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Section 1

Executive Summary

Background to the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to scope disability and employment focussed services provided by specialist and other intermediaries, primarily within the City of Edinburgh, but also in the neighbouring East Lothian and Midlothian travel to work areas. Intermediaries were (in the main) keen to participate in and contribute to the completion of the study, recognising an opportunity to collectively promote their services and quantify the impact they make in placing and supporting people with disabilities into employment. The study represents the first time that such a detailed analysis of the local disability and employment service sector has been undertaken, and comes at a time when national government policy and resources are becoming ever more targeted on reducing the numbers of people claiming inactive benefits, particularly those in receipt of Incapacity Benefit.

Those clients receiving a service are generally those defined as having a disability under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995. The Act defines a disability as:

“A physical or mental impairment which has a substantial and long term adverse effect on the ability to carry out normal day to day activities”\(^1\)

Quantitative and qualitative information was gathered in order to:

- Calculate the current capacity of intermediaries to work with disabled job seekers against actual and potential demand for these services.
- Quantify the cost of and job impact made by these services.
- Communicate to stakeholders the increasing relevance and wider value of the work undertaken by disability and employment

\(^1\) Disability Discrimination Act 1995 (c. 50)
intermediaries, and the need to at least maintain or increase investment in this area of activity.

- Identify gaps, weaknesses and opportunities for development within the current service framework.

- Identify, if there are, patterns of working which could encourage ‘demand led’ academies to work more effectively in partnership with ‘client centred’ intermediaries.

Information was collected and collated from 18 key disability and employment intermediaries. These intermediaries provide services incorporating

- Pre-employment
- Employment transition and post employment support.

Information was also provided by:

- Edinburgh’s eight Sectoral Employment Academies
- The City’s local Area Based Initiatives
- Further Education Providers and Jobcentre Plus.

**Policy, Service Framework, Funding and Legislative Context**

**National Policy Framework**

The launch of the Green Paper ‘A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work’\(^2\) and subsequent Welfare Reform Bill has provided a driver for debate as to how people can be helped to move from ‘enforced inactivity’ into work. The proposed replacement of Incapacity Benefit and the creation of a new ‘Employment and Support Allowance’, complemented by mandatory work focused interviews and a revised ‘Personal Capability Assessment’ process, moves the focus to supporting capability, rather than sustaining incapacity. These changes, barring any major pre-implementation rethink, will come into force from 2008 onwards. They represent not

only a concerted effort to reduce the numbers of people currently claiming Incapacity Benefit, but an attempt to control the numbers of people taking up and staying on the new Employment and Support Allowance. The key service initiative supporting this shift will be ‘Pathways to Work’, which will be rolled out nationally by 2008 – with an expected arrival in Edinburgh and the Lothian in October 2007.

Service Framework

Pathways to Work will build on the current disability and employment service framework, a mix of core national programmes managed by Jobcentre Plus and sub contracted out to a range of national and local service providers across the public, private and voluntary sectors. These core programmes are complemented by a myriad range of additional services, funded largely by local authorities, local enterprise companies, the European Social Fund, the Big Lottery and grant giving Trusts. As a consequence, this current service framework, with its preponderance of short term contract and project based funding, can be confusing to jobseekers, employers, funders and even service professionals alike. The level and sophistication of provision can also differ significantly from one geographical or local authority area to another – although this is less of a problem in Edinburgh, Midlothian and East Lothian than other areas of Scotland. However, there are disparities in the depth of provision across these three council areas, with Edinburgh, as would be expected, having a comparatively greater depth of provision.

Given the perceived complexity of the current service framework and the ‘competitive free for all’ on which it is based, the recently launched ‘Workforce Plus: An Employability Framework for Scotland’ is a further addition to the drive for change. The stated desire to ‘connect specialist and employment services in a coherent framework which promotes long term progression by individuals into and through employment’, indicates that although the ‘problem’ is well recognised, it may be the solution and the collective desire to achieve it will be somewhat more elusive.

Funding and Resources

Amidst this desire for change, resources and the use of those resources is never far from the centre of debate. Within the context of the Welfare Benefit Green Paper and the new Employability Framework, the better use of existing resources is a key message.

3 ‘Workforce Plus’ An Employability Framework for Scotland (draft), February 2003
Increasing those resources is not necessarily on the agenda. In all probability we are entering a period where the modus operandi may well be the better use of fewer resources.

As is demonstrated in this study, many current services depend on sources other than Jobcentre Plus to fund their services – most notably local authorities and the European Social Fund. Local authority funding becomes more stretched with each financial year, and the ongoing imposition of cost saving regimes and zero growth budgets will not alleviate this trend. The latter source will reduce to 45% or less of its current level from 2007 onwards. This unavoidable reduction will have a significant impact, as this source has been used to fund services which many feel should already have been mainstreamed. Supporters of this view can certainly be found within those organisations who subscribe to the ‘supported employment’ model – a person centred ‘process’ which traverses the initial engagement phase right through to post employment ‘in workplace’ support. Supported Employment has never made the leap from ‘project to mainstream’ funding. The impending reduction in ESF funding could certainly lead to the closure of some key organisations and services – many of which are geared towards working with a specific disability or those people most distanced from labour market participation.

Legislation

In terms of legislation, the study also recognises the ongoing implementation of the DDA and the public duty element which covers the employment practices of all public bodies. Equally important, given the increasing incidence of mental health issues within the working age population, is the Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003, whose Section 26 charges local authorities with the responsibility of ‘providing services designed to promote well being and social development’ including ‘assistance for people over school age in obtaining and undertaking employment’. Given that one in three people are now presenting for Incapacity Benefit with mental health issues, this could place an increasing demand on local authorities and further highlights the gap between mental health service capacity and potential demand. The demand on mental health services could potentially intensify if IB claimants whose principle disability is not a mental health problem are in receipt of mental health services.

Given the policy, service framework, resource and legislative contexts, it is clear that disability and employment provision is entering a period of such significant change, it is yet unclear what shape and form it will emerge in after this change is fully enacted. What this study indicates are some elements of that change process
around which a clear direction and activities can be undertaken, progress made and benefits derived.

The Local Disabled Population

Although the current employment rate in Edinburgh (77.1%) is above the Scottish average (74.9%), people with disabilities still face significant difficulties in obtaining and sustaining employment – even in what is considered a relatively buoyant regional labour market. In the City of Edinburgh, 60.6% of those people who come under the scope of the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA), or have a work limiting disability are currently inactive – approximately 19,000 people. The corresponding ‘inactive’ figures are higher in both Midlothian and East Lothian – 4,300 (72%) and 4,100 (70%) respectively.

Approximately 30,000 people in Edinburgh, East and Midlothian are in receipt of Incapacity Benefit (IB) or Severe Disablement Allowance (SDA). Around 18,000 people in these local authority areas receive Disability Living Allowance (DLA) – individuals in receipt of DLA may also be in employment, as this benefit is awarded regardless of occupational status. Given the annual collective service capacity identified within this study (around 1400 clients per annum), and taking into account that only a proportion of those people in receipt of inactive benefits will be able to or want to take up employment, a new benefits regime providing ‘more active encouragement to take up work’ may founder on that lack of service capacity. Even assuming employers would wish to recruit from that group; recent studies undertaken on behalf of the CIPD indicate that one in three of companies surveyed would not recruit people currently on inactive benefits. Within the Edinburgh labour market context, a further issue is the increasing number of migrant workers from accession states within the EU. Those migrant workers may offer a ‘skilled’ and ‘lower cost’ recruitment option, in comparison with employing local people who have been out of work for some time and face a range of ‘barriers and issues’.
Study Findings

- The total value of identified funding for disability and employment intermediaries was approximately £3 million per annum, equating to around half of the £6 million annual spend on employment access provision within Lothian.

- Around 10 major funding streams were identified, with organisations (on average) funded by at least three different funding bodies.

- Of those funding streams, the largest spend was made by Local Authorities and the European Social Fund.

- Intermediaries indicated they would prefer more collaboration with funders, expressing the view that funding bodies had a lack of awareness of the difficulties in placing disabled people into sustainable employment.

- Sustainability of funding and a move away from ‘short termism’ was considered more important than collaboration between or reduction in the number of funders.

- Only 29% of intermediaries currently receive funding on an open ended basis. In the main organisations have less than five years funding, however those organisations who are heavily funded through the ESF route fare less well with less than two years funding left.

- Collectively, the disability and employment intermediaries surveyed were able to provide a service to approximately 1400 clients in an operational year – indicating a considerable shortfall between capacity and demand, especially if potential reforms to the welfare benefits system are implemented.

- Most direct client referrals to intermediaries came through Jobcentre Plus, however 82% of Jobcentre Plus referrals are to NDDP Job Brokering services, leaving only 18% of their referrals to intermediaries catering for a specific disability.

- The second largest source of referrals to intermediaries were health providers, mostly to those intermediaries working with people with severe and enduring mental health problems.

- Self referral is a bigger source than through local authority Social Work departments, who tend to work mostly with
those intermediaries supporting people with learning disabilities.

- In the operational year surveyed (2004-05), almost 300 disabled individuals were placed into open employment through the use of intermediary services, a further 486 gained work placements or obtained permitted work.

- The average length of time to achieve a recognised client outcome varied across different service elements, with Job Broker services achieving the shortest ‘time worked with’ at 8.4 months in comparison with average ‘time worked with’ in a learning disability service at 17.5 months.

- In terms of staff resource, the majority of employment intermediaries did not stipulate any minimum qualifications for staff working in a client facing employment development role, preferring to find a prospective employee with the right ‘values base’.

- A very small number of staff across the intermediaries surveyed are currently studying for a supported employment qualification, with cost and lack of funding to support training activity cited as the major reason for this.

- A knowledge and awareness gap exists between disability and employment intermediaries and sectoral employment academies. Academies have little knowledge of the work of those intermediaries and disability in general, with funding ‘mismatches’ and ‘barriers to programme entry’ continuing to make it difficult to traverse that gap.

- Those with physical disabilities have no generic services catering to their collective needs. There exists organisations catering to specific physical disabilities or health problems but other than these very specific services they are catered for through Edinburgh, Lothian and Borders network of NDDP job brokers, whose services are being increasingly stretched by the large number of clients with mental health problems.

Conclusions – Gaps and Opportunities

1) There is no common set of performance data collected by disability and employment intermediaries. Information chosen for recording purposes depends on the demands of a particular funding body and the individual organisational method of working. Some organisations collect different data
sets for different funders, who ostensibly fund the same activity. Lack of availability of consistent data makes it difficult for organisations to make stronger funding cases – particularly those supported employment agencies who do not track and record sustainable outcomes (the key ‘selling point’ outcome of the SE model), as they are not funded or required to do so.

2) There is an opportunity for greater levels of collaboration between intermediaries and their funders, with a view to increasing programme flexibility that better reflects the needs of and barriers faced by service users. Increased levels of awareness on the part of funders may lead to the removal of unnecessary programme entry barriers and geographical constraints.

3) Funding is largely outcome driven, with less emphasis on achieving sustained outcomes even beyond (in many cases) a 13 week period. This short term emphasis is distinctly at odds with longer term job sustainability as a key measure of success.

4) There is often little or no funding for ‘aftercare,’ the result of which is intermediaries supporting individuals out of their own reserves e.g. clients referred by Jobcentre Plus onto supported permitted work for which there is no funding, with a consequence that clients and employers may feel they are receiving a ‘cut price’ service below what they expected or were promised.

5) Intermediaries are inconsistent in recording sustained outcomes, with many not undertaking this task as they are not funded to do so. Although intermediaries are able to make a strong funding case based on the innumerable benefits to the individual enhanced evidence of sustained employment outcomes, would only strengthen the funding case (incorporating a valid cost benefit analysis of the ‘supported employment’ model) could then be made.

6) There are recognised professional qualifications within the field of supported employment. Unfortunately, none of these qualifications has, as yet, achieved an ‘industry wide’ acceptance. This denies supported employment practitioners a recognised career path and militates against the development and implementation of a quality standards framework for service delivery. This is exacerbated by short term funding which leads to higher levels of staff turnover. A lack of a recognised professional status makes it difficult for
supported employment practitioners to operate as equals with partners from Health Service and Social Work.

7) There is a need to raise the profile of ‘supported employment’ amongst referring agencies and health practitioners, ensuring that all potential clients can gain an active awareness of the employment support options available to them.

8) Partnership working between intermediaries is usually client centred and not (as yet) based on formal agreements, practices and procedures. Whilst this supports a degree of flexibility, it does not support the shared adoption of a quality standards driven framework for service delivery.

9) There is no single entry gateway to disability and employment service provision, making it confusing for clients, employers, service professionals and other key stakeholders. Disability Employment Advisors and Personal Advisors at Jobcentre Plus (theoretically) are the accepted ‘gateway’, but this concept works less well in practice as the bulk of referrals made through this route are directed to Job Broker agencies.

10) The current focus of service provision is on getting people back into work, with little or no emphasis on assisting people with or developing a disability to retain their existing job. National statistics suggest that the longer someone is out of work the less likely they are to return to employment, therefore a greater focus on and resources devoted to helping people retain their existing employment may be beneficial – especially when concerns about an aging workforce are taken into account.

11) Sectoral Academies and ‘supported employment’ providers have not, as yet, worked effectively together. Academies are invariably training people for immediate vacancies whereas intermediaries’ clients are often quite distanced from the labour market. The Sectoral Academies have encountered a number of funding changes affecting both their course durations and entry specifications - changes which have made it increasingly difficult for people with disabilities to engage with the Academies.

12) There is currently a clear disparity between service demand and capacity, particularly for the increasing number of clients presenting with mental health problems and the relatively few services available to meet those needs. Specialist intermediaries catering for those clients with severe and enduring mental health problems are leaving job brokering
services to pick up an increasing number of people whose inactivity is a result of a mental health problem. There is also a clear need for further mental health training across the spectrum of intermediary agencies and employers.

Recommendations

1) Mutual Agreement on the Scope of Performance Data Collection

Collectively, disability and employment Intermediaries should agree, with funders, on a common template of performance data. This data should then be gathered across programmes, on a regular basis. The creation of a template could be achieved through current representative networks or a special focus group formed for this particular purpose. The template should consider what data is of most use in accurately representing performance and presenting strong funding arguments. There are current gaps in data collection around recording longer term sustained outcomes, this would be a more meaningful statistic which could be of assistance to funders, and help intermediaries to promote the supported employment model more effectively.

2) Funding Stability

Increased stability within the funding framework, even more so than the level of available funding and resources, would increase the focus on effective service delivery and the quality of that delivery, allowing intermediary organisations to plan in the longer term and invest in organisational and staff capability. This research has shown that many disability and employment intermediaries operate on very short funding timeframes – between one and three years is the norm. This ‘short termism’ is perhaps the greatest barrier to developing a service framework which meets the needs of disabled jobseekers.

3) Benefits Flexibility

There is need for the introduction of a more flexible mechanism, where benefits income can be retained whilst employment income rises to an agreed level, and in turn that employment becomes stable and long term. A recurring theme in undertaking the research for this project is the mismatch between entry level job salaries and the level of benefits received by those people with more severe disabilities. This mismatch moves employment, even as an option, out of the reach of many people who would like to work,
particularly older people with families. Even with the introduction of Tax Credits (formerly known as Disabled Person’s Tax Credit)) and other tweaks to the system, this mismatch between potential earnings and benefits income still remains.

4) Collaboration with Funding Bodies

There needs to be increased collaboration with funding bodies to raise awareness of the specific needs and characteristics of this particular client group. A national representative association (like the Scottish Union for Supported Employment (SUSE)) is probably in the best position to take this forward, supported by their linked local area networks of employment intermediaries.

5) Collaboration with Job Centre Plus

As a substantial funder of programmes Job Centre Plus should endeavour to collaborate more with smaller providers at a local level this would enable programmes to better reflect the local circumstances and build upon local expertise. Increased collaboration with local providers would allow programmes to develop based on existing capacities and provision.

6) Efficacy of the Supported Employment Model

There needs to be further research on the impact of the supported employment model, focussing particularly on more detailed cost benefit analysis. This information would help funding bodies, stakeholders and policy makers to assess the model and make investment decisions based on its efficacy. This is particularly important in comparing (what can be) the higher initial costs of the supported employment model versus the longer term financial impact in terms of benefits saved, tax and disposable income generated etc. over a longer period of time.

7) Matching Service Capacity with Demand

Further investment and better targeting of resources is required to address mismatches between service capacity and demand for those services. This is particularly relevant in the area of mental health service provision, given the number of people now presenting with mental health issues and proposed welfare benefit reform which will bring in a new regime where there is more ‘active encouragement’ to engage with work.
8) Raising Professional Standards

There is a need for a ‘universally recognised’ professional qualification specific to ‘supported employment’, affording supported employment practitioners the status and recognition of any other professional service. In the interim, intermediaries should endeavour to develop a set of shared ‘core competencies’ by which to measure applicants, reducing the subjectivity associated with choosing potential employees with the ‘right value base.’

9) Operational Partnership Working

Intermediaries should introduce formal protocols to support more effective operational partnership working. They should aim for a better balance between ‘client centred’ driven joint working, and more formal agreements between organisations. These protocols would help the sector deal with what will be a rapidly changing funding environment, where there may be an increased need for joint bidding for contracts and possible mergers of existing services or organisations.

10) Engaging with Health and Social Work Agencies

Collectively, disability and employment intermediaries need to promote more effectively to key referring agencies. They may want to focus particularly on raising their profile to community based health professionals and GP practices.

11) Linkages with Academies

Opportunities for the Sectoral Employment Academies and disability and employment intermediaries to exchange information should be created, filling the knowledge gap which currently exists. This could be achieved through specific events or intermediary led training and information provision under the auspices of the Lothian Employability Forum or Joined Up for Jobs Partnership Forum.

