Ministry of Housing,
Communities &
Local Government

# Controlling Migration Fund Prospectus

A fund to help local authorities respond to the impact of
recent migration on their communities

# Contents

**Annexes**

Annex A: Summary of projects already funded

Annex B: Application form and checklist – local services element of the Fund

Annex C: Outline logic model and guidance for completion

Annex D: Scoring criteria for proposals

Annex E: Impact Summary for reference

Annex F: Local Immigration Compliance Enforcement (ICE) contact details

# Section 1: A fund to help local authorities respond to the impacts of recent migration on local services

## A. Introduction

The Controlling Migration Fund ("the Fund") was launched in November 2016 to help local authorities mitigate the impacts of recent migration on communities in their area.

It has two separate elements:

A) A bidding fund available from 2016-17 to 2019-20, against which English local authorities are invited to propose projects to mitigate the impact of recent migration in their area.  This is managed by the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG).  So far £73.6 million of the total £100 million has been committed to local authorities across England - details of these successful bids can be found at **Annex A**.  This prospectus sets out how local authorities can apply for funding against the remaining £26.4 million in the local services element of the Fund (Section I).

B) The other element (Section II) is £40 million worth of Home Office Immigration Enforcement staff time over the same period.  This is available in response to requests from local authorities across the UK for support in tackling illegal migration.

1.  Britain is an open and tolerant country with a long history of welcoming migrants and the benefits they bring to our communities, businesses and services. However, we recognise that sudden, very concentrated migration into local communities can put a strain on local services and amenities. This is particularly true in areas of higher deprivation and areas that are unprepared for, or unused to, new migrants. The Fund, launched in November 2016, recognised this and made £100m of funding from MHCLG available to help ease pressures on local services.

2.  Within existing government spending plans, £26.4 million of funding remains over 2018-19 and 2019-20 to help local authorities ease pressures on services linked to recent migration. Plans beyond 2020 will be considered within the next Spending Review.

3.  This prospectus invites local authorities to submit proposals against the remaining £26.4 million in the Fund. It sets out how English local authorities can access these remaining funds and the types of proposals that will be considered.

4.  While the Fund aims to ease local service pressures as a result of recent migration, the separate 'Integrated Communities Innovation Fund' introduced in the Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper is inviting expressions of interest for innovative approaches to tackling all integration challenges. When taken together, these Funds will improve our understanding of the impacts of migration where they arise, as well as what works to build integrated communities.

**What the Fund has supported so far**

5.  To date, £73.6 million of funding has been awarded to local authorities across England. This is made up of four elements:

    •   126 projects, worth £50.7 million, that are tackling a range of issues identified locally, such as English language provision, rough sleeping or rogue and criminal landlords.

    •   32 projects, worth £8.9 million, are being delivered by authorities caring for unaccompanied asylum seeking children.

    •   £2.8 million for centrally directed pilots covering Modern Slavery victim support in six local authority areas and 35 Local Authority Asylum Support Liaison Officers in 19 local authority areas in 2018-19.

    •   £11.2 million (£2.2 million in 2017-2018 and £9 million in 2018-2019) has also been allocated by formula to help build the capacity of over 135 local authorities to care for unaccompanied asylum seeking children. This was supplemented with a further £12.3 million from other MHCLG budgets.

6.  For a full list of all projects in each region see **Annex A**.

**What these bids are showing us**

7.  We invited bids from local authorities in part to gain a greater understanding of how migration affects communities, places and services. In reviewing all the bids received so far and speaking with recipient local authorities and other stakeholders, some clear themes and trends are emerging.

8.  When taken as a group we have seen that those authorities that have submitted bids to the Fund have a greater concentration of deprived areas than those that did not submit bids. This suggests that in deprived areas, the strain on local services as a result of migration is more keenly felt.

9.  We have also seen that a substantial portion of bids focus partially or wholly on small area impacts – that is, where recent migration impacts are focused on a specific street, ward or neighbourhood. Again, these tend to be the areas with the highest level of deprivation. The lower cost of accommodation is a common reason for migration into these areas.

10. Transience, where people live in an area for a short time before moving on, exacerbates many issues. This is because the wider local community and services must continually respond to the needs of recent migrants, who may have limited English or be unfamiliar with local norms. The ability of local authorities to plan and deliver services effectively is hampered by a high amount of churn, in addition to the views of the transient groups themselves being seldom heard by service providers.

