Checklist for cities to address residential and educational segregation of Roma[1]

Table of Content

1. Introduction

The Roma are the largest ethnic minority in Europe, with a population estimated to be around 10-12 million on the continent, of which 6 million live in EU Member States. The Roma have long been affected by social exclusion and discrimination, and antigypsyism continues to be a widespread phenomenon. To improve the social integration of Roma population is a main goal of the European Union, which has been manifested in the formulation of European Roma Framework Strategy, setting Roma integration goals and requirements toward the Member States to take active measures for improving the situation of their Roma population and decrease discrimination in all domains of life. Member States had to develop their own National Roma Inclusion Strategies, and monitor its progress. The EU has also set up mechanisms to monitor the progress of Roma inclusion, requesting member states to provide monitoring reports; but more recently independent monitoring by civil society organisations has also been carried out.[2]

Residential segregation and educational segregation often go hand in hand – although not necessarily. Research shows that children living in segregated settlements attend segregated schools in over 50 percent of the cases, since children tend to attend schools in the proximity of their residence. However, even if no sharp residential segregation is in place, Roma children are still likely to be affected by educational segregation. This shows that educational systems themselves often display segregating mechanisms, in part due to free school choice by parents. "White flight" and the self-sorting (self-segregation) of Roma and other ethnic minorities are often cited as main causes of residential segregation, which public policies cannot counteract efficiently. Therefore relatively few examples of direct desegregation measures exist, even though the EU clearly encourages this approach. Local governments are still more willing to upgrade deprived areas and Roma settlements, which fails to address the overarching self-sorting mechanisms and the reproduction of socio-economic and ethnic segregation; while in segregated schools the aim of interventions is to improve the quality of education, which again does not address underlying segregating mechanisms. Nonetheless, some initiatives show that desegregation measures can be successful if implemented in an integrated way, also addressing complementary dimensions of marginalization, and backed by a long-term integrated strategy, stable funding, and political support. This is true for both residential and educational segregation.

This document was commissioned by the Urban Poverty Partnership with the aim to provide a checklist for cities, to support the development of urban desegregation actions addressing the problem of residential and/or educational segregation primarily of Roma but also of other ethnic minorities.

Following the Introduction the second chapter provides the Checklist that summarizes the minimum requirements for desegregation actions. Cities should check whether their planned actions comply with these requirements. The third chapter presents the main principles that have served as basis to develop the checklist. The fourth chapter provides a detailed description of concrete steps to follow in designing desegregation measures aiming to eliminate or at least alleviate residential and educational segregation. The fifth chapter summarizes existing methodological practices in Member States to identify residential and school segregation of Roma (and/or disadvantaged groups, other ethnic minorities). The sixth chapter shows positive examples of locally implemented residential and educational desegregation measures. Furthermore, it also presents broader policy measures which can indirectly prevent or reduce segregation. In the Annex country examples of measuring / mapping segregation of Roma are shown.

2. Checklist for desegregation actions of cities

Are the planned actions are sufficiently inclusive to tackle segregation? (Tick the box if yes)	
Assessing the scope and scale of segregation	
Map of urban segregation developed, incl. illegal settlements and housing situations	
Segregated schools identified	
Strategic approach to desegregation	
Coherent integration strategy developed and incorporated into the urban development strategy, with actions against both residential and school segregation	
Segregated schools and residential areas ranked according to need of intervention	
Multi-dimensional causes of segregation identified (labour, housing market, education, etc)	
Local sectoral policies assessed for exclusive or discriminatory mechanisms	
Actions against residential segregation	
Relocation action from segregated area planned in urban development actions, including for most vulnerable households and those in illegal housing/settlements	
Sufficient stock of social/affordable housing available in the city	
- Purchase or construction of social/affordable housing necessary	
- Municipal regulation includes exclusive/discriminatory mechanisms	
- Available schemes offer long-term, secure housing for relocated persons	
Local social benefit system contributes effectively to housing affordability	
Actions include measures to prepare households before, and support after, relocation	
Measures are taken to ensure necessary services in the receiving community	
Actions are taken to improve legal employment, labour market opportunities	
Segregated community involved in the relocation planning process	
NGOs and grassroots organisations included in the planning and implementation	
Actions against school segregation	
Current approach in line with severity of school segregation	
The city aims at overall transformation of the school system, including	
- phasing out segregated schools	
- introducing capping rules on disadvantaged children per school	
Rate of disadvantaged children to be decreased to a pre-set level across schools	
Measures involve schools outside general enrolment rules (e.g. church, private schools)	
(If applicable) the share of Roma children in specialized schools/classes addressed	
Actions planned to improve the quality of education for disadvantaged children	
Teachers provided adequate preparation and training to deal with diverse classes	
- including new pedagogical methods, tailored to children's needs	
- need for additional school staff assessed, appropriate funding provided	
Measures ensure the provision of extra-curricular activities for disadvantaged children	
Measures involve and empower parents of disadvantaged children	
City actions foster communication between schools and local communities	
Public transport systems adapted to school commuting needs	
Affected parties and general public adequately informed of desegregation efforts, including public forums, awareness raising campaigns	
Financing and monitoring interventions	
Intervention period adequately long, channels all relevant sources (EU, national, local)	
Output and outcome monitoring system set up, followed up regularly; covers all dimensions of the program	
Mechanism in place to channel feedback to decision makers, allow necessary corrections	

3. Main principles of desegregation checklist

In this section, on one hand, the main principles are presented that have served as a basis for compiling the desegregation checklist, on the other hand, the most important element of national framework policies are summarized.

1.   The checklist applies a comprehensive approach to desegregation interventions, taking into account the multi-dimensional mechanisms behind residential and educational segregation. Besides housing and educational intervention, measures must are proposed in the sectors of employment, social and health care provision, and community development.

2.   In an evidence based approach, cities first need to map the scope and scale of residential and educational segregation. Segregation should be measured by socio-economic indicators instead of purely ethnic data. Low educational attainment, high unemployment, and low income are effective indicators of the spatial concentration of poverty. In education, a high rate of children with disadvantaged family backgrounds and weak educational performance indicate segregated schools.

3.   Long term programs are needed to effectively eradicate segregation, in line with, and incorporated into, urban development strategies (especially the Sustainable Urban Development Strategy and the Urban Spatial Development Plan), as well as urban sectoral policies.

4.   In tackling segregation, highly inclusive measures must also targeting the most marginalised groups, including those in illegal settlements or housing situations.

5.   Desegregation programs must be participative, actively involving affected communities (including the Roma) and civil society stakeholders (NGOs, grassroots organisations).

6.   The multi-sectoral and participatory nature of desegregation interventions have to be reflected in the organisational structure of the programs, involving sectoral and non-governmental organisations in the decision making structure (e.g. by establishing a Local Support Group).

7.   Desegregation programs can only be effective with appropriate financing schemes, ensuring that available EU and national funds are used and sufficiently complemented by local resources.

8.   Desegregation programs have to be accompanied by a sound monitoring system of output and outcomes indicators. The locally applicable monitoring system has to provide ongoing feedback to program implementation, and serve as a basis for necessary modifications and corrections.

National frameworks

As relevant examples presented in this paper show national governments can efficiently support cities' desegregation efforts with schemes which are available on the long run and provide predictable funding and technical assistance. These schemes are especially effective if they include

- mapping segregated areas of cities (and other localities) as well as segregated schools on national level;

- methodological guidelines for cities to develop desegregation programs;

- provision of technical assistance on the ground in the process of planning and implementation desegregation programs.

4. Detailed recommendations for cities to assess residential and educational segregation, and develop desegregation measures

It is important to develop a comprehensive approach to addressing residential and educational segregation, as they are the products of a complex set of exclusionary and discriminatory mechanisms on labour and housing markets; educational, health, welfare and cultural services; and discrepancies of political inclusion and representation. Based on the EU anti-discrimination legislation[3] the EU has set up a policy framework in respect of the use of ESI funds to support desegregation actions in the field of housing and education, and counteracting labour market discrimination. Numerous related guidance documents have also been developed to assist member states and local governments to develop desegregation policies and concrete actions[4].

This section provides local governments with a checklist of concrete steps, to follow in designing desegregation measures aiming to eliminate or at least alleviate residential and educational segregation. The checklist consists of the following main steps and activities:

1. Incorporating the assessment of, and actions against, residential and educational segregation into the Sustainable Urban Development Strategy (SUDS) of the city;
2. Methods to assess residential segregation;
3. Methods to assess educational segregation;
4. Developing desegregation measures to alleviate/eliminate residential segregation;
5. Developing desegregation measures to alleviate/eliminate educational segregation;
6. Elaborate a monitoring system to assess the results of desegregation and prevention measures; and
7. Using participative methods throughout the phases of planning and implementation.

1. Incorporating the issues of residential and educational segregation in the city's SUDS, in both the diagnosis and the action plans

In the Sustainable Urban Development Strategy (SUDS) social exclusion and segregation should be a cross-cutting issue in all sectoral domains. The diagnostic sections should examine whether there are significant inequalities in the local society, which might also point to segregation in one or more domains. It should be noted that segregation may be an issue even cities with a balanced overall socio-economic profile, as pockets of poverty and marginalization may also exist in prosperous cities.

1.a   As a first step, the presence of marginalized groups, the level of inequality in the local society, and the signs indicating segregation must be investigated in the SUDS. Mechanisms of exclusion in the local socio-economic system as well as in the public provision system must also be identified. Therefore the SUDS should examine:

---

[3] Council Directive 2000/43/EC of 29 June 2000 implementing the principle of equal treatment between persons irrespective of racial or ethnic origin.

[4] For example: EGESIF_15-0010-02, 20/04/2016. European Commission: Guidance for Member States on Integrated Sustainable Urban Development (Article 7 ERDF Regulation) http://ec.europa.eu/regional_policy/en/information/publications/guidelines/2015/guidance-for-member-states-on-integrated-sustainable-urban-development-article-7-erdf-regulation

Regarding educational desegregation the Council of Europe published a complex set of related recommendations: Fighting school segregation in Europe through inclusive education: a position paper by the Council of Europe Commissioner for Human Rights. 2017. https://rm.coe.int/fighting-school-segregationin-europe-throughinclusive-education-a-posi/168073fb65

i. The spatial distribution and concentration of disadvantaged, marginalized, and/or ethnic minority groups (or groups of immigrants and their descendants)[5]; and whether the spatial development plan of the city affects any of the areas where the concentration of socially disadvantaged or marginalized groups and/or ethnic minorities is high.

ii. The demographic trends in the city in general, and by social and ethnic groups.

iii. The overall economic situation of the city. In this respect the level of unemployment should generally be examined to reveal if certain social groups are particularly affected by unemployment (especially long-term unemployment); and labour market discrimination against specific groups must also be addressed by age, gender, qualification, and ethnicity.

iv. The efficiency and equality of educational and training system must be assessed. In this respect, SUDS diagnostic chapters must look at the composition of the population by educational attainment to assess if any social groups are affected by low or extremely low level of education, and whether this has a clear ethnic dimension. Special attention must be paid to the educational attainment of the young generation, as it indicates the quality and inclusiveness of the current local education system.

v. The housing market and the operation of local social housing system must be examined. The share and accessibility of affordable housing in the owner occupied sector and the rental market are crucial for preventing segregating mechanisms. The SUDS must determine whether there are any housing exclusion mechanisms present, and if discrimination affects any specific groups by household type and ethnicity. Moreover, the operation and efficiency of local housing policy should be assessed by the type of available housing subsidies and allowances, by the target groups of different measures, and if any specific groups are systematically excluded from these measures (whether or not deliberately).

vi. The accessibility and efficiency of the local welfare and health care system must be investigated. It must assess if any social groups are excluded from, or have limited access to, quality public services; if so, for what reasons; and whether discrimination in public service provision has an ethnic dimension. Regarding the welfare system, SUDS must assess if any major social problems exist that are not adequately addressed.

vii. SUDS should take a look at the strength of community cohesion, and the presence of the civil society sector. It should check if any social groups (including ethnic minorities) are excluded from community and cultural participation in the city. It should assess if the presence of civil society is strong enough to ensure the appropriate representation of every social strata and ethnic groups (including the Roma) in the city's community life, and if it is able to include and represent their interests.

The diagnosis part of the SUDS should be based on sound statistical data.

1.b The problems revealed in the diagnosis part must be addressed in the action plan as follows:

i. Economic development measures must also address the problems of disadvantaged groups, creating specific measures to tackle unemployment and labour market discrimination, and develop efficient training programs, in cooperation with employers.

---

[55] Ethnicity related data are not allowed to be registered by authorities, only the country of origin. Ethnicity related data can be obtained from surveys or censuses.

ii.   Educational inequalities have to be addressed by programs that increase the educational performance of children with disadvantaged social backgrounds. If educational segregation is identified, measures must be in place to decrease it.

iii. If housing affordability is a specific problem, the city's land and zoning regulation should provide sufficient land for residential housing purposes; in the spatial planning system, the zoning regulation should be adjusted to the needs. If cities owns enough land, they should allot land plots for affordable housing construction. In municipal housing policy, social housing measures should be further developed by increasing the municipal social housing stock, and/or through providing rent supplement subsidies (particularly if a central housing subsidy does not exist or is insufficient). Housing related indebtedness must be also addressed.

iv.   The local health care system should ensure the equal access to quality health service; measures should also find a way to address those who have no social security and thus have no access at all to local health care provision. In both health and welfare measures the prevention of extreme difficulties and individualized support for the most disadvantaged, marginalized groups should be in focus.

v.   Measures should address capacity building of grassroots groups and civil society organizations which deal with the most disadvantaged groups, among which the Roma and other ethnic groups. Such civil society and advocacy groups should be included in a participative way in the planning process of SUDSs and their implementation.