12) Service User Involvement

More detailed research and consultation involving service users would benefit future service planning. This process would be beneficial in terms of identifying future needs and developing and resourcing appropriate service provision to meet those needs.
13) Workforce Retention

Disability and employment intermediaries should not focus their efforts solely on those who are out of work, but provide services to those who have difficulty in sustaining their current employment. Little retention work is currently undertaken by any of the intermediary agencies, as there is no funding to support this work – other than through the Workstep programme where places are at a premium. However, the recent ‘Green Paper’ sets ambitious targets for reducing the number of people claiming Incapacity Benefit, with a focus on moving people off the benefit as quickly as possible – or perhaps reducing the likelihood of them claiming it in the first place. Disability and employment intermediaries are well placed to provide these retention focussed services.
Section 2

Introduction

This report contains findings from a study funded by the Capital City Partnership (CCP)\(^4\) to scope employment access provision for people with disabilities in Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian. This work was undertaken between October 2005 and June 2006. The report contains the findings from disability intermediaries and other organisations concerned with providing employability services for people with disabilities or health concerns.

Why was this Research Commissioned?

This study was commissioned by the Capital City Partnership and with the cooperation of the Lothian Employability Forum, a network of around 40 organisations and projects providing employment development support, linked training and work experience opportunities to people with disabilities.

Member organisations of The Lothian Employability Forum wanted to demonstrate their collective worth, highlighting the value of the work they undertake in the local labour market. They also wanted to take stock of the current service framework, identify gaps and opportunities and calculate current capacity against demand – using statistics provided by organisations themselves and not extrapolated from national statistical sources, which could be subject to considerable deviation.

---

\(^4\) CCP is a partnership of key statutory, voluntary and community agencies in the city working together to promote social inclusion and achieve social justice for the people of Edinburgh.  
www.capitalcitypartnership.org.uk
The study also aimed to fulfil the purpose of providing the Capital City Partnership with an increased understanding of this key target group, and how service provision ‘fits’ with the Joined Up For Jobs model.\(^5\)

### Aims of the Research

The objective of this study was to collect a range of data to give a better indication of the collective impact of disability employment services in Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian.

Data was collected from Intermediaries who:

- Provide employment access services for those with disabilities.
- Provide pre-vocational training or employability training for people with disabilities.
- Implement the model of ‘supported employment’.
- Are providers of DWP programmes for people claiming IB\(^6\), SDA or DLA.

The intermediaries approached all provided a service specifically for people regarded as having a disability under the Disability Discrimination Act 1995, intermediaries were broadly categorized as catering for learning disabilities, severe and enduring mental health problems, pan disability services and specialist providers providing services for a specified disability. For a comprehensive list of participating organisations see Appendix 5.

In addition to data collected from intermediaries, information was also gathered from Sectoral Employment Academies, Further Education Providers, Area Based Initiatives and Jobcentre Plus. The information gathered, sought to:

- Measure their contribution to employability focussed services for disabled job seekers.

---

5 Joined Up for is the joint strategy for access to work in Edinburgh of the Capital City Partnership, Scottish Enterprise Edinburgh & Lothian, Jobcentre Plus and the City of Edinburgh Council. www.joinedupforjobs.org.uk

6 IB – Incapacity Benefit. For this and other abbreviations please refer to the Abbreviations and Glossary Section.

---
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• Identify ways of working which could encourage academies to work more effectively with those intermediaries.

The information collected would:

• Calculate the current capacity to work with disabled job seekers and the costs of providing these services.
• Identify the funding sources supporting those services.
• Communicate to stakeholders the contribution the sector makes to the social inclusion agenda.
• Take stock of the various services offered.
• Identify provision and opportunities for developing partnership working.
• Identify information necessary for creating a common data template.

The researcher was able to fulfil most of the aims of the study. However, there were some gaps in the information – through unavailability or on the part of organisations not wishing to participate in the study. Those gaps in the research are recognised and taken into account in the nature and scope of the conclusions and recommendations drawn.

A Definition of Employability

There are a number of definitions of Employability but it is generally understood as the ability of an individual to move self sufficiently within the labour market and realise their potential through sustained employment.

Individual employability depends on a person’s assets: their skills, knowledge and attitude; and the presentation and deployment of those assets within the context of seeking work, sustaining work and developing within a work setting.

For the purpose of clarity, the definition of employability used throughout this report is the one used by the Scottish Executive in its recently published ‘Workforce Plus: an Employability Framework for Scotland’. The framework defines employability as “the combination of factors and processes which enable people to

7 Workforce Plus – An Employability Framework for Scotland, Feb. 2006
progress towards or get into employment, to stay in employment and to move on in the workplace.”

Career Management Skills

Career management skills are crucial in raising an individual’s employability, enabling that individual to sell themselves successfully in an open labour market situation. Skills such as academic and vocational qualifications, well developed interview techniques and a substantial work history can be included in this category.

People with disabilities or chronic health conditions often find themselves disadvantaged by their lack or absence of career management skills.

- They may lack practical skills and knowledge through limited access to education or vocational training. Indeed the Disability Rights Commission\(^8\) reported that 58% of the Scottish disabled population have no qualifications, compared with only 24% of their non disabled counterparts.

- They may also face a discriminatory labour market where they are deemed to be of little economic value, often resulting in a limited or absent record of employment - a major barrier to progression in itself. Without any evidence of work history and it’s accompanying experience it is difficult to secure an initial paid position and often people with disabilities resort to unpaid work, through a placement or voluntary work. Although this is a valuable way of gaining experience some people with disabilities may find this is the only option open to them. Unpaid work can furnish the individual with both beneficial practical and personal skills, however some employers may tend to favour paid experience over experience obtained in a voluntary capacity.

Raising Employability

Underpinning the definition of employability is the concept of human capital as more than just a supply of labour. Human capital can be defined as a set of skills acquired through training and employment experience, thereby increasing the employee’s market value. The higher the value of human capital, the greater the ability of the

individual to increase their labour market value; the more opportunities they have to gain, sustain and progress in employment.

Employability as a term can convey a number of things and its individual interpretation affects what is considered as ‘employability development’ i.e. those tasks undertaken with the specific purpose of increasing the employability of the individual.

In Edinburgh and Lothian there are many organisations delivering programmes and services aimed at enhancing employability. The question is whether they all have the same purpose, or do alternative definitions impact upon the methods used and purpose? The numerous and diverse range of organisations working together under the JUFJ banner all offer employability services. They differ mainly in who they provide services to; the nature of the service delivered and their position on the pathway to employment.

**Edinburgh’s Employability Strategy**

At the heart of employability policy within the City of Edinburgh is Joined Up For Jobs under Edinburgh’s Employability Agreement created in 2002. The key features of JUFJ is that it is demand led, responding to Edinburgh labour market needs. At the same time it aims to be client centred, responsive to the differing needs of specific target groups and joined up, improving the coordination and integration of provision within the city.

Joined Up for Jobs has recognised that Edinburgh is in a favourable economic position compared to other parts of Scotland. However, unacceptably high levels of economic inactivity remain amongst target groups. People with physical disabilities, people with learning disabilities and people experiencing mental health problems are just three of the target groups defined as having ‘high levels of economic inactivity’.
The Current Economic Climate

At present, Scotland is in a period of record employment with an employment rate of 74.9% between March 2004 and February 2005.

Lothian compares favourably with the national average with the City, East and Mid Lothian all being above the average rate, at 77.1%, 77.5% and 81.3% respectively. Edinburgh has the lowest rate of economic inactivity of the UK’s major cities.

Despite the Lothian’s strong economic position, there remain groups excluded from economic activity on the margins of society. Over this same timeframe the economic activity rates for the disabled population of working age was a mere 44.5% at a Scottish national level, and slightly higher at 51.1% for Edinburgh, 51.8% for East Lothian and 53.4% for Midlothian.

Employability Services

Within the City of Edinburgh and its neighbouring travel to work areas, there is a variety of provision catering specifically for people with disabilities. Services are subdivided into three distinct groups; those providing services for individuals whose primary disability is a learning one; those services for individuals with severe and enduring mental health problems and those providing pan or general disability services across a range of different disability client groups. In addition to this, there are a number of smaller specialist services catering for clients with very specific disabilities.

Intermediaries offer a range of services from job search and recruitment, to more general employability development support and supported employment, which encompasses post employment in workplace support. Some intermediaries such as The Action Group also offer additional support through their full benefits assessment, which calculates the financial benefits of working. The benefits assessment allows a person considering work to make informed financial decisions. In addition to a full benefits assessment intermediaries such as The Action Group are able to give money

9  Annual Scottish Labour Force Survey: Scottish Executive, July 2005
management advice. For some intermediaries they are not only providers of supported employment but are also providers of DWP programmes, such as New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP).

Service providers in Edinburgh and Lothian are able to offer a full portfolio of services which incorporate all the major DWP / Jobcentre Plus national assistance programmes. Department for Work and Pensions specialist employment programmes for disabled people include Work Preparation, Workstep, New Deal for Disabled People and the Job Introduction Scheme. The eligibility criteria for using these programmes is that the individual needs to be in receipt of Incapacity Benefit or other specific disability benefits e.g. Severe Disablement Allowance, Disability Living Allowance.

The largest programme in terms of volume of participants is New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP). NDDP is offered through a network of Job Broker organisations who provide help and support to find and sustain work. Job Brokers work across the spectrum of disability, but tend to cater for those people who are closer to labour market participation i.e. people who need lower levels of input and support to find work (although as with any programme there is a significant degree of variation in terms of the level of client need). There are five job broker organisations working in the area covered by this study - Remploy Interwork, A4E, Scottish Employment Opportunities, EUS Community Learning Centre (A1 for Jobs) and Intowork - all of whom agreed to participate and provide information.

Workstep is a programme to assist those people with more complex needs to obtain and / or retain work. The purpose of Workstep is to afford those individuals the opportunity to develop their skills in a commercial but supportive environment. As such, Workstep is delivered in a variety of environments, from the traditional purpose built ‘sheltered’ workshop environment e.g. Blindcraft, through to departments within large public organisations, but less frequently (in Edinburgh and Lothian) in private sector organisations. There are five Workstep providers operating in the area covered by this study - four of whom participated and provided information. There is now a growing emphasis on participants progressing on from Workstep into open employment.

Work Preparation is another programme offered to those facing more substantial barriers in making a return to work. Work Preparation enables clients to sample different types of work and gain work experience prior to going onto open employment or perhaps moving

onto a Workstep place. One of the intermediaries participating in this study offers a small Work Preparation service.

During the period this study was undertaken, DWP / Jobcentre Plus piloted two short courses aimed at people with disabilities or long term health issues – ‘Customer Options’ and ‘Preparing for the World of Work’. Customer Options is a two and a half day course providing information on available assistance and job finding. This course feeds into Preparing for the World of Work, although it is not necessary for a person to undertake both courses. Preparing for the World of Work is a two week job focussed activity course. Piloted by DWP/ Job Centre Plus at the same time was Healthy Returns aimed at recipients of Incapacity Benefit or Job seekers Allowance with a disability premium. Healthy Returns enabled clients to meet with a specialist advisor to decide a suitable treatment programme for the particular condition, the treatment is dependent on client needs and some additional funding limitations. All three pilot programmes have now concluded and currently only Customer Options has been provided with further DWP funding.

Alongside DWP funded programme delivery, intermediaries offer services under what is commonly described as the ‘supported employment’ model.12 There are a number of definitions of ‘supported employment’ in circulation. However, it is generally considered to encompass employment in an integrated work setting rather than in a sheltered or specially created environment. The key feature is that personalised support is provided in the workplace. Supported Employment was originally developed in the 1970’s with the aim of helping people with learning disabilities to secure employment. It is now recognised that ‘supported employment’ can be used as an employment development and support mechanism across the spectrum of disadvantage. Its key feature is the delivery of support in the workplace for as long as is required, which adds to the sustainability of the job outcome. The current concept of supported employment emphasises user participation and the need for what are called ‘natural supports’ in the workplace – supports which reduce the need for ongoing external support.

The Supported Employment model is better equipped to promote social and economic inclusion, affording individuals the opportunity to participate in an ‘open’ work environment, as opposed to a traditional ‘sheltered’ environment which may maintain their exclusion from wider society.

For the purpose of this study the definition of Supported Employment adopted by the European Union of Supported Employment\textsuperscript{13} was considered the most suitable. That definition is –

“providing support to people with disabilities or other disadvantaged groups to secure and maintain paid employment in the open labour market.”

Supported Employment as referred to in this paper and throughout the research was taken as meeting this definition.

**Service Users**

There are approximately 22 intermediaries within Edinburgh and Lothian who offer employment focussed assistance and / or vocational training to people with disabilities or health problems. The service may be specific to one group of disabled people or cover disability generally i.e. pan disability. Employability focussed activity may be one part of a bigger service offering supported accommodation and other forms of assistance, or the provider may work with this group as a part of a service to other excluded groups.

Agencies tend to be categorised according to the group they specialise in providing a service for. The intermediaries who are the focus of this study all provide specialist services for people who have disabilities or long term health conditions. These agencies can be sub divided as working with those clients in the following categories -

- learning disabilities
- severe and enduring mental health problems
- pan or general disability
- higher support needs

Inevitably there are service overlaps, particularly with those organisations working across a range of different disabilities. In some instances it is difficult to identify which service is best suited to meeting the needs of a client, as a result of the high incidence of co-occurring disabilities or health problems e.g. a person with a learning

disability may also experience mental health problems. Generally agencies work with clients whose disability is their primary speciality e.g. The Action Group working with people with learning disabilities. A client’s additional issues and disabilities are then often addressed by working in partnership with another agency with a different specialism.

In Lothian there have been a number of agencies specifically set up to meet the demands of people with learning disabilities or people with mental health problems. Those agencies, in the main, are often the local arms of larger national charities e.g. SAMH or Capability Scotland. Many of these organisations are based in Edinburgh but work with clients resident in Mid and East Lothian, although in some cases funding constraints prevent clients using services in a different local authority area. The main organisations working in the learning disability field are The Action Group, Capability Scotland, The Engine Shed (Garvald Community Enterprise Ltd) and Enable Scotland.

There are four organisations operating in Lothian whose main remit is to assist clients with severe and enduring mental health problems back into employment. Those organisations are NHS Lothian Primary Care Organisation, Forth Sector, the National Schizophrenia Fellowship and the Scottish Association for Mental Health (SAMH). City of Edinburgh Council Supported Employment Team also has a dedicated worker assisting people with mental health problems through their Open Employment Scheme.

People with physical disabilities generally access employment services through what are commonly referred to as pan disability services i.e. those services which cover a range of disabilities rather than concentrating on one. Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian is currently served by five New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) Job Brokers. Job Broker agencies offer a service to anyone currently claiming specific inactive benefits e.g. Severe Disablement Allowance, regardless of the nature of their health problem. The five NDDP Job Brokers operating in Lothian are A1 for Jobs, Action for Employment, Remploy Interwork, Intowork and Employment Opportunities Scotland.

A small number of pan disability services are also offered in Mid and East Lothian, mostly through the local authority. Midlothian Training Services and East Lothian Vocational Opportunities Scheme are the main Council based services within this category, although there is little in terms of other general provision within those areas. In Midlothian, people with learning disabilities (specifically those using the Council’s day centre network) can receive a service through STEM, and the Midlothian branch of The Action Group. In Edinburgh there are a number of other agencies offering a service for niche groups such as the Future Plus Project at Waverley Care, an
organisation which assists people who are HIV+ or have a blood borne disease. Moving Intowork is also Edinburgh based and offers a supported employment service to people with an Acquired Brain Injury (ABI) and people on the Autistic Spectrum.

Other Relevant Research

Green Paper – ‘Welfare Reform’

People who are economically inactive because of their disability or limiting health conditions are now ‘the’ major focus of Government welfare benefit reform. The current Government aims to reduce the current number of Incapacity Benefit claimants by 1 million nationwide, over a ten year period.\(^\text{14}\)

To achieve this, the Government has introduced the ‘Pathways to Work’ pilot schemes in a number of areas with the highest levels of IB claimants. Modified versions of the original Pathways to Work pilots will be introduced to other parts of the country during the next couple of years, with a national programme fully in place by 2008.

A number of key factors have created this impetus for reform, in particular the number of people not working because of ill health trebled during the last period of Conservative government. This dramatic increase was primarily due to the collapse of traditional industries, and in some commentators view, also as a result of numerous alterations in the statistical method of recording claimant numbers. Those previously recorded as unemployed were now being recorded as unable to work due to ill health.

The Benefits Trap

People with disabilities or health problems are deterred from seeking employment by a benefit system which traps people into benefit dependency. Many entry level jobs are unable to match the level of their benefit entitlement, more so the longer someone has been on benefit as the level of benefit rises with the length of the claim period.

---

\(^{14}\) Department for Work and Pensions: A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work, January 2006
Perhaps even more of a deterrent has been an inconsistency in the level of assistance and support provided by Jobcentre Plus. When people have found themselves in the position of claiming IB for long periods, there has been little encouragement or compulsion to return to work, although this situation will change as proposed welfare benefit reforms come into effect in 2008.

The Government have found that of the 40% of IB claimants who do not return to work within the first year, 29% are still claiming benefits 8 years later - a direct result, they concluded, of a lack of early and meaningful intervention.\textsuperscript{15}

Current Issues with Employability Assistance and Support

Current Challenges

Intermediary organisations involved in providing employment access provision to those with disabilities are entering a period of considerable uncertainty and change. The greatest challenge facing most organisations is the acquisition and retention of adequate levels of funding. In an environment of ever tightening funding constraints, the impending reduction in European Social Fund monies to, at best, 45% of their current levels is perhaps the most challenging – given the ESF dependence of some smaller specialist employment intermediaries supporting people with disabilities.

Capacity to Provide Employability Assistance

Employability focussed services, as a specific element within a larger organisation, are often staffed by only one or two individuals. This size and staff resource constraint often limits their capacity to provide effective and comprehensive services. Previous research undertaken by the Training and Employment Research Unit at Glasgow University\textsuperscript{16} found that of the employment access services they surveyed, three quarters had fewer than 10 employees. Many

\textsuperscript{15} Department for Work and Pensions: A new Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work, January 2006

\textsuperscript{16} McGregor, A; Glass, A; Higgins, K; Macdougall, L and Sutherland, V Employment Access Services: Training and Employment Research Unit, December 2002
specialist providers operating in the area covered by this study are similarly constrained by a lack of staff resources.