11. Pressures on services and communities can arise when recent migrants may have no or limited English and are unfamiliar with how things work locally. This includes, for example, fire and road safety, local expectations about waste disposal, fly tipping and socialising in the street.

12. In recognition of the need to build trust between communities, and between those communities and the public servants that work with them, some local authorities have facilitated honest conversations about attitudes to recent migration. These conversations help to uncover what the real issues and impacts are, in order to address them, and also to promote understanding and trust between different groups.

13. Many bids noted the lack of accurate local data on recent migration to aid service planning. The national information which does exist is at local authority level, so some critical impacts on smaller areas within an authority are less clear from the data. The lack of information at the local level, combined with the last census being conducted in 2011, means there is a need for authorities, other services and national government to improve their understanding of the migration picture.

14. Over the next two years the Office for National Statistics (ONS) is working to transform the information that the Government Statistical Service (GSS) produces

on migration to better understand the impact migrants have while they are in the UK.  This will include the sectors in which recent migrants work, the communities they live in and the impacts on public services, such as the National Health Service and schools.   This will put existing administrative data at the core of evidence on migration.

# B. How local authorities can apply to this element of the Fund

15. Local authorities are invited to put forward proposals for a share of the remaining local services element of the Fund. There is £10.8 million available in 2018-19 and £15.6 million in 2019-20.

16. We are open to considering any proposals, including extensions of existing projects, where bidders can clearly evidence the impact recent migration has had on communities and local services.

17. This is as long as:

    a) The proposal is submitted by an English local authority for delivery in England, although it may be in partnership with other local authorities, other public bodies, and/or the voluntary and community sector.

    b) There is no duplication of existing funding.

    c) Proposals do not directly benefit illegal migrants.

    d) The impact on the wider local community is clearly evidenced. As part of this, proposals to extend projects into 2019-20 would be expected to show evidence that the project is already delivering positive benefits in this regard.

    e) The intended outcomes of the proposal, including benefits for the wider local community, and how this will be evaluated, are clearly set out.

    f) If Immigration Enforcement support is needed, prior agreement has been obtained through the local Immigration, Compliance and Enforcement (ICE) team (see the checklist at **Annex B** and contact details at **Annex F**).

    g) All partner services can indicate a commitment for the duration of the project before the proposal is considered for funding.

18. All proposals, whether an extension or a new project, will be assessed against the same criteria and will be considered on the merits of the case made.

19. Proposals which bid to extend an existing project do not necessarily have to extend the whole project where some elements have been more successful than others.

**What proposals should include**

20. We expect well evidenced proposals that are proportionate to the money remaining in the Fund. The application form **at Annex B** details the type of evidence that we are looking for.  In brief, completed applications should explain:

a) recent migration in the area covered by the proposal. If the proposal is for an extension the application should evidence the continued migration patterns which make the proposed extension necessary.

b) the issues that recent migration is causing for local services. Data that is used to evidence this should be local and include costs to the public purse where these are known.

c) how you are proposing to tackle the problem and why this is your preferred approach. If your local authority is already receiving funding from the Controlling Migration Fund and/or you are submitting more than one proposal, you should explain how the combined projects fit within your overall strategy and how the projects will be co-ordinated.

d) how the proposal will benefit the wider local community. You should include evidence of the views of residents and how you have been made aware of them. In the case of extensions, the success of the project so far should be clearly shown through the benefit to local residents.

e) the value for money of the project. This will be based on evidence taken from your application form, particularly the cost breakdown and the explanation of how you will tackle the problem. We will consider whether the project is justified as a reasonable investment of public money with evidenced and reasonable costs. You should be clear about any savings that will result from the project and where these will be made. In the case of extensions, bids should demonstrate any efficiency for the on-going running of the project. As there is a limited amount remaining in the Fund, a value for money assessment will look favourably at proposals where the Fund is not the sole contributor of resources to the project. Examples of other resources could be the contribution of accommodation or staff time by the local authority, or funding that has been obtained from other sources.

f) outputs, outcomes and evaluation plans for the project. In short, how will the success of the project be measured? Evaluation plans should be proportionate to the level of funding sought. The costs of evaluation can be included in the bid but should be discussed with your Fund regional lead before submitting. (See Section D for more information on evaluation.)