2. Assessing residential segregation

A thorough diagnosis of the overall situation described in point 1 shall reveal the nature and level of inequalities that exist in the city. If significant inequalities are present, it must be checked if they result in residential segregation.

2.a   In several countries, cities have access to national surveys that measure residential segregation, and identify and precisely locate segregated or deprived areas. In such cases, cities should assess if any major changes occurred in the pattern and level of residential segregation since the production of this mapping; and if so, explain the reason for the changes. In the process of revising segregation patterns follow steps of point 2.b.

2.b   If such mapping is not available, cities should assess residential segregation as follows:

i.   Using Census statistical data[6] for the city, disaggregated on small spatial units (blocks, electoral districts etc.), to measure the rate of:
   o   people with low average level educational attainment (e.g. large share of residents with primary school and/or vocational school as highest level of completed education);
   o   the age composition of the population, with special attention to the share of children, as marginalized communities often have a higher fertility rate;
   o   inactive people in the age group of 18-65, unemployed people, among which long-term unemployed, in order to assess the level of labour market exclusion;
   o   ethnic/minority composition of the population (if available);
   o   housing quality, including the availability of basic public utilities and amenities (flush toilet, bathroom, connection to water and sewage networks etc.);
   o   the share of overcrowded housing.

---

[6] Or other regularly collected data that can be spatially disaggregated.

ii.   Using statistical data on income, disaggregated on a small spatial level (if available) to measure the share of people with significantly below average income levels within the economically active age group (18-65). Either the median income of small spatial units should be compared, or the share of persons whose income is below a certain percentage threshold (e.g. 60%) of the city median income level should be measured.

iii.   Using data collected by welfare providers to examine if a spatial concentration of take-up rates occurs, including
- high spatial concentration of persons who receive regular social benefits (such as unemployment benefits, housing/rent allowances, child care benefits etc.)
- outstanding share of recipients of social support services (social counselling, debt management services, child protection service etc.)
- the presence of illegal settlements on the outskirts of the city, in areas which are non-residential, and hence might not be covered by statistical data collection (such as Census).

When welfare data is examined, nonetheless, the evaluator should keep in mind that subsidy and benefit take-up rates may be low in case of marginalized groups and communities; particularly if the residents have no legal residency status in the city, live in illegal settlements etc. But low take-up rates can be due to a dysfunction in the welfare system as well. Therefore qualitative data might have to be collected from the service provision system, in which key informants have high importance (see in point 2.b.v.)

iv.   Using crime statistics to identify areas with a high concentration in crime rates. Nonetheless, the assessor must keep in mind that crimes may not be reported in some highly deprived areas, thus qualitative information is also important in this field.

v.   In order to contextualize statistical data, qualitative information has to be collected from organizations working in fields related to
- extreme spatial concentration of social disadvantage, including groups with multiple forms of disadvantage (low income, unemployment, indebtedness, health problems etc.);
- people in poor quality or substandard housing, or in legally or otherwise insecure housing situation.

vi.   Identifying potentially segregated locations, and carrying out targeted field research with survey and interviews, measuring
- population;
- demographic and ethnic composition, presence of Roma population;
- average level of educational attainment;
- the rate of inactivity and unemployment, and also the rate of those in insecure and/or irregular employment;
- the average income level of households;
- occurrence and average level of indebtedness;
- type and severity of social problems;
- housing situation, including the survey of legal titles to housing;

- o availability of basic services (public and commercial), especially access to educational services (kindergarten, pre-school, early development services, social and health care services, and transportation);
- o crime rates and public safety indicators;
- o the presence of NGOs and support organisations.

vii. Based on the collected information, the areas affected by residential segregation must be defined, through
- o specifying the location of segregated areas, including those outside the city limits (in non-residential areas), or located in inner cities or brownfield areas, taking into account those isolated from the integrated part of the city (e.g. by physical barriers);
- o identifying the main affected social groups (e.g. families with children, elderly people), and examining if segregation has a clear ethnic dimension (e.g. whether it is partially or predominantly a Roma community);
- o identify the main underlying causes of segregation, whether due to
  - ▪ employment: unfavourable labour market position, discrimination, long-term unemployment, low-paid work;
  - ▪ access to housing: the lack of affordable and social housing in the city and as a result a "spontaneous" crowding out effect could greatly affect marginalized groups, among them the Roma;
  - ▪ inadequate planning, like urban development projects replacing lower cost housing: in such cases mechanisms must be assessed related to the replacement housing or compensation of original (displaced) residents, to see whether the related procedures contribute to segregation;
  - ▪ discriminative or not efficiently targeted welfare and housing policies, e.g. housing and benefit allocation system may systematically exclude certain social groups.

viii. If several segregated areas are defined in the city, they should be ranked according to the severity of the problems and the size and population of the area.

3. Assessing educational segregation

Although mapping of educational segregation on the national level is available only in few countries, generally more data are available to assess school segregation as schools have to report data related to the (under)performance of students.

i. In order to assess school segregation, school level disaggregated data must be collected to measure the even or uneven distribution of socially disadvantaged children and educational performance related problems across the school system. Data that reveal school segregation include:
- o the rate of children coming from a disadvantaged social background. Indicators of this include the rate of recipients of specific social benefits or allowances, parent unemployment, parents with low educational attainment, or in low status employment;
- o high absenteeism rates;
- o high dropout rates;
- o low overall educational performance: low results of competence testing (significantly behind national and/or city average);

o high rates of pupils who do not continue their school career after completing primary education, or outstanding rates of students going on to vocational schools.

Most of these data have to be collected by schools and reported to relevant authorities and national statistical institutions. Cities should also begin collecting (if they do not already do so) and analyzing these data. It is important to note that in many countries ethnic minority related data are not available, as public authorities are not allowed to collect such data. Nevertheless, as in the case of residential segregation, there is a strong correlation between high rates of socio-economic disadvantage, students systematically underperforming compared local and national averages, and the rate of (marginalized) ethnic minorities, such as the Roma. Therefore the high rate of disadvantaged and low-performing students indicates a high probability of ethnicity-based school segregation.

i. Segregation can also take place inside the schools, in form of operating segregated classes (e.g. Roma-only classes). Accordingly, the distribution of the above listed indicators should also be examined across classes (e.g. a high, but not extreme presence of low performance indicators could point to within-school segregation).

ii. The examination should also include schools not run by public authorities, e.g. church schools, especially if their presence in the local education system is significant. In many cases, different regulations apply to such schools, e.g. they do not have taken into account catchment areas in their enrolment practices.

iii. Special needs schools should be also examined; disadvantaged (e.g. Roma) children may be overrepresented in such schools. In many countries there are widespread practices in place to enrol Roma children in special needs schools or classes through misdiagnosing them. Such practices should be revealed.

4. Developing measures to support residential desegregation

i. For each identified segregated areas, a long-term strategy must be defined; whether the goal is

  o to eradicate the segregated area, and relocate its residents; or
  o to upgrade the area, by also fostering social mix.

A priority order must be defined, to establish which segregated area(s) need the most urgent interventions.

ii. If the eradication of a segregated area is planned, the following measures should be included in the action plan:

  o rehousing people into social rental housing in integrated parts of the city, in a dispersed way to avoid the repeated concentration of disadvantage and hence the creation of new segregated neighbourhoods;
  o to ensure dispersed rehousing, additional social dwellings might have to be purchased if the municipality has a limited supply of social housing;
  o the local community must be involved in the planning process for rehousing;
  o before, during and after rehousing, comprehensive individualized support must be provided to the affected persons and families (including social, health, educational, and employment support);
  o after rehousing, the relocated households need support in integrating into their new community (this might include mediation in the neighbourhood or the school and

other support interventions), and this support should be ensured for as long as needed;

- o housing provided after relocation must remain affordable for the affected households, for which a range of measures can be deployed, such as rent subsidy, employability support measures etc.

iii.   If upgrading is planned, the concentration of socio-economic disadvantage (whether or not related to ethnic minorities) is still necessary, to prevent the future downgrading of the targeted neighbourhood.

- o Some desegregation measures (like the rehousing some of the local households) should be planned in this case as well, following the principles described above.
- o In case of renewal of existing housing, it should be ensured that renovated housing will remain affordable for the disadvantaged households (including Roma, or other persons with severe socio-economic disadvantage). Therefore if necessary, rent subsidies should be provided.
- o Soft (ESF) measures should be provided alongside hard investments in a comprehensive way, to ensure the sustainability of positive outcomes. These measures should aim at improving educational career and attainment of children and young people, better employability of adults, and community development.
- o Striving for social mix is strongly advised, through attracting households with higher (medium) socio-economic status in order to avoid the re-concentration of socio-economic disadvantage in the neighbourhood. Community development activities are needed to boost local social cohesion between different social groups, including among Roma and non-Roma families.

iv.   Adjusting sectoral local policies according to the need of the planned measures:

- o housing policy: social housing measures should be aligned to the needs of the most disadvantaged, socially excluded groups in terms of allocation of social housing and prevention of loss of housing;
- o the welfare provision system must address the issue of indebtedness;
- o the social support and health services should allocate adequate capacity to individualized intensive support to the most disadvantaged;
- o crime prevention should be inclusive towards at-risk groups, paying special attention to children and young people; emphasis must be placed on prevention and harm reduction, including for substance abuse.

v.   During the scheduling of planned interventions, funding for implementation must be allocated combining cities' own resources, EU funding, and available national schemes.

- o ESI funds can be used for investments related to dispersed relocation (e.g. purchasing social housing) of marginalized groups, and for implementing comprehensive accompanying measures. ESI funds can also support the upgrading of existing social housing, energy efficient housing investments (which in turn decrease housing costs), urban environment, establishing new community spaces etc.
- o Cities' own resources should be used to re-adapt local welfare and housing related benefits in order to reach marginalized groups and provide them with more efficient services of good quality.

vi.   Provisions must be taken to include civil society organizations, grassroots activities, and local communities throughout the planning and implementation process. (See more in point 7.)

5. Developing measures to support educational desegregation

Cities should address all forms of school segregation: segregated schools, segregation within schools (between classes), and special needs schools in which Roma children are enrolled at a much higher rate than their share among the local population of the same age group.

Several practices exist to alleviate school segregation:

- reforming the entire local education system;
- gradual closure of the segregated schools through stopping admissions, and directing children to desegregated educational institutions;
- putting a cap on the rate of children with disadvantaged/ethnic/religious etc. background.

i.   Transforming the whole local education system by redesigning the catchment areas of schools:
    o   This measure is particularly effective when the number of children affected by school segregation is high, therefore only including schools in the vicinity of segregated areas is insufficient; instead, schools further away should also be involved in the redistribution of children with disadvantaged socio-economic backgrounds.
    o   If children are distributed to schools further away from their residence, attention must be paid that they are involved in extra-curricular activities in the school, and also that transportation to and from their residential area is available.

ii.   Gradual steps to decrease segregation involves measures like
    o   gradually closing segregated schools by discontinuing first grade classes; and
    o   launching programs to enrol some of the children from segregated schools to other, integrated schools.

Such gradual desegregation usually happens in cases when the decision makers and public have to be convinced about the feasibility of desegregation, and their support has to be gained. It is important that gradual steps should be continued over a prolonged period; the final aim should be the full implementation of the desegregation scheme.

iii.   Introducing a cap on the rate of disadvantaged children, using socio-economic indicators:
    o   This measure can be efficient if the affected school is not fully segregated; or if it is fully segregated, but operates with substantially underused capacity. Fully segregated schools with high numbers of disadvantaged children would be extremely costly and difficult (if not impossible) to transform to integrated schools.
    o   The schools in the vicinity should be also involved in the process, as they will have to be prepared for the integration of marginalised children redirected from the segregated school.
    o   In case of capping, catchment areas are usually redesigned as well, creating larger areas inside which parents have a broader choice of schools. When enrolling children into school, parents are requested to name several schools in preferential order. Enrolment is decided by the relevant authority based on the parents' preference list, and also taking into account the capping rules ensuring the even distribution of marginalised or disadvantaged children.

iv. In all forms of desegregation measures, it should be ensured that
   o the rate of children with marginalised background do not exceed a certain rate (the threshold is usually 20 or 25 percent) in any schools, grades, and classes;
   o children are successfully integrates into the class and the school community.

v. The transport of children to integrated schools must be supported by providing school buses, or ensuring that public transportation is available and frequent enough. If needed, financial support should be provided to enable disadvantaged children and their parents to use public transportation.

vi. Cities have different options to act against school segregation in centralized and decentralized education systems, but cities can take action to relieve school segregation even in centralized systems. It is important that measures should affect the whole local education system, from early childhood education to secondary schools.
   o In decentralized systems, cities can deploy more direct measures to reduce educational segregation using one of the above mentioned approaches.
   o In centralised systems, cities can negotiate with the relevant responsible bodies in order to redesign school catchment areas; and they can also cooperate in developing the strategy of desegregation and take active part of the implementation, e.g. by providing supplementary programs (social support, community and extracurricular activities etc.). Cities can also launch awareness raising campaigns on the advantages of integrated education.
   o In both centralised and decentralised systems, free parental school choice should be addressed by a thoroughly elaborated desegregation strategy, communicated with stakeholders from the planning phase onwards; including the affected school staff, parents, the receiving school communities and the broader public.

vii. Desegregation measures always have to be accompanied by steps to improve the quality of education for disadvantaged children in both centralized and decentralized systems. These measures include:
   o providing additional funding for increasing the number of the teaching staff, and for introducing new pedagogic methods tailored to the individual needs of students;
   o more active involvement of parents;
   o more extra-curricular activities;
   o improving links between schools and the local community;
   o increasing the capacity of early childhood education, and providing skill development from an early age – as experience shows that children with a marginalised background and living overcrowded housing often have more early-age learning challenges compared to the average;
   o supporting (e.g. through mentoring) the transition among the different levels of education, e.g. from pre-school/kindergarten to primary school and from primary to secondary school;
   o providing more information on the local school system, and actively promoting the advantages of mixed schools among parents;
   o improving the integration of the education system and social and health services to tackle the social problems of disadvantaged families, with special attention to pupils at risk of early school-leaving;

o establishing stronger link between schools and employers, which can positively affect the career/profession choice of marginalised children.

