as sexual health, sexual exploitation or substance use, as well as preventative health work. Specialist organisations are often unable to undertake this work since they do not have established trusting relationships with their target client group.

‘Explicit, but not exclusive, targeting’ of Roma?\(^{18}\)

Among the organisations participating in this project, there are none whose remit exclusively covers Roma (except, perhaps, for the informal, Roma-led football group in Doncaster). Instead, there are approximately 22 Roma-specific projects across the South Yorkshire region, but these fall within services’ wider remits covering migrants, new migrants/arrivals, GRT, ethnic minorities, or deprived neighbourhoods etc.

The rationale services gave for developing Roma-targeted projects varied. Some are based on the fact that some Roma have complex needs, have little or no engagement with

---

\(^{18}\) 'Explicit but not exclusive targeting' in relation to Roma inclusion programmes is advocated by the Council of Europe. See for example, Council of Europe (n.d.) Roma inclusion at local level: The ROMACT Approach p.3 [http://coe-romact.org/about-romact](http://coe-romact.org/about-romact)
mainstream services compared to other migrant or ethnic minority groups, or the numbers of Roma children and young people. Some projects are Roma-exclusive, with one or two being even narrowed to nationality, such as projects aimed at Slovak Roma specifically.

While Roma-specific projects are often seen as engaging better with Roma communities, some concerns exist around the lack of transition (back) to mainstream services, and the way such projects are perceived by the rest of the local community. In addition, there are concerns that some projects seem to have inadvertently become exclusively for Roma or non-Roma service users, because one group ‘opts-out’ due to the presence of the other.

An appetite for further, more effective partnership working

We have come across many organisations working together on Roma issues. This occurs within the same sector (statutory services working in partnership, or third sector services signposting to one another) as well as cross-sector (statutory - third sector collaborations).

However, there are some gaps in terms of strategic, coordinated service delivery in different areas of South Yorkshire. There were more examples of services working together in Sheffield, but this is partly due to the higher number of services working on Roma issues in Sheffield. In fact, due to its size, Sheffield seems rather uncoordinated, and some services do not always hold one another in high regard.

Rotherham and Doncaster seem to have a grasp of what is happening on the ground in relation to work with Roma. This is perhaps due to the smaller number of services involved. However, these services also at times feel under-resourced and over-subscribed, particularly the more popular locally-based services such as advice sessions and drop-ins.

Various services across the region mentioned the need for more evaluation and sharing good practice. This was evident in places like Barnsley, feeling newer to working with Roma communities. There is an appetite among services in these areas for better joined-up working both locally as well as regionally, to maximise the expertise of organisations and resources available.

2.3 An overview of local approaches

Local authorities in each of the four locations in South Yorkshire have slightly different approaches to Roma communities settling in their localities. In three of these, some attempts have been made to establish the size and spread of Roma communities:

- Barnsley Council has been conducting an informal mapping exercise of its Roma communities. It confirmed that Roma communities are not concentrated in specific streets or localities, unlike the other parts of South Yorkshire. It is believed that the Roma population size is in the low hundreds rather than thousands, although this knowledge reflects their understanding of Latvian Roma living locally - with little understanding of the size, location or needs of Slovak Roma, thought to be a growing community here. Some services were aware of Roma may be living and working in the Goldthorpe/Dearne area in the east of the local authority area, like other EU nationals, but this understanding seems to be underexplored.

- Rotherham’s approach is more locality-based. The majority of work focused on Roma is based in Eastwood, and Roma-specific projects tend to be delivered by the third
sector. An informal door-to-door ‘census’ survey has been undertaken in Eastwood for the last three years, estimating the Roma population at 4,500. The survey also suggests more stability among Roma, with transience slowing down compared to the previous year (measured by calculating the percentage of residents living in the area for longer than 12 months). Slovak and Czech Roma continue to be the dominant Roma nationalities, with no significant increase in the Romanian Roma population.

- Sheffield’s Roma population estimates are often based on the number of children being enrolled in local schools. Estimates are sometimes made for certain localities rather than for Sheffield as a whole. A health needs assessment completed in 2016 may add to this knowledge, but has not yet been shared beyond the health sector.