21. An outooine logic model (also known as a theory of change) should be included as part of any application. The template for this and guidance on what to include is at **Annex C**. For the purposes of the application, only a rough outline needs to be submitted. The template is designed to help you to structure your proposal and guide the development of an Impact Summary, which all funded projects are

required to complete when they have ended. A copy of the Impact Summary is included at **Annex E** for reference only, as it will not be required until a funded project has been completed.

22. Bids must include a clear breakdown of the requested funding in an annex to the completed application. Costs for overheads can be included but must be listed as actual costs (not as a percentage) and evidence must be provided to support the amount that is included.  The funding cannot be used to contribute to the costs of existing managers who will be responsible for the project. However, the costs of additional project support can be met where these are proportionate to the size of the project.

23. Bids can include funding for capital costs provided these are proportionate to the money remaining in the Fund. Capital costs should be supported by a strong value for money case. You will also need to take into account the need to spend the funds by 31 March 2020.

24. We expect that demand for the remaining funds will be extremely competitive, so recommend that bidders pay close attention to the guidance (in this prospectus and on the application form and checklist at **Annex B**).

**Scoring critieria**

25. Bids will be considered by MHCLG officials and scored in accordance with the criteria and weightings set out at **Annex D**.  You may be contacted during the assessment process if clarification is needed on any element of the bid.

26. Proposals will be scored against each criterion.  For a bid to be considered for funding, it must meet a minimum threshold for each criterion.  Each criterion is also given a weighting that reflects its strategic importance.  This means that not every criterion contributes the same value to the final score given to a bid.

27. The minimum threshold or pass mark for each criterion is 2 out of 5.  Where a proposal scores a 2 or above for all of the criteria, and 50 per cent or above of the available weighted score, it will be included in advice to Ministers.  Bids will be excluded from further consideration if they score 1 against any of the criteria.

28. In the event that there are insufficient funds for all the bids, or parts of bids, that score over 50 per cent, the final recommendation to Ministers will take account of the total weighted score.  Where scores are the same, bids will be ranked in accordance with the priorities set out in the paragraph below. The final decision on which proposals receive funding will be made by Ministers.

29. Given the limited funds available, ranking for bids that score the same will be decided in the following order:

a) First, those authorities that have received no previous funding – this is to ensure that the maximum number of areas can benefit from the Fund.

b) Second, bids for funding for new projects – this is to ensure that the Fund can support as diverse a range of interventions as possible.

c) Third, bids for funding extensions of projects we have already funded.

**Deadlines and project lengths**

30. Bids should be submitted by midday on 1 October 2018.  If there are sufficient funds remaining to run another bidding round, a further deadline may be announced later in the year.  However, this is not guaranteed.

31. Bids should request funding until end March 2020 only. Where an authority feels that a project's sustainability would be improved by a funding commitment beyond March 2020, it will need to make this commitment from within its own finances.

32. We encourage areas thinking of developing proposals to contact us at migrationfund@communities.gsi.gov.uk to discuss their plans, either for a new project or to extend an existing project, as early as possible. We can:

a) clarify any part of the revised prospectus that isn't clear. We will keep an FAQ on our website to update potential bidders on the answers to any questions we are asked.

b) listen to your ideas and advise whether any element isn't in scope as set out in this revised prospectus.

c) request other local authorities that have received funding for a similar project to offer advice.

d) comment on one draft bid for you and advise whether anything is clearly out of scope, there is any missing information or any apparent misunderstanding of what the application needs to contain. This offer is open to all authorities – not just those that have not bid before.

## C. Types of proposals the Fund can support

33. The underlying principle of the Fund is that it responds to the needs of the community, as identified by the local authority, where these have been brought about by the impact of recent migration. Any local authority proposal to mitigate the impact of recent migration must evidence this issue, and include evidence of the impacts on, or the views of, the wider local community.

34. Every bid must have a clear benefit to the wider local community.

35. From the first year of running the Fund, we know it can be challenging to properly assess the needs and views of residents especially as the subject matter can be sensitive. However, this is vital to understand the root causes of any tensions or pressures to demonstrate how changes to local services have benefitted them, and in some cases how their views of the local community and recent migrants may have changed too.