6. Establishing a monitoring system to assess the impact of desegregation and prevention measures

It is important to regularly monitor the results and impact of desegregation measures, throughout the process of implementation as well as afterwards in order to see the emerging problems and unexpected effects.

i. To monitor <u>residential desegregation</u> actions and their effects, at least the following data should be measured:

o the number of households who were relocated compared to the total number of households in the segregated area;
o segregation level of the receiving area where households were rehoused, and the number of marginalized households who were rehoused in a given area in order to avoid newly emerging concentration of disadvantage;
o the number of relocated households who struggle to cover housing costs and are at risk to accumulated debts;
o the number of relocated households threatened by eviction, and the number of evictions;
o the number of terminated or not renewed rental contracts;
o the number of conflicts reported by the receiving community or the client households;
o the take-up rates of social benefits and rent subsidies by the marginalized households, keeping in mind that this is a relative measurement and at the evaluation it should be compared to the initial targets, whether take-up rates was expected to decrease (indicating the improved self-sufficiency of client households) or to increase (indicating better access to services);
o children's school performance (level of absenteeism, grade repetition, dropouts, or improvement in grades); and
o the number of people who successfully accessed formal employment (previously unemployed, illegally employed, or employed but with low working income should be differentiated). Measuring labour market outcomes is crucial as exclusion from the job market or poor labour market position is a main underlying cause of housing marginalization.

ii. To monitor <u>educational desegregation</u> actions and their effects at least the following data should be measured at school level:

o the number of children who were enrolled into integrated schools from segregated schools;
o the number of first grade students with marginalized background who were enrolled into segregated schools;
o the educational performance, including dropout and absenteeism rates of integrated schools that took in marginalized children;
o competence measurement results in schools, and their comparison across the school system;
o the number and rate of marginalized children who attend kindergarten from age 3 to compulsory school-age.

- o It is also important to measure the number of NEET youth on the city level, and if possible on a lower territorial level.
- o In case of educational desegregation, a continuous monitoring of segregation indicators (if they are in place) should be implemented.
- o Monitoring the results of accompanying programs aiming at improving the quality of education in receiving schools; e.g. the increase in the number of teachers, the number of teachers receiving trainings, the introduction and results of new teaching methods, the number of parents of marginalized situation involved in communication, and specialized school programs.

8. Channelling resources and capitalizing the knowledge of and experience of (local) NGOs and the local community

The use of a participatory approach is generally a must in actions targeting marginalized communities. It is particularly true when desegregation measures are planned and implemented; without this there is a high risk of conflicts deriving from the rejection of the program both on the part of marginalized communities and the majority population; which can jeopardize political support from the program.

Cities should therefore ensure the involvement of the following stakeholders:

i.   Civil society organisations, particularly Roma NGOs and those supporting the integration of deprived communities. Many examples show that these organisations have substantial experience and innovative practices in actions targeting the integration of marginalized Roma people and communities. They also have initiated and implemented several desegregation projects. The involvement of experienced NGOs is therefore strongly recommended. Beside their thorough knowledge, another advantage of involving them is that they can operate programs in a more flexible way, and they are responsive to the needs of the marginalized.

ii.   Municipal departments, institutions and other authorities who operate mainstream public services (social support, education, health, police etc.). It is important to have a long-term approach to desegregation, which exceeds the scope of a single project, and ensures that measures needed for long term integrations are taken in mainstream service provision as well. Without this, desegregation actions cannot yield sustainable results.

iii. The affected marginalized community. Without their support, desegregation actions cannot be successful. It is also important to take into account their needs when relocation or school desegregation measures are elaborated. In order to ensure their actual involvement and active participation, initial community development and mobilization measures are often necessary, as these groups usually have a limited ability to express and channel their interests.

iv.   Majority representatives of the local society should also be involved; as the lack of majority support is one the most frequent reason for local governments' rejection of desegregation actions. Awareness raising and regular communication can effectively counteract their resistance or rejection.

5. Methods to measure the level of residential and educational segregation of the Roma population

Measuring segregation is important in order to identify the scope of the problem and to gain information on its nature and possible causes. It is also important from the perspective of targeting policy measures to the area in need of improvement, and to measure changes over time and the effects of policy intervention.

Roma related statistical data

There is no precise statistical data on the size of the Roma population in EU member states, and it is difficult to produce disaggregate data on ethnic minorities for several reasons. Authorities do not usually register ethnicity related data. The most detailed data on ethnic background is generally provided by Censuses: in EU member states, Census questionnaires ask for the ethnic or minority belonging of respondents. However, this data is fully self-reported. Roma people often do not declare themselves as belonging to Roma minority due to distrust in the anonymity of the system, and fear of discrimination. Therefore Census data systematically and significantly underestimates the size of the national Roma population. In the case of other ethnic and minority groups, censuses provide more realistic data on the actual size of the given groups; for example in UK census data on Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) is considered reliable and is widely used for social analysis purposes.

Measuring residential segregation

Several methods are used to measure segregation. From the perspective of the aim of this paper we can differentiate them according to (1) whether ethnic or socioeconomic data are used to define segregation, and (2) whether identification is based on statistical data or estimations.

As for the methodology of measurement two main types segregation indexes[7] are most frequently used:

- dissimilarity indexes measure the uneven distribution of social groups across the city (relative indexes);
- segregation indexes measure high concentrations of social disadvantage or ethnic minorities across a territory (absolute indexes).

Examples are selected from countries with very different size and profile of Roma population. Four examples are drawn from the five countries with the largest Roma population (with the exception of Bulgaria, which was not included); one (Spain) from countries with significant, and one (Scotland) with small Roma population. Two examples (England and France) were taken which measure segregation, but not directly related to Roma population; they, nonetheless, serve as a good example both for school and residential segregation.

Based on this case selection it can be said that the prevailing method to identify segregated Roma neighbourhoods is **using ethnical profiling**, initially based on the knowledge of local key informants. Then the initially identified areas are then cross-checked with field research (including site visits and interviews) and local data gathering. The aim of this follow-up research is three-fold: beside the

---

[7] This is a very simplified categorisation, because in reality many approaches to measuring segregation are used. For example in a study of T.D. Logan and J.M. Parman: Measuring Residential Segregation, 2014. https://economics.yale.edu/sites/default/files/segregation-measures_03-24-14.pdf refers to Massey & Denton who collected and twenty types of segregation measurement tools, and classified them into five groups. The study itself also introduced a new method for measuring segregation.

verification of original information, it is also to gain more in-depth insight to the ethnic, demographic, socio-economic, housing, and community cohesion profile of the local population; and also to assess the availability and actual accessibility of a wider range of services. The most commonly used statistical data and qualitative information are:

- registered population by age breakdown, being aware that such neighbourhoods often have high and frequent in- and out-migration: many residents are therefore not registered, and many of those who are registered do not live there;
- households composition: size and type of the households (number of children, nuclear families);
- the unemployment rate of the active age population, and economic activity profile;
- housing situation: type of housing, tenure structure, legal title to the dwelling, availability of basic public utilities, amenities, prevalence of overcrowded housing;
- availability of public services: educational, social, and health care services; cultural and community services; commercial services; and public transportation;
- take-up rate of social benefits and level of use of social services;
- the relative spatial position of the neighbourhood in the structure of the settlement (city, town or village).

Based on such mapping of Roma neighbourhoods and communities, several analyses set up categorisations of Roma neighbourhoods based on the spatial position of the segregated neighbourhood, and the share of people of Roma ethnicity in the population of the neighbourhoods. Regarding the level of physical segregation, usual categories are neighbourhoods isolated from the main settlement, situated on the edge or the city, or located in the inner part of the settlement. Some categorisation also distinguish if there is a physical barrier between the segregated area and other residential areas settlement. Regarding the share of Roma population categories differentiate if the neighbourhood is exclusively or almost exclusively inhabited by Roma residents, if the majority of the residents are Roma, or if Roma are in minority in the neighbourhood. Several analyses conclude that the higher the share of the Roma population, the more disadvantaged and socially excluded the neighbourhood. A similar correlation is shown between spatial patterns and the level of segregation: usually the more isolated neighbourhoods (those outside the main settlement, cut off by a physical barrier, or situated in industrial area), the more socially excluded the residents.

Some analyses also make a comparison to the size of local Roma population living in integrated environments in the settlement.

Several studies use the definition of Roma as either people who self-identify (declare themselves) as Roma, or people who are perceived by others as Roma.

Such method were applied in the Czech Republic, Romania, Slovakia and Spain. In Scotland, a similar mapping was used, but with the aim to identify municipalities where the number of Roma migrants from Central, Eastern or Southern Europe is high (so local travellers were excluded).

Among countries with high or significant Roma population, only Hungary uses **socio-economic statistical data** to identify residential segregation. The segregation index measures the share of unemployed persons whose highest educational attainment is completed primary school within the economically active age (15-59) population. Territorial units are defined as segregated areas if they exceed a certain threshold of this compound indicator, set according to the type of the settlement. Statistical data is taken from the Censuses, so it can only be updated every 10 years, which is a serious limitation of this method. Therefore an alternative method was also defined, based on the spatial concentration of social benefits provided on a monthly basis by the central government, with the same

eligibility conditions in the whole country. However, this method was used by local governments to a very limited extent, because of the difficulties of producing spatially disaggregated data.

Non-Roma related examples of residential segregation measurement are taken from France and England, where residents with migrant backgrounds are typically affected by segregation effects.

In England the so called Indeces of Multiple Deprivation (IDM) is applied to measure segregation; this encompasses several statistical data in seven main domains (employment, education, housing, health, crime, and living environment). Each domain consists of several annually and spatially disaggregated statistical data. The method uses a relative order of spatial units (neighbourhoods) and looks for the most deprived neighbourhood as the bottom first decile or quintile. On the contrary, the French method uses only median household income per consumption unit data to define deprived urban neighbourhoods. Deprived neighbourhoods are those where median income is below a given threshold, as a combined index of median incomes of all metropolitan areas in France and of the metropolitan area where the neighbourhood is located.

This kind of measurement is sensitive to the method of defining and delineating the territorial unit. The Hungarian method is a good example for this problem, as the territorial unit is blocks of housing (bounded by streets). These concentrate very different population sizes; and therefore smaller segregated units (e.g. poverty concentrated only along one street of the block) in larger blocks can be statistically "eliminated" by a higher number of higher status people. In the case of England IMD is measured on small urban units with approximately 1,000-1,500 residents. In France the income index is produced on the neighbourhood level, which has at least 10,000 residents.

Experiences shows that identifying the most deprived areas with socio-economic indicators usually reliably points to areas where the socially disadvantaged ethnic minorities live in high concentration. In Hungary in the designated segregated areas the Roma population is significantly overrepresented; and there is a strong correlation between the value of the segregation index and the share of the Roma population. Similarly in England and France the most deprived neighbourhoods have high concentration of ethnic minorities.

Table 1. Types national mapping of residential segregation

	Identification is based on statistical data	Identification is based on estimation	Identification is based on ethnic profile	Identification is based on socio-economic profile
Czechia: Socially Excluded Localities		X	X	
Slovakia: Roma Atlas		X	X	
Romania: SocioRoMap		X	X	
Spain		X	X	
Scotland		X	X (only immigrant Roma considered)	
Hungary: segregated areas	X	(X)	(X)	X
France: Priority Neighbourhoods (not Roma related)	X			X
England: Index of Multiple Deprivation (not Roma related)	X			X

Measuring educational segregation

Examples to measure school segregation was also examined in several countries. The Hungarian and French examples show the use of socio-economic indicators to define the share of children with socially disadvantaged backgrounds. In both cases complex indicators are used, its main components being low income status (eligibility to a particular type of social benefit), weak labour market status, and low educational attainment of the parents. Such indicators are good proxies also for the high concentration of ethnic minorities with socio-economic disadvantage.

Other examples (Spanish, Czech) show that there have been attempts to compile list of schools affected by the segregation of Roma children. In the Czech case, the survey of schools was part of a research project on socially excluded localities. The research surveyed schools that children from the deprived localities attended by estimating the share of Roma children in the institutions. In Spain a pilot research project was carried out in four big cities with segregated Roma neighbourhoods to assess the level of educational segregation. Here too a similar method was applied: estimations were based on information gathered from local officials, school employees and residents.

Conclusion on methods for measuring segregation

These results demonstrate that socio-economic indicators serve as a reliable proxy for the effective targeting of the most deprived Roma communities, and both their residential and school segregation can be detected without having to rely on disaggregated data on Roma ethnicity.

(See the country examples of measuring segregation and identifying segregated Roma settlements in Annex)

6. National and Local Policy frameworks supporting desegregation actions

Both residential and educational segregation needs to be tackled in a comprehensive way, as they are results of complex set of social and economic problems and mechanisms. This implies that to achieve sustainable outcomes, targeted desegregation actions must be accompanied by interventions in different policy fields. Furthermore, it requires coordination and cooperation among the different levels of governments, as responsibilities for key policy areas (urban planning, housing, education, employment, health, welfare and social services, transport policies) are distributed among the central, regional, and local governments. The distribution of responsibilities varies greatly in the member states, so no single and unified recipe can be applied to structuring complex programmes addressing the issue of segregation.