While there are clear advantages in services knowing and understanding Roma communities better, it is important to be mindful of some implications of counting or mapping Roma. We know that Roma are often reluctant to self-identify as Roma. Making estimates of the Roma population can be contentious and can impact upon relationships between services and Roma communities. For example, it was stated at a project event that there is a belief among some Roma that some organisations might inflate their estimates of the Roma population in order to seek greater levels of funding. On the other hand, at another project event it was explained that Roma will often comply with requests to confirm their ethnicity for monitoring purposes, if they are given a clear explanation of why this information is needed.

Barnsley and Doncaster are local authorities that feel they have a more recent experience of migration from EU countries. These have a single point of contact for all migrants (Barnsley) or Roma specifically (Doncaster), based in different departments: Community Safety and Enforcement (Barnsley) and Children and Young People Services (Doncaster). In contrast, Rotherham and Sheffield have more experience of migration to their cities and have had negative media that has affected their reputations as cities and has affected community cohesion. Their responses to Roma residents are more complicated. They seem to be locality based and concentrated in places with the highest density of the Roma populations (Page Hall in Sheffield and Eastwood in Rotherham).

There seems to be a tendency within the statutory sector for teams to work parallel to one another, rather than fully collaborating in their work with Roma. Dissimilar approaches can then arise, with enforcement activity (such as licencing schemes, community safety and enforcement) contrasting strongly with those undertaking engagement work and focusing on improving relationships with Roma communities (such as those working in education or community development). These different approaches may well appear confusing to local residents.
2.4 Conundrums: complex issues to consider when planning services

There were a number of issues discussed during this project where it became clear that these were complex or difficult to resolve, with few immediately obvious ‘right’ answers. Rather than advocate one view over another, it is probably more useful for this report to outline the issues and perspectives involved, in order that decision-makers can think through different perspectives before coming to an informed choice that is the optimal choice for their own context.

How can we take one approach with a diverse group like Roma?

It is clear from the participants in this project that it is not always helpful to treat migrant Roma as one migrant group or one ethnic group. Roma come from different places across a large geographical area in Central and Eastern Europe, they communicate in different languages and have different social and cultural practices.

Given this variation, how can funders and services take a common approach to working with this diverse group? Here are some ideas:

- **Talk about ‘Roma communities’**. We have amended our vocabulary in these reports to refer to ‘Roma communities’ (rather than ‘the Roma community’) to recognise the diversity of Roma in our everyday thinking, discussions and working practices. We would encourage others to adopt this phrase.
- **Improve staff knowledge and understanding of Roma communities**. Staff members need support in developing their knowledge and response to Roma clients to improve everyday service delivery.
- **Consult different Roma communities to improve service plans and delivery**. Consultation with Roma service users should take account of the differences between Roma communities rather than assuming a single representative could represent all of these voices. This will mean seeking out views from different Roma groups, including those who are hardest-to-reach, illiterate or least engaged with services.

Finally, another difficult issue to face is that some Roma might hold views about other Roma communities that we might find difficult to understand or unacceptable in the UK. This may warrant further exploratory work in the future.

Are Roma a completely unique client group?

Some practitioners in this project were a little despairing because Roma seemed to present unique characteristics and experiences. Even services used to working with new arrivals to the UK felt they had to ‘start from scratch’ in their knowledge, understanding and engagement with Roma service users.

It became clear during this project that not every need, characteristic or aspect of Roma communities is unique, although in combination they may seem more challenging. Services could draw on relevant experience with other client groups where there are parallels with Roma experiences. For example:
- Roma are subject to the same rules as other EU nationals. These include rights to residency, work, access to benefits and ESOL. They are likely to have similar concerns about hate crime and the impacts of Brexit upon their rights in the UK.
- Like refugees and asylum seekers, Roma can have fears about authority and distrust of interpreters, due to their experiences in their countries of origin.
- Roma often have social and family ties and responsibilities in more than one country, like many other migrants and ethnic minorities in the UK. This can, for example, result in the need to travel unexpectedly due to family emergencies etc.
- Like some other (perhaps vulnerable) client groups, older Roma can struggle to adapt to the trend of increased digitalisation of services. Roma who struggle with literacy and language issues and are not familiar with online systems may need face-to-face interaction with service providers to fully comprehend service availability.

Recognising and building on this existing experience with other client groups could help boost staff confidence when delivering services to Roma clients, as they will have a point of reference to build upon. It may also be helpful to communicate to Roma themselves that they may share experiences or difficulties with other non-Roma groups, to avoid misinterpretation of certain difficulties as the result of discrimination against Roma.