36. We expect that bids will have been developed based on an understanding of the views of local residents and the impacts on services used by those communities. The strongest proposals will put forward ways to continue to communicate progress with the wider local community throughout delivery.

37. Some examples of ways to do this are indicated on the application form at **Annex B**, and may include resident focus groups (especially where the problem affects a particularly small area), resident surveys, online consultations, neighbourhood events or, in the case of problem identification, through complaints to the authority.

38. Proposals may be developed in partnership with one or more local authority and/or other service providers.  Some of the strongest proposals have done just this – for example a regional bid from the West Midlands, led by Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council,  brings together all 14 local authorities to share and build their expertise in caring for unaccompanied asylum seeking children.

39. As with the first phase of the Fund we will also retain the ability to centrally direct funding to projects and activities that respond to the impacts of recent migration on local communities and services.

40.  Most bids we have supported so far include a mixture of several inter-connected themes or issues, some of which were not specifically listed in the original prospectus. Bids should focus on responding to those impacts which are most important to their communities, so proposals may include one or more themes which may not be listed in this prospectus. There is no requirement to indicate which themes your bid covers on the application form.

**Communities – projects to foster mixing and encourage integration**

41. The Fund will continue to support projects that promote meaningful social mixing between people from different backgrounds, facilitating the integration of recent migrants and asylum seekers, thereby helping authorities plan and deliver appropriate services for their communities.

42. We have seen from previous bids that sudden, very concentrated migration into local communities unprepared for or unused to it can put a strain on local services and amenities, particularly in deprived areas. This has often led to tensions between new migrants and the wider local community. As a result some local authorities have focused on activities that encourage integration and mixing between different groups, to build understanding and trust and relieve these tensions.

43. Community tensions and service pressures can also sometimes result from a lack of understanding of the social norms and expectations of behaviour in Britain. Sometimes these problems are borne of a genuine misunderstanding about social conventions in this country, for example being unaware that you cannot obtain a prescription when visiting Accident & Emergency services. In other cases, projects are tackling more fundamental expectations, such as behaviours in relation to women and children.

44. Proposals of this nature also included projects which allow people to voice their concerns and address difficult or sensitive topics. Participants are able to hear different perspectives and local service partners can better understand the issue in order to tackle it. For example, extending youth provision to reduce the local community's sense of being 'pushed out', whilst also using this to bring different groups of young people together to discuss wider issues.

**Learning English and how things work**

45. As emphasised in the [Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper](#), the ability to speak and understand English helps migrants to integrate into life in this country, accessing and making good use of local services, becoming part of community life, supporting their children at school, getting into work and contributing taxes. The Race Disparity Audit findings, that ethnic minority women are more likely to be disadvantaged in the workplace or socially excluded, also highlight the importance of English for participation in communities.

46. Where recent migrants speak little or no English, this can put a strain on local services, for example the cost of interpretation or translation and additional support in schools. In addition, widely-accepted social norms and expectations may be unfamiliar to some groups, but can create tensions in areas where they aren't observed, for example drinking in the street, fly tipping and waste disposal.

47. The best solutions tend to tackle multiple issues like these together to deliver a more holistic and efficient service. At the same time they aim to remove barriers to learning for example by providing crèches and varying the location and timings of classes. Many strong projects deliver English alongside skills such as CV writing, job searching, information on social norms and expectations, as well as more sensitive topics like relationships and attitudes towards women. One such funded project is supporting ethnic minority women into work through teaching them English.

48. The Fund will continue to support bids to;

    a) develop and strengthen local partnerships between English language providers.

    b) ensure mainstream funding is used effectively.

    c) facilitate progression from community and pre-entry level into more advanced stages of learning English.

    d) improve the information and support available to learners.

    e) provide additional classes or conversation clubs which help people in the early stages of learning English, where there is evidence of need.

    f) support projects which handle sensitive conversations alongside language learning.

49. The Integrated Communities Strategy Green Paper proposes developing a new strategy for English language in England. Learning that has been gathered through funded projects so far will help to inform this. While this is formulated, the Fund will continue to fund proposals as outlined above.

---

**Case study: learning about civic and cultural expectations while learning English**

**Hertfordshire** has experienced a rapid increase in the numbers of migrants with limited English arriving from EU accession states. This has led to unmanageable pressure on public services, translation services and a high demand for ESOL classes that can't be met by existing education providers. As a result, many migrants with poor English, but good qualifications from their home country, end up in jobs for which they are over-qualified. At the same time, regional data shows that employers are struggling to recruit staff with sufficient English language skills to fill key vacancies.