In this chapter examples are presented which effectively support desegregation efforts. First, positive examples are shown for national policy frameworks that can effectively support local authorities in their desegregation efforts, then local desegregation initiatives are presented. Some sectoral policy measures that can contribute to reduce segregation are also shown.

It should be emphasized that the aim of this section is not to provide in-depth analysis of the examples, but only to highlight the positive and progressive features of interventions that have contributed to residential and educational desegregation of Roma communities.

Equal opportunity based development policy in Hungary[8]

This example shows that incorporating equal opportunity related ex-ante conditionalities into development policies can progressively contribute to desegregation efforts especially if sufficient technical assistance and policy measures are provided additionally.

The novelty of equal opportunity based development policy was the condition that local governments could only access to certain EU funds if they developed an equal opportunity strategy for vulnerable groups. The system was developed gradually, and changed substantially over time. It started in 2005 in the field of education: local governments had to develop their public education equal opportunity plan, using objective indicators to assess their local educational system (kindergartens, primary schools and secondary schools). They had to identify schools where the concentration of children with multiple disadvantage was high, also taking into account the prevalence of other problems such as special needs, absenteeism, dropouts, and so forth, on the local and the school level. A local educational system was considered segregated if the segregation index between local schools was higher than 25 percent. Based on this assessment local governments had to develop action plans to decrease inequalities in the system, and to identify measures to decrease or eliminate school segregation if it existed. If local governments applied for education related EU funds (both ESF and ERDF), first they had to use them for measures to decrease segregation and to improve the level education for disadvantaged children.

From 2007 a similar system was introduced in the field of urban development. Cities and towns had to develop Integrated Urban Development Plans (IUDP) as a condition for applying for EU funded urban rehabilitation projects. The so-called Desegregation Plan was a compulsory part of the IUDP, addressing the issues of segregates or areas threatened by segregation (defined by the segregation index, based on Census data). Desegregation Plans contained a detailed assessment of these low status or at-risk urban neighbourhoods, and based on this an action plan had to be developed with complex measures, and setting out integrated interventions in different policy fields to decrease segregation. The desegregation plan had to define a long-term strategy for each segregated or at-risk area for upgrading or elimination. It also analysed the possible effects of other urban developments planned in the IUDP on segregation.

In 2010 with the amendment of the Act on Equal Opportunity local governments were obliged to develop an overall equal opportunity plan targeting all vulnerable groups, among which the Roma. This plan also had two parts, a problem assessment and an action plan; it included the main findings and measures both from the education Equal Opportunity Plan and the Desegregation Plan, although it did not replaced them.

The main features of equal opportunity based development policy are the following:

---

[8] Summary is based on the study „Analysis of the effects of the equal opportunity based development policy in Hungary and recommendations for EU, Member State and local level to endorse the approach in the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020". Authors: G. Bernáth, G. Daróczi, E. Somogyi, O. Szendrey, N. Teller. 2014. The study was funded by Open Society Foundations.

- Problem assessment was based on objective indicators: the educational and residential segregation index unambiguously defined the institutions and residential areas affected by segregation.
- Detailed methodological guidances were provided for the in-depth assessment of the situation, and the development of action plans. The guidances suggested concrete measures for specific problems.
- The development of plans was assisted by independent experts. This system was first developed for educational equal opportunity plans, and then replicated for other sectoral plans. The experts helped to identify problems and formulate the needed actions. They also provided quality assurance by certifying with countersignature that the plan meets the methodological requirements.
- Resources to implement the action plans were provided mainly from EU funds. To get access to resources through the equal opportunity plans, a conditionality criteria was built into the system to ensure that local governments also implement actions in the favour of vulnerable groups, among them the Roma. The strictness of this conditionality varied between policy fields, however. In the case of education the use of resources was more directly linked to concrete action against segregation; while in urban development no particular action was required. It depended on the municipality whether they decided to apply for resources to address the challenges of segregated areas.
- As the related legal framework was developed, the requirement of equal opportunity plans was built into the sectoral laws.
- However, a main deficiency of the system was that an effective monitoring system related to the implementation of action plans was never developed.

After 2010 the system of equal opportunity based development policy has weakened, although it still exists. The reason behind this is complex, but it is also related to significant institutional changes in the overall administration and public service system. The responsibility to coordinate education was transferred from local governments to the central state, except for kindergarten; at the same time, the welfare system also underwent many changes, which narrowed down the room for interventions of local governments. As a result the independent expert system was gradually discontinued, and the methodological requirements were loosened. In the current programming period local governments still have to develop the plans (except for the educational one), and applying for related to EU funds still require the existence of the relevant plans, but action plans ceased to be a strong conditionality (nonetheless, calls still specify the requirement that all project proposals have to be in line with equal opportunity plans, or in case of urban development with the desegregation plan).

Agency for Social Inclusion in the Czech Republic[9]

The Agency for social Inclusion is an exemplary initiative to local capacity building for both local NGOs and public administration. The Agency's work also contributes to raising awareness about the social exclusion of Roma, its causes, and inclusive measures to address the problem.

The Agency was established in 2008 by the government in order to assist local stakeholders to develop and implement local strategies for social inclusion targeting socially excluded Roma localities. The need for this kind of actor was revealed by several research findings, as they pointed out that there was a lack of capacity to absorb EU and national funds both on the part of public administration actors and civil society organisations. This was concerned as a main barrier to implement programmes in order to

---

[9] Homepage of Agency for Social Inclusion. https://www.socialni-zaclenovani.cz/o-nas/#koordinovany-pristup

decrease segregation of socially excluded Roma localities. Therefore the activities of the Agency has been focused on

- assisting in the needs assessment of socially excluded localities, identifying the mechanisms that contributes to segregation in the field education, employment, housing, and so on and the main needs of local residents;
- assisting in the development of the strategic plan which identifies the main field of interventions and cooperating with the local stakeholders to develop concrete projects for different calls, also by sharing good examples from other places; and
- providing support throughout project implementation.

The agency works together with municipalities, since 2015 in the framework of so called "Coordinated Approach". The approach is a tool to assist municipalities, associations of municipalities and micro-regions to elaborate Strategic Plan for Social Inclusion to improve the integration of socially excluded localities and persons. The local strategic plans integrate different policy measures (education, employment, social services, public safety, housing, debt issues, territorial development) and therefore interact with local sectoral policy strategies. A main requirement is that these sectoral policies should not weaken the effects of measures of the Strategic Plan for Social Inclusions. The strategic plan is a prerequisite to apply for ESI resources related to social inclusion.

Municipalities have to apply to participate in the Coordinated Approach scheme. The Agency launch the related calls and those municipalities can apply who want to implement actions for socially excluded localities. Municipalities who plan several projects especially from different OPs enjoy priority in the bid. In the beginning of the cooperation the two parties sign an agreement, and then a local action group is set up with the participation of the municipality, public authorities, institutions and civil organisations. Whenever it is possible, the local action group operates in working groups formulated in line with the field of interventions (education, housing, crime prevention etc.). The working groups are always defined by the local partnership actors. The involvement of civil organisations in the local partnership is key in the Agency's strategy, as many services and actions for socially excluded Roma people are delivered by these organisations.

The Agency assist municipalities and their partnership through the whole process; from planning through implementation to evaluation.

The Monitoring Committee for the Activities of the Agency for Social Inclusion also serves as an advisory body to the Government Council of Roma Minority Affairs.

In 2018 the Agency was active in 59 municipalities, out of which 48 is part of the Coordinated Approach to socially excluded localities. Since 2008 altogether 85 municipalities cooperated with the Agency. The cooperation between the Agency and the municipalities is rarely free from conflicts, however; in some cases it had to be even suspended temporarily, but in some places it resulted in promising projects based on broad local partnerships.

Inclusionary zoning in the national regulatory frameworks of the UK and France

The involvement of inclusionary zoning in national legislation appears as a good practice as it increase the affordable housing supply more evenly distributed across cities, which is a necessary condition for effective desegregation measures. Although the example of the UK and France also demonstrates that effective measures should be in place to make cities fully comply with such regulations.

Under "inclusionary zoning" – sometimes called "inclusionary housing" – regulation, developers are required to dedicate a pre-set percentage of newly constructed homes as social and/or affordable

housing; in a physically dispersed manner; through regulatory requirement or incentives. This is expected to create socially mixed neighbourhoods and foster spatial integration, through impeding the re-emerging concentration of deprivation, and the consequent risk of inadvertently creating new slums. The regulation is used in some US cities, as well as in some European national regulatory frameworks.

Research on the issue began in France, Italy, Ireland, Spain, and the UK from the mid-1990s.[10] It became quite widely used in the US before in European countries, as the latter tended to opt for more direct intervention in the previous decades. Two European countries explicitly enable local authorities to impose a requirement for inclusionary housing in their national housing provision framework (the UK and France); while others (Spain, Ireland and Italy) mandate it on the local or regional level[11].

In the UK, Section 106 of the 1990 Town and Country Planning Act provided local authorities to recapture rising land value through requiring developers to contribute to affordable housing provision[12]. It became a successful tool for helping low to medium income groups access affordable housing; in part as in England development rights are separate from land ownership, the latter having been effectively nationalised since 1947. The 1990s Planning Act allowed local authorities to reject development permission unless the developer proposed to include affordable housing in a project; mediated individually, site by site, at the local level. Local authorities therefore had the room for manoeuvre to adapt the national framework to the local conditions. The weakness of this system surfaced in 2007, at the wake of the global crisis, though: it was largely feasible for developers to comply with the regulation thanks to large windfall gains from previously soaring land and real estate values. This allowed developers to pass Section 106 costs on consumers. After the crisis began to impact English markets, the production of affordable housing began to dwindle.

In France, the ENL law of 2006 set out to implement mandatory social mix goals[13]. While France continues to also implement strong state-led interventions to provide social and affordable housing, this softer measure was introduced to diversify and explore non-governmental channels of the production of affordable homes; and complementing social housing expenditure. In addition, it was also intended to help avoid some missteps of the 1950-70s, when the physical proximity of mass social housing led to the reproduction of slums with detrimental social consequences. French local governments (communes) of a certain population are required to pass local regulation to have 20 percent of their total housing stock as social rental housing in 2002. In 2006, communes were given explicit priority to impose inclusionary requirements on developers; and its imposition has become common practice since then[14].

Nevertheless it is important to note that based on experiences so far some cities rather pay fines than comply with national regulation on inclusive zoning. It is especially true for cities with substantial demand pressure on housing market.

---

[10] Calavita, N. 2006. Inclusionary Housing in the US and Europe. Calavita, Nico, Inclusionary Housing in the US and Europe, 42nd ISoCaRP Congress http://www.isocarp.net/Data/case_studies/737.pdf

[11] Calavita, N. and A. Mallach (eds.) 2010. Inclusionary Housing in International Perspective - Affordable Housing, Social Inclusion, and Land Value Recapture. Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, Cambridge, MA.

[12] Morrison, N. and G. Burgess 2014. Inclusionary housing policy in England: the impact of the downturn on the delivery of affordable housing through Section 106, *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 29(3), pp 423–438.

[13] Calavita and Mallach 2010. ibid.

[14] Mallach, A. 2008. Inclusionary housing and the goal of social inclusion: policy choices in cross-national perspective. The Brookings Institution, Washington DC (manuscript)

Good examples for local (regional) policies supporting residential desegregation
Madrid, Spain[15]

This case shows that through comprehensive long-term programs with appropriate resources even large shanty towns can be eradicated in a socially sustainable way.

The program has been implemented by the Region of Madrid (Comunidad Autónoma de Madrid) through one of its institutions, the Institute of Rehousing and Social Integration (IRIS). A previous program was implemented between 1978 and 1986 to eradicate shanty towns and segregated neighbourhoods in Madrid, as a considerable part of the Roma population in the region lived in segregated and precarious housing conditions (shacks, substandard housing). However, rehousing mainly into social housing was carried out in a spatially concentrated way, soon resulting in the emergence of new slums. For 1,120 families housing was provided in the newly developed so-called Neighbourhoods of Special Typology. Such special neighbourhoods meant improved housing conditions, but still in segregated areas; often without public transport, and only with limited access to public services (school, health care etc.). By the mid-1990s around 2,500-3,000 Roma families lived in slums in dilapidated housing, a number similar to that in the 1970s when the first program was launched.

Based on the experience of the first program, IRIS applied a new, more sustainable approach and developed a dispersed rehousing program into subsidized rented flats, complete with intensive and prolonged social work. The program was launched in 1999 and is still ongoing. By 2011, around 2,200 families were rehoused to standard housing in non-segregated areas of the region. IRIS buys the flats then rent them out to beneficiary households. It tries to avoid the concentration of families, thus in one building only one Roma family is rehoused. Nevertheless, not everyone in the slums is eligible to be rehoused, only those who can prove their residency (they moved to the settlement before a given date), who have low income and no properties.

The process of relocation and integration consists of 2 main stages. The social support to families starts when they still live in slums, social workers, educators, teachers visit the families regularly while they still live in the slum; connect them to social services; and also help them to prepare the documentation needed for participating in the program. This first stage usually lasts from 6 months to one year. Finding and renovating the alternative housing for the beneficiaries is done by IRIS. Social workers assign housing for each family according to the size of the family and its other needs, such as proximity of work place etc.. Right after families are rehoused their former housing in the slum is demolished.