It is also important to recognise similar needs across diverse communities living in the same neighbourhood, and to provide remedies for whole communities where appropriate – in the spirit of ‘explicit, but not exclusive, targeting’. It is not always helpful to single out one group for additional support or resources, as it can create local resentment and reinforce social segregation.

Reconciling the need for safe social spaces and for ‘mixing’

A clear request from different Roma participants in this project was for Roma community centres. By this, participants suggested a number of different things: a physical building or house designated for use by Roma communities; a safe space for Roma to socialise, celebrate and play sport; and, a place at least partly managed by Roma where Roma can seek information and advice about local services from one point of contact in their own language.

A key desired outcome for local communities from service perspectives in this project was to improve interaction, mixing or ‘integration’ between different communities in neighbourhoods. This effectively means increased constructive contact between Roma and non-Roma, rather than the assumed meaning of integration that Roma might interpret, as discussed in Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire (i.e. assimilation, or being required to deny their own background and wholly adopt British customs). More specifically, ‘non-Roma’ includes UK nationals as well as other migrant groups (such as non-Roma EU nationals, asylum seekers and refugees, and other non-EU migrants).

These two options were important to each respective group. However, mixing was not key aspiration for Roma participants (and perhaps could also be true for non-Roma), and a Roma community centre was not a key objective to services.

Further, they could be seen as incompatible: it may be feared that a Roma community centre could reinforce or even encourage Roma exclusion from the rest of the community, which is counter to the objective of increasing mixing between communities.
However, there may be ways of achieving both aims (for example, a Roma-led centre could host events or activities for the wider community). This would require some careful, perhaps creative planning and reviewing what works in existing practice elsewhere.

**Interpreters and communication in the Roma language**

Communication with Roma clients poses a significant challenge for services. They need to identify the best way to communicate with individual clients based on their language and literacy skills. There are very few accredited Roma interpreters, so services may struggle to find interpreters from the same country of origin that are trusted by Roma service users. This can have a significant impact on dealing with sensitive issues such as trafficking and exploitation, on the outcomes of cases involving the police or in the courts for example. Staff may be unaware that some Roma can only communicate effectively in the spoken Roma language as they may be illiterate and do not speak the first language of their country of origin (Slovak, Romanian, Czech etc.). For these service users then, translated materials would not be effective and they might only understand information provided in spoken Roma.

**Information provision and translation for Roma clients ideally needs to be able to be provided in the form of the spoken Roma language. This is not necessary for all Roma, but for perhaps the hardest-to-reach or the more vulnerable it is particularly important.**

Some services in South Yorkshire who recognised this problem tried different approaches in order to genuinely communicate with Roma parents. Some promising ideas included providing information in simple written English which was then supplemented by a verbal explanation in the Roma language (either in person or through an audio-recording). While improving English language skills of Roma themselves is also a desirable option, there will always be some newly-arrived Roma who still require this kind of support. A further, long-term option could be to train and employ Roma as community interpreters, mindful that some services are required to use interpreters with specific qualifications.

**Spokespersons for Roma**

On a positive note, services want to improve their engagement with Roma service users and Roma communities more broadly, and Roma want to participate in decision-making and running of services that directly affect them.

While some services have sought community leaders to develop this dialogue, **individual Roma can be uneasy about taking on roles intended to represent or speak on behalf of entire Roma communities.** The project has shown that Roma communities are diverse and that it is not unusual for different Roma communities to have minimal interaction with one another - to the extent that they may even regard other Roma communities as holding different social statuses. There are no easy solutions here, which reflects the difficulty that existing services have faced to this point. It is not realistic to expect staff and services to understand the complexities of Roma social structures, and to be able to identify all the existing different Roma communities within their catchment area in order to engage with each one. Additionally, any Roma-led initiatives would need to demonstrate that they are not excluding certain Roma groups.
We have discussed the way that intermediaries (employed staff, often Roma themselves) are used to broker the barriers between Roma communities and services. This seems effective but, as discussed in *Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire*, there are clear difficulties on relying on this approach because of the burdens it places on the intermediaries and the lack of knowledge transfer to other colleagues.

We have noted in this project that young Roma who have been schooled in the UK seemed to be particularly effective as spokespeople for Roma due to their education and language skills and their understanding of both UK and Roma cultures. If young people are used to represent Roma communities, a varied group of individuals should take on these roles (not just the ‘usual suspects’) to reflect some of the diversity across Roma communities and to minimise the expectations repeatedly placed on the same individuals.