The local authority observed that tension between residents and recent migrants, and police and the new communities was more apparent due to misunderstandings about British cultural expectations and values – for example the role of police or tenants' rights.

---

To tackle these issues in a holistic way, Hertfordshire's project embeds modules about British culture, local expectations and citizenship into verbal and written English language classes. Working in partnership with local ESOL education providers, the local borough councils and members of the target communities themselves, the project aims to engage with the most recent migrants as a priority. Alongside this classes are being supported by guest speakers from the police and other services. Project participants are also encouraged to be more active in their local community through engagement activities, such as volunteering, and to make better use of local public services, such as libraries. Community cohesion will be promoted through the ESOL classes with the support of volunteers from the wider community.

**Schools**

50. In some areas with high numbers of young migrants, local authorities' bids have highlighted that schools have significant numbers of new children with little or no English and/or a disrupted formal education.  This creates additional demands on the school.  This may be exacerbated where populations are transient – creating churn within the school population and generating knock-on impacts for staff and other pupils.

---

**Case study – the impact of transience on schools**

In central **Middlesbrough** schools are facing pressure due to the large number of asylum seekers and economic migrants arriving. Some pupils arrive having had no formal education and most arrive with little or no English.  The high level of transience of pupils is particularly problematic as settling new pupils into school demands a significant amount of time and resources - from teachers, teaching assistants, school leaders and administrative staff. The local authority wants to ensure that all children flourish in health, well-being and education, and to support the majority to achieve above national average at each Key Stage.

Funding has been used to implement a range of initiatives including; recruiting additional teachers and teaching assistants to support recent migrants and free up classroom teachers, the delivery of community learning to ensure new families understand the education system, and play therapy training to allow staff to support traumatised children.  These interventions will help new migrants, those children already in the classroom and the school's performance more generally.

**Housing and wider impacts**

51. In the first prospectus, we indicated that one of the possible ways to mitigate the impacts of recent migration might be through tackling rogue landlords. Bids that were submitted under this theme showed that there are much wider impacts on housing for both migrants and residents as a result of recent migration, and proposed additional or tailored solutions to tackle them.

52. We have seen from the proposals submitted by local authorities that poorer migrants often settle in areas where housing is more affordable, but the quality is low and services and resources are already under strain. The overcrowding and exploitation of migrants can have an impact not only on housing standards, street scene and fire safety, but also on relationships between the wider local community and migrant, often transient, groups. Tackling poor housing and rogue landlords can also uncover harmful and illegal activities such as trafficking and modern slavery.

53. The most compelling proposals under this theme identified and addressed the broader range of social issues that matter to the wider local community rather than just the immediate housing concerns.

54. The strongest bids have been holistic and multi-agency in their approach, showing a nuanced understanding of the interrelationship between housing, health, safeguarding, and social and economic integration. Importantly, they also recognise the range of agencies needed to tackle them successfully, involving local authority partnership and information sharing with the relevant combination of other bodies and institutions, including the Police, Fire and Rescue Service, HMRC, Trading Standards, GLA Gangmaster Licensing Authority, Housing Benefit, Council Tax , social services and the voluntary sector. Without this co-operation, responses are often inefficient and ineffective in creating long-term change.

---

**Case study– taking a holistic approach to housing solutions**

**Barnsley** Council noted that the predominance of unfamiliar languages and practices around a settled community in one ward was affecting neighbourhood cohesion. Demand for low-rent homes was creating an opportunity for exploitation by rogue landlords and an overall deterioration of housing standards. Their bid also acknowledged the wider impacts of poor housing on health, educational attainment, economic prosperity and community safety. To tackle all of this, their proposal involved expanding the role of Housing Enforcement Officers to deliver a combination of key housing services, community safety initiatives, cohesion and environmental management in partnership with the police.

---

**Tenants' rights**

55. Some solutions have included making tenants aware of their rights, as new migrants in particular are vulnerable to exploitation if they speak little or no English and are unfamiliar with the legal requirements for housing standards. In Bristol the local authority has used targeted social media campaigns aimed at pages accessed by migrant groups to advertise the rights of tenants and signpost them to the local authority or other services for advice.