The second stage, the integration process starts after relocation and lasts approximately for 3 years, but more if needed. During this stage follow-up services are provided for the beneficiaries: the social worker team who accompanied the families in the relocation process connects them with social service providers (and also passes over the families' documentation) located in the new living environment. Additionally, a social worker is appointed from the relevant Community Development Centre. The families are regularly visited by the social workers, who also mediate if conflict emerge between the beneficiary families and the residents of their new neighbours. The community centres and the job centre implement programs to facilitate the social integration of newcomers, offering job training courses, help in job search and application, if needed. Support children's school carrier is a main focus

---

[15] L. Santiago: Leaving the slums behind: measuring the impact of IRIS pro-integration housing program. The University of Warwick and Instituto de Realojamiento e Integración Social. Policy Report. December 2012. http://goodpracticeroma.ppa.coe.int/sites/default/files/iris_policy_report_-osf_and_decade_0.pdf

of the program, children's school attendance is followed and help is provided in case of difficulties. Another important action is that they help to interconnect rehoused families with similar problems and needs, who also live closer to one another in a new neighbourhood.

The IRIS program was evaluated in 2012 and among the main findings it was observed that relocated families (who joined the program in earlier years and) supported with long term social assistance were less likely dependent of welfare benefits and they were more likely in formal employment than their peers living slums. Rehoused families children school outcomes were also more positive than their peers in slums: they were more likely in school grade that corresponds to their age.

According to the study in 2012 around 400 slum dwellings remained in the region and most of the shacks were concentrated in certain parts of the large illegal shantytown area, Canada Real, outside Madrid. However, in this area only a smaller share of the households are Roma, who are of largely foreign origin, from Romania and Bulgaria. The relocation of families living in Canada Real has not been carried out yet, despite a Regional Pact was established to rehouse approximately 150 families from one of the area of the shantytown that already has been designated to demolition[16].

Romanian Romani residents of Wroclaw program, Poland[17]

This example shows that illegal settlements inhabited by undocumented immigrant Roma families can be eradicated in an inclusionary way. To achieve it, the support of local political leaders is a must.

With a population of 640,000, Wroclaw if the fourth largest Polish city, and the largest in the Silesia region. Poland has seen a small scale in-migration of Romani groups from all over the Eastern and South Eastern European region since the 1990s, but the migration of Romanian and Bulgarian Roma accelerated after 2007, when their home countries joined the EU. From 2007, several small Roma slums of self-built shacks began to appear in unused or publicly owned land plots in the city; these areas had no access to utilities whatsoever, yet their residents reported to live under better conditions than in their country of origin. Public authorities began demolishing the camps in 2015. However, human rights NGO, Nomada Association stood up in support of the evicted families, whose property was ruined in slum clearance, and lost their valuables (e.g. power generators, medicine, clothing).

The overall situation presented a novelty, nonetheless: city authorities had no similar examples in Poland to use as precedent. While still addressing the issue of slums as a primarily legal matter, the city government eventually chose to explore a more "humanitarian" approach, with the active involvement of social provision services (Municipal Social Welfare Centre, Integration Centre, schools and educational services), and in cooperation with NGOs Nomada Association and Foundation House of Peace (the latter working with Wroclaw residents in precarious situation).

In 2016 the municipality allocated a funding of 120,000 EUR for the Foundation, which manages the "Romanian Romani residents of Wroclaw" program, whose goal is to ensure the social integration and the socio-economic independence of Romani families. The Foundation followed the Housing First approach, believing that their social institutions could not realistically support people in integrating into society unless they have a decent place to live. In the apartments they would have to cover utilities and a reduced rent. This was a significant rise compared to their living costs in the camps; nonetheless, the families did appreciate the amenities after rehousing (heating, running water, electricity); and could use Poland's relatively generous PLN 500+ child benefit programme to have a very low but stable

---

[16] http://www.comunidad.madrid/servicios/urbanismo-medio-ambiente/pacto-regional-canada-real-galiana
[17] The summary is based on the promotion film on the project (draft version):
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7WC4uNE16O4&feature=youtu.be

starting income. The first families were rehousing in 2016; and in April 2018 the last camp dweller family was housed in a reduced cost rental flat. Social workers applied an inclusive and empowering approach, with the aim to have the needs of the families met; nonetheless, mediation was required as their final goal is to have the new residents fully integrate into Polish schools, labour market, and society; and to incentivize families to take control of their own affairs.

To improve employability and labour market integration, the Foundation has been working closely with the municipal Labour Office. For them, too, working with extremely low income and low educational attainment clients was a novel challenge – many adults were almost illiterate, only started to learn Polish, and had little understanding of the labour market. Social workers have been providing abundant in-depth support helping clients familiarize themselves with the routines and expectations of day-to-day work. A major problem arose when an employer refused to pay a months' work to the Romani employees. This was of course very discouraging for them – posing another challenge the social workers had to negotiate. A tactic social works use is to motivate adults by alluding to the better life their children can eventually have. In line with this, steeply improving the school enrolment of children is a major achievement for the Foundation.

Pécs, Hungary[18]

Pécs is a good example for the municipal coordination of different resources in the framework of several projects to decrease residential segregation. It also demonstrates that cooperation with NGOs can add important support for the social inclusion of marginalised Roma communities, especially if they can build on the cooperation with the municipality and the local institutional system. It also shows that the long-term intensive presence of NGOs can establish trust in the targeted Roma community.

Pécs is a city with population of 150,000. It had eight segregated neighbourhoods according to the segregation index of the 2001 Census, the majority of which in and around the former miner housing colonies. In the 2007-2013 programming period the municipality carried out several projects from different resources (all from EU funded Operational Programmes) to decrease the level of segregation. One project included only ESF measures while three other projects combined ERDF and ESF measures in an integrated way (these patterns followed the structure of the calls). The projects were implemented between 2012 and 2015 in a total value of 1,500,000 HUF (4.8 million EUR). One smaller isolated slum outside of the city was fully eliminated, while in three other segregated neighbourhoods upgrading and desegregation measures were carried out. In total 30 households were relocated from slums to integrated parts of the city.

The Hungarian Charity Service of the Order of Malta started its field social work in one of the segregated areas (György-telep) of Pécs in 2007, where they established a community space which allowed them to be present constantly. In the following years the organisation succeeded to establish cooperation with the municipality, and in 2012 together with the UNDP they signed a cooperation agreement with the municipality to implement integrated community development and social work in order to mobilize Roma communities' own resources and set up local grassroots organisations. Another major focus of the program was to address housing insecurity, particularly housing cost arrears and the prevalent lack of legal title to housing. These activities prepared the Roma families to

---

[18] J. Hegedüs, Á. Kullman, E. Somogyi, N. Teller: Komplex telep-program értékelése (TÁMOP 5.3.6-11) Összegző tanulmány. (Evaluation of the Complex segregated settlement programme, Social Renewal Operational Programme 5.3.6-11) Városkutatás Kft. 2016. p. 56-60.

the housing and infrastructural investments of the subsequent larger scale projects. The three EU funded complex projects were implemented in the consortium of the municipality, the Charity Service, and the local Roma NGO Khetanipe Association. In one of the projects the Labour Office and the governmental institution responsible for social inclusion also participated as consortium members. ERDF investments included housing renewal and infrastructure development, as parts of the slums were only equipped with electricity but not with other basic infrastructure. Several substandard houses were demolished outsides the one eliminated slum as well, and follow-up social work was provided to the affected households to ensure their integration into their new neighbourhoods. ESF measures also included activities to help to increase Roma people's employability: trainings were provided and then assistance to find work. However, employment mainly meant public work and some of the clients were employed by NGOs.

Cluj – Pata Rat pilot project[19]

Although the Pata Rat desegregation pilot is a much debated project, it shows that even in the case of the most marginalised, large segregated communities, long term and appropriately scheduled action in a realistic scheme can be implemented to eliminate segregation, which can also successfully engage municipalities initially reluctant to deal with the problem. The technical support of reliable and experienced organisations can generate the critical resources to launch the projects, but the long term commitment of funding organisations including the national government is also a must.

Cluj is the second largest city of Romania with a population of around 320,000 people. The case is a small scale pilot project to relocate marginalised mainly Roma families from Pata Rat. The Pata Rat area of Cluj consists of four settlements in an isolated, marginalised informal settlement, outside of the city near a landfill. In 2012 around 300 families (1,200 people) lived in the area, the majority of them was Roma (approx. 70-75%). The age composition of the population is very young, with 40 percent being under the age of fourteen. Many of the families were evicted from the city's inner area, while others came from the surrounding villages to find work in the landfill (sorting reusable waste). Families face with extremely deprived living conditions with the majority living in shacks, improvised or precarious housing lacking basic infrastructure (water and sanitation, electricity) and being exposed to health risk because of the strongly polluted industrial land. More than half of the families have no legal title to their housing at all.

As Pata Rat is one of the most marginalised segregated Roma community in Romania, the desegregation pilot intervention was initiated by international organisations. The Open Society Foundations funded a two-year preparation phase planning the model pilot for desegregation and social inclusion in a participative way with the marginalised local communities (2012-2014), which was part of the action plan elaborated for the period of 2014-2023. The desegregation pilot was implemented by the UNDP local group between 2014 and 2017 supported by the Norway Grants. A next phase was initiated as a tender for the relevant ERDF call but did not gain support in 2018.

The model program sought a comprehensive approach to address the complex needs of the marginalised families. The action plan included interventions in housing, education and training, employment, health and social services, the increase in take-up of social benefits, and the inclusion of the local community in the planning and implementation processes. Furthermore the safety of the

---

[19] Source: In Acces la locuire decentă (Access to decent housing) published in: Tonk, Gabriella, Adorjáni, Júlia şi Lăcătuş, Bela Olimpiu (eds.) (2017). Servicii sociale publice pentru comunităţile vulnerabile clujene. Rapoarte de evaluare pentru proiectul pilot Pata-Cluj. (Public social services for vulnerable communities from Cluj. Evaluation reports for the Pata-Cluj pilot project) Cluj Napoca, Asociatia de Dezvoltare Intercomunitara Zona Metropolitană Cluj, pp. 26-34, 88-90. (In Romain: https://issuu.com/pata-cluj2/docs/pata_raport_19-07_c)

local community and the anti-Roma attitudes of the majority population was also addressed. As a result actions were implemented not only from the Norway Grants, but also from local and other resources.

Regarding the housing desegregation measures, altogether 35 families were relocated to social housing; 12 apartments were built in one village in the metropolitan area, while 23 apartments were purchased in the integrated part of Cluj and two adjacent villages, which covered around the 10 percent of all households. The methodology was based on a human rights approach, which focused on the right to decent housing which should be accessible for all, particularly emphasizing children's rights. However the project did not target the most vulnerable families, as the existing social system could not provide the complex services and benefits that would have ensures that these families can sustain decent housing in an integrated area. The selection criteria were defined in a participatory way with several focus group meetings with the communities; families with more stable incomes and some kind of employment, who also respect majority rules, were given priority. During the selection of families the needs and resources were assessed in a way to ensure that those selected could sustain their housing with the complex support provided in the project before and after moving. Regarding the relocation, the individual needs of families were taken into account regarding the localities (urban or rural area) as well as the type of housing. Other interventions targeted all members of the marginalised community, including measures to increase employability and employment, and improving access to health and educational services. Regarding education measures, children were supported in enrolling to non-segregated schools in the city and surrounding villages, with providing transport to the schools and extracurricular classes. Four schools participated in the program in the beginning, but the two schools in the city of Cluj withdrew later on as they were not able to handle children with marginalised background. The two schools in the surrounding rural area are still participating in the program, with the support of the Municipality of Cluj.

Much of the critics focused on the social infrastructure investments that were implemented in the marginalised communities parallel to the desegregation pilot project, as they conceived that such investments contribute to the maintenance of the segregation instead of supporting its elimination.

Brno, Czech Republic

This examples shows how measures toward a more inclusive housing policy can also support residential desegregation, and how the systematic planning of Urban Development Strategies on the long run can contribute the social inclusion of marginalised Roma communities. This case also highlights that NGOs and other organisation providing expertise can efficiently support this process.

Brno, the second largest city in the Czech Republic with 380,000 residents has been gradually developing a more inclusive approach toward marginalised Roma population and the socially excluded Roma localities. Altogether approximately 15,000-17,000 Roma live in the city, out of whom 9,000 live in socially excluded localities. The largest such locality is Cejl, an inner city neighbourhood where around 5,000 Roma reside, although many of them gradually moved out or were evicted primarily because of large housing related debts. Many indebted families who lost their housing ended up in homeless hostels for families, living in overcrowded units, and often under substandard circumstances. The city owns a municipal housing stock of 29,000 units but the majority of the stock is not operated as social housing.