The local situation appears to be one where impairment specific organisations concentrate on obtaining job opportunities for their clients, rather than helping those people keep that employment i.e. assistance is front weighted. This is not a new or local area specific experience, as research carried out on behalf of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation found similar results as far back as 1998.\(^\text{17}\) This study indicated that too many projects concentrated on training and entering work, rather than sustaining employment. In the Rowntree study, many projects were identified as impairment specific and there was clear duplication of effort across those agencies.

**Aftercare**

The Capital City Partnership commissioned TERU Report found that organisational size has implications on capacity, but also influences the ability to deliver other service elements such as aftercare. If staff numbers are limited, specific parts of any given service may well be less well developed in relation to demand. Indeed, aftercare may be one such part of the service, offered on an 'as and when required' basis - primarily because this is all that staffing levels allow, rather than being offered as a staple element of the service.

Other studies\(^\text{18}\) concur with this, having identified that although all intermediaries engage in some 'follow up' activity; this activity is under-funded and poorly coordinated. Restrictions imposed by funding providers may also increase the likelihood of this situation continuing, as outcome driven funding often ceases when the person has secured employment, or at best shortly after. The aftercare required to sustain that job is in many cases funded through the use of the intermediary’s own resources.

For many individuals their disability is not static, it can fluctuate with periods of relatively good health, and periods where a condition becomes extremely disabling. This is particularly the case for those people experiencing mental health problems, but is by no means exclusive to any particular disability. This fluctuation in a person’s condition can often place an extra burden on the intermediary i.e. they

---
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feel obliged to continue supporting a person and their employer long after the funding for this activity i.e. getting the person into a job, has ended. Current arrangements with funders generally fail to account for this longer term support relationship.

Further research has shown that for many disabled people sustaining employment is particularly difficult. Burchardt\textsuperscript{19} found in a review of various surveys that one third of disabled people who manage to find work are economically inactive again by the following year. This may in part be a result of the front weighting of funding to support that move into work, with a corresponding lack of resources available at the end of that process to help the person sustain their employment.

Subsequently, a person may find themselves in a difficult work situation possibly because of changes to the job, the working environment or even colleagues moving post or leaving the organisation. Without appropriate levels of support through this period of change, it can prove too difficult for a person to stay in their employment. In essence, Burchardt indicated from her findings that good aftercare and the subsequent improvement in retention could make a substantial difference to overall rates of employment among disabled people.

**Information Sharing**

Previous research indicates\textsuperscript{20} a lack of coordination between employment access intermediaries; some of whom provided specialist disability services. This lack of coordination manifests itself in duplicated effort, where organisations waste time gathering information which is already there. The initial client assessment is one key area of information gathering where the same process is often repeated and information is not shared or exchanged. Organisational sensibilities, including an over reverence towards data protection requirements, can result in some important information being omitted. It can also be repetitious for the client, who may have to go through a highly similar ‘diagnostic procedure’ with several different organisations.

Reluctance to share client information may also be due to concerns over client confidentiality allied to resource and time constraints. This can preclude the input and update of this information on a shared system. At its most restrictive, a reluctance to share client information


\textsuperscript{20} McGregor, A; Glass, A; Higgins, K; MacDougall, L and Sutherland, V Employment Access Services: Training and Employment Research Unit, December 2002
can also be driven by a need to maintain their competitive edge, as organisations seek to deliver within an outcome driven funding regime.

Differing organisational cultures are also reflected in the range and type of client information collected and kept. Some organisations may not be willing to alter their practices to achieve a consistency with and across other organisations. Again, research has commented on the lack of partnership working between specialist providers and mainstream service providers.21

Lack of Consistent Performance Indicators

TERU noted that data provided by intermediaries can often be lacking in good quality performance indicators,22 there is limited information on various outcomes, making it difficult for funding providers to make informed funding decisions.

Riddell et al (2005)23 examined disability and employment nationwide. They found that of the many programmes aimed at placing those with disabilities in employment, only one fifth of their participants are successfully placed in employment. As they point out, this is not necessarily a problem with existing services but with the measurement of the performance of those services, a numbers process which fails to consider the extent of the barriers faced by people with disabilities.

Riddell et al (2005)24 highlighted the need for the UK government and its agencies to consider how programmes are measured, and the balance of measurements between soft and hard outcomes. Often the balance is in favour of the more easily measurable hard outcomes as indicators of success or failure. Hard outcomes are not only more measurable, they reflect policies rooted in a desire to increase the human capital of a nation and ultimately that nation’s competitiveness in the global marketplace.

21 McQuaid, RW; Anastasiadous, C; Fuertes, V; Greig, M; Lindsay, C and Wise, S (2005) Working Together for Employment and Inclusion in Edinburgh: A Baseline Study: Employment Research Institute, August 2005
22 McGregor, A; Glass, A; Higgins, K; Macdougall, L and Sutherland, V Employment Access Services: Training and Employment Research Unit, December 2002
23 Riddell, S; Banks, P & Tinklin, T Disability and Employment in Scotland: A Review of the Evidence Base, 2005
24 Riddell, S; Banks, P & Tinklin, T Disability and Employment in Scotland: A Review of the Evidence Base, 2005
Funding providers often focus on job outcomes as the only admissible measure of success, yet many disabled people face an inordinate number of barriers which places them at greater distance from the labour market. In this situation, any move closer towards labour market participation should be treated as a success.

Crowther et al (2001)\textsuperscript{25} found supported employment was more effective than pre-vocational training in enabling people with severe mental health difficulties to obtain open employment. Their research suggested a need for greater stakeholder recognition of the vital role played by on the job support in achieving a successful outcome.

Although no evaluation has been undertaken at a local level of the costs and benefits of supported employment, there have been a number of studies carried out within the wider UK. Beyer et al\textsuperscript{26} studied the costs and benefits of supported employment in Wales and found just over 5000 individuals were being assisted by 210 identified agencies. The largest source of funding was the local authority sector, followed by the European Social Fund – a situation similar to the Edinburgh and Lothian area. They found that most supported employment agencies were relatively small, with, on average, 2 Employment Development Officers supporting around 25 clients.

Whilst this study did not find significant benefits from the practice of supported employment in terms of increased revenue from tax and national insurance, there were financial benefits from a reduction in welfare benefits paid and potential savings to other health and day services as people transferred to employment.

**Barriers to Employment**

Someone with a disability faces discrimination not only within a work context; they may also have to overcome personal barriers such as lack of confidence and social skills - a direct result of the isolation caused by disability. When these barriers are combined, the goal of sustainable open employment becomes a longer term goal, not readily achievable within a short time period.

Other factors often interlink and strengthen these barriers to employment including age, socio-demographic characteristics,

\textsuperscript{25} Crowther, R E; Marshall, M; Bond, G R and Huxley, P Helping people with severe mental illness to obtain work: systematic review. British Medical Journal 27 January 2001

qualification levels and type of disability. Burckhardt, in her research on behalf of the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, indicated that disability specific barriers and more general barriers affecting other groups in society, need to be dismantled to support the achievement of full inclusion of this particular group.


This section will look at the current disability and employment service framework and the various service options available to people on the pathway to employment, and subsequently in employment. It will hopefully inform the analysis contained in later sections of this report.

To disabled jobseekers, employers and even disability practitioners, the current service framework can appear as a ‘confusing’ amalgam of services and projects. In essence, the framework is constructed around a range of –

- Mainstream or national programmes supported by DWP and delivered by Jobcentre Plus, in conjunction with a range of contracted public, private and voluntary sector organisations
- Geographically focused or localised services funded by local authorities, local enterprise companies and voluntary sector organisations
- Specific projects (usually time limited) funded by a variety of sources including the European Social Fund (ESF), grant giving trusts etc.

A good analogy for the service framework would be with the average UK High Street i.e. a fairly standard group of national chain stores supported by a variety of smaller localised traders. The support framework equivalent is therefore a range of national programmes e.g. Workstep, Access to Work etc., supported by a myriad range of localised services, many of which are client group specific e.g. Edinburgh’s Engine Shed and the Action Group (Real Jobs) which focus on learning disability.

The consequence of this is that the service framework available to disabled jobseekers can be distinctly different in defined labour market or local authority areas, with the extent of this difference dictated by the level of local authority support available and the strength of voluntary sector representation in the area.
Understanding the Current Service Framework

The service framework can be segmented or categorised into three specific elements (see Figure 1), namely -

- Pre-employment support
- Transition to employment support
- In-employment support

The most straightforward option of all, and one which many people with disabilities take up, is moving into employment without any form of support. However, given that a disabled person is three times more likely to be unemployed than a non-disabled person, taking advantage of the support available is essential for many people, making a move into employment more realistic, achievable and sustainable.

As each individual has his or her own specific needs, there is no official starting or finishing point when it comes to accessing the assistance available. (See Figure 2) Specific elements can be used or bypassed depending on those needs. Some of the options are flexible and can be used in tandem with others. Alternatively, there may be gaps in service or waiting times to take up a service which preclude an individual getting the support and assistance package they need.

For more detailed information on the various pre-employment, transition and in-employment support options, please refer to Appendix 1. This includes a number of diagrams outlining the support available in the City of Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian local authority areas.
Figure 1: Employment Development and Support Assistance for People with Disabilities
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Figure 2: This diagram shows the various entry points and services people may use when seeking employment. It has been adapted and extended from the Joined Up for Jobs Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial Engagement</th>
<th>Support Agency</th>
<th>Support Agency / Employment Academy</th>
<th>Employer / Support Agency / Post Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disabled person engages with Employment Agency</td>
<td>Pre-employment Stage</td>
<td>Supporting the Transition to Employment</td>
<td>Delivery on-the-job support to employee and employer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Assessment</td>
<td>Core Skills Life and Social Skills Personal Effectiveness Work Preparation</td>
<td>Core Skills Work Preparation Work Tasters Training &amp; Work Experience Opportunities</td>
<td>Vocational Training Active Support Extended Training &amp; Work Experience Opportunities Job search Sectoral Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic Life Skills Employment as an Option (?) Benefits Advice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vocational Training In Work Support Longer term relationship with employee/employer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distance ➔ Travelled ➔ JOB

Supported Employment ➔ New Deal for Disabled People ➔ Workstep ➔ Work Preparation ➔ Access to Work ➔ Job Introduction Scheme ➔
Demand versus Capacity

No mapping of service provision for people with disabilities would be complete without examining the capacity to deliver services against actual or potential demand.

The questions are, how large is the disabled population in Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian and how many of those who are considered disabled (under the Disability Discrimination Act and its amendments) are actually able and willing to work? In this analysis, figures are presented on employment rates for both the disabled population and the inactive population. The inactive population includes those individuals who do not want to work or are unable to start work within a given time period.

Whilst it is relatively straightforward to establish the number of people who are disabled or claiming inactive benefits, it is a far more arduous task to extrapolate the ‘can and will work’ from the ‘cannot or will not work’. This section seeks to establish as accurately as possible, the demand for services in Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian, by comparing information from a number of sources. Some caution must still be exercised, as with any extrapolation from a larger data source, it will never be entirely reflective of the actual local situation.

Demand

Counting People with Disabilities

Estimates on the number of people in Scotland with a long term health problem or a disability, as defined by the Disability Discrimination Act, are currently up to one fifth of the Scottish
population. These estimates range from 13.7%, or around 800,000 people, up to 20% or 0.9 million individuals affected by a disability or long term health problems.

A significant disparity exists between the economic activity rates of the disabled and non-disabled population. Findings suggest that the economic activity rates for disabled men and women are much lower than those for non-disabled people. Correspondingly there are significantly higher unemployment rates for disabled people than non-disabled people. There are also a higher proportion of part-time workers in the disabled population than in the non-disabled population, in part reflecting benefit restrictions and the ‘benefit trap’ disabled workers encounter. To compensate for loss of benefits would require salaries reserved for skilled employees, whereas people with disabilities often find themselves consigned to entry level jobs, a level at which they, all too often, remain at throughout their working lives.

In Edinburgh there are almost 304,000 inhabitants of working age. Midlothian has a working age population of nearly 49,000 with East Lothian slightly higher at around 54,000. Approximately 10% of these respective populations have a disability.

The Lothian Labour Force Survey (2003/04) calculated that of Edinburgh’s 304,000 working age residents, just over 31,000 are DDA or work limiting disabled. This figure is slightly higher at around 34,300 if the Annual Population Survey (2004/05) is used. The APS must be used with caution for this particular time period as a number of problems with data collection were encountered. The author of this report would prefer, for statistical accuracy, to utilise the older LFS data.

East and Midlothian have similar disabled populations according to the Labour Force Survey at 5,900 and 6,000 respectively. When this population is further broken down it reveals that approximately 40% (12,600) of the DDA and work limiting disabled population of the city are economically active, with the remaining 18,800 being inactive, either because they are unable to find suitable employment, are currently unable to work because of their disability, or do not want to
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work. In East Lothian only 30.5% of the disabled population are engaged in economic activity, whilst the remaining 69.5% (4,100) are economically inactive. A similar situation exists in Midlothian where only 28.3% of the disabled population are economically active, whilst the remaining 4,300 or 71.7% are inactive. The graph in Figure 3 depicts this situation, showing the total disabled population subdivided into economic activity and inactivity.

**Figure 3:** Total disabled population subdivided into economic activity and inactivity.

It would be inappropriate to assume that all those people who are currently economically inactive or on inactive benefits are actually able and willing to enter the labour market. Indeed, it is very difficult
to gauge how many of the inactive population are actually willing or want to work. However, the figures give a clear indication of the potential demand on employment services, and in particular on those specialist services offering supported employment. The City of Edinburgh has around 22 projects offering employment access provision or training to people with disabilities, some of which are comparatively small organisations with a limited service delivery capacity.

East and Midlothian are far smaller in both geographical and population terms, and this is reflected in their employment access provision. Based in Midlothian, there are only three projects whose specific focus is working with people with disabilities. This provision is supplemented by Midlothian Training Services, the training arm of Midlothian Council, who deliver a number of training programmes which are also available to people with disabilities. In East Lothian, two organisations provide services specifically for this group. Although many of the Edinburgh based intermediaries offer services to clients residing out with the city limits, this involves travel for either the client or provider. Depending on the providers’ caseload, this may not always be feasible or possible. Clients themselves can often be deterred by the travel involved, particularly as travel is often a significant barrier for individual disabled people. Even if only a small proportion of the inactive populations of East and Midlothian were actively seeking or wanting to work, this would put a considerable strain on existing resources. Currently 8,400 people who are DDA and work limiting disabled are inactive in East and Mid Lothian, with only five locally based organisations to cater specifically for their needs.

Welfare Benefits

In January 2006, there were just over 35,000 claimants claiming Incapacity Benefit, Severe Disablement Allowance or Disability Living Allowance within the City of Edinburgh. Of that population, 22,050 were claiming IB or SDA, with the remainder claiming Disability Living Allowance, a benefit which is unaffected by earnings. Unlike Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance, Disability Living Allowance is given to claimants regardless of their occupational status or their eligibility for IB or SDA. An individual can claim DLA whilst in full-time employment at any salary level, equally they can be in receipt of Incapacity benefit short term, long term or transitional or Severe Disablement Allowance without effect on their eligibility for DLA. This benefit depends on both the amount of assistance the
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person requires to perform the activities of daily living and their level of mobility. If we consider those who are also in receipt of IB or SDA, Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian have a total of 30,500 individuals who are recipients of Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance. Many of these people are able to work and want to identify and take up suitable employment opportunities.

The table on the next page details claimant numbers in each local authority area.

**Figure 4: Benefit Type and No. of Claimants in each area (January 2006)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disability Living Allowance</th>
<th>Incapacity Benefit/ Severe Disablement Allowance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Edinburgh</td>
<td>12,955</td>
<td>22,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midlothian</td>
<td>2,945</td>
<td>4,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lothian</td>
<td>2,665</td>
<td>4,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburgh, East and Mid Lothian</td>
<td>18,565</td>
<td>30,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Information Directorate - MIDAS

**Disability Categories**

Any analysis of the disabled population in the area covered by the study would be enhanced by a greater ability to establish how many people were in each disability category, i.e. how many had physical disabilities, learning disabilities or mental health problems. However, this represents a gap in our knowledge, as no data is currently collected which would provide accurate information on these populations. This is partly because of the difficulty in categorising individuals e.g. many people with a learning disability may also experience mental health difficulties or have a physical disability. The Action Group, who work with people with a learning disability, estimate that approximately a fifth of their clients have mental health difficulties, and around a quarter have a physical or sensory disability. There may also be a lack of clarity over which category an illness or particular disability falls into, or that it may fail to fit into

---
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any of the existing three broad categories. Finally there may be some confusion over definitions, which leads to people being wrongly categorised.

A review of services for people with learning disabilities\textsuperscript{36} found 1,339 people of working age residing in Edinburgh, East and Midlothian. Most of these people, 993 in total, were resident in Edinburgh. The resident numbers for East and Midlothian were similar, at 168 and 178 people respectively. However, these figures indicate only those people who are known to a local authority. There may be a significant number of people who the local authority has no knowledge or information about. The statistics presented here are based on a definition of a learning disability as a significant, lifelong condition that started before adulthood, that affected development and means that an individual requires assistance to understand information, learn skills and cope independently. Edinburgh, East and Midlothian collectively have 43,300 individuals who are DDA or work limiting disabled according to LFS (2003) statistics, 1339 of whom have a learning disability.