**Tackling ‘difficult’ issues around safeguarding and exploitation**

*Safeguarding and exploitation are issues about which participants in this project were concerned.* These ‘difficult’ issues included labour exploitation, children missing from school, child sexual exploitation, substance use and trafficking. These safeguarding issues are relevant to all communities, and involve both victims and perpetrators from various communities.

There were also some locally-specific issues raised by participants in this project. For example, some professionals had concerns about power relationships within some Roma communities, and understood that some families might be being coerced into making false benefit claims.

Safeguarding issues can be difficult to address anywhere. This is a big challenge in Roma communities because of existing mistrust of those in authority, the inward-facing nature of Roma communities and their lack of experience and ability to challenge power imbalances. There have already been significant difficulties around the impact of the work of social services with Roma communities in the UK. Whilst acting on the legal safeguarding duty to address harm, it is important for professionals and services to intervene carefully to minimise negative impacts on the relationships between Roma and employers, landlords, service providers, and local communities, where possible.

Some organisations in South Yorkshire are already undertaking work on ‘difficult issues’. This is another example of where more practice-sharing could be really valuable. It seems that the local organisations which are trusted by Roma have had more success in approaching sensitive subjects than specialist organisations (that lack this trusted relationship). Where expertise is needed, it will be important for specialist organisations to work in partnership with those that have established good relationships with Roma. It may also be appropriate to consider delivery locations that are already familiar to Roma communities, such as primary schools, churches, third sector drop-in services, and health services etc.

**Different priorities for Roma and services**

*One of the key messages of this project is that Roma can have different priorities to services.* Main concerns of Roma centre around gaining meaningful and sustainable employment, and around the immediate needs of their families, while priorities favoured by services (for example around learning English, having good relations with the local community, early/preventative interventions or reporting hate crime) are less urgent for
Roma. There is a danger that organisations might try to impose their own priorities and consequently be perplexed at a lack of Roma engagement.

These differences can to some extent be mitigated by careful service design and consultation with Roma communities. For example, ESOL classes could focus on issues related to work, or Roma could be employed as community development workers. Employment skills support may need to be flexible to fit around family commitments.

It can be difficult to resolve clashing priorities. A good example of this is in the context of family illness or bereavement for a Roma worker, particularly when this involves someone who is not an immediate family member. Roma employees are likely to prioritise care for ill family members or attending a funeral, to the exclusion of other commitments such as employment. This can be difficult for employers to respond to for a number of reasons. Employers need to be consistent in their relevant absence policies for all employees, and UK work culture tends to only permit emergency absences for immediate family members and is unlikely to take into account the time required for travel if the employee needs to return to their country of origin. Roma working in insecure jobs may quickly find themselves without work in this scenario (and thus preventing some from escaping the cycle of poverty), while Roma professionals in secure employment may struggle to reconcile the expectations of their communities with the requirements of their employers.
2.5 Nine recommendations for working with Roma in South Yorkshire

The following nine recommendations are based on our learning from this project, drawing on the experiences and views of both Roma and service providers. The recommendations are aimed at funders and those commissioning services, those responsible for designing and delivering services with Roma as part of their client group, and those wanting to improve the integration of Roma into our local communities. While these recommendations are based on the specific situation of Roma in South Yorkshire, we hope that they will also be relevant to other areas outside South Yorkshire. We intend these recommendations to be applied in the spirit of ‘explicit, but not exclusive, targeting’ of Roma communities, and that service delivery can take the needs of the wider local community into account.

1. **Prioritise employment interventions**

Prioritising employment interventions would reflect both Roma and service priorities expressed consistently throughout this project. There need to be realistic alternative work options for Roma beyond insecure agency work, particularly for those with low levels of English and literacy. Employment interventions could include ‘soft’ support in terms of preparing Roma for the UK job culture, providing apprenticeships and work placements and vocational skills training, ESOL for work (with vocational qualifications), and advice for setting up in self-employment. For those interested in working with Roma themselves or other vulnerable client groups, voluntary work could not only provide relevant experience, but also enable DBS checks to be undertaken (they can be costly and take a long time for new applicants with various previous addresses).