Brno municipality developed an Integrated Urban Development Plan targeting Cejl with a complex urban renewal project (IUDP) financed from ERDF and ESF between 2010 and 2014. Hard investments

included the renewal of municipal housing and public areas, while ESF measures were implemented by NGOs. It is also important that the municipality took back the management of the housing stock from private companies and established a municipal property management company with the aim to provide better support for low income tenants. The municipality cooperated with an NGO to provide counselling and support by social workers for insolvent tenants who are at risk of eviction. The municipal property management company also used a software to monitor tenants' risk to fall in arrears. As a result of these measures during the project the number of evictions drastically dropped to one-third of the original number. However, the municipal housing policy was not comprehensive in the sense that it also substantially increased rents and regulated that tenants should also contribute financially to the cost of renovations. These measures made the renewed municipal housing unaffordable for many families. Moreover, there was unrealistic pressure on social workers to solve the problem of indebtedness while no financial help was available for the families at all. Other soft measures were integrated into the project, for example an employment program, which achieved limited success.[20]

In 2016 Brno municipality in cooperation with a local NGO (IQ Roma Servis) launched a Housing First pilot project to end family homelessness. In the preparation phase 421 families, two-third of them Roma, were identified as homeless living in hostels and precarious housing conditions, out of which 50 families were randomly selected to participate. The families were provided standard municipal housing in non-segregated flats. Individualised social work was provided based on Housing First principles, for which the social workers received training from an experienced foreign organisation. The IQ Roma Servis NGO closely cooperates with the local social and child protection services, the education department, and also with the labour office. The cooperation is coordinated by the municipality, which is the leader of the project. The project impacts are also tracked, measurement is provided by the Ostrava University (randomised controlled trial method). First results show that families could stay in their apartments in the first year, the first positive results indicated children's better behaviour, improvement in school performance, stabilized family life, and some adults gaining employment. Although instances of non-payment did occur, these could be managed with the help of social workers and the municipality.[21]

In the current programming period Brno Municipality elaborated its Strategic Plan for Social Inclusion 2016-2019 to improve the situation of socially excluded localities and persons with the support of Agency for Social Inclusion. Working groups were set up during the preparation of the plan, including the Housing Working Group. The problem analysis highlighted that the current regulation excludes marginalised Roma households from accessing municipal housing because of the strict conditions (e.g. requirement of a five year period without debts) and only very few dwellings (10-15) can be distributed annually for social purposes. Main actions planned in the IUDP in the field of housing were built on the former experiences:

- The availability of standard rental housing in both municipal and private rentals must be ensured. This measure includes the continuation of pilot homeless programs for families and single persons, which also affects the marginalised Roma families. The municipality planned to provide at least 150 apartments for this purpose by the end of 2018.
- The social housing stock must be expanded through refurbishment or new purchases.

---

[20] World Bank. 2014. *Handbook for improving the living conditions of Roma (English)*. Washington, DC: World Bank Group. http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/426791468030548664/Handbook-for-improving-the-living-conditions-of-Roma p. 246-247.

[21] Platforma pro Sociální Bydlení: Housing First for families in Brno. https://hf.socialnibydleni.org/housing-first-for-families-in-brno

- An effective prevention program must be created and operated to prevent the loss of housing, primarily focusing on socially excluded localities.
- Social and health service support must be increased for households with complex social problems (entailing counselling, mediation, psychotherapy or psychiatric support if needed), also promoting a participatory approach for households to take active part in the management of the housing stock.
- An implementation and monitoring system must be created.[22]

Policy measures supporting desegregation or prevention of further segregation

In this section some policy measures are presented that alleviate the level of segregation. The cited examples are not necessarily related to Roma communities, but show practices from cities affected by other kinds of ethnic segregation.

The relation of **urban development strategies** to spatial segregation is presented through the case of Berlin Strategy 2.0. Berlin is a city with a significant and increasing migrant population: one quarter of the city's population has a migrant background or foreign origin, the largest groups being the Turkish and Polish nationalities. There is no extreme spatial segregation in the city, but higher problem density areas are scattered across the city, mostly in inner city areas where people with a migrant background traditionally live in higher concentration. The Berlin Strategy foresees a significant population growth in which migrants and refugees play a major role. The growth generates demand for new housing construction; accordingly, 50,000 units were planned primarily in the outer area, but densifying the inner areas are also intended where feasible. To avoid segregation and support the integration of migrants the new developments are planned to be mixed tenure, with a significant share of affordable housing. In the development of affordable housing the cooperatives and public housing associations will play a key role. As the city has a rapidly growing population and economy, there is strong competition among different land use functions; the strategy therefore put an emphasis to balance the different needs in order to develop socially mixed neighbourhoods with diverse functions such as public and cultural, commercial, leisure services, and adequate supply of green spaces creating equal access to good quality services all over the city.

In terms of housing policy measures, there are several ways through which cities can influence the level of segregation of affected and at-risk areas. The most common measures to counteract spatial segregation include the allocation of social housing, and rent supplement subsidies. [23]

Frankfurt has a relatively low level of segregation, as migrants and foreigners are relatively evenly distributed across neighbourhoods. Nevertheless the city considers the **prevention of segregation** an important task. Therefore the so called Frankfurt Contract was made to **allocate social housing** in such a way as to prevent the concentration of foreigner nationals, migrants, and socially disadvantaged groups (recipients of social benefits) in neighbourhoods where the social housing stock has higher share. The city made an agreement with the housing companies that a quota is used in when allocating social housing units. The quota ensures that in individual buildings the proportion of foreign residents, welfare recipients or ethnic Germans does not exceed a certain level (30, 15, and 10% respectively). A

---

[22] Strategický plán sociálního začleňování města Brna pro období 2016 – 2019. (Strategic Plan for Social Inclusion 2016-2019.) p. 148-159.
[2323] Berlin Strategie 2.0.
https://www.stadtentwicklung.berlin.de/planen/stadtforum/download/5stadtforum/SenStadtUm_BerlinStrategie2.0.pdf

shortcoming of this practice is that groups affected by the quota, particularly foreigners, have to wait for longer times for social housing, as less native Germans are willing to move to buildings or estates with higher share of foreigners.[24]

In England there was a central government initiative to provide more information locally to social tenancy applicants by **increasing customers' choice related to social housing options**. It was seen as a possible tool to influence Black and Minority Ethnic groups (BME) not to choose vacancies in neighbourhoods with high proportion of BME population. This practice is called Choice-Based Letting (CLB), which aims to provide more information for the applicants on vacancies, the location, etc. and thus making the housing allocation system more transparent in terms of the supply of all council and housing associations. In Sheffield BME communities were involved in the design of the CBL system. In Bradford the CBL system facilitated for BME applicants to choose housing in areas where the concentration of BME population was traditionally low. CBL schemes improved the social housing service in other respects too, for instance it increased the proportion of BME people among beneficiaries of social housing. [25]

The use of **rent supplements** to decrease segregation appears to be a good example in the Czech Republic; however, the initiators and implementers of such schemes are NGOs who deal with marginalised Roma communities. Nevertheless, few city government support the NGOs. In the Czech Republic the rent supplement is financed by the central government and it is available both for municipal and private rental housing (the former generally does not mean social housing). In cities many marginalised Roma communities live in municipal or private rental housing, or in (family) homeless hostels which are often extremely low quality. While NGOs support families with complex social work, they also help them to find decent quality private rentals in the integrated parts of the cities. While the examples show that this scheme is a viable tool to deliver improved housing conditions in integrated areas, decision makers do not sufficiently support it. [26]

Good examples for local policies supporting educational desegregation

Vidin, Bulgaria

As the first desegregation program in South Eastern Europe, this case demonstrates the possibility to convince both the school staff and Romani families about the advantages of desegregated education, and then gain the support of the wider public and the municipality with the outstanding results.

Vidin is a middle sized city in North-Western Bulgaria with 48,000 residents. The Roma population represents one third of its total population, mainly living in a single large Roma neighbourhood (Nov Pat). The desegregation program was initiated by a local Roma NGO, Organisation Drom. As early as 2000 this was one of the first educational desegregation programs supported by the Open Society Institute's Roma Participation Program, and it received several awards since.

In the first year of the program 300 students enrolled into six mainstream schools in the city from the segregated school of Nov Pat. By 2013, the total number of Roma children who attended mainstream

---

[24] European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions: Housing and segregation of migrants. Case study: Frankfurt, Germany. 2009. https://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/case-study/2009/germany/quality-of-life-social-policies/housing-and-segregation-of-migrants-case-study-frankfurt-germany

[25] Archer, T. Dr, and Stephens, M. Dr: Housing, integration and segregation: A rapid literature review. Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research. March 2018. http://shura.shu.ac.uk/19004/1/housing-integration-segregation-rapid-lit-review.pdf

[26] Such program is implemented by Romodrom, in the framework of HomeLab project, funded by DG Employment, Social Affairs and Inclusion, EaSI programme. http://homelab.mri.hu/czech-republic/

schools reached 1,200 not only in Vidin but also other localities in the Vidin district. Romani children are equally distributed among the six schools and inside the school among classes. A school bus service was also organised to transport children from Nov Pat to the city.

In the beginning Organisation Drom negotiated with the school headmasters, local authorities and other stakeholders, including Roma organisations to gain support for the project. They also trained seven Roma youths with high school diploma to work as mentors in the program: six of them worked in the receiving schools, and one mediated between mainstream schools and parents. Before the first school year an awareness campaign and meetings with parents were organised in order to convince them to join the program and let their children study in mainstream schools. It was not an easy task, because many parents feared that peers and teachers would be hostile with their Roma children, who would feel insecure among the non-Roma.

Extra classes were provided by the teachers for those who had difficulties catching up with their peers in the new school. The integration of Roma children was also supported by a number extra-curricular activities, in which non-Roma children were also involved. Special attention was paid to keep the parents informed and discuss any emerging issues with them. Parents were involved also in school affairs, and in two schools Roma parents even gained membership in the school council board. [27]

The results of the program were measured from the beginning. By 2010 they showed low dropout rates (approx. 2% annually) and good school performance of Roma children: two thirds of them had good or very good grades, 10 percent had excellent grades and only 2 percent had poor grades. Around 30 Roma youngsters who participated in the program and graduated from high school went on to university.[28]

To gain the support of the general public campaign was organised consisting of frequent appearance in the media (local and nationwide newspapers and TV), organising events with locally well-known people and so on. Also alliance was built with Romani movements and civil right organisations to promote the desegregation program. In few years the program was replicated in several other cities.

Sofia, Bulgaria[29]

This example shows that a municipality can join and work together with NGOs and take responsibility in an already established educational project aiming to gradually develop an integrated local educational system. The project also used a human right approach as it promoted the equal right to education of Roma children and families.

In Sofia, a city of 1.3 million people, about 120,000 Romani people live according to expert estimation, representing almost 10 percent of the total population. The Roma mainly live in segregated neighbourhoods, and are also strongly affected by educational segregation. The largest Roma neighbourhood of the city is Fakulteta with a population of approximately 15,000 people situated on the edge of the district Krasna Poliana (60,000 inhabitants). The district has eight schools, but at the project start Romani children attended only one segregated school.

---

[27] Donka Panayotova and Evgeni Evgeniev: Succesful Romani school desegregation: the Vidin case. 2002.
http://www.errc.org/roma-rights-journal/successful-romani-school-desegregation-the-vidin-case
[28] NGO Organisation Drom. The Vidin Desegregation Program (2010-2011). http://drom-vidin.org/images/webpics/final.eng.version.pdf
[29] The summary is based on the project description submitted for the MERI (Mayors Making Most of EU Funds for Roma Inclusion) Awards held on 11-12 October, 2012.

In 2011 Sofia Municipality took over a scheme initiated by the Roma NGO Romani Baht, which had already been running for about 10 years, to assist Romani children's enrolment into non-segregated mainstream schools. The project was implemented together with Roma Education Fund, which secured two thirds of project funding; while the municipality financed the remaining one third at the total value of 105,580 EUR. The main activity was providing transportation for 548 Roma children to attend mainstream schools in the year of 2011 and 2012. The enrolment of further 120 children aged 5-6 was also prepared for the school year of 2012/2013. The project was integrated: besides securing transportation, Roma mediators were also trained and five of them were employed to implement school mediation between teachers and Roma families. An awareness raising campaign was also organised targeting Roma parents about the equal right to and importance of education, qualification, and employment in general, and of the advantages of children attending integrated mainstream schools. The campaign also promoted sports and cultural activities in schools, as well as the benefits of a multicultural environment and non-formal and extra-curricular education facilities. Community public hearings and parents' school meetings were also organised. In addition, preparation was made for expanding the project to other schools in the district, and to other districts where Roma neighbourhoods are located.

Hódmezővásárhely, Hungary[30]

This case shows how a municipality can efficiently redesign the catchment areas of schools in order to ensure the even distribution of disadvantaged children across the entire local educational system. The importance of continuous monitoring is also highlighted.

Hódmezővásárhely is a middle sized city with a population of 47,000. A non-segregated school system was introduced in 2007 by redesigning school catchment areas. A first step toward the new system started in 2003 when the municipality obliged schools and kindergartens to communicate to parents the importance of registering their children as multiply disadvantaged (MD) if they were eligible. Then they started to survey the distribution of MD children across the schools and across classes within schools. The survey revealed that mainly schools in the outskirt of the city had high MD rate; although it is important to note that not only Roma children were affected by multiple disadvantages, but also numerous children of families living in farms, and in the old city centre. Altogether 2,600 children received a child protection allowance, out of which 750 children were also MD in 2006. A plan was elaborated with the assistance of external educational experts (financed by the Roma Education Fund) to restructure the local school system and redraw catchment areas. To do so, the place of residence of MD children was mapped. The school catchment areas were drawn in such a way that the rate of MD children should remain below 20 percent in each school. The number of schools was also decreased; schools that operated substantially below their optimum capacity were closed. As a result, in the remaining schools new classes were launched with a substantial number of children meeting the educational law criteria. Prior to the restructuring some of the schools had privileges to enrol children from the whole area of the city, while other schools were allowed to take children only from their catchment area. Such privileges were abolished. The borders of school catchment areas were monitored each following year, and amendments were made if needed. It have to be mentioned that one of the schools was transferred to a church, and thus it ceased to fall under municipal regulation (in other words children can enrol into this school from the whole area of the city).