**Rough sleeping**

56. Where rough sleeping has been identified as a major issue as a result of recent migration, local authorities have varied in their solutions to tackle it. In the first year of operating we have spent £2.4 million on bids that are already having an impact in their local communities - some examples of models the Fund could support are outlined in the case studies below.

57. However, we are keen to do more in this vital area and encourage local authorities dealing with migrant rough sleeping to submit a bid to the Fund, where their proposals meet its criteria. The proposal should demonstrate a wider resident benefit with clear outcomes, value for money and be proportionate to the overall size of the remaining Fund. This could include, for example, outreach workers and support to find employment and access English language services, support for substance misuse, health or mental health issues and support to find and sustain accommodation.

58. Local authorities wishing to carry out voluntary returns for EEA nationals - who wish to return home and are requesting assistance to do so - can also bid for funding for this purpose. This could include funding for transport costs, to secure identification documents, provide support for individuals awaiting return and small discretionary payments – for example to cover transit between the airport and services in their home country.

---

**Case study– support for EEA migrant rough sleepers**

A pilot project in **three outer North London Boroughs** explores working with Central and Eastern European migrants who have travelled to the UK in the hope of finding paid employment, but have since become homeless and work in cash-in-hand, un-regulated work – i.e. the 'grey economy'.

Their joint bid proposed funding for Polish and Romanian speaking outreach workers to assist these rough sleepers into low cost shared accommodation and entry-level

---

regulated employment, for example by completing the required certification to find construction work, and English language support where appropriate. They are also helping migrant rough sleepers return home, where they have requested assistance to do so.

In **Fenland**, their bid also employs a full time migrant outreach worker to deliver holistic, coordinated solutions to issues for migrants who are sleeping rough. This includes ways of preventing homelessness by giving accommodation options, benefits advice, deposits and tackling illegal eviction and harassment. They also provide co-ordinated advice and connections to other services, both statutory and voluntary, such as mental health support and voluntary reconnections.

Fenland are already seeing the impact of this project. So far, 10 rough sleeping cases have been prevented; 3 reconnections achieved; 9 clients engaged with mental health services; 62 with drug services; 61 with alcohol services; and 14 have accessed work.

### Evidence and local intelligence

60. We will continue to consider proposals which are largely, or wholly, directed at establishing a better understanding of the impact of migration on services and communities. Strong proposals should intend to use this work to inform future service changes, or they may offer lessons for local or central government.

### Funding for unaccompanied asylum seeking children, refugees and victims of modern slavery

61. Over 20% of the Fund has already been allocated to assist local authorities in developing their capacity to care for unaccompanied asylum seeking children. £8.9 million has been awarded to 32 projects that were submitted by local authorities to tackle specific service pressures, such as a shortage of appropriate accommodation or insufficient English language provision for school-age children. This included places, like Kent, taking higher than average numbers of children as well as places with little or no experience of caring for this group who wanted to develop their capacity, like Shropshire. These bids are included in the summary table at **Annex A**.

62. A further £9 million of funding has been allocated to 135 local authorities to build capacity across England to care for this vulnerable group. The funding enables English local authorities to take a greater number of children through the National Transfer Scheme, and relieve pressure on authorities such as Croydon and Kent County Council.

63. This funding was separate to the on-going unaccompanied asylum seeking children tariff payments met by the Home Office, which are currently the subject of a review.

64. The Fund will not duplicate tariff arrangements but will continue to support bids that seek to develop local authority capacity to care for this group.  All bids must meet the Fund's criteria at **Annex D**.

65. The Fund has also committed £1.7 million to fund the first year of 35 Local Authority Asylum Seeker Liaison Officer posts in 19 areas. Participating local authorities have match-funded the second year of this pilot, in which officers will support asylum seekers and their families before and during the 28-day "move-on" period from government support following a positive decision.  This pilot is being delivered in areas with some of the highest concentrations of supported asylum seekers.  It aims to improve access to housing, employment, benefits, English language learning and health services for those with a successful decision, as well as support a return home for those whose application is unsuccessful.

66. Local authorities with high numbers of supported asylum seekers wishing to replicate this model should be able to commit to match-funding the second year of the pilot and submit their bid in the same manner as other bids.