It is extremely difficult to quantify the numbers of people experiencing mental health difficulties within the area covered by the study. The term mental health difficulties encompasses an array of conditions, issues and problems, some of which interfere minimally in a person’s daily life, through to problems which leave the person unable to function normally for a prolonged period of time. The extent of the impact on a person’s life will undoubtedly depend on the nature and severity of the problem. Most intermediaries offer their services to those clients who are experiencing severe and enduring mental health problems. It is estimated that a third of new Incapacity Benefit claimants in the United Kingdom cite mental health conditions as the primary cause of their incapacitation.\textsuperscript{37} It is reasonable to assume that a very large portion of the disabled population examined here are people experiencing mental health difficulties. Indeed the Government’s Green Paper\textsuperscript{38} on welfare reform stated that the percentage of people claiming IB was as high as 40%. Previous research\textsuperscript{39} estimated the figure to be around 11,300 people, within the city itself. The employment needs of those people are catered for

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36}Statistics Release: Adults with Learning Disabilities Implementation of ‘The Same As You?’: Scottish Executive National Statistics Publication, 2004
\item \textsuperscript{37}Department for Work and Pensions: A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work, January 2006
\item \textsuperscript{38}Department for Work and Pensions: A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work, January 2006
\item \textsuperscript{39}McMurray, S: The Position of Joined Up for Jobs Target Groups (Disability) in the City of Edinburgh: Capital City Partnership, 2005
\end{itemize}
by five organisations, working solely with people with severe and enduring mental health problems.

Within the scope of this research it proved impossible to obtain more accurate statistics on numbers within the three broad disability categories. In particular it was impossible to establish any approximation of the population with physical disabilities, partly reflecting physical disability as a very wide category. The research mentioned previously arrived at a figure of around 18,000 for the city alone. As was noted previously, this figure could be open to significant error and hence be misleading. What can be established is the relative absence of employment access providers specifically catering for this group. Most generalist provision is delivered through the area’s five NDDP Job Broker services, who tend to work with those closest to labour market or job readiness. Job brokering services are also becoming increasingly pressurised by the demand for services from those people experiencing mental health problems.

Research Methods

The research was carried out with several different stakeholders. This methodology is described below.

Disability Employment Intermediaries

Stage one involved identifying appropriate employment access providers for inclusion in the study, and the creation of an opportunity for these providers to influence the type, scope and range of data collected.

Intermediaries were invited to attend a Development Event ‘Measuring the Impact of Employment Intermediaries in the Edinburgh and Lothian’s Labour Market’, the workshop component of which encouraged intermediaries to consider what data would be most useful to gather, what would be relatively easily obtained and what would be more difficult to collect, but be of value to the study. The remit had been to identify topics for data collection which would be the most effective in evidencing the level, scope and quantity of work done, but also highlight areas for improvement. This process enabled intermediaries to have greater ownership of the study and hopefully was instrumental in assisting increased ‘buy in’ to the project. The identified topics were then used to generate questions for the resulting questionnaire, which would facilitate the collection of the most representative data from intermediaries.

In order to identify suitable organisations for inclusion in the study, a number of factors had to be considered.
• The primary purpose of the organisation (or the relevant department) had to be procuring employment for clients or providing training which would subsequently place clients in a stronger labour market position through inputs with an employability or pre-vocational focus.

• The organisations had to provide services primarily for people with disabilities i.e. offering a service to people with a specific disability or to a more generic client base.

• The organisation had to provide either statutory or voluntary services for clients residing in Edinburgh, Mid or East Lothian.

This study also aimed to provide a wide enough range of providers to represent all the possible Department of Work and Pensions programmes available both nationally and locally e.g. Work step, Work Preparation and NDDP Job Brokering.

Initially organisations were identified and approached through their membership of the Lothian Employability Forum, a network of disability and employment service providers working across Edinburgh and the Lothian. Many of these organisations had already demonstrated their active support for this project. Organisations linked to the wider Joined Up for Jobs Partnership Forum were then approached. This wider network of organisations is not disability specific, but many of the intermediaries linked to it still engage with disabled jobseekers e.g. the Edinburgh based area initiatives. In total, twenty organisations were approached; eighteen of whom participated and provided information (See Appendix 5).

Data was gathered over two face to face interview sessions. The focus of the initial interview was to gather background information and introduce the questionnaire. The second interview focussed on gathering performance data to complete the questionnaire. The two interview approach was recognised as the most appropriate course of action – for a number of reasons. Firstly, it ensures the accuracy of information gathered by allowing time for the most up to date figures to be produced and collected. Secondly, completing the questionnaire ‘face to face’ increases the likelihood of a high completion rate. Finally, quantitative and qualitative data can be more easily gathered, with each element playing its part in informing any future actions.

Data was gathered on a range of topic areas:

• Hard Outcomes
• Soft Outcomes
• Funding
Data gathered was used to provide aggregate figures for Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian and to compare the provision across the agencies' primary disability groups.

Academies

One of the aims of the research undertaken was to examine the current uptake of Academy places by disabled clients. Edinburgh’s sectoral employment academies are seen to be both ‘demand led,’ and ‘client centred’, responding to the recruitment needs of their specific economic sector. Employment access intermediaries whose purpose is to seek out suitable employment for their clients are perceived as being less ‘demand led’ and more ‘client centred’. The research aimed to identify ways in which these two different but complementary operational models could work more effectively together, to the benefit of disabled jobseekers.

When this research was conducted, eight Sectoral Employment Academies were operating in Edinburgh -

- Childcare Academy
- Creative Industries Academy
- Hospitality and Tourism Academy (Springboard)
- Social Care Academy (Midlothian Training Services)
- Public Administration Academy (Deal Me In)
- Construction Academy
- Retail Academy
- Healthcare Academy

Information and data was collected from all eight academies, to gain the broadest perspective of the Academy experience in working with harder to reach groups. Interviews were arranged with representatives from each of the Academies. The interview process focussed on several main areas, including -

- The history and structure of the academy;
- The training provided;
- Their experience in working with disabled jobseekers;
Partnership working with employment access intermediaries representing people with disabilities.

Further Education Providers

Further Education Colleges, in their role as pre-vocational providers are a key part of employability provision within Edinburgh and Lothian. The three main Further Education Colleges operating within the area covered by the study were interviewed. The interview focused on courses offered to this particular student group; the number of students and range of disabilities served, funding for this provision and identifying any issues and problems. The Colleges who participated were Edinburgh’s Telford College, Stevenson College and Jewel and Esk Valley College.

Job Centre Plus

Information and data was also collected via a face to face interview with one of the Lothian Business Development Team at Jobcentre Plus. The purpose of this interview was to establish what Department of Work and Pensions employment programmes were available in Lothian, and the numbers of inactive benefits claimants being referred on to these programmes.

Area Based Initiatives

Edinburgh has four area based intermediaries situated in community planning partnership areas. These are areas with higher than average unemployment rates and where the residents face greater barriers to gaining and retaining employment. The key purpose of area based intermediaries is to enable those people distanced from labour market participation to acquire the pre-requisite skills for employment. Anecdotal information was gathered from:

- **EASE** (Employment Access South Edinburgh) catering for people living in South Edinburgh.
- **WEA** (West Edinburgh Action) operating in the West Edinburgh community planning partnership area.
- **Working Links** serving the residents of North Edinburgh and
- **Worktrack** which provides services for those in South Edinburgh and residing in Craigmillar partnership area.
Limitations of Data

Although an extensive data collection process was embarked upon, there were limitations to the data collected. In some cases these limitations have allowed us to make little more than an inference. However, in these instances, the writer has sought to provide an adequate explanation for those gaps in the data. Any conclusions drawn and recommendations made, also take these data limitations into account.

One of the biggest challenges in mapping provision was the diverse range of data sets and procedures. Across Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian there is no shared or universally acknowledged template for data collection. Indeed, for most organisations, adopting or working to such a template would probably require an additional financial commitment. As a result, considerable differences exist in the range and scope of data collected. Some organisations keep extensive records and archives on client outcomes and supporting aspects of their client based work, whilst other organisations prefer, for a variety of reasons, to keep data collection to a minimum. Reasons for this inconsistency include a lack of resources (including staffing), and outdated IT systems. Indeed, for some organisations, a lack of awareness on what data to collect precludes them from collecting anything other than basic information.

The range, scope and type of data collected are also determined primarily by sources of funding, and consequently the aims of the programme or project. An organisation providing NDDP will be required to collect information on registrations, job outcomes and sustained outcomes in order to receive payment. Conversely, a mental health provider in receipt of a Mental Health Specific Grant (MHSG) will have no such recording requirements. In essence, most of the providers studied gather information specifically required for the application, appraisal, monitoring and payments process dictated by their funders.

The data analysis was also limited by the differing operational or accounting periods. Within this research, as far as was possible, we sought to gather information for the operational period 2004 – 2005. However, ‘operational year’ in some cases indicated a tax year; in other organisations a calendar year and for some organisations an ESF year, which varies according to the start and finish date of a project. Many organisations, which have a multiplicity of funding sources, produce set statistical information to meet these different funder timeframes, with resulting overlaps and a degree of confusion regarding data collection.
The vast differences in programmes offered, sources of funding, and client group focus result in comparisons between organisations which are quite dissimilar. Indeed, you are not comparing ‘like’ with ‘like’, and this needs to be considered before drawing any conclusions or making recommendations.

The current local climate often results in a risk of individual clients being counted as an outcome for more than one organisation. This tendency to multiple counting may reflect the lack of a suitable template for data collection for use across organisations. Multiple counting creates a confused picture for providers, funding bodies and other stakeholders as client numbers risk being an exaggeration of what they really are.

Fear is a definite factor in limiting the sharing of data, although not the collection of that data. Organisations within the intermediary sector operate in competitive funding environment, an environment which may be becoming even more strained as impending changes are implemented e.g. the upcoming reduction in ESF funding. Many organisations are aware of policy makers’ and funders’ desire for less complex and more cost effective system. There have been discussions over the benefit of creating greater ‘economies of scale’, where smaller organisations form partnerships or merge to remain relevant and competitive. The danger in all of this is that some of the smaller organisations may cease to operate. In this environment of change, some organisations are reluctant to provide any sensitive information. Organisations faced with reduced funding are increasingly aware of their need to maintain a competitive edge, in order to secure other or further funding. In terms of this study, a small number of providers viewed the process of providing detailed information on outcomes and funding as ‘giving away their competitive edge’.

**Gaps and Opportunities**

‘Preparing to meet the challenges of the new funding and delivery framework.’

This section reports the findings from the mapping exercise. Various outcomes are examined and discussed in relation to previous findings, the local situation and future developments. A fundamental
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aim of the research was to demonstrate the current situation in Edinburgh, Mid and East Lothian, providing the most up to date and accurate picture of disability and employment focussed provision. A further objective of the study was to identify any gaps in provision and examine the current extent of partnership working between disability and employment intermediaries and Edinburgh’s employment sector academies. Previous studies\(^\text{41}\) have found a strong working partnership between area based intermediaries and the sectoral employment academies. Our task was to see if this was replicated with disability and employment intermediaries, and if not, how could working practices be altered to enable more effective partnership working. Finally, all this is couched in terms of significant and impending changes to funding and delivery frameworks e.g. proposed welfare benefit reform etc.

### Capacity of Employment Intermediaries to meet Demand

For the purpose of this study, data was gathered from 18 intermediaries on the number of clients given a service in the operational year 2004 – 2005 i.e. those individuals who received some form of supported employment, employment access provision or pre-vocational training during that period.

A key aim of the research was to calculate the capacity of the sector and compare it with current or potential demand. Another aim was to compare the number of clients assisted against those numbers the organisation was actually funded to assist. The reason for this was to examine a potential gap in the service e.g. where aftercare is provided without financial support and reliance on the agency utilising its own reserves to fund an activity. Although the provision of aftercare may not be the only activity affected by lack of funds, it is certainly an area of work where funding is stretched or inadequate.

Figure 5 below shows the number of clients who received a service, and how many of those clients agencies actually received funding to work with. A service in this context is taken to mean being seen on more than two occasions, i.e. they were not signposted to a more suitable service or given only minimal advice. A service in this

\[^{41}\text{Anastasiadou, C; Lindsay, C and Wise, S Working Together for Employment and Social Inclusion in Edinburgh: The Employment Academies Research, August 2005}\]
instance is defined as receiving a number of appointments, dependent on their individual needs and the organisation’s method of working. The organisations interviewed may, in some instances, have worked with considerably more people than was reported, all of which reduces the amount of time left for those clients they are prescribed to work with.

**Figure 5: Service Users Assisted in Full Operational Year 2004/05**

![Chart showing agency types and numbers of clients assisted]

In the operational year 2004 – 2005, the 18 organisations surveyed assisted a total of 1414 clients, 1291 of which they received funding to work with. The Local Labour Force Survey (2003) calculated the DDA disabled and work limited population of Edinburgh, East and Midlothian to total of 27,200 economically inactive individuals. Of course a substantial proportion of these claimant numbers may be people who are permanently unable to work or not wanting to work. Indeed a further proportion may be people who are able to find appropriate employment without assistance or with just limited assistance. However, it would be fair to suggest that there are still a considerable number of people who are unable to receive an employment focussed service because of limited service capacity.
Figure 5 also demonstrates that across the range of disability and employment intermediaries, providers work with or assist more people than they are actually funded to. Only NDDP job broker services and local authority based provision in the travel to work areas assist the same number of clients as funding dictates or permits – this reflects funding arrangements where funding is attached to clients. All of the intermediaries representing the three main disability service categories, have exceeded their funding capacities to meet existing demand. This is particularly the case for specialist mental health and pan disability providers.

Figure 6 shows the number of disabled clients who received employment assistance from specialist intermediaries and area based initiatives during 2004 to 2005. Area based initiatives were able to assist a further 269 clients all of whom reported a disability. Some of this assistance takes the form of ‘signposting’ a client to a disability specific service, although this is not always the case as some clients may prefer the relative ease of accessing a service within their own locality. Data inclusive of area based initiatives indicated that 1683 disabled clients were assisted during the 2004 – 2005 operational period.
Figure 6: Number of Clients Assisted by Specialist and Area Based Providers (2004/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Types</th>
<th>No. of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Broker</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health</td>
<td>404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pan Disability or specialist service</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel to Work Area</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area based Initiative</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Funding Framework

Of the numerous challenges facing any given employment intermediary, probably the most challenging is that of acquiring sustaining funding. For those voluntary sector based intermediaries in particular, the demand for funding normally outstrips available supply. The gap between funding demand and supply is becoming ever more pointed and the impending reduction in ESF funds, particularly for smaller specialist providers, will be a major factor in determining the future size and scope of the disability and employment service framework.

The amount of ESF money available for the 2007 – 13 Framework has yet to be determined, but current indications are that it will be 45% of current levels at best and potentially – in a worst case scenario – as low as 20% of the current level of support. Many voluntary sector organisations have been heavily or in some cases solely dependent on ESF funding. These organisations now face the prospect of making up substantial and impending shortfalls through alternative routes, planning new ‘income generation’ ventures, or entering into partnerships or even mergers which support joint bidding. All of these options have their own individual merits, but are problematic for most intermediaries. While the number of applications to other sources of funding e.g. the Big Lottery will increase dramatically, there is unlikely to be a corresponding increase in available funds from these sources, the result of which is less funding becoming even more stretched to meet current demand.

The unavoidable consequence of this impending funding ‘crisis’ will be the loss of projects, and perhaps organisations in their entirety. Joint bidding and increased partnership working may be a likely solution to some of the funding issues, but partnerships themselves are no guarantees of a successful funding bid. Many intermediaries operate in a climate of self preservation, “a competitive free for all rather than an employability service,” making the sharing of information necessitated by joint bidding a difficult task. Organisations are not used to or comfortable with giving up this information and to do so may require overcoming some serious changes in attitude and practice.
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Figure 7 details the funding amounts and sources for the operational period 2004 to 2005, for 14 of the 18 projects or organisations. Unfortunately, the writer was unable to determine the amounts of ‘localised’ funding for four of the organisations, mainly because they were larger national organisations who could not or did not wish to disaggregate funding information down to a local level.

Figure 7: Value and Sources of Funding (2004/05)

The total value of the funding identified for this period was £3,038,184 (GBP). The largest source of funding was the local authority sector, which provided over a third of available funding (34%). The second largest source of funding was the European Social Fund (mainly Scottish Objective 3 Programme) funds, which at £739,234 accounted for almost a quarter of the remaining funding (24%). If the ESF funded projects here were only to obtain 20% (a worst case scenario) of what they currently receive, it would mean funding of £147,847, an amount smaller than the current value of some individual ESF funded projects. Some estimations suggest ESF funding may be 45% of its’ current value, equating to approximately £332,355 of funding. Even this higher figure would result in a considerable loss of provision. For existing ESF funded organisations
to maintain their current level of service, there will obviously be a considerable funding gap to fill.

The other large sources of funding used within the area covered by the study were SEEL, the DWP and the Scottish Executive, who funded or part funded a variety of service providers and specific programmes.

Figure 8 indicates the total value of funding sub-divided according to disability, area or specific service provided. From this chart it is evident that, in the period investigated, the largest amounts of funding were awarded to those agencies assisting people with learning disabilities – over the period a total of £859,424. The area of learning disability service provision is characterised by a number of large and well established national charities, supplemented by services delivered by smaller local voluntary sector organisations that have been set up to meet local needs. It should be noted that this funding figure excludes one of the largest national learning disability organisations, who deliver a significant employment access service, but who unfortunately did not participate in this study. If these additional figures had been included in the total collective spend, it could be surmised that the funding received by agencies working with people with learning disabilities would be significantly higher than any of the other disability service groupings.

Figure 8: Total Funding Values by Agency Type (2004-05)
Perhaps surprisingly, those agencies working with people with severe and enduring mental health problems accounted for only £693,000 of funding. Surprising considering, that according to various sources people with mental health problems represent the biggest percentage of those currently on inactive benefits.

NDDP Job Brokers agencies received the lowest amount of funding during the period reviewed at just over £170,000. Some degree of caution must be exercised when interpreting this amount as only three of the five job brokers surveyed provided funding information and data, with the remaining two unable to give this information in any degree of localised scale or detail.