---

[30] The summary is based on the description that was submitted for the MERI (Mayors Making Most of EU Funds for Roma Inclusion) Awards held on 11-12 October, 2012. A shorter version of the description can be found here: Issues of Inclusion and Segregation: Reorganising the System of Public Education in Hódmezővásárhely City of County Rank. http://goodpracticeroma.ppa.coe.int/en/pdf/559

Throughout the process intensive communication was maintained with school headmasters and teachers. A communication campaign was also organised targeted at parents before launching the new system in the school year 2007/2008. A school bus service was also launched to deliver children (altogether 166) from the outskirt of the city. In the reorganised school system the most experienced and successful teaching staff was employed, and priority was given to those with experience in competence development. The rearrangement of the teaching staff was based on a performance evaluation system. Around 100 teachers were dismissed, but not only from the schools that were shut down. Training and additional resources were provided for renewing pedagogical methods in schools, for which a complex ESF project was implemented. A complementary program was implemented in kindergartens, focusing on the early enrolment of children from disadvantaged families with the help of visiting nurses (who are in regular contact with every family from the birth of a child and employed by the municipal health system), their early development, and their successful preparation for school.

The success of the new system was proven by competence measurement results which were higher than the national average in every school ever since the first year. The Roma Education Fund provided a Student Mentoring program to Roma students in order to prevent dropouts. This new system was financially more economic as well.

Similar desegregation measures were implemented in Szeged, Mohács, and Ács in order to develop an inclusive high quality local educational system of higher quality.

7. Annex

In the Annex an overview is provided on the methods mapping residential and educational segregation in selected countries. Some of the examples is directly related to the segregation of Roma but others represents more general methods identifying socio-economic segregation both in spatial and educational domain.

Country case examples for methods to identify residential segregation

France

In France the so called "Politique de la Ville" focuses on deprived urban neigbourhoods (priority neighbourhoods) with the aim to increase social cohesion, rehabilitate the areas and increase employment and economic activity. The priority neighbourhoods are defined in a uniform method, the principle of which is specified in national legal legislation[31]. It stipulates that the neighbourhood should be of a minimum number of inhabitants and that the criteria to measure the neighbourhoods' socio-economic gap is based on the income situation of the inhabitants. Inhabitants' income is compared to the national income level and to the one of the urban unit in which the neighbourhood is located. The exact method is defined centrally. Based on the methodology the list of urban priority neighbourhoods is produced on national level and published with maps and other socio-economic indicators for each neighbourhood. [32]

Methodology of defining Priority Neighbourhoods:

Median income of households is under a threshold compared to the national average and to the average of the neighbourhood in which the zone is lying (median income/equivalent consumption unit). The threshold is counted by the following formulas:

For urban areas with less the 5 million population:
$T = 0{,}6 \times ([0{,}7 \times RMUC\text{-}nat) + (0{,}3 \times RMUC\text{-}UU])$;
For urban areas with at least 5 million inhabitants:
$T = 0{,}6 \times ([0{,}3 \times RMUC\text{-}nat) + (0{,}7 \times RMUC\text{-}UU])$,

Where
T : is the threshold of the median income per consumption unit,

RMUC-nat: is the average or the median income per consumption unit of metropolitan areas in France,

RMUC-UU: is the median income per consumption unit of the given urban area, where the neighbourhood is located.

The typology is only relevant for neighbourhoods of urban territories (at least 10,000 inhabitants/settlement). One neighbourhood must have at least 1,000 inhabitants.

---

[31] LOI n° 2014-173 du 21 février 2014 de programmation pour la ville et la cohésion urbaine (Law on planning of the city and urban cohesion)
https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000028636804&categorieLien=id
[32] Ministère de la Cohésion des Territoires & Commissariat Général à l'Égalité des Territoires (2016): *Atlas des quartiers prioritaires de la politique de la ville*. [Ministry of Territorial Cohesion & General Comity for Territorial Equality: Atlas of priority **neighbourhoods of the city** policy]. Retrieved from:
https://sig.ville.gouv.fr/Atlas/atlas-qpv-2017.pdf

Hungary

In Hungary a socio-economic indicator is used to measure urban segregation. The indicator is basically assessed by using census data: areas are considered segregated if the number of people with completed primary school as highest educational attainment and the number of people without regular income from employment reaches 50 percent, and the population is at least 50 people. Areas are considered being at risk of segregation if the index is between 40 and 50 percent. The investigated territorial units were residential blocks, as the data was gathered for this unit. The Hungarian Central Statistical Office (HCSO) has produced a segregation map for every city, in which the segregated areas and the areas at risk of segregation were marked. However, the majority of Urban Development Strategies were made first in 2008 and 2009, so the data of the 2001 Census may not have precisely reflected the then-current situation. Therefore an alternative indicator was introduced, which measured the spatial concentration of regular social benefits (housing benefit and regular child protection allowance). According to this indicator, areas were considered as segregated if the ratio of such benefits per housing stock was more than double of the local average; in case of being at risk of segregation the ratio is 1.7 times the local average. However, the calculation of this indicator was optional for cities, while the index based on census data for each city which was preparing such a strategy was produced by the HCSO on a mandatory basis.

For the current EU programming period 2014-2020, the residential segregation index was revised in terms of the thresholds of the index. The new index is based on Census 2011 data with the same data composition, but the thresholds were decreased for cities and towns. The reason is that the educational level increased across the whole population between 2001 and 2011, therefore the share of those who have only primary education or less decreased even in the deprived areas. The level of unemployed did not change significantly, which showed that higher educational attainment did not result in a better labour market position (although at the time of the Census the global financial crisis still had a harsh effect on the Hungarian labour market). The new thresholds of the segregation index was set at 30 percent in cities, and 50 percent in villages. In the capital two thresholds were defined: one for the more densely inhabited inner areas (20%), and one for the sparsely populated outskirts (25%). As for areas at the risk of segregation, the threshold was set 5 percent lower respectively for each category of locality. The Central Statistical Office provided the map of segregated areas, the related demographic and socio-economic data, and data on the housing stock according to the relevant regulation.[33]

A list of segregated areas on national level has not yet been compiled. Thus segregated areas were only mapped if they were located in cities and towns that prepared their Integrated Urban Development Plans, or in smaller settlements which planned to implement Roma settlement eradication or upgrading projects.[34]

Nevertheless, there were several surveys in the past decades aiming at to count Roma settlements or neighbourhoods which lack basic infrastructure and have precarious housing conditions. The last one was carried out in 2010, using a mixed definition of segregated areas. For cities and towns the definition was the segregation index based on the 2001 Census data; while in other settlement types segregated localities were defined as neighbourhoods regarded by the local population as a marginalised or Roma neighbourhood or smaller unit (such as street or row), where deeply

---

[33] 314/2012 Government Degree, 10 and 11 Annexes.
[34] Each city and town which planned to use EU development funds had to prepare their Integrated Urban Development Plans which had to include the definition of segregated areas provided by the Central Statistical Office.

marginalised people live concentrated in one block. The survey was carried out by the local experts of the Small Region (then NUTS 4) Coordinator Network system. Altogether 1,663 segregates were identified in 823 settlements (cities, towns, villages) and in 10 districts of Budapest. The estimated number of inhabitants was around 300,000. [35]

England

In England deprivation indices are calculated since the 1970s; the latest calculation was carried out in 2015.[36] It was based on 37 separate indicators grouped in seven distinct domains of deprivation: income; employment; health and disability; education, skills and training; crime; barriers to housing and services; and living environment deprivation domains. The deprivation indices are combined to one Multiple Deprivation Index (IMD 2015) using weighting of 22.5 percent for income and employment, 13.5 percent for health and education related indices, and 9.3 percent for crime, barrier to housing and services and living environment deprivation domains. The IMD is calculated on small areas (called lower layer Super Output Area, which are statistical units with approximately 1,500 residents). Altogether 32,844 small areas, also called neighbourhoods, were defined in 2015. All neighbourhoods are ranked according to IMD from the most deprived (highest IMD value) to the least deprived. Deciles are calculated by this ranking, and usually the first or the first two deciles are regarded as the most deprived neighbourhoods (although this is a relative term, as it was described).

Looking at the most deprived neighbourhoods (first decile) the analysis of the IMD 2015 shows that two-thirds of the 3,284 small areas are highly deprived in four or more of the seven domains. Aggregating data on local authority levels statistics can be shown such as cities with the highest number of most deprived neighbourhoods, (e.g. Birmingham has the highest number, 26 deprived neighbourhoods), and the proportion of deprived neighbourhoods compared to total number of neighbourhoods in a local authority.

The Index of Multiple Deprivation is used both on national and local level to target funding and programmes to deprived areas, locally often used as evidence in development strategies verifying the needs to channel extra resources (national, local etc.) to such areas. The voluntary and community sector also uses the data to identify areas where people need their services most.[37]

It is also important to note that ethnic minorities are more likely to live in the most deprived neighbourhoods than White British. Based on Census data 2001 and 2011 a research shows that more than one in three in the Bangladeshi and Pakistani groups, and more than one in five among other Black, African and Caribbean ethnic group lived in a deprived neighbourhood (the first decile of neighbourhoods).[38]

---

[35] Veronika Domokos: Szegény- és cigánytelepek, városi szegregátumok területi elhelyezkedésének és infrastrukturális állapotának elemzése különböző (közoktatási, egészségügyi, településfejlesztési) adatforrások egybevetéséve l, 2010. (Territorial and infrastructural analysis of marginalised and Roma settlements, urban segregates by comparing different (educational, health and urban development) databases.) Commissioned by the National Development Agency.

[36] Department for Communities and Local Government: The English Indices of Deprivation 2015. https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2015

[37] The English Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2015 - Guidance. Department for Communities and Local Governments. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/464430/English_Index_of_Multiple_Deprivation_2015_-_Guidance.pdf

[38] Ethnicity and deprivation in England: How likely are ethnic minorities to live in deprived neighbourhoods? Summary. Authors: Stephen Jivraj and Omar Khan. In series The Dymanics of Diversity: evidence from the 2011

Czech Republic

The first mapping of socially excluded Roma localities was carried out in 2006[39] with two main objectives: to gather information on the basic socio-economic profile of deprived areas inhabited (not exclusively) by Roma, which can be used also for planning programmes targeting Roma integration in the EU programming period of 2007-2013; and to assess the presence of local service providers including civil society organisations in the field, and their absorption capacity. The research was replicated in 2014[40] with a similar methodology, to update information on socially excluded localities and compare the situation with that in 2006.

In the research "Roma" was defined as people who claim to be Roma, or who are perceived as Roma by the majority population. Socially excluded localities were defined as areas where the concentration of the socially excluded people (individuals or groups) – who are hindered or completely denied access to resources, positions and opportunities in different domains of life – is high. All types of units or localities could qualify, e.g. a single multi-family building, a street or a neighbourhood, but the number of residents should be at least 20 people. Deprived areas without any Roma residents were excluded from the research.

In both researches the first step was compile the list of socially excluded localities based on gathering information from experts on central and local level (e.g. ministries, Agency of Social Inclusion, regional Roma coordinators, civil society organisations), desk research overviewing existing studies, and databases. During the 2014 research a more thorough desktop analysis was carried out on existing studies and research, as many research projects (regional mapping updates, case studies etc.) were conducted in the prior years, often commissioned by government organisations. In the second research statistical data were also used (on social allowances, educational enrolment, criminality map, juvenile delinquency etc.). The field research was carried out by social researchers and included local data collection, and interviews with stakeholders (like municipal officials, local institutions, civil organisations and local residents). In 2014 a field survey was conducted in 316 municipalities; officials of 100 municipalities were interviewed on phone; and in depth qualitative surveys were carried out in 20 municipalities.

The comparison between the research results of 2006 and 2014 reveals that the number of socially excluded localities increased from 310 to 606; furthermore, approximately 700 "hostels" (substandard commercial accommodations) were identified with residents facing social exclusion. The population living in socially excluded localities almost doubled as well, in 2006 around 60,000-80,000 people, while in 2014 95,000-115,000 people lived in such deprived areas. The profile and spatial pattern of socially excluded localities changed during the examined period. Parallel to the growing number of localities the average size of population tended to be lower (271 in 2006 v. 188 in 2014); and more localities emerge in smaller and even in rural settlements, while formerly spatial segregation was predominantly an urban phenomenon. Furthermore, the number of socially excluded localities increased more in regions which already had higher numbers of such localities in 2006. Regarding their ethnic

---

Census. http://hummedia.manchester.ac.uk/institutes/code/briefingsupdated/ethnicity-and-deprivation-in-england-how-likely-are-ethnic-minorities-to-live-in-deprived-neighbourhods%20(1).pdf

[39] GAC spol. s r.o.: Analysis of socially excluded Roma localities in the Czech Republic and absorption capacity of entities involved in this field. Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs, 2006
https://www.gac.cz/userfiles/File/nase_prace_vystupy/GAC_MAPA_Socially_Excluded_Roma_Localities_in_the_CR_en.pdf

[40] Mgr. Karel Čada, Ph.D.: Analysis of Socially Excluded Localities in the Czech Republic. Co-authors: Mgr. Daniela Büchlerová, Mgr. Zuzana Korecká, Mgr. Tomáš Samec. May, 2015. GAC spol. s r. o.
https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Housing/InformalSettlements/PublicDefenderCzechRepublic_2.pdf

composition, the number of localities where Roma population were not the majority also increased, even though the majority of segregated localities were still mostly inhabited by Roma. Nevertheless, the connection between the share of Roma population and level of social exclusion is still strong, the higher the share of Roma population the poorer and more excluded the localities are.

Atlas of Roma communities in Slovakia

The first Atlas of Roma Communities was prepared in 2004, which was updated in 2013[41]. The aim of the research was on one hand to provide an overview on the spatial distribution of Roma population in terms of the level of residential segregation; and on the other hand to provide an "inventory" of Roma settlements identifying their location, spatial distribution across the country, their societal, economic and housing conditions. Three types of spatial pattern were used, based on the following categorisation: Roma residents are dispersed in the community (locality); concentrated at the outskirt of the locality; or concentrated outside of the locality (remote from the main locality, separated by physical barriers).