There is also a need to build up knowledge about Roma rights and entitlements in relation to work (which could be shared not only with Roma but with support agencies and employers), a need for advocacy to support Roma who need to challenge or complain about treatment at work and perhaps liaise with employers, as well as advice around documenting and proving residency and work history in the UK (with a view to applying for proof of residency).[^19]

Employment support projects need to take into account any existing local provision, whether through JCP or more tailored support through the third sector, as well as the needs and options for the long-term unemployed in the local community. Employment support would also need to anticipate imminent changes to the right to work for EU nationals, in light of the UK’s exit from the EU.

2. **Use interventions with young people to engage with other family members**

The mapping exercise for this project identified a significant proportion of projects already working with children and young people, reflecting Roma priorities expressed during this project and thus perhaps accounting for good engagement already in some areas.

Work already established with children and young people could build on these relationships and provide an entry point for work with parents and other adults in the extended family. For example, employment support might begin targeting Roma youth who have been discussed as a priority by research participants, and then later expand the target group to...
include other out-of-work or precariously-employed adults in the family, once the project has been established as trusted by the local community.

3. **Aim to encourage mixing or interaction between communities**

‘Integration’ is a goal that is often discussed at a strategic and national level. However, the term ‘integration’ was not viewed positively by some Roma participants in this project (as discussed in *Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire*). Indeed, we understand that even social interaction between Roma and non-Roma communities is not seen as a priority for different communities. To aim for ‘mixing’ or ‘interaction’ between different communities is a practical recommendation for the short-term, and a step towards integration. In addition, these terms may be more constructive and the intentions behind them may be more easily understood.

There are lots of ideas in this report that could inspire activities to improve mixing between Roma and non-Roma communities. Activities could build on those that are already established as effective (such as sport and cultural events) or be based around issues that Roma prioritise (involving employment, children etc.). Interventions could build on the promising interaction that seems to exist among pupils in primary schools. They could involve encouraging and supporting Roma to participate in local fora such as school PTA/governors. It is also worth exploring what hasn’t worked and why, as some services have reported hosting inclusive activities but different communities have ‘opted-out’.

4. **Aim to empower Roma communities as a project outcome**

Empowering Roma communities is an aspiration that brought together Roma participants and service providers in this project. Roma wanted to be more involved in influencing decisions that affect them, while services wanted to be able to work with Roma communities better. The information from this project led to ideas that include the following:

- employ Roma workers, with a significant element of job descriptions to include opportunities for training, accreditation, qualification etc., and opportunities for progression within the organisation
- provide opportunities for Roma communities to be involved in managing or leading local initiatives
- train a set of Roma community interpreters for everyday support in accessing local services
- actively encourage or mentor individual Roma to follow their aspirations, for example in applying for jobs, seeking further/higher education, or taking on voluntary roles in local communities.

5. **Use locations that are already trusted by Roma communities**

All interventions could consider locations for service delivery that are already trusted by Roma communities, such as primary schools, churches, third sector drop-in services, and possibly health services etc. This might be particularly appropriate for

- new projects or new providers
- services that have struggled to engage with Roma in the past
• when tackling ‘difficult’ subjects such as drugs, child sexual exploitation (CSE), safeguarding etc.

This approach may also help services to work in partnership and share information. This may need to be managed, as at the other extreme there are dangers of popular sites becoming overburdened.

6. **Support (statutory) staff to gain more knowledge, understanding and confidence to work with Roma service users and to communicate with them effectively.**

Services should review their engagement and interaction with Roma service users, to ensure that staff members have knowledge, understanding and confidence to work with Roma service users and to communicate with them effectively. This is particularly important for frontline staff in statutory services where services are designed for all members of the local community (such as local councils, police, education and health), including those who are likely to be the first to encounter and greet clients (such as reception or security staff). It is also important that services which feel confident in their communication activities with non-English speakers (such as the use of interpreters) review whether their approach meets the specific needs of Roma service users.

Improving staff skills and cultural competence could involve using Roma workers or intermediaries to (co-)train their colleagues, or commissioning training that Roma organisations already deliver around the UK.

It also may involve drawing together different services to share how they have approached communication with Roma clients in different ways (e.g. QR codes idea, simple English plus Romani verbal explanation).

7. **Think through the relevant conundrums (as per Section 2.4) that affect local services**

Not all recommendations or solutions to the challenges identified in this project can be applied straightforwardly to every context. For some questions there is no ideal answer. For example, provision of a Roma-specific service may meet the needs of one particular Roma community, but it may also result in other communities developing negative perceptions about preferential treatment being directed towards Roma residents over their own social group.