Figures 9, 10 and 11 indicate the amount and sources of funding for each of the agency groupings. Findings indicate that with the exception of specialist or pan disability services, most agency groupings have only 3 or 4 main funding sources, rather than a wider spread. They may of course receive smaller ‘one off’ grants, but these are rarely for direct client work and are not a reliable or consistent source of funds. An obvious problem of having a more limited number of funding streams is the greater impact a reduction in ‘a major one’ will have. Organisations reliant on ESF funding are becoming increasingly aware of this. Conversely, a small number of funding streams are less confusing for funders and other stakeholders.

**Figure 9: Funding Sources and Values for Mental Health Agencies (2004/05)**

- **Scottish Exec. - Direct**: £171,000
- **Local Authority**: £231,600
- **NHS Lothian**: £74,400
- **ESF**: £216,000
- **Other**:
- **Charitable Trusts**:
- **New Futures Fund**:
- **SEEL**:
- **DWP**:
- **Lottery (NOP)**
Mental health intermediary agencies (Figure 9) received over two thirds of their funds from the Local Authority and European Social Fund streams. Around 33% of available funds were provided through local authorities, the benefit of this being the relative stability of this source of funding, which is usually contracted through a ‘rolling’ service level agreement or on an annual grant approval basis. For the operational year 2004 – 2005, 31% of funds came through European Social Fund route.

The learning disability agencies (Figure 10) studied obtained almost sixty percent of their funding via the local authority route (58%), with a further quarter of their funding (28%) through ESF, and the remaining 14% from the Lottery’s New Opportunities Fund and other sources. Employment access services for people with learning disabilities receive significantly more local authority funding in comparison with other sources, than any of the other agency groupings. A consequence of this may be a greater ability to plan and develop services as a result of increased security, but the reality is that other sources of funding are still required to maintain a full and relevant service.

Figure 10: Funding Sources and Values for Learning Disability Agencies (2004/05)
Pan disability and specialist services work with a wider range of funding streams ([Figure 11](#)). However, in keeping with the other agency groupings the largest funding providers remained the local authorities, accounting for 34% of overall funding, augmented by ESF which accounted for a further 27%. The Department for Work and Pensions provided 17% of the funding, primarily through its funding of the Workstep programme. The wider range of funding streams perhaps reflects the ‘spectrum’ of disabilities worked with and the range of providers drawn from across the public, private and voluntary sectors.

**Figure 11:** Funding Sources and Values for Specialist and Pan Disability (2004/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Sources</th>
<th>Funding Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ESF</td>
<td>£213,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHS Lothian</td>
<td>£267,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery (NOP)</td>
<td>£58,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEEL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td>£138,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Futures Fund</td>
<td>£30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Exec. - Direct</td>
<td>£10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Trusts</td>
<td>£71,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The length of funding varies according to programme, group, organisation and funding source ([Figure 12](#)). Some organisations have sufficient funding for only the next year, whilst other organisations e.g. large national charities are able to continue operations indefinitely. Of the 18 projects and organisations studied, data on length of funding was gathered from 17. The data collected demonstrates that slightly over a third of organisations (35%) have funding for a period of between 2 and 5 years, representing the biggest proportion of organisations. A further 29% have funding on
an open ended basis, with learning disability intermediaries disproportionately represented within this group. Almost a quarter of the organisations surveyed had less than 2 years of available funding, with those organisations particularly dependent on ESF funds represented here.

**Figure 12:** Length of Funding Period for all Agencies and Disability Groups (averaged over all projects and streams) (2004/05).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency Type</th>
<th>Less than one year of funding. (0%)</th>
<th>More than one year but less than 2 years. (0%)</th>
<th>More than 2 years but less than 5 years. (0%)</th>
<th>Open Ended – annual approval or other. (0%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Agency</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disability Agency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist or Pan Disability Agency</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the funding detailed here is specifically for the purpose of employment and employability focussed activity. Hence, this excludes other sources of funding which may be attached to business development or capacity building, rather than client services. Although this funding shares the common thread of employment and employability, stipulations vary with each service and provider. Some funding stipulates open employment as the main measurable outcome, whilst others are more flexible, considering any movement in the direction of enhancing employability as a satisfactory outcome.

**Funding – What works and what doesn’t?**

Running concurrently with the collection of funding statistics, opinions were also sought on the pertinent issues surrounding funding. These findings are detailed below.
A lack of long term secure funding has led to reactionary service planning and development, where intermediaries plan projects in response to the changing demands of their funders. Funding itself is more highly responsive to the political situation and Government policy, where any shift or change in policy can and often does result in changes to what ‘funders are looking to fund’. Unless an intermediary is fortunate enough to secure local authority funding, primarily on a ‘rolling’ service contract basis, most funding will be for fixed periods from a year or two years (in the majority) up to 5 years (very much in the minority), but very unusually beyond this. This ‘short termism’ has made it virtually impossible for voluntary organisations to plan in the longer term, or develop their services and projects with any degree of consistency. The uncertainty over funds can result in a lack of continuity, with services being interrupted while funding decisions are made.

Fifteen of the intermediaries questioned indicated that they would prefer more collaboration with funders. One of the main reasons for this was what they considered to be a lack of awareness on the part of funders, particularly around the difficulties encountered in placing disabled people in employment. Many of the intermediaries commented that funders set unrealistic targets, without fully realising the extent of the barriers faced by many clients. Some intermediaries, although supporting the idea of more collaborative working between funders, were sceptical that it would improve the awareness of funders. Instead they felt it may be lead to a ‘cost cutting and rationalization exercise.’ On the other hand, many of the intermediaries considered that having so many funding streams resulted in ‘ridiculous levels of administration and auditing,’ collaboration would reduce this.

Increased collaboration was seen as a way of reaching more mutually acceptable goals for both intermediaries and funding bodies. Through increased collaboration, a better understanding of each other’s respective positions and constraints could be achieved. Some intermediaries were concerned about the funder/service provider relationship in any collaborative activity - would they occupy the position of junior partner or collaborate on level terms?

Although increased collaboration was generally endorsed, no such ringing endorsement was forthcoming for a reduction in the number of funding bodies. Generally intermediaries were divided on the issue. Seven of the intermediaries interviewed considered that a reduction of funding providers would be beneficial. Six however were opposed to reducing the number of funders. They felt this would result in a reduction of funding opportunities, the implication being that fewer providers would equate to less money being available, rather than a more cohesive or less complex funding environment. Intermediaries also indicated that some of the more specialist client groups may lose
a service in a ‘fewer funders’ environment. The remaining agencies thought that any reduction in providers would have no implication in practice, and were neither for nor against it. A more limited number of funding streams could potentially result in a situation where funding was given to generic services or those representing the needs of a large well known client group. Organisations catering for a small specific client group could find themselves in a situation where they might fail to meet the criteria of any of the limited funding opportunities available. Conversely, should more funding bodies exist then the greater the likelihood of being able to fit the funding criteria of at least one.

Of those organisations who did wish to see a reduction, this was primarily because of the bureaucracy associated with it. Intermediaries were very conscious of the considerable amounts of time tied up in making funding applications, administration and auditing – some of which time could be better utilised in direct client work.

Many of the intermediaries expressed the opinion that any reduction in funding bodies would diminish the creativity of the sector. The voluntary sector has been able to provide some innovative programmes where statutory provision has remained more static. Intermediaries felt this innovation was only achieved and maintained through having recourse to funds from a wide variety of sources. If all the funding was held by a restricted number of funders, then consequently this innovation and creativity would be stifled.

Another concern expressed by intermediaries was that the independence of the voluntary sector could be reduced by any decrease in the number of funding bodies. Fewer funders on the ground might mean having to ‘jump through even more hoops to secure funding.’

Finally, intermediaries considered that reducing the number of funders would not reduce the complexity or make it easier to apply for funding. Indeed they felt it would make it more difficult to obtain funding, with a likelihood of ‘making programmes that fit the funding’ rather than finding funding to fit the programme.

The vast majority of intermediaries considered collaboration and reduction of funding bodies to be secondary to the sustainability of funding. Most considered that their projects would be more effective if funding was awarded over longer periods of time, providing them with additional security and stability to plan and deliver more effectively.
Outcomes

Where do clients go?

The success employment access providers is often measured in terms of their ability to place people into employment, preferably open employment. Further success is measured by the length of time that employment is retained - with the aim of people being able to function effectively in the open labour market and sustain or develop their employment. Enhancing a person's employability would ultimately lead to this. Funding bodies and providers are keen to collect data on employment outcomes, the former can establish whether they are getting value for their money, and the latter can evaluate where they are in relation to where they would like to be.

Most organisations collect information on outcomes. These desirable outcomes can include –

- Open employment where the client or provider does not need or provide support.
- Open employment where the client continues to be supported.
- Full time, part time, permitted work or supported permitted work.
- Voluntary work as a taster for future employment.
- Work placement through Workstep or Work Preparation.
- Further or Higher Education.

Which outcomes are emphasised is dependant upon who is funding and the criteria for their funding e.g. the DWP funding for NDDP Job Broker agencies is all about achieving and sustaining paid employment outcomes.

The 18 intermediaries studied as part of this research were able to provide details on their outcomes for the operational period 2004 – 2005. However one agency was only able to provide a sample of their outcomes, therefore the information is technically incomplete.

In the time period studied, a total of 1040 outcomes were achieved (see Figure 13). Of this figure, 281 (27%) went into open employment with and without support, 152 (15%) of these clients were unsupported in their employment, the remaining 12% were given support through a range of agencies operating to the "supported
employment’ model. The largest group, 288 clients (28%), went into permitted work. Often this is the only option open to disabled people, as they find it difficult to find jobs above entry level, which would give them salaries to recompense the loss of benefits. In addition, if a person with a disability engages in permitted work arrangement, they can retain entitlement to free prescriptions and other benefits. The potential loss of these entitlements often precludes people with disabilities from considering employment as a realistic option.

The second largest number of clients participated in work placements, with 188 (18%) identified through the time period surveyed. Work placements are a way of gaining work experience which is particularly useful to those clients significantly distanced from labour market entry. Work placements can however have a down side, as the ‘trainee’ is often a supernumerary member of staff and in some instances may gain little in the way of useful experience.

The intermediaries studied noted some of the problems with longer term work placement arrangements like those supported through the Workstep programme. There was a recognised difficulty in moving clients on from Workstep participation to open employment. Clients and their employers have in some cases developed a dependency on Workstep i.e. there are financial incentives and support provided to employers which they are often reluctant to give up. A disabled person’s lack of confidence and other barriers may make it very difficult for them to make the move to open employment. Many of the Workstep providers interviewed commented on this barrier to progression.

Often people who are distanced from the labour market may require some initial period of work experience to prepare them for paid employment. This may be a result of their disability and the consequent lack of an employment track record. Having had a limited exposure to work or even no work experience at all, they are unaccustomed to the requirements of employers and the regime of the workplace. Many intermediaries encourage the use of voluntary work to prepare clients and as a means to further enhance their employability. Findings from this study show that 11% of clients went into a voluntary work placement as a step towards employment.
**Figure 13**  Client Outcomes for the Full Operational Period (2004/05)

The categories of outcome and the numbers of each vary widely, depending on the type of programme and its particular constraints. **Figures 14, 15, 16 and 17** detail outcomes by speciality.

**Job Broker Services**

NDDP Job Brokers agencies work exclusively towards placing people on inactive benefits into employment, and this is reflected in their collective outcomes. **Figure 14** indicates that the majority of NDDP clients went into open employment or permitted work, 114 and 189 people respectively. A smaller number of clients obtained open employment with support, reflecting the funding constraints placed on Job Brokers in terms of delivering ongoing in workplace support. This smaller number of clients (37), who received additional support, received this through alternative funding streams - as NDDP makes no funding provision for longer term in workplace support.
NDDP Job Broker services achieved considerably more open employment outcomes than any of the specialist intermediaries, partly due to their client base being closer to job readiness. Clients who tend to be referred to job brokers are often more ‘job ready’. They tend to have already overcome some of the obstacles to employment, and have reached a level of confidence and employability which allows them to consider employment as a more achievable and attractive option. There has always been an inference – mainly on the part of other intermediaries – that some NDDP Job Brokers indulge in a process commonly referred to as ‘cherry picking’ i.e. selecting out and working with the most ‘job ready’ clients. This ‘practice’ may result in enhanced employment outcomes and consequently higher levels of income and retained future contract values for an organisation. The system of funding for NDDP Job Broker agencies creates a correlative relationship where any increase in outcomes will result in a corresponding increase in funds – assuming the contract with DWP allows it. Whilst this correlation between outcomes and income is maintained, it will be difficult for Job Broker agencies to fully refute the claim that they concentrate their efforts on those people who are easier to place into work – leaving working with more difficult to place clients to other service providers within the service framework.
Mental Health Services

People with severe and enduring mental health problems are disadvantaged in terms of labour market participation in the personal barriers they face and the strong reluctance on the part of many employers to employ someone with a mental health problem. Most people with a disability face challenges in attempting to access the labour market, however a great deal of mystery remains around mental health issues, mystery which can lead to employers having pre and often ill conceived notions of mental illness and it’s behavioural impacts.

This research found the highest number of clients (see Figure 15) were involved in work placement activity, 121 (38%) of clients taking up work placements including involvement on the Workstep programme. This unsurprising statistic reflects the numerous barriers faced by people with severe and enduring mental health problems. Workstep provides reassuring support and a financial incentive for employers, who otherwise would be reluctant to consider employing someone with mental health difficulties. A subsequent problem is in persuading both the client and the employer that the client is ready to ‘move on’ to open employment or standard job arrangement. The employer understandably fears what will happen when the support is removed, and the client is unsure about his or her ability to sustain employment without support.

Findings show few open employment outcomes, both supported and unsupported, with 35 (11%) of the outcomes in this category. Clients assisted by specialist mental health agencies are often those who require very intensive support, and considerable assistance in terms of personal development and enhancing career management skills, prior to any work being undertaken. To prepare clients with severe mental health difficulties for employment requires considerable time and a staged approach. They have often been economically inactive for lengthy periods and subsequently lack the confidence and skills to obtain open employment. Initially, they require voluntary work or work placements to assist with making a positive adjustment to the world of work.
Figure 15: Outcomes for Clients seen by Mental Health Agencies (2004/05)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>No. of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Employment (without support)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Employment (with support)</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Employment</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Placement</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE/HE or Training Course</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Work or continued to claim benefit</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Learning Disability Services

Figure 16 shows the outcomes for agencies specialising in working with clients with learning disabilities. The majority of clients obtained open employment with support, 17 (30%), with the second largest number going into further education or training courses, 16 (28%). Very few clients obtained permitted work, 2 (4%). This may reflect the benefits system, which can act as a powerful disincentive to obtaining employment. Taking up a Permitted Work arrangement can result in a loss of other benefits, which cannot be compensated for by the salary levels prevalent in entry level jobs. Given reduced cognitive capabilities, the scope and type of work is more limited for people with learning disabilities. The type of work available is often low paid, failing to meet the monetary value of the benefits received or potentially lost in the move to paid employment.

It is difficult to conclude anything of further significance from the data presented here as we were unable to obtain data from a large learning disability organisation, which may have changed the pattern.
of results. Significantly, one of the agencies included in the analysis was also unable to provide complete data.

**Figure 16: Outcomes for Clients seen by Learning Disabilities Agencies (2004/05)**

Specialist and Pan Disability Services

**Figure 17** shows the outcomes for specialist and pan disability services. There were a total of 166 outcomes during the operational year 2004-05. The chart shows the largest number of clients during 2004-05 went into supported open employment, 47 (28%), with another 11 (7%) moving into open employment without support.

Almost equal numbers of outcomes were achieved through voluntary work, work placements or permitted work, with 15%, 14% and 17% outcome levels respectively.
**East and Midlothian based providers**

East and Midlothian based providers had a total of 42 outcomes for the operational period 2004 – 2005. Of these outcomes, 36% went into open employment without support, and 31% into permitted work. No clients obtained supported open employment or engaged in voluntary work.
**Figure 18: Outcomes for Clients seen by East or Midlothian Based Agencies (2004/05)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Types</th>
<th>No. of People</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Employment (without support)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Employment (with support)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Employment</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Placement (exclusive of Workstep)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE/HE or Training Course</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Work or continued to claim benefit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Length of time required to reach an outcome**

The length of time taken to achieve an outcome is dependent primarily on a client’s starting point and will vary depending on the individual client. However, this study has attempted to average the length of time taken to secure an outcome across different disabilities. **Figure 19** shows how long it takes to achieve a recognisable outcome. In this case, an outcome is not necessarily paid employment, but is any move in the direction of achieving greater employability.

The study indicated that on average, it takes 15.98 months for clients to achieve an outcome. NDDP Job Brokering services, in comparison to other intermediaries working with harder to place clients, took considerably less time due to the enhanced job readiness of many of their clients. In the travel to work areas of East and Midlothian, it took almost two years for an outcome. Services in East Lothian have a strong Workstep programme focus, which could account for this longer lead time. Learning disability services took slightly longer to
reach an outcome than those intermediaries working with other disability groupings. This in turn may reflect the numerous barriers faced by this client group, and the limitations of both the benefits system and jobs market meeting their needs. From the findings of this study it appears that on average, any progression towards enhanced employability and job readiness, takes more than a year to achieve.

Figure 19: Length of Time for an Outcome (2004/05)

Where do referrals come from?

Referrals to intermediaries can come from a variety of sources - from social work, health providers, jobcentre, other intermediaries and clients themselves. However, access to employment support provision is not particularly clear and currently there is no single entry
gateway for disabled jobseekers. It can be confusing both for clients and for referral agencies. Some referral agencies are well informed of the existence and remit of employment intermediaries. However there remain a significant proportion of referral agencies lacking sufficient information or knowledge on which to make appropriate referrals. This study attempted to establish the source of referrals and where any existing gaps are in terms of referral agencies.