67. In addition to the above pilot the Fund has committed £1.1m to trial new ways of supporting victims of Modern Slavery in six local authorities, as they transition away from government support and integrate into their communities. Once concluded, this pilot will provide valuable learning about the best ways to support this vulnerable group. In the meantime, the Fund will not be funding any similar model, although we will continue to consider bids to gather and share data and prosecute rogue and criminal landlords, where the proposal helps to identify victims of Modern Slavery.

# D. Evaluation of projects – evaluation planning, success measures and learning

**The value of evaluating**

68. We want to develop our understanding of how migration affects local services and communities as well as cultivate a better understanding of successful local responses to alleviate these pressures. The issues identified by local areas, the solutions proposed and the impact of projects and actions will all contribute to this. We will therefore continue to expect a suitable degree of individual evaluation of the Fund's projects.

69. Strong monitoring and evaluation of success is not only of benefit to policy makers nationally, but is also a key means of demonstrating to local service commissioners and delivery partners that an initiative is worth continuing to fund in the longer term, or making part of mainstream provision. It may also identify changes to local systems or practices that will lead to better outcomes.

70. To help local authorities develop proposals that show clear evaluation plans, bidders should outline the theory of change for their project (**Annex C)** and submit this alongside the proposal. A good logic model, will set out how evaluation plans work in the local context to demonstrate the success of the intervention. Guidance for completing an outline logic model is included at **Annex C**.

**Setting out evaluation plans in the proposal**

71. All proposals will continue to be asked to define the problem locally, using the best data available and set out what success would look like in each particular case.

72. The strongest proposals that we have already funded clearly defined the problem, developed solutions (some tried and tested, some new) to address it, ensuring these were relevant within existing local service structures. They included appropriate plans for the oversight, monitoring and evaluation of the project – the best have proposed appropriate metrics that were relevant to the original problem, building on existing metrics where practicable but seeking to enable the impact of the project to be identified. This is something that we expect from any proposals made to the Fund now.

**Case study– evaluating a multi strand programme**

As well as monitoring the programme activity, a good evaluation plan will demonstrate the value of that activity by showing evidence of positive impacts on the problems identified. That evidence might include before and after measures of key issues, or case studies investigating the process of change.

One example of a strong evaluation plan is that of **Rotherham Council** where a multi-strand approach has been developed to address complex issues including segregation and exploitation. First, the programme of activity was made very clear through specific targets, for example 150 learners benefitting from English tuition, or 6 workshops covering mediation. Measures of impact were relevant to these activities, such as a reduced need for interpreting services or a decrease in the numbers of neighbourhood resolution cases. Measures such as a survey of resident perceptions, before and after the intervention, will also indicate the impact of the programme more broadly.

This programme made very effective use of existing data accessible to the local authority, such as money spent on interpreting, rates of hate crime, or prosecutions for fly tipping. As well as being more cost effective than commissioning new measures, this allows comparison back to historical figures.

**Monitoring and evaluating**

73. It is a requirement of receiving funding that all projects complete an Impact Summary (**Annex E**) within six months of the project's completion. This will include a completed logic model (**Annex C**) so that the overall impact of the scheme, when reported, is clearly shown against the original intention. The Impact Summary can also provide a template that can be used for on-going reporting of progress.

74. To ensure the Impact Summary is as beneficial as possible to central government and local authorities in demonstrating what works, we expect a proportionate level of on-going monitoring and evaluation before, during and after the project.

75. An indication of the governance and ongoing evaluation plans should be demonstrated in the proposal. These should explain how the information to complete the Impact Summary will be gathered. The strongest Impact Summaries will benefit from some independent challenge throughout the monitoring and evaluation process, in addition to clear pre- and post-baseline measures.

76. Where a very strong case is made we will also consider proposals for external evaluations of some projects. If the proposal includes plans for an external evaluation as part of the bid for funding this should be discussed with officials before submission.

77. Based on the monitoring and evaluation of funded projects so far, it is clear that methods to demonstrate success can be challenging, particularly for complex bids that are seeking to achieve multiple aims through a number of interventions. There

is some guidance on how to do this on the application form at **Annex B** and the theory of change model and guidance at **Annex C**.