Service providers may find it valuable to think through the relevant conundrums (outlined in Section 2.4), how they could or should respond to them, weigh up the different options available and consider the implications of different choices. Part of this process could involve consultation with different sections of the community in a neighbourhood where a service is being proposed or adjusted. Difficult scenarios could also be tabled at relevant practice-sharing meetings for discussion with peers who have dealt with similar issues.

8. **Share practice knowledge among services in relation to Roma residents**

There is an appetite from practitioners and officers particularly in the smaller towns of South Yorkshire to share knowledge and promising practice among themselves. There are some organisations that work across more than one local authority area of South Yorkshire, such as the Youth Association, South Yorkshire police and CCGs, who may be more naturally be placed to welcome practice sharing across different local authority areas.
Examples of this kind of practice sharing occurred spontaneously during some local meetings for this project, where people working in one town attended another town’s meeting. For example, during discussions about inadequate monitoring data of Roma residents in Rotherham, attendees from Doncaster shared how they engage with new arrivals by using school admissions data. Further, Doncaster’s schools have nominated GRT Champion Teachers (CTs) (following a model of the DT or Designated Teacher role for Children in Care) which could be replicated in other parts of South Yorkshire.

Another form of practitioner support could include ways for Roma workers to develop a peer support network across South Yorkshire. This could include, for example, Roma workers to share information about employment opportunities or ways of working with different Roma communities.

9. Tailor new work for the local context

It is of course important to tailor any new work or changes to existing service to the local context. In addition to considering the overall recommendations for the whole of South Yorkshire, individualised recommendations for each local authority area are outlined in the next sections. The headline tailored recommendations cover:

- Barnsley: recognise and document the different Roma communities in Barnsley; respond to the newly-identified priorities of Roma participants; build on existing confidence in working with other migrant groups; and, draw in organisations that do (or want to) work with Roma.
- Doncaster: build on existing or recent successes; draw in organisations that do (or want to) work with Roma; respond to the newly-identified priorities of Roma participants; and, dovetail new work with existing approaches and strategies.
- Rotherham: draw in organisations that do (or want to) work with Roma; and, dovetail new work with existing approaches and strategies.
- Sheffield: respond to the newly-identified priorities of Roma participants; and, seek ways of sharing practice and working together better.

We encourage local authorities not only to dovetail work with Roma within their existing approaches and local strategies, but there is also an opportunity to work together as the Sheffield City Region, particularly in light of increasing devolution of responsibility and budgets to this level (for example, around employment support for ‘harder-to-help’ claimants).

---

20 HM Treasury and Sheffield City Region (2015) Sheffield City Region Devolution Deal Agreement
http://sheffieldcityregiondevolution.org.uk/the-deal/
3. Conclusions and recommendations

The main purpose of this project was to bring together Roma communities and Roma support organisations to look at how best to tackle Roma exclusion in South Yorkshire. We built upon existing knowledge from a range of national and local reports about Roma in South Yorkshire, in recognition of over a decade of Roma settlement and service delivery to Roma in local areas. We then consulted over 100 individuals from local services and Roma communities from Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield during the course of the project. By bringing together Roma and staff from local services we also hoped that services had the opportunity to better understand Roma views and priorities for their own lives, and hoped to encourage partnership working in the future.

In this report we mapped and analysed existing service provision for Roma across South Yorkshire, and identified the priorities of local service providers and Roma residents to direct future work. In our companion report, *Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire*, we investigated Roma perspectives on their views and priorities in more detail.

3.1 Mapping Roma settlement and service delivery across South Yorkshire

**Services working with Roma**

The project identified around 80 services that have been or are interested in working directly with Roma communities in South Yorkshire. There are, of course, many more generic services (e.g. transport, emergency services etc.) that include Roma communities within their broader service user population, but do not target them specifically or consider them in their service design or strategic planning.

There are a wide range of services and projects aiming to work with Roma communities across the statutory and third sector, usually falling within a broader service remit for working with migrants, new arrivals, GRT, ethnic minorities or deprived communities. The more common themes for direct work are children and young people, and advice work. Projects tend to report working with Slovak Roma more than any other nationality, except in Barnsley where there is a significant Latvian Roma population.

**Geography of Roma settlement and service delivery**

The distribution of these 80 services across the four areas of South Yorkshire inevitably reflects general population patterns and the relative urban sizes of each local authority area, with Sheffield providing around half of these services, Rotherham a quarter, and smaller proportions in Doncaster and Barnsley. We understand Roma communities to also be more populous in Rotherham and Sheffield (in the low thousands), than in Doncaster and Barnsley (in the hundreds).