Figure 20: Source of Referral (2004/05)

The majority of referrals in 2004 – 2005 (Figure 20) came through Jobcentre Plus. A disproportionate number were referred on to job broker agencies with 82% of Jobcentre Plus referrals 'moved on' to the five job brokers serving the Edinburgh and Lothian area. Whilst Jobcentre Plus and more importantly, DEA’s and IBPA’s, are aware of intermediaries with an NDDP Job Broker contract, there may well be a gap in their knowledge of other available services for this particular client group. The consequence of this would be a suitable referral for clients with less complex needs, but a failure to cater effectively to the needs of those clients facing more challenging barriers and issues as a result of their disability. Only 18% of Jobcentre Plus referrals were to other intermediaries. This situation could be partially rectified by intermediaries raising their profile with
Jobcentre Plus, creating more opportunities for networking and collaboration.

The second largest sources of referrals were health providers, although intermediaries noted that this is rarely from General Practitioners or other specialist elements within the Healthcare sector. More often referrals from health providers are from Occupational Therapists, Community Psychiatric Nurses and (less often) Health Visitors. Some specialist intermediaries did receive referrals from other health professionals, but this primarily was due to their delivery of other support services e.g. supported accommodation and not due to their employment capability. Referrals from health providers were found in most instances to be to agencies assisting those with severe and enduring mental health problems, with 81% of referrals to agencies dealing specifically with those clients. Again, this demonstrates a gap in health provider awareness of other client groups who would benefit from the support and assistance offered by these agencies.

Possibly one of the most concerning findings is that more people self refer to services than are referred through a Social Work route. Only 8% of referrals in this period were from social work, indicating a limited awareness and lack of understanding of the role of specialist intermediaries or little appreciation of the worth of this work and perhaps this sector. The largest numbers of social work referrals are to agencies working with people with learning disabilities. These specialist agencies and Social Work have a long history of working with each other, a history which other intermediaries working with other disability client groups do not enjoy.

Intermediaries were found to be good at making referrals to other intermediaries, depending on the appropriateness of the service and the client’s needs. One fifth of referrals came from other intermediaries. Many of the intermediaries commented on their desire to signpost or refer clients to the services which best met their needs. In many cases there were examples of partnership working between intermediaries on a client by client basis.

**Training – How do we develop the sector?**

A particularly contentious issue amongst supported employment providers is the question of training. Whilst recognising that supported employment has developed considerably since its conception in the 1970’s, there remain some fundamental difficulties with its supporting infrastructure. There is still debate amongst
agencies on what supported employment is, and interpretations of the model vary from organisation to organisation. This causes inconsistency in what skills are valued and what training is required. Also, there is currently no recognised framework of quality standards for the delivery of supported employment – although The European Union of Supported Employment (EUSE) has produced a framework which could be easily adapted or amended to meet a Scottish national context.

While other professions have benefited from having a recognized qualification affording them professional status, this has not been the case for supported employment. Staff involved in delivering supported employment are disadvantaged by inconsistent levels of training. They also lack the professional status to operate on a level playing field with other professions, including healthcare and social work.

The lack of professional status and career structure leads those in the ‘profession’ to view it as a ‘job’, rather than a career. People often find themselves working in the role of employment development officer as it was the ‘generic role’ on offer at the time, rather than something they aspired to as part of a longer term professional career development path. In some cases it may even be a stop gap, until they can find a post suited to their particular qualifications. The knock on effect of this (in conjunction with short term funding and contracts) is higher staff turnover, as people leave to pursue more ideal job opportunities. Another impact is on the organisations themselves, who have no formal starting point when considering employee competencies.

When considering a potential employee’s aptitude for the post, it often depends on the history of the organisation where the emphasis will lie. Those organisations more closely linked to social work and healthcare may value disability knowledge, whilst others may value the skills associated with the recruitment sector. Finding candidates who combine both in their work history would be the ideal, but in practice is unusual.

This study sought to examine training and staffing amongst these key disability intermediaries by seeking responses to questions on minimum qualifications, provision of accredited and in house training, and how a recognised qualification is perceived by intermediaries.

Of the 18 projects and organisations interviewed 13 indicated that they had no minimum qualification for Employment Development Officers (EDO), the remaining 5 stipulated a relevant first degree as a minimum qualification, although recognising that currently no degree programme is an ideal fit for supported employment. Relevant degrees were those fitting broadly within a social science or health
background, placing the emphasis on disability rather than employment. Of those providers who did not stipulate a minimum qualification level many of them stressed an emphasis on the right values and beliefs, the assessment of which is fairly subjective.

Two of the staff across the 18 projects had obtained the Diploma in Supported Employment and a further 2 were studying towards this. When questioned on the reason for these comparatively low numbers, intermediaries cited the prohibitively high costs of the diploma for the voluntary sector, many of whom do not receive funding which supports staff training and development.

The volume and range of training depends on the organisation, with some having fairly comprehensive training packages. Most of the training is in the form of short courses which although developing skills and knowledge, do not offer nationally accredited qualifications. With the exception of those providers who are part of the respective councils, providers generally had less than 50% of their training nationally accredited. Eight of the organisations had no accredited training, most of their training being in-house or non-accredited. A further two organisations were not suitable to be assessed in this category.

An overwhelming majority of intermediaries considered that the supported employment sector needed a recognized professional qualification, with 16 (89%) of respondents wanting to introduce this qualification. A number of reasons were enounced. It was thought that a professional qualification could raise standards and provide practitioners with the pre-requisite knowledge and skills to undertake the post. A professional qualification would increase the credibility of the sector and perhaps make it easier to engage with both employers and some of the referral agencies who may see added value in the work done.

A professional qualification, it was suggested by some intermediaries, might provide some desperately needed uniformity and even conformity between staff performing the same job. Intermediaries noted that there are current disparities between the levels of staff doing the same job, with some performing at much higher levels than their peers.

Some concerns about a professional qualification were that it may inadvertently exclude those who, because of prior ‘on the job’ learning, would have exceeded the standards set. It was felt that any qualification should recognise prior learning, perhaps ‘fast tracking’ those with considerable and relevant past experience. There were some small concerns that very good employment development officers, who were less academic, may feel excluded by this attempt to raise professional standards.
Intermediaries were asked if ‘the level of training currently on offer generally meets the training needs of the staff?’, with 56% of intermediaries considering that it failed to meet their training needs. Reasons given for this were that available training is piecemeal, with some areas being well covered and other areas neglected completely. A key area currently not well catered for was training in supporting people with mental health issues and meeting their support needs in relation to employment.

Some organisations considered current training to be geared towards support work rather than employment. Intermediaries have found a lack of training relevant to their needs, commenting that even when suitable training was identified, they lack the financial resources and time needed to participate. There was a general feeling that funding needed to be provided specifically for training, as an investment in the longer term development of staff and services.

### Outcomes – soft outcomes

Organisations use soft outcomes to measure distance travelled. Soft outcomes refer to those less measurable outcomes which aid progression towards a goal. An increase in confidence, motivation, self awareness and self control would all be considered as soft outcomes, and as these factors increase the client will become more able and ultimately more employable. Intermediaries use soft outcome measures for different purposes –

- They are useful for planning a client’s progress towards employment.
- They allow clients to assess how far they have actually come, even when less tangible goals remain out of reach.
- They can better demonstrate to stakeholders the value of the work being undertaken.

Most of the intermediaries 12 (67%) use a range of soft outcome measures, although 10 (56%) considered these measures to be ineffective or minimally effective as a tool to communicate to funding bodies and stakeholders. The intermediaries thought they were effective as a planning and evaluation tool with clients, but this was subject to considerable variation depending on the client group. The most commonly used measures were case studies and the Rickter Scale, a tool created for this purpose.
Employers – Who do Intermediaries work with?

Finding suitable employers is a key part of the process, whether it is for a work placement, voluntary work experience or paid employment. The needs, capabilities and wants of the client need to be considered alongside those of the employer. Intermediaries are also keen to engage with sympathetic and flexible employers, who realise the challenges and rewards faced in employing someone with a disability.

Intermediaries utilise a very wide variety of methods to find employers, some methods are used infrequently and others more consistently. Currently, intermediaries are not enthusiastic about sharing employer details. This approach has been tried in the past with varying success through initiatives like Service Link, an online gateway to a central database of labour market information. This enables intermediaries to identify quickly and easily where current vacancies exist, without spending considerable time on the search part of the process. The sharing of employer information would reduce the amount of time spent on this activity allowing intermediaries more time for direct client work. However, there are a number of perceived disincentives to information sharing.

Intermediaries remain resistant to sharing contact details, for a number of valid reasons –

- They fear it will jeopardize the relationship they have with an employer.
- If other agencies are using the same employers, there may be no opportunities left for their clients and employers may become inundated with requests.
- There is recognition of the tendency ‘to want to keep a good employer’.

All these reasons are understandable when you consider the investment of time and resources which go into creating a good employer intermediary relationship.

**Figure 21** indicates the variety of methods used to find suitable employers, and the most commonly used methods. Most employers (19%) are found through events or informal networking. Most intermediaries found that this was an ideal opportunity to informally chat about each others roles. Although intermediaries did not attend these events with notions of particular jobs for specific clients, they often leave with many suitable contacts. Employers attending these
events are invariably those most favourably disposed towards employing someone with additional support needs.

The second most commonly used method (17%) was cold calling using directories. Although this is a time consuming method, many intermediaries felt it produced reasonable results and allowed them to move towards finding an ideal client employer fit. Other methods which respond more directly to existing vacancies lack the flexibility to fully consider the client’s own aspirations and preferences.

Another commonly used method (15%) is word of mouth or existing contacts. Quite often intermediaries will place more than one client with the same employer, particularly if they are a larger employer. It is this use of existing contacts which deters intermediaries from sharing employer information.

Most of the participating intermediaries, 12 of the 18 participants, have an internal system of keeping and updating employer’s contacts and details. On average intermediaries surveyed are in regular contact with around 28 employers, although this figure varies widely.
Networking and Partnerships

How are partnerships formed?

This study hoped to assess the current level of partnership working amongst intermediaries and to examine how those partnerships were formed and what protocols governed these partnerships. Findings show that the majority of the intermediaries interviewed, 16 organisations, work in partnerships with other organisations. Most of these partnerships are informal, with 7 (47%) partnerships based more on networking than formalised partnerships governed by shared protocols.
Intermediaries tended to form partnerships in response to client needs, rather than identifying an area where organisations could work effectively together. Partnerships are often ‘ad hoc’ on a client by client basis, with intermediaries realising the potential for joint working to assist individual clients. Partnerships of this nature might involve support being provided by a specialist disability intermediary, for clients who are also being assisted by non disability agencies.

Seventy two percent of the intermediaries interviewed considered networking to be essential to their organisation. Networking enables intermediaries to be knowledgeable on the current service framework, and any impending changes or developments. It also allows intermediaries greater opportunities for sharing best practice.

Partnership working may become increasingly important in a tighter funding environment where more restricted funding may require organisations to make joint bids. Organisations may need to combine their respective strengths to make more feasible bids for funds, making the development of formal delivery protocols more essential.

**Employment Academies**

**How can the Employment Academies and Intermediaries work together?**

Sectoral Employment Academies operate in Edinburgh and represent different employment sectors within the city. These Academies are generally considered to be demand led in that they respond to employers needs to fill vacancies, whilst also responding to individual client needs. However, funding constraints and entry restrictions have created a somewhat rigid person specification. This combination has made it difficult for disability intermediaries and Academies to work together as effectively as they possibly could.

One of the key aims of this research was to identify the current uptake of Academy places by disabled jobseekers. We also wanted to identify if Academy courses could be more inclusive for those with disabilities, and how this might be achieved.

There were a number of key findings. Firstly the number of disabled participants on Academy courses remains relatively low, with some academies having had no disabled participants during their operational lifespan to date. This situation is unlikely to improve with changes in funding creating further eligibility restrictions.
The Academies interviewed, although keen to include people with disabilities on their courses, did cite a number of reasons which would preclude some disabled individuals from taking up work in their respective sectors. The most common reasons given were health and safety oriented. Some Academies felt the physical environment or demands of their sector were beyond the capabilities of certain disabilities, even with reasonable adjustments in place. This was more apparent in those sectors where individuals are required to work with complex equipment, or be responsible for vulnerable others.

All of the Academies interviewed felt they lacked sufficient information on specific disabilities, and recognised that they were not acquainted with the range and scope of capabilities of those considered disabled under the terms of the DDA. All the Academies acknowledged the need for awareness raising events, with many commenting on the fact that ‘disability’ often focuses on mobility problems and they needed to become more aware of a wider range of disabilities and capabilities amongst, what is a non-homogenous group.

Generally Academies reported very little contact with specialist disability intermediaries. Much of their contact was with NDDP Job Brokers, seeking to set up training places for individual clients. This is often the case as job brokered clients are considerably closer to being ‘job ready’, and Academy training courses require ‘job ready’ clients to fill current vacancies. There were however other examples of disability intermediaries approaching academies, speculatively seeking information. These requests, however, tended to come from a minority of intermediaries. Generally there was little awareness of the wider range of disability employment intermediaries operating in the city, and who did what, where and for whom.

Academies commented on what they often considered to be ‘unsuitable’ referrals from intermediaries. They felt that intermediaries often referred clients who were still considerably distanced from the labour market, and as an Academy representative noted “we are training clients for vacancies which exist now, not in nine months time.” (Academy Representative) Academies also noted that clients were often referred with little more than a scant interest in the particular sector. These referrals failed to obtain places, not as a result of a disability, but because they lacked the necessary desire to work in a particular sector.

Intermediaries noted that quite often information about Academy courses was received too late for them to refer appropriate and interested clients. Some suitable clients were unable to participate in a course simply because they had missed the deadline. Intermediaries considered a solution to this would be to have a rolling intake, although how practicable this would be remains to be seen.
Academies considered that the current Academy course structure would be unable to integrate more fully with the supported employment model. Current outcome targets and current staffing levels make it impossible to provide the necessary levels of support, with assistance required from other sources. For the Academies to work with higher support need trainees, whilst continuing to market their courses and liaise with employers, would require additional external assistance. Unless funding changes are made, this additional assistance is unlikely to be forthcoming. Although disability intermediaries are well placed to provide the support and Academies have good employer contacts, more effective partnership working between the two would require a funding structure which was more flexible and not so outwardly ‘outcome driven’.

Further Education Providers

What pre-vocational opportunities do they offer people with disabilities?

Three Further education institutions serve the geographical area of Edinburgh, East and Midlothian - Stevenson College, Jewel and Esk Valley College and Edinburgh’s Telford College. All of these colleges have provision for people with disabilities, both within mainstream and specialised provision. The type of provision currently available includes bridging courses aimed at people with learning disabilities, and SQA courses for individuals with a range of disabilities who are looking to progress towards mainstream training or employment.

It proved impossible to establish how many people with disabilities attended pre-vocational courses at these institutions during the academic year 2004 – 2005, as many people with disabilities were recipients of mainstream provision. However, both Stevenson College and Jewel and Esk Valley College run courses for specific disabled client groups, with, on average, around 500 places available annually on a range of courses.

One of the difficulties commented on by Further Education providers was the ‘revolving door or training cycle syndrome’, whereby trainees undertake the same course on multiple occasions without making any progress towards an employment or training goal. This was felt to be exacerbated by the high staff turnover within supported employment. New staff are unaware of the training a person has previously undertaken and so refer them for courses the person has already completed. This is also undoubtedly a result of poor information sharing – in terms of client assessment and previous academic, training and employment history.
Although all the institutions tracked students upon leaving the course as part of an exit interview, 6 week follow up and 6 month follow up process all conceded that it was difficult to ascertain where someone was and what they were doing, even when a variety of tracking methods were employed. The tracking of former students was considered to be patchy and difficult to coordinate, particularly given the large numbers they were working with.
Conclusions – Gaps and Opportunities

Based on the study findings we were able to conclude on a number of gaps and opportunities within the current service and funding environment.

**Outcome Data Inconsistencies**

There is no common set of performance indicators collected or collated by intermediaries. The information chosen to record depends on the demands of the funding body and the individual organisations own method of working. Lack of consistent data makes it difficult for organisations to make strong funding cases. Although funding may be for similar activities, the data set required by different individual funders can vary widely.

**Lack of Collaboration between Agencies and Funders**

Currently there appears to be little collaboration between intermediaries and their funders. The result is a lack of awareness and flexibility on the part of funders. Increased awareness might lead to the removal of unnecessary programme entry barriers and geographical constraints.

**Outcome Driven Funding**

Much of current funding is outcome driven, with less emphasis on sustaining outcomes beyond a 6 month period or in some cases beyond 13 weeks. Increased emphasis on sustained outcomes would demonstrate more effectively the benefits of the Supported Employment model, which although initially costly, produces better sustained outcomes.
A Lack of Funding for Aftercare

There is often little or no funding for ‘aftercare,’ the result of which is intermediaries have to support an individual out of any reserves they may have. This places a financial strain on the service and may also use valuable staff time needed for clients currently receiving a service or on a waiting list. Indeed, it is difficult too for intermediaries to make a definite impact on a waiting list when they are using staff time to provide services for ‘unfunded’ clients. Employers may feel they are not getting the service they expected or were promised, as a lack of funding may result in a very basic ‘aftercare’ service. It represents a one sided investment on the part of funders, and a failure on their part to realise that further investment needs to be made if a job is to last more than a short time.

Inconsistencies in recording Sustained Outcomes

Intermediaries are inconsistent in recording sustained outcomes with many of them failing completely to do this. A stronger funding case for the cost benefit of ‘supported employment’ could be made with better evidence of sustainability.

Lack of Professional Status for Intermediary Staff

Although there are professional qualifications within the sphere of supported employment, these are not universally recognised or accepted. An impact of this is that there is no recognised career path and professional status for employment development officers. In addition, funding restrictions result in short or fixed term contracts and higher levels of staff turnover. Lack of professional status makes it difficult for employment development officers to operate as equals or gain professional recognition with partners from Health Services or Social Work.

Low Profile of Supported Employment

There is a need to raise the profile of ‘supported employment’ amongst referring agencies and health practitioners.