**The national evaluation of the Fund**

78. Ipsos MORI will be conducting the national evaluation of the Fund on behalf of MHCLG.  Using a sample of projects the national evaluation will demonstrate the impact of the Fund on local areas. After an initial scoping and cost benefit analysis stage to inform the approach, fieldwork and analysis using the most appropriate techniques will be carried out in a sample of areas. This should provide robust evidence (for example cost benefit ratios for different types of programmes) to support policy development and future funding decisions.

79. In a further group of areas we hope to gain a greater understanding of the local migration data landscape by working in partnership with local authorities and other local partners.

80. The evaluation will also capture the benefits of projects to local communities.

81. Ipsos MORI will also identify and share good practice between local areas through the evaluation – including through a number of action learning sets, where local areas are brought together to discuss a specific issue. This will ensure insights are shared with local areas as the evaluation progresses.

82. The full report of findings for the national evaluation is due in 2020 but interim products will be produced before this point.

**Sharing learning within local government**

83. Separate to the national evaluation, we are working with the Local Government Association (LGA) to find ways for local authorities to share their experience of evidencing migration impacts as well as any learning from the delivery of projects. This might include sharing evidence, learning and good practice through the new Cohesion and Integration Network. This new network is aimed at bringing local and national government, academic institutions, civil society and businesses together to share knowledge, experience and work more effectively on cohesion and integration.

# E. The next stage

**For government**

84. Learning from the Fund will inform policy making. We have shared interim progress and examples of good practice from projects with Home Office and the Department for Education to inform future policy and funding decisions. The outcomes and evaluations of funded projects, the national evaluation and the evaluation of projects funded by the Innovation Fund will help build a picture across government of what works to integrate communities and how migration affects different parts of the country at a very local level.

**For bidders**

85. Proposals against the remaining £26.4 million should be submitted by email by 1 October and will be considered by officials. We will let successful bidders know as soon as possible.

86. If you have any further questions about the Fund that are not answered in this document, get in touch with us at migrationfund@communities.gsi.gov.uk. See para 32 for more details on the elements officials can comment on.

# Section 2: Immigration Enforcement element

**Context**

1.  The Home Office will continue to support the Fund's objective of providing support to local communities facing pressures arising from migration, working with local authorities across the UK and building on existing joint work.

**How local authorities can get access to this part of the Fund**

2.  The Home Office contribution consists of a resource equivalent of £40 million of Immigration Enforcement activity over four years.

3.  Local authorities do not need to go through a formal bidding process for the Immigration Enforcement element of the fund. You can speak directly with your local Immigration, Compliance and Enforcement (ICE) team or Immigration Enforcement Local Partnership Manager (LPM) to explore the types of activity that Immigration Enforcement can support, in line with local community priorities. Details of your local ICE team lead can be found at **Annex F**. To contact an LPM, please email the LPM support team at I&SDLPMSupportTeam@homeoffice.gsi.gov.uk

4.  Every proposal for joint working will be considered on its own merits, including the length and cost of the project. Immigration Enforcement will work with the local authority to agree the scope and resource required for any proposal taken forward. Immigration Enforcement also welcomes regional proposals from local authorities wishing to work together in any particular region, as well as proposals from individual local authorities.

**How can Immigration Enforcement help local authorities under the Fund?**

5.  Immigration Enforcement has a range of powers available to address problems arising from individuals' lack of lawful immigration status, which can impact local communities.  Examples of existing Immigration Enforcement activity that local authorities may wish to consider for their own area or could use to develop proposals that reflect their local or regional circumstances include the following:

6.  **Employers and landlords**: such as joint work with local authorities to ensure compliance by employers and landlords with obligations only to offer work and accommodation to legal residents, powers to investigate those involved in organising or facilitating immigration offences, and powers to address the position of those in the UK without status; the latter includes the power to grant status to those who substantiate a claim to remain in the UK, and powers to assist others to return to their country of origin.  Immigration Enforcement continues to participate in multi-agency operations involving landlords providing dangerous and overcrowded housing conditions in the private rented sector, to assist local authorities, the police and other agencies tackle the exploitation of vulnerable migrants.

7.  Immigration Enforcement also has a crucial role to play in identifying migrant victims of modern slavery offences, so they can be referred for support.

8.  Immigration Enforcement can also provide advice and support to local authorities who are working with EEA and non-EEA nationals who are sleeping rough.

9.  Immigration Enforcement maintains regular oversight over Controlling Migration Fund related activity, which informs our approach and engagement with local authorities.