Roma communities are perhaps more spread out across these areas than is commonly realised, although there are certainly areas of higher concentration that seem to be the ‘first ports of call’ for new Roma arrivals, in Eastwood and around the city centre in Rotherham, in a number of neighbourhoods in Sheffield including Page Hall/Fir Vale, and in the Hexthorpe area of Doncaster. Services with Roma-specific projects tend to deliver in these ‘first ports of call’.

**Trust and social cohesion**
Some trusted relationships with local services, particularly third sector services, have developed in these areas. In the absence of established civil society groups to represent Roma and to facilitate trust in services, a key element of successful engagement has been to use Roma workers or volunteers. We know of almost 70 Roma working or volunteering locally in these kinds of services, particularly in Sheffield and Rotherham (although there do not seem to be any Roma workers in Barnsley at all). However, as a consequence of this approach to initial engagement and establishing trust between services and local Roma communities, there seem to be some difficulties in transitioning Roma clients onto more mainstream services.

More broadly in local communities, there seem to be some tensions among local residents, which have been exacerbated by the EU referendum vote in June 2016. There are other, less overt strains we are aware of, such as relationships within and between different Roma communities, and some scepticism among Roma about the motives of some local service providers, whether services are seeking their own longevity or are genuinely interested in empowering Roma communities and responding to their priorities, needs and preferences.

### 3.2 Nine recommendations for working with Roma in South Yorkshire

The project developed nine key recommendations for working with Roma communities in South Yorkshire (as discussed in Section 2.5). In brief, they are as follows:

1. Prioritise employment interventions
2. Use interventions with young people to engage with other family members
3. Aim to encourage mixing or interaction between communities
4. Aim to empower Roma communities as a project outcome
5. Use locations that are already trusted by Roma communities
6. Support (statutory) staff to gain more knowledge, understanding and confidence to work with Roma service users and to communicate with them effectively.
7. Think through any relevant conundrums that affect local services (as per Section 2.4)
8. Share practice knowledge among services in relation to Roma residents.
9. Tailor new work for the local context.

The final point - to tailor any new work or changes to existing service to the local context - is vital for strategic planning and implementation in any area of work. In addition to considering the overall recommendations for the whole of South Yorkshire, individualised recommendations for each local authority area in their own sections of this report suggest how each context and priorities can vary. The tailored recommendations covered the following areas:

- In Barnsley: also recognise and document the different Roma communities in Barnsley; respond to the newly-identified priorities of Roma participants; build on existing confidence in working with other migrant groups; and, draw in organisations that do (or want to) work with Roma.
- In Doncaster: also build on existing or recent successes; draw in organisations that do (or want to) work with Roma; respond to the newly-identified priorities of Roma participants; and, dovetail new work with existing approaches and strategies.
• In Rotherham: also draw in organisations that do (or want to) work with Roma; and, dovetail new work with existing approaches and strategies.
• In Sheffield: also respond to the newly-identified priorities of Roma participants; and, seek ways of sharing practice and working together better.

These recommendations are grounded in the consultation and discussions held during this project. They are not a guarantee of success, but are a suggested way forward based on a combination of Roma priorities and service experiences.

3.3 Three key messages to take away from this project

There is lots of food for thought in the material we generated through this project, and within the two project reports: Roma in South Yorkshire: mapping services and local priorities and Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire. There are three important messages we would like readers to go away with:

1. **Engagement and trust with Roma service users could be developed further by designing interventions that build on Roma priorities.** The top priorities of Roma in this project concerned employment or their children. Future projects could consider, for example, linking to the health or education of Roma children, employment support for young people (leading to supporting all adults into work), or supporting Roma into work in statutory sector positions. Statutory recruitment of Roma could be particularly helpful to break down barriers in sectors where trust is particularly difficult to develop with Roma communities, such as police and social care teams. More indirectly, conversational ESOL classes could be sited in the workplace, health or educational settings familiar to Roma and may increase their likelihood of participation.

2. **There are significant gaps in the knowledge of many staff in statutory services and among the host community about migrant Roma living in their local areas.** Building up their knowledge, understanding and engagement with Roma as service users, colleagues and neighbours could improve Roma access to mainstream services and improve relationships within local communities.