Few Formal Partnerships

Partnership working is usually undertaken on an informal and individual case basis, and is not often based on formal agreements, practices and procedures.
No Clear Gateway to Services for Clients

There is no single entry gateway to ‘supported employment’ or other support, which makes it very confusing for clients, employers, intermediaries and other key stakeholders. Disability Employment Advisors and Personal Advisors at Jobcentre Plus, theoretically are the gateway, but their requirement to work towards personal targets may hinder this.

Little if any focus on Retention Issues

The current focus of ‘supported employment’ is on getting people back into work, with little emphasis on retention work. National statistics suggest that the longer someone is out of work the less likely they are to return to employment. Therefore it might be of more benefit to clients and employers to help more people to remain in their existing work.

Linkages with Academies

The rationale of employer linked Sectoral Academies and the ‘supported employment’ model does not currently work very effectively together. Academies are invariably training people for immediate vacancies, whereas intermediaries’ clients are often quite distanced from the labour market. The Sectoral Academies have encountered a number of funding changes affecting both the course duration and programme entry specification, changes which have made it increasingly difficult for the ‘supported employment’ model to be incorporated.

The current up take of training places on Academy courses by people with disabilities is very low; reflecting more rigid eligibility criteria including which benefits the individual is a recipient of. It also indicates a lack of awareness on the part of Academies of various disabilities and the organisations which exist to assist them.

Service Demand v Capacity

Currently there is a disparity between service demand and capacity, with more clients presenting with mental health problems and few services ‘on the ground’ to meet those needs. Specialist intermediaries cater for those clients with severe and enduring mental health problems, leaving job brokering services to pick up an increasing number of people whose inactivity is as a result of a mental health problem. In addition to placing increasing strain on job
brocker services, is the need for further mental health training within the service.

**Recommendations**

1) **Mutual Agreement on the Scope of Performance Data Collection**

Intermediaries involved with this client group should collectively create, in consultation with funding bodies, a template of data to be gathered on a regular basis. Creation of the template could be through a representative Lothian Employability Forum or the wider Joined Up for Jobs Partnership Forum, or a focus group formed for this purpose. The template should consider what data is of most use in presenting strong funding arguments. Current gaps in data collection are around sustained outcomes, information which would be of great use to funders. A template would allow intermediaries to easily and accurately demonstrate their collective worth and promote the supported employment model more effectively.

2) **Funding Stability**

This research has shown that many disability and employment intermediaries operate on very short funding timeframes – between one and three years is the norm. This ‘short termism’ is perhaps the greatest barrier to developing a service framework which meets the needs of disabled jobseekers. Stable longer term funding would give intermediaries greater flexibility to invest in organisational and staff capability. Short term funding often has the effect of creating reactionary planning on the part of intermediaries, who constantly respond to the changing funding landscape. Longer term funding would result in increased stability allowing intermediaries the opportunity to plan more effectively.

3) **Benefits Flexibility**

There is need for the introduction of a more flexible mechanism, where benefits income can be retained whilst employment income rises to an agreed level, and in turn that employment becomes stable and long term. A recurring theme in undertaking the research for this project is the mismatch between entry level job salaries and the level of benefits received by those people with more severe disabilities. This mismatch moves employment, even as an option, out of the reach of many people who would like to work, particularly older people with families. Even with the introduction of Tax Credit and
other tweaks to the system, this mismatch between potential earnings and benefits income still remains.

4) Collaboration with Funding Bodies

There needs to be increased collaboration with funding bodies to raise awareness of the specific needs and characteristics of the disabled client group. Greater awareness of the specific issues affecting people with disabilities could allow for funding which responds better to these needs. Disability by its very nature is not static. A person with a disability can experience long periods of good health and likewise periods of ill health. They will need support during these periods to remain in employment. Unfortunately outcome driven funding does not deliver flexibility in support. A national representative organisation like the Scottish Union for Supported Employment (SUSE) is probably in the best position to take this forward, although this could be achieved at a local level between local provider networks and funding bodies.

5) Efficacy of the Supported Employment Model

There needs to be further research on the supported employment model. It would be of use to intermediaries, funding bodies, stakeholders and policy makers to have more accurate information on sustained outcomes. It would enable stakeholders to ascertain the real value of the model in terms of savings in benefit and welfare costs, and disposable income and tax generated over a period of time, against the initial higher costs of implementing the ‘supported employment’ model.

6) Matching Service Capacity with Demand

Further investment and better targeting of resources is required to address mismatches between service capacity and demand for those services. This is particularly relevant in the area of mental health service provision, given the number of people now presenting with mental health issues and proposed welfare benefit reform which will bring in a new regime where there is more ‘active encouragement’ to engage with work.
7) Raising Professional Standards

There is a need for a recognised and accepted professional qualification specific to ‘supported employment’, affording it the status and recognition enjoyed by other professions. A qualification would support greater consistency in the ability and level of staff employed in this work, giving staff a comprehensive, theoretical and practical underpinning. In the interim, intermediaries should endeavour to develop a set of shared ‘core competencies’ by which to measure applicants, reducing the subjectivity associated with choosing the ‘right values.’ Developing a set of core competencies would make it easier to assess staff in terms of training needs and their longer term professional development.

8) Operational Partnership Working

Intermediaries should introduce formal protocols to their partnership based activity. They should aim for a better balance between ‘client centred’ partnerships and formal agreements between organisations. Formal protocols will equip them better in a changing funding environment, where there may be an increased need for joint bidding.

9) Engaging with Health and Social Work Agencies

Disability intermediaries need to promote collectively the work they do and how they do it to key referring agencies. They may want to focus particularly on raising their profile to community based health professionals such as GP practices.

10) Linkages with Academies

Opportunities for the Sectoral Employment Academies and disability and employment intermediaries to exchange information should be created, filling the knowledge gap which currently exists. This could be done through specific events or intermediary led training under the auspices of the Lothian Employability Forum or Joined Up for Jobs Partnership Forum

11) Service User Involvement

Further research involving service users would be of benefit in terms of identifying and developing resources appropriate to meet the needs of the client group.
12) Workforce Retention

Disability and employment intermediaries should focus their employment efforts solely on those who are out of work, but provide services for those who have difficulty staying in their current employment. Little retention work is currently undertaken by any of the agencies as there is no funding to support this work. However, the Government’s ‘Green Paper’ on Welfare Benefit Reform seeks to reduce the numbers of new Incapacity Benefit claimants and disability intermediaries are well placed to provide these retention services.
Section 6  

Future Developments

A Period of Change and Uncertainty

As stated earlier in this report, disability and employment intermediaries are entering a period of considerable uncertainty with regard to:

- The future sources and **availability of funding**
- Potentially significant changes to the **shape of future service provision**
- The staged rollout of the government’s flagship ‘Pathways to Work’ programme throughout Scotland, in the period up to and including 2008.

The Impact of the Reduction of ESF Funding

In terms of funding pressures, the impending reduction of ESF funding (down to 45% of current levels or even less) is perhaps the most serious and immediate hurdle for intermediary organisations to overcome.

ESF funding has been a more or less ‘staple feature’ in funding disability and employment services, particularly those geared towards working with people who face the most significant barriers in accessing and retaining work.

Organisations like The Engine Shed, Forth Sector, The Action Group and Intowork all receive substantial proportions of their current funding through the ESF route. Even if they are successful in maintaining 2007-2013 Framework ESF funding at 45% of current levels, these organisations will have to find significant monies from other sources to maintain existing complements and levels of service.

While there is a strong argument for a reduction in the numbers of projects and providers ‘on the ground’, the Edinburgh and Lothian
scenario (as detailed in this paper) indicates that those specialist intermediaries working with the most vulnerable clients / client groups e.g. learning disability, mental health problems etc., will bear the brunt of this funding reduction.

The bulk of general service provision is funded through ‘mainstream government programmes’, albeit mainly on a contractual, outcome driven, time-bound basis. More specialist services, however, have tended to use the ESF route with its longer funding periods (up to three years), and focus on innovation and developing new responses to overcoming labour market barriers.

The negative aspect of this approach is that very few ESF projects (and this is across Scotland) have made the jump from ‘project to mainstream’ funding. Provision coming under the banner of the ‘supported employment’ model, has to all intents and purposes remained on the ‘periphery’ of the mainstream service framework.

The short term outcome driven funding environment in which intermediary agencies operate has severely hampered their capability to promote the supported employment model. However intermediaries themselves have unintentionally assisted with the apparent marginalisation of the supported employment model, by failing to effectively evaluate or promote it.

The situation faced by these smaller specialist intermediaries is now quite critical, with some already indicating closure of services and / or significant ‘frontline’ job losses through to the end of 2006 and on into 2007. Whether the new ESF operational programme can be ‘up and running’ in time is a moot point, as current ESF project funding ends and the task of filling the shortfall becomes even greater. The recently launched Big Lottery programme is now ‘the road to financial salvation’ which specialist intermediaries will most probably have to travel. Suffice to say competition for these funds will be intense.

**Service Reduction and its Impact on the Rollout of Pathways to Work**

There is also an implication for other future developments e.g. the rollout of Pathways to Work, in that much of the specialist provision required to make this programme work, particularly in terms of mental health focussed service provision, might not be ‘around’ by the time Pathways to Work arrives in the East of Scotland.
Potentially significant changes to the shape of future service provision

Workforce Plus: An Employability Framework for Scotland

The recently launched ‘Workforce Plus: An Employability Framework for Scotland’ is yet another new element within a changing funding and operational environment. The Framework promotes the message of ‘local partnerships to deliver appropriate services at a local level – with the expertise and knowledge of their own area and a recognition that one size will not fit all’.

The partnership based recommendations contained in the Framework document appear to be contrary to some recent activity e.g. the award of mainstream New Deal contracts to national private sector agencies versus a number of local authority led area consortiums. The apparent gap between what the Scottish Executive wants and the degree to which key budget holding national agencies like DWP/Jobcentre Plus can acquiesce (at a local or regional level) towards supporting and achieving those goals is at the heart of the matter. If they cannot, and remain constrained at a local/regional level by wider UK dictates, numbers and targets, then the new Framework will be ineffective.

Although Edinburgh is not one of the seven pilot local authority areas chosen to help move more people from benefits to work, it is well placed to continue the ongoing development of existing local area and delivery partnerships – always assuming the necessary resources will be available. If those resources are not available and Edinburgh and its surrounding travel to work areas are marginalised or penalised in terms of funding because of their apparent economic success, then sizeable numbers of people will remain economically inactive.

Welfare Benefit Reform

The government’s recent Green Paper on welfare benefit reform ‘A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering people to work’\(^{43}\) acknowledges that the focus of reform should shift from ‘what people cannot do, effectively trapping them in enforced inactivity – to what they can do, opening up opportunities to take up work’. This is a laudable shift in

---

\(^{43}\) Department for Work and Pensions: A New Deal for Welfare: Empowering People to Work, January 2006
emphasis, but the real question remains as to how this will be achieved and effectively resourced.

The Incapacity Benefit claimant level in Edinburgh and the surrounding travel to work areas (varying between 6% to 8%) is low in comparison with Glasgow and other areas of the West of Scotland. There are fears that Edinburgh and Lothian will be 'penalised' in terms of resource allocation, as the economy is considered 'too prosperous' with comparatively low levels of unemployment. Unfortunately, the city may now be experiencing the phenomenon of 'increasing exclusion within a prosperous economy'. The city has long been an 'employment magnet' for people from other parts of Scotland and the wider UK. If we now add in migrant workers entering the city’s economy from EU accession states, then those people who have been 'out of the labour market' for a considerable period of time (around 50% of people in receipt of Incapacity Benefit have received it for 5 years or more) are becoming even more disengaged from work or even thinking about work as a potential option.

We would opine that people with disabilities fall into this category – recent CIPD research (undertaken in late 2005) showed that –

“Sixty per cent of employers actively exclude groups with certain characteristics from the recruitment process. It is these ‘core jobless’ that the government wants to get back to work. The most excluded groups are those with a history of drug and alcohol problems, those with a criminal record and those with a history of long term sickness. Each of these groups is excluded by around one in three employers. Widespread reluctance on the part of employers to recruit the core jobless highlights the magnitude of the task facing government as it strives to get more economically inactive claimants off welfare and into work.”

Given that the ‘Pathways to Work’ programme will be the major service delivery element in trying to reduce the number of people claiming Incapacity Benefit (and its successor ‘Employment and Support Allowance’), there are considerable reservations around what the proposed rollout will mean for the smaller specialist disability and employment intermediaries. Recent mainstream New Deal contracting exercises would tend to suggest that contracts will be awarded to larger private sector agencies or charities who are more able to drive down contract pricing – leaving those smaller specialist intermediaries in the role of subcontractors. The formation of contract

---

44 Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development: Labour Market Outlook: Survey Report, summer/autumn 2005
bidding consortiums or operational partnerships which enter in collective ‘sub contracting’ arrangements may represent the only survival route for these intermediaries. As the Pathways to Work programme probably won’t reach Edinburgh until 2007, there is time to prepare – again with the premise that some specialist intermediary agencies working with the most excluded client groups, might not be around by that time.

Mental Health (Care and Treatment) (Scotland) Act 2003

The Mental Health Care and Treatment (Scotland) Act 2003 is a challenging piece of legislation, for every local authority in Scotland. Section 26 of the Act places a statutory responsibility on local authorities to provide services (for people with mental health problems (those in hospital, and those not in hospital) and also people with a learning disability) ‘designed to promote well-being and social development’. Those services are deemed to include –

- Social, cultural and recreational activities;
- Training for those persons who are over school age; and
- Assistance for those persons who are over school age in obtaining and in undertaking employment.

As one Scottish local authority put it, the assistance available for people with mental problems to gain or regain employment is seriously underdeveloped. This assessment of the capacity (if certainly not the quality) of mental health and employment service provision could probably be applied to Edinburgh. There are currently only three organisations working as specialists in the field – particularly with those people with severe and enduring mental health issues. Given the implications of Section 26 and the intended changes to the welfare benefits system, increasing investment in mental health and employment service provision would seem to be a logical course of action – particularly when one in three people now presenting for Incapacity Benefit have mental health issues. From a labour market perspective, people with mental health problems experience the highest rates of unemployment (80%+) of any ‘disabled’ client group. The implication of this is that considerable work still needs to be done with employers to reduce ignorance and tackle prejudice, or those unacceptable unemployment rates will remain a feature for some considerable time to come.

The Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) - Public Sector Duties

The Public Sector Duty is a key element within the ongoing expansion of coverage of the DDA. The ‘positive duty’ requires all public bodies
to promote equality of opportunity for disabled people – including employment. The new duty focuses on tackling ‘institutional discrimination’ and thereby shifts the emphasis from the individual having to take action to confront discrimination, to the organisation taking action to ensure that its practices do not disadvantage disabled people. Public bodies will have to (from December 2006) –

- Prepare and publish a Disability Equality Scheme
- Implement their Disability Equality Scheme
- Report annually on progress
- Revise the Scheme within three years of first publication

The Schemes should also have the following key features –

- Disabled people must be fully involved in their design
- They must be accompanied by Action Plans
- Schemes must be monitored
- Impact assessments must be conducted
- Progress must be reported

Under pre DDA quota based disability and employment legislation, the disability and employment record of public bodies (and Local Authorities in particular) was not particularly good. Performance and practices have moved on somewhat since the implementation of the DDA in 1996, but there is a general recognition that further improvements are required. Whether there will be sufficient resources available to implement the Disability Equality Schemes to their full potential is open to question. The proposed ‘Public Sector Academy’, operating within City of Edinburgh Council, would be one positive way in which to improve access to employment opportunities within the council. Leading on from that, there will also be an increased responsibility on the part of disability and employment intermediaries to support this process and engage more effectively with the council – in terms of referral and using their expertise to support those people ‘placed’ within the council.

**Summary**

In combination, these various factors present a rapidly changing environment in which intermediaries, particularly smaller specialist intermediaries, must operate and forward plan. The general consensus among those smaller specialist intermediaries is that some will ‘go to the wall’ as funding constraints bite over the next
eighteen months, principally because of the impending reduction in ESF funding. Larger national organisations, private and voluntary, currently involved in managing larger contracts through DWP and with greater internal reserves, are better placed to traverse this difficult period. The concern is that the expertise of those specialist intermediaries e.g. in mental health and learning disability, may be lost and that the future service landscape will be dominated by large organisations and henceforth large contract holders. Those specialist intermediaries still in existence will then be reduced to the role of ‘sub contractors’ with little or no financial slack within the system to continue working with and supporting those individuals with higher support needs i.e. the emphasis will remain on quick outcomes and not on longer term sustainability.
Appendix 1: In Employment Support Options for People with Disabilities

Pre Employment Support

Resource Centres

For many people leaving the education system (especially people with more severe disabilities who have not participated in mainstream education), a place within a Resource Centre (still commonly referred to as Day Centres or Adult Training Centres) is a starting point on a potential pathway to employment. These ‘sheltered’ facilities are usually run by local authorities and some of the larger voluntary organisations. There has been much debate in recent years over the effectiveness of ‘day centres’ and the fact that many people have not been able to progress or ‘move on’. Many service users have also expressed dissatisfaction with the provision and the lack of variety in the activities on offer. With this criticism in mind, many Centres now have Employment Development Officers in place. They work ‘one to one’ with people, developing strategies which help those individuals explore different activities and refer on to other intermediaries delivering employment support. In some cases, Resource Centres have developed their own distinct supported employment service e.g. Bonnington Resource Centre’s North East Edinburgh Employment Support Service.

Further & Higher Education

The five main Further Education Colleges in Edinburgh and Lothian all have (what they sometimes term) ‘special provision’ and specialist learning support for people with specific disabilities e.g. Jewel & Esk Valley College has always specialised in supporting learners with a visual impairment. Students can follow a selection of mainstream modular courses leading to National and Scottish Vocational Qualifications (NVQs / SVQs), or a variety of ‘extension’ programmes (as a follow on to formal education) which help people acquire a combination of basic and occupational skills, allied to personal development. Most Colleges also participate as contracted providers on government funded training programmes such as Get Ready for Work, Training for Work and New Deal. These programmes are open to students as complementary or progressive options. In addition,
most Colleges employ Employer Liaison or Employment Development Officers who approach employers on a regular basis for short and longer term ‘work experience placements’. These placements are an integral part of many courses and can lead to permanent employment.

Work Preparation

Jobcentre Plus has a number of general and specialist contracts with local organisations to provide work preparation. Work preparation is valuable in helping people explore their employment interests and find out more about what is involved in work. A person draws up an Action Plan in conjunction with their Disability Employment Adviser (DEA). They then engage with a work preparation provider who supports them during a 6 week period - including a period on work placement with an employer. In exceptional circumstances, the period on work preparation can be extended up to 13 weeks (if the individual, work preparation provider and work placement provider agree this would be beneficial). Work preparation is a beneficial option at different stages on the pathway to employment and is equally relevant in the transition to employment phase.

Training and Work Experience

At the pre-vocational or transition to employment stage, training and work experience is an almost self explanatory option for people in terms of exploring the world of work and settling on a potential type of job. For many people with disabilities the task of getting to and from work, ‘re-arranging’ daily life around work and fitting in with the ‘culture’ of the workplace are new or distant experiences. In particular, the use of short ‘work taster’ periods with different employers and working environments are used to help a person identify the type of work that best suits them and their own circumstances. With the emphasis on achieving employment outcomes, the length of time spent on work experience placement is now becoming much shorter.

Transition to Employment Support

As a person moves closer to identifying the type of job they want or looking for actual opportunities with employers, the options of work preparation, training and work experience continue to feature in the support options available.
Preparing for Employment

At this point, a person may have decided on the type of job they want. In some cases (where a person has been away from employment as a result of their disability) they may wish to return to a job they have been used to doing. A period of work preparation can help restore confidence, abilities and skills, or hone more recently acquired skills. A period of work preparation at this stage can also identify specific workplace support needs. These support needs can be serviced through Access to Work, if at a later stage, the employment becomes permanent.

Mainstream Programmes - Training and Work Experience

Vocational training accompanied by periods of work experience is one of the ‘linchpin’ options on the path to employment. The previous support elements described in this section e.g. work tasters, work preparation etc. have helped people decide on the type of work they want to do. Training and work experience at this stage is geared towards moving into employment with the benefit of acquiring relevant vocational qualifications.

The three main government funded training programmes all incorporate periods on work experience placement.

These programmes are:

- Get Ready for Work
- Training for Work (TfW)
- New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP)

Get Ready for Work (GRfW)

GRfW is targeted at 16-17 year old school leavers entering the labour market. Young people can be recruited as an employee (commonly referred to as ‘employee status’) or as a trainee (receiving a weekly training allowance). In both cases, the young person is able to undertake vocational training leading towards a Scottish Vocational Qualification (SVQ) or equivalent. Programmes are available in a broad variety of skills and occupations delivered through an extensive network of contracted training providers, including Colleges, private training organisations, trade bodies and local authorities. The training period generally lasts up to 2 years, but extensions to this are available in specific circumstances.
**Training for Work**

*TfW* has been around for a number of years. *TfW* is generally funded by the local enterprise company and helps people update and improve their skills through practical training leading to recognised qualifications. Generally, *TfW* is open to anyone aged between 25 and 64 years old who has been unemployed for 6 months or more and are currently claiming Jobseekers Allowance.

The 6 months qualifying period does not apply if the person has a disability.

Additionally, a person may be eligible to join the programme if they are 18-24 years old, and they are currently claiming Incapacity Benefit (IB), Severe Disablement Allowance (SDA) or Income Support (IS).

The length of a *TfW* programme is 6 months and participants receive a ‘benefits plus’ arrangement incorporating a £10 per week ‘top up’ training allowance. The situation regarding the current coverage and scope of *TfW* is less clear, given funding constraints and ongoing cuts in the level of support for this programme.

**New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP)**

This programme is the government’s major initiative in helping unemployed people with a disability back into work. Under the ‘welfare to work’ banner, it is one of a number of New Deal options open to people with disabilities, some of which are less attractive because of programme entry limits relating to qualifying benefits. *NDDP* is available to people through a number of contracted Job Broker organisations.

The main qualifying benefits for participation on *NDDP* are Incapacity Benefit, Severe Disablement Allowance, Income Support (including a disability premium) and Disability Living Allowance (providing the person doesn’t get Job Seekers Allowance (JSA) and is not in paid work for 16 hours or more per week).

The programme offers a fairly ‘standard mix’ of job search and job application support, access to training, work experience, referral onto specialist agencies where appropriate and in workplace support during the first six months of employment.

*NDDP* is funded on outcomes with providers negotiating a ‘per client per job’ payment regime i.e. different organisations are paid at different rates. Some providers have used other funding routes e.g. matching into ESF to enhance the overall level and quality of service.
In terms of participating in any of the main New Deal options, the major qualifying benefit is Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA); accompanied by varying periods of unemployment e.g. 18-24 participants must have claimed JSA for 6 months or more, and 25 plus participants for 2 years or more. This qualifying claim period does not apply to people with disabilities who are claiming JSA (they are able to participate immediately). However, as most people with disabilities claim Incapacity Benefit (as opposed to JSA), the main New Deal options and their various benefit restrictions i.e. the potential reduction or loss of benefits do not provide an attractive support option.

New Deal for People with Disabilities is delivered by a range of large (mainly private sector e.g. A4E) and smaller (mainly voluntary sector e.g. Intowork) providers.

**The Future - Pathways to Work**

Pathways to Work (PtW) is currently being rolled out in various areas of the country after a pilot phase was completed during 2003–2005 (Inverclyde was the pilot area in Scotland).

PtW will probably not reach Edinburgh and Lothian until 2007, but its mix of support options including the new ‘condition management’ element will enhance the level and range of service available to disabled jobseekers.

The major concern around the proposed Pathways to Work model is the accompanying regime of compulsory work focused interviews and the potential imposition of benefits penalties for non-participation.

Additionally there is a perception that some people with higher support needs will be consigned to a ‘higher level of benefit’ and those perceived as being closer to employment will become the main focus, creating a ‘two tier’ system of those ‘who can work’ and ‘those who can’t’.

Another concern (from a service provider’s perspective) is the contracting process which will accompany the rollout process. With the current emphasis on voluntary sector delivery, there is a fear that serious funding constraints e.g. the impending reduction in ESF funding will reduce the capacity or, in a worst case scenario, force the closure of a number of providers prior to PtW reaching Edinburgh and Lothian. Secondly, that delivery contracts will be offered to larger providers, reducing the role of key specialist intermediaries to that of sub-contractors. The inference from this second point is that smaller
providers will be ‘at the mercy’ of larger contract holders, and that quality and scope of service might suffer.

In Employment Support

Supported Employment

‘Supported Employment’ is not to be confused with the Workstep Programme, the latter which was formerly known as the Supported Employment Programme. As a model, ‘Supported Employment’ was originally developed in the USA to assist people with a learning disability (although the practice is now being applied to people with other types of disability and in the wider ‘field’ of disadvantage) to gain and sustain employment in an open workplace setting. Supported Employment is a flexible process based on a defined framework of principles and values – with promoting person-centred planning, self determination, inclusion and equality underpinning its practice. This defined framework encapsulates different tools and techniques that are tailored to the specific needs of an individual. The Supported Employment delivery process incorporates 6 key stages –

- **Engagement**: initial marketing of the service to the individual to secure an agreement to work with that person
- **Vocational Profiling**: helping individuals to identify their skills and preferences for work
- **Job Development**: identifying the person’s preferred job through employer canvassing
- **Job Analysis**: finding out more about the workplace, co-workers and the supports the person might need in that work environment
- **Job Support**: identifying and implementing ‘just enough’ creative help, information and backup to both employer and employee to ensure success in the job and the development of independence through ‘natural supports’
- **Career Support**: helping the employee and employer think about longer term career progression through structured appraisal and development plans

A number of local organisations have adopted the supported employment model as the cornerstone of their service e.g. The Action Group / Real Jobs, ENABLE and Intowork.
Employers are also becoming more heavily involved in the process, with many companies encouraging immediate work colleagues of disabled employees to undertake the role of support worker, buddy or mentor.

Unfortunately, many supported employment services are currently oversubscribed. However, most supported employment providers encourage people to approach them, even though they may have to go on to a waiting list before accessing the service.

In comparison with other options within the current service framework, the key selling point of the supported employment model is the perceived sustainability of its employment outcomes. This is based on the practice of delivering ongoing and flexible ‘aftercare’ in the workplace, for as long as this is required i.e. tapering and reducing as the person becomes ‘settled’ in the job and working environment. It is not unknown for agencies to maintain a support link with an individual over a number of years after placement into employment, although this is not usually at an intense level, but rather on a ‘care and maintenance’ basis.

**The Workstep Programme**

The Workstep Programme (formerly known as the Supported Employment Programme) is funded by Jobcentre Plus and assists people with severe disabilities. A number of local organisations have been appointed as contractors, to manage Workstep places on Jobcentre Plus’s behalf. These include local authorities, Remploy (through its Interwork scheme) and large voluntary sector organisations including Shaw Trust, Capability Scotland and ENABLE.

Participants on Workstep are paid the going rate for the job. They receive the same access to training and enjoy the same facilities and employment conditions as other non-disabled colleagues. Jobs on Workstep are expected to be permanent and placements should offer at least 6 months employment. The major difference with Workstep (in comparison with a standard employment arrangement) is that although employed on equivalent terms as any other employee there remains a three way partnership between employer, Workstep provider and the disabled person, with the provider continuing to provide, in some cases, financial support alongside a tailored package of employee support. In essence, the Workstep sponsor contracts with Jobcentre Plus to find the person a supported placement upon finding a placement the provider continues to be contracted by the jobcentre to support employer and employee until the employee is able to progress to open employment when the placement will cease.
Workstep as a programme has benefited in recent times from greater flexibility whereby providers are not obliged to offer financial incentives to employers which some felt could undermine the dignity of the individual particularly if they were not made aware of this arrangement.45

The Job Introduction Scheme

The Employment Service’s Disability Service Team manages the Job Introduction Scheme (JIS). JIS allows you to try out a job for a period of 6 weeks. This can be extended up to 13 weeks if a person’s Disability Employment Adviser thinks it is appropriate. The employer pays the normal rate for the job during the trial period and receives a subsidy towards wage, salary or other costs. The job can be full or part time but must be expected to last for at least 6 months after the trial period ends. JIS cannot be applied retrospectively and the employer must apply before the job trial period starts. Presently, employers are paid £75 per week during the job trial period.

In time, a person may gain the opportunity to become a direct employee of the company they work for. However this would only be done if everyone agreed it was in the person’s best interests. Places on Workstep are in great demand and are presently oversubscribed. In recent years the Workstep programme has been overhauled, moving away from an ‘employer wage subsidy’ approach, and now focuses on using funding to provide ongoing support for an individual’s personal and occupational development in the workplace. A new emphasis has also been placed on moving ‘long term’ recipients of Workstep support into permanent jobs with their placement employer, thereby freeing up places for other people. There are currently around 1800 managed Workstep places in Scotland, with the host support organisation receiving a ‘fee per managed place’ of approx. £4,800 per annum.

Access to Work

Access to Work is a major assistance programme operated by Jobcentre Plus. It is designed to help potential, new and existing employees with a disability and their employers. It provides assistance in a variety of different ways including -

- A communicator at interview if a person is deaf or has a hearing impairment.

- A reader at work if you are blind or have a visual impairment.

- Alterations to premises or a working environment.

- Special equipment or alterations to existing equipment, to suit specific work needs.

- A support worker, if a person needs practical help in the workplace or assistance getting to and from work.

- Help towards the cost of getting to and from work if you are unable to use public transport.

Access to Work meets all approved costs for help for unemployed people who have a job to go to. Similarly, if people are self-employed or about to undertake self-employment Access to Work will meet all the approved costs. If a person has been in a job for 6 weeks or more, Access to work will meet up to 80% of the approved costs of help, after the first £300. In each case the employer is expected to make a realistic contribution. Approved travel to work costs and communicator support at interview costs are met in full.

**Figure 22: Access to Work Costs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approved Cost</th>
<th>Maximum Access to Work Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than £300</td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between £300 and £10,000</td>
<td>80% of the cost over £300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over £10,000</td>
<td>80% of the cost between £300 and £10,000\n100% of the cost over £10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Work assistance packages are approved for periods up to 3 years in duration. After that, renewal of assistance is re-assessed and considered under the rules that apply at that time.
Other Specific Employment Options

Whilst employment (full and part time), training and further education are recognised outcomes, the extent to which people with disabilities can take up these possibilities is governed not only by their disability, and the level of support available, the jobs market, employer attitudes et al – but by the financial constraints placed upon them by the current welfare benefits regime and the extent to which the labour market can offer a competitive remuneration. For many people the extent to which they engage with employment is pretty much ‘taken as read’ at the initial engagement phase with an intermediary. Complex linkages with Council Tax, Housing Benefit and Working Tax Credits define what is possible for many people and this channels them into earnings disregard work, permitted work, supported permitted work and part time working.

Permitted Work

Permitted Work Lower Limit – often referred to as Earnings Disregard, a person can earn up to £20 per week for an unlimited period with no benefit implications. This arrangement has limited impact in terms of the hours a person can work, specifically when National Minimum Wage regulations are taken account. However, this ‘benefits plus’ arrangement is the first experience of ‘work’ or a return to a work environment that many disabled people (particularly those with more severe disabilities or those experiencing mental health problems) get.

Permitted Work Higher Limit or Supported Permitted Work

Permitted Work Higher Limit (purely a benefit arrangement) - a person can work for up to 16 hours per week, on average, with earnings up to and including £81 per week for a 26 week period. The period can be extended for another 26 weeks by a PA or DEA who agrees that this arrangement will help a person progress towards taking up working for 16 or more hours per week. There is no limit to the number of times a person can take up a permitted work option (whilst in receipt of Incapacity Benefit), but there must be a gap of at least 52 weeks between periods. Subsequent permitted work periods can be for up to 52 weeks and a Job Broker, PA or DEA must support the permitted work option from the outset.

Supported Permitted Work (again purely a benefit arrangement) – a person can take up permitted supported work for earnings up to and including £81 per week for an unlimited period. Supported permitted
work can only be taken up where there is an ongoing support or supervision arrangement through a professional caseworker i.e. someone employed by a local authority or voluntary sector organisation which provides or finds work for people with disabilities. There is a problem faced by many organisations supporting a ‘supported permitted work’ arrangement, in that there is no specific funding available for this work. Indeed some organisations are now refusing to enter into this type of arrangement (mostly activated through referrals from Jobcentre Plus) as it places additional demands on already stretched resources.

**Service Provision by Local Authority Area and Disability**

As previously stated, the service framework in each local authority area varies according to the level of commitment (from that local authority) to providing employment focused services and the depth of voluntary sector representation in the area.

In general, services can usually be sub divided into general or pan-disability i.e. those working with people across the disability spectrum, and disability specific categories i.e. those providing specialist services with a single disability focus. The service framework by ‘sector of origin’ in the City of Edinburgh, Midlothian and East Lothian are represented in Figures 23, 24 and 25. The service framework by disability type is represented in Figure 26.

**Figure 6** identifies positioning of the various support options and major government funded assistance programmes, in relation to an amended Joined Up for Jobs service delivery model. Most government funded programmes are available across the three local authority areas, but in most cases the operational base for providers is in Edinburgh.

**Local Authority Services**

City of Edinburgh, Midlothian and East Lothian Councils have all developed their own ‘in house’ supported employment service. These services also manage a number of contracted Workstep places, mainly supporting people placed in different departments across the local authority and on occasion, although to a lesser extent external commercially based placements in the private or voluntary sector.

As well as working more generally with disabled jobseekers, these services link with individual ‘day centres’ and the employment development workers based there. In addition, Councils operate a range of complementary services that impact on employment focused
activity, the most important of which (in the employment context) is the provision of Welfare Benefits advice.

**Voluntary Sector Services**

The voluntary sector plays a significant role in delivering employment focused services to people with disabilities and employers. Organisations involved in service delivery activity range from large national charities (including Capability Scotland, Shaw Trust and ENABLE) to smaller local organisations (like The Action Group and Intowork). Organisations work across the spectrum of disabilities and generate their funding (in the main) through contract delivery for Jobcentre Plus, support from and delivering services for local authorities, the European Social Fund, the Big Lottery and various grant giving trusts. A number of these voluntary sector intermediaries use variations of the supported employment model as the main focus of their employment service delivery e.g. The Action Group / Real Jobs, Intowork etc.

**Private Sector / Other Services**

Representation from the private sector is growing, not so much in terms of numbers of agencies working in the field, but the size and scope of the ‘contracts’ they manage. Action for Employment (A4E) is the ‘major player’ in terms of its New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) Job Broker role.

**Services by Disability Type**

The service framework by type of disability is represented in Figure 5. It is clear to see that there are fewer providers working in the mental health, learning disability and specialist fields. The bulk of provision occupies the general service category, where providers work with people across the disability spectrum. However, a number of these ‘general’ providers retain some element of specialist capability, usually around the client group they were originally set up to work with e.g. Capability Scotland in supporting people with Cerebral Palsy. Other providers e.g. ENABLE, focus on a specific disability, but because of the size and scope of the organisation and the range of contract work available, they now work with and support people with ‘other’ disabilities.
Figure 23: **CITY OF EDINBURGH: Disability & Employment Service Provision**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory</th>
<th>Local Authorities</th>
<th>F E Sector</th>
<th>Voluntary Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jobcentre Plus</strong>&lt;br&gt;Assistance through DEAAs and New Deal PAs</td>
<td><strong>City of Edinburgh Council</strong>&lt;br&gt;Health &amp; Social Care Day Centre Network (with linked employment workers)&lt;br&gt;Petherbank, St. Helens&lt;br&gt;McLeod Street, Longstone&lt;br&gt;