In the mapping of 2013 three databases were used to identify the municipalities to be surveyed: the former Roma Atlas (2004), Census 2011 data (municipalities with more than 30 Roma people, based on self-identification), and the list of the Office of Roma Plenipotentiary (responsible for Roma inclusion) on localities with Roma population. The latter list was compiled by registering the municipalities who submitted local strategies with a comprehensive approach in the framework of Horizontal Priority of Marginalised Communities in the programming period of 2007-2013; and using the results of a telephone survey conducted by the Office on marginalised Roma communities in 2010. After merging these three databases 1,070 municipalities were selected for the survey. Two questionnaires were used. The first surveyed the entire municipality in terms of Roma population, their spatial distribution, social-economic profile, the access to public services, political participation, and project activities. The second questionnaire surveyed the individual Roma settlements along the same dimensions, but in more detailed way. The survey was conducted by trained researchers who made interviewers with local informants (mayor or deputy mayor, and municipal officials who have in-depth knowledge on local Roma communities).

The mapping of 2013 showed that there were 804 Roma settlements in 584 municipalities, out of which 246 were inside, 327 on the edge of village/town and 231 located outside of the residential area of the village/town with an average distance of 900 meters. The survey estimated that the total Roma population was of 402,840 people of whom 187,285 (47%) lived integrated with the majority population. Altogether 21,168 dwellings were counted, of which 9849 units were illegal. Among illegal housing the number of non-standard housing units (shacks, prefabricated cabins etc.) was 4784. The number of Roma settlement without access to public water network was 188.[42]

Beside estimate the size and distribution of Roma population and settlements, the goals of producing the map were to provide information for local decision makers, to target policy measures to marginalised communities in national and regional level and to support national policy making.

---

[41] Alexander Musinka, Daniel Skobla, Jakob Hurrle, Jaroslav King: Atlas Rómskych komunít na Slovensku 2013. UNDP. https://www.unipo.sk/public/media/18210/Atlas_romkom_web.pdf

[42] Presentation: Alexander Musinka (Presov University), Daniel Skobla (IVPR): The Atlas of Roma community in Slovakia. http://slord.sk/buxus/docs/PODUJATIA/Atlas_of_Roma_/PresentationATLAS_Brussels.pdf

SocioRoMap[43] in Romania

A survey was conducted in 2017 in Romania in order to count the segregated Roma settlements. The survey covered all the 3,182 local administrative units (LAU) of Romania, with the aim to identify Roma settlements at LAU level ("community census of Roma communities"), to categorize and analyse Roma communities and to examine the social and welfare system and the structure of inclusion at local level. Compact Roma communities were defined as "cluster of households/residential area inhabited by Roma", with at least 15 inhabitants. The response rate of LAUs was 97.5 percent: out of 3,182 LAUs 3,101 answered, 42 did not, and 39 filled the survey only partially. A local official working at the department of social assistance had to fill out the questionnaires.

The methodology was constructed similarly to the Slovak mapping. There were two rounds of questioning. First, a questionnaire was sent to each LAU inquiring about the total number of Roma population, out of which the number of those who live dispersed among non-Roma and those who live segregated, the number of compact Roma communities, the level of welfare services and benefits, the cooperation between public services (social, educational, health, police etc.).

In the second round field workers were asked to fill out another questionnaire separately for each identified compact Roma community. The questionnaire included detailed questions on relative location of the Roma community, availability of infrastructure, public utilities and services, physical and legal aspects of housing conditions, and demographic-social-economic co mposition of households.

As the result of the survey is largely based on estimation of the local officials, thus in several cases under-or overestimation, or lack of listing some of the Roma communities might had happened, therefore the collected database was validated by using former mappings and census data. Another way of checking data that local health and school mediators were asked to fill out another questionnaire. These questionnaires required information on the Roma population and living circumstances and on the work of mediators. Furthermore also locally active NGOs were asked to fill out a questionnaire surveying the level of Roma related activities and projects aiming at their social inclusion.

The research identified 2,315 Roma communities situated in 1,661 localities, distributed in 1,121 territorial administrative units (TAU: communes, towns and cities). According to the local experts who responded to the questionnaires, the number of people of Roma ethnicity living in these communities is 722,844 (59.1 percent identified Roma, according to the research methodology). Thirty percent of the total Roma population lived in compact communities with less than 20 households, and another thirty percent in compact communities of 20-49 households; meaning that 60 percent of Roma compact communities are not very large. The research identified 314 (13.6%) compact communities with more than 150 households, and only 8 of them have more than 1,000 households.

Counties and municipalities use the mapping to elaborate Local Development Strategies for Urban Marginalised Communities and project planning for EU funds related proposals.

---

[43] The project was implemented by The Romanian Institute for Research on National Minorities, in partnership with The Foundation for an Open Society adn the Research Centre of Interethnic Relations. The project was supported by the Norway Grants. SocioRoMap Compact Roma Communities in Romania: Survey of Local Experts on Social Inclusion. Authors: István Horváth, Tamás Kiss. http://ispmn.gov.ro/page/publicaii
Questionnaires: http://ispmn.gov.ro/page/metodologie-i-instrumente-de-cercetare

Spain

The first mapping of Roma communities' housing situation was carried out in 1991, then replicated in 2007 ("Mapping housing and Roma communities in Spain"); the latest similar research was done in 2015[44]. The main outcomes of the latest mapping are a summary report, disaggregated data on the regional level, and list of municipalities with Roma population. An interactive map was also produced.

The methodology of the research of 2015 was similar to the two previous ones, allowing for longitudinal comparison; although it also contained some new variables in order to be able to analyse new developments related to the changing economic and societal context (effects of the global crisis, evictions, vacant units etc.). The research focused on 15 dimensions of the Roma population's housing situation, ranging from the identification and location of the individual Roma neighbourhoods, and their typology according to the urban environment and housing profile, to providing detailed data on the individual Roma settlements, the number of housing units, tenure, quality and crowdedness of housing, households' social and demographic profile, ways of access to housing in the given area, public interventions on housing, and on other aspects related to the improvement of the situation of affected Roma population. It was also an important aim to identify the presence and situation of Roma of foreign origin.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods were used. As for quantitative measurement a questionnaire was compiled and a survey was conducted by trained researchers with local officials, and with representatives of institutions and civil society organisations for each individual neighbourhood. The qualitative method covered semi structured interviews with Roma families on the consequences of segregation and poor housing conditions on their lives, and the effects of public interventions carried out between 2007 and 2015. The first results of the analysis (both quantitative and qualitative) were discussed with an expert group.

Scotland

A research was carried out in Scotland to estimate the number of Roma migrants coming primarily from Eastern Europe.[45] The methodology of the research included an online questionnaire sent to 32 local authorities (only two of them did not respond); interviews were conducted with local key stakeholders (public institutions, civil society organisations), two workshop session were organized (in Glasgow, Kirkcaldy) attended by academics, grassroots practitioners, and local authority services. Two focus groups were also organized, one with Glasgow Community Response Team, and one with the staff of Holyroad High School.

Mapping revealed that about 4,000-5,000 Roma migrated to Scotland, primarily from Slovakia and Romania. The majority of them live in Glasgow, about 3,000-4,000. Some of the migrant Roma are settled (mainly the Slovak Roma), but others move around after work and their families.

---

[44] Estudio-Mapa Sobre Vivienda y Población Gitana, 2015. Informe Septiembre de 2016. Gobierno de Espana, Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad.
www.gitanos.org/centro_documentacion/publicaciones/fichas/117552.html.es
[45] Mapping the Roma community in Scotland. Final Report. 26th September 2013.
https://www2.gov.scot/resource/0043/00434972.pdf

Country case examples for methods to identify school segregation

France

A good example for a nationally developed data system on school segregation is the French practice, which uses a complex index to compile a list of segregated schools on the national level, and updates the list regularly. The so-called priority schools are defined by the complex index which measures on the school level the share of pupils

- with parents falling into disadvantaged socio-professional categories;

- living in sensitive urban zones (where low-income households are concentrated);

- who have repeated a school year before the first year of *college* (at the age of 11);

- or who receive social benefit for school age children.

The French Ministry of Education launched the policy of "Priority Education" to improve the quality of education in schools where the share of children from a low socio-economic background is high, to fight inequalities and segregation in the education system. The reform policy of priority education declared that in all fields of priority education (schools affected by segregation or are at risk of segregation) it is necessary to reach the aim of social mix by all means. The reform also highlights that the educational system has to contribute to the equality of chances and to fight against social and territorial inequalities in the field of educational performance, and to ensure the social mix of students in educational institutions. In 2017, 18 percent of elementary school students (6-10 years old) and 20 percent of "*college*" students (10-14 years old) are in priority education.[46]

Hungary

In the field of education an approach similar to the residential segregation index was used, as no ethnic data is collected which could have been used in the measurement. The aim of the index, which was introduced in 2006, is to identify the number and share of children with multiple disadvantages in schools. Children are regarded as having multiple disadvantages if their family receives child protection allowance, and whose parents have primary education as their highest qualification. The child protection allowance is linked to the families' income situation; families whose per capita income is below a certain threshold are eligible. The differences in segregation index was also examined across the schools in a given settlement. If a school exceeded the local average index value by 20 percent, a segregating mechanism was presumed. The components of the index were changed in 2013. Additional requirements were added beside the recipients of the child protection allowance, namely at least two of the following criteria: the parents had low educational attainment (no higher than completed primary school); one of the parents was unemployed; and the family lived in a segregated neighbourhood or in precarious housing circumstances. As a result of the stricter conditions the number and share of the children with multiple disadvantage decreased statistically. The number of children with multiple disadvantages is registered in schools (certification is issued by the local

---

[46] L'Éducation Prioritaire. Rapport d'évaluation D'une politique publique. Synthese. Octobre 2018.
https://www.ccomptes.fr/system/files/2018-10/20181017-synthese-education-prioritaire_0.pdf

government's notary), and has to be reported to the central register system of the government's Educational Office.[47]

Spain

A pilot research project was conducted in 2012[48] with the goal to explore the scale of school segregation of Roma children and youth. The research defined segregated schools if the share of Roma pupils in a school was higher than the proportion of Roma children in the neighbourhood. It also aimed to find out if there are schools with extremely high concentration of Roma pupils (85-90%). The research included four cities (Barcelona, Badajoz, Córdoba and Madrid) in its sample, and examined 28 schools in 11 neighbourhoods where a significant Roma population lives. In two neighbourhoods the share of Roma population was 50 percent; in other two neighbourhoods it was between 30 and 40 percent, while in five locations it was between 15 and 20 percent. In one neighbourhood there was no data on the ethnic composition.

The research used the definition of Roma for those who either identify themselves as Roma or who are perceived as Roma by others. Altogether ten researchers conducted 95 interviews with NGOs working at the national level, NGOs working on the local level, school mediators, and officials from education department of regional and local municipalities; 42 interviews were conducted with Roma families, and 19 with school teachers and directors. However, not all the schools could be reached in the catchment areas of the selected neighbourhoods: only the public schools were included, while charter schools were left out due to the time limit of the research. No additional data could be collected on Roma children's access to charter schools. Another difficulty/lesson was that regional and local authorities' educational departments were not able – or were reluctant – to provide data on the share of Roma pupils in the school system.

Czech Republic

Overall research on school segregation has not been carried out, and there is no national data collection system with the purpose to study educational segregation. Nevertheless, the two mentioned previously researches on socially excluded localities also surveyed the schools in or near the area of the localities, estimating the share of Roma children in the total number of pupils in the school. In 2006, a total number of 320 primary and special schools attended by children living in socially excluded localities were surveyed. In primary schools, the share of Roma pupils were higher than 60 percent in 10 percent of schools, and almost in 80 percent of the schools the share of Roma was no more than 20 percent. In the case of special educational needs schools the percentage of schools where the share of Roma pupils were more than 60 percent was around 30 percent. In 2014, 400 schools were surveyed. The research showed that 22 percent of primary school aged children attended ethnically homogenous schools, where the share of Roma pupils was higher than 80 percent. It was also revealed that in more than half of the socially excluded localities (59% of localities) children go to schools where the share of Roma children is less than 20 percent. This latter estimation was due to the fact that the

---

[47] The summary is based on the study „Analysis of the effects of the equal opportunity based development policy in Hungary and recommendations for EU, Member State and local level to endorse the approach in the Multiannual Financial Framework 2014-2020". Authors: G. Bernáth, G. Daróczi, E. Somogyi, O. Szendrey, N. Teller. Manuscript, 2014. The study was funded by Open Society Foundations.

[48] Segregación escolar del alumnado Gitano en España. Abril 2012. Federación de Asociaciones de Mujeres Gitanas Kamira y La Fundación Mario Maya. http://federacionkamira.es/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Informe-de-Segregaci%C3%B3n.pdf

number of small socially excluded localities increased, especially in smaller settlements and villages, while segregated schools are prevailing in larger cities where the larger excluded areas are located.

The research also addressed the problem of the low pre-school attendance rate of Roma children; however, no estimation was provided in this respect. But the interviews confirmed the findings of previous research findings on this topic, namely that only a small share of Roma children are included in pre-school education due to economic reasons, and the serious lack of capacity of kindergarten institutions.[49]

[49] Mgr. Karel Čada, Ph.D.: Analysis of Socially Excluded Localities in the Czech Republic. Co-authors: Mgr. Daniela Büchlerová, Mgr. Zuzana Korecká, Mgr. Tomáš Samec. May, 2015. GAC spol. s r. o.
https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/Issues/Housing/InformalSettlements/PublicDefenderCzechRepublic_2.pdf