3. **Services need to react quickly to changes that are occurring in Roma communities.** There are reports of increased diversity among Roma service users (from a greater range of countries for example), less transience than previously, increased precariousness in terms of work, income (particularly in terms of benefit changes) and reception by local communities. There may even be a new opportunity for engagement in light of the EU referendum and after Article 50 is triggered. For example, Roma may be receptive to support in documenting their residency in the UK (assuming they need to prove residence to stay). Another opportunity could be to capitalise on the intentions of Roma for whom the EU referendum made them decide that their future is definitely in the UK, and encouraging them to be seen as permanent members of the local community.

We hope that these three key messages could be discussed and considered in the future plans of local services and decision-makers, for the benefit of all local residents.
Annex: Stakeholders and project participants

Organisations providing service information for the project

73 organisations/individuals provided information about their service for this project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Rotherham and Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMBC Adults Education</td>
<td>A&amp;N Care Solicitors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMBC Community Safety and Enforcement</td>
<td>Endeavour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMBC Early Start and Families</td>
<td>Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Nazarene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Karen Dyson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish Library</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SW Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley and Rotherham</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corpus Christi Federation (3 primary schools)</td>
<td>City of Sanctuary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Association</td>
<td>Centre Of Nations Cultures Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Doncaster</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Glyn Jones</td>
<td>British Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Club Doncaster Foundation</td>
<td>Cathedral Archer Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIAL Doncaster</td>
<td>Children’s Society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMBC Stronger Communities</td>
<td>Chilypep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMBC Virtual school for GRT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster &amp; Bassetlaw Hospitals (S Yorkshire &amp; Bassetlaw NHS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster CAB</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster Community Arts (Darts)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster CVS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R Hon MP Rosie Winterton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham, Doncaster &amp; S Humber NHS Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Jude’s Church</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Leger’s Homes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rotherham</th>
<th>South Yorkshire and beyond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apna Haq</td>
<td>South Yorkshire Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clifton Learning Partnership</td>
<td>SY Police and Crime Commissioner Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberty Church</td>
<td>University of Salford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Abuse Counselling Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Citizens Advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Diversity Forum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham Rise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMBC Adult Care &amp; Housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee Council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham United Community Sports Trust</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Ann’s Junior and Infant School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMCA White Rose</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Organisations participating in events only

Nine further organisations are clearly interested in Roma communities as they participated in project events, but did not supply service information separately. This may be needed for a fuller picture of service delivery and it may be appropriate to involve them in future work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berneslai Homes</td>
<td>Ashiana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITS (Independent Training Services)</td>
<td>Cohesion Advisory Group (SYMAAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Firth Park Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCC Firth Park Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCC Housing Private Tenancy Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCC Neighbourhood Intervention &amp; Tenant Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Yorkshire and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YWCA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organisations unable to respond

27 further organisations were identified as potentially being interested or involved in work with Roma communities, but largely were unable to respond to our queries during this project. It may be appropriate to involve them in future work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barnsley</th>
<th>Sheffield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BMBC Education and Welfare</td>
<td>Big Issue North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster</td>
<td>Hinde House School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doncaster Children's Services Trust</td>
<td>Owler Brook Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall Cross Academy</td>
<td>Page Hall Medical Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juraj Maria</td>
<td>Scout Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Admissions</td>
<td>Sheffield Inclusion Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC</td>
<td>Sheffield University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham</td>
<td>Fir Vale Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Taiba Yasseen</td>
<td>SCC Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coleridge Children's Centre</td>
<td>SCC Public Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP Sarah Champion</td>
<td>Byron Wood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Multicultural Centre</td>
<td>Firs Hill Community Primary School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools and education</td>
<td>Oasis Academy Don Valley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Yorkshire and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foodbank Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Home Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European Roma Network</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These lists of 109 projects and individuals represent those with whom we tried to engage during this project. It is possible that there are other organisations in South Yorkshire who work with or are interested in working with Roma clients.
The series of reports for the South Yorkshire Roma project

This report is the third in a series of reports for the South Yorkshire Roma project:

**South Yorkshire reports**

Report 1: *Executive summary*
Report 2: *Roma experiences of living and working in South Yorkshire*
Report 3: *Roma in South Yorkshire: mapping services and local priorities*

**Local reports**

Report 4: *Roma in Barnsley*
Report 5: *Roma in Doncaster*
Report 6: *Roma in Rotherham*
Report 7: *Roma in Sheffield*

These are available to download from [www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk](http://www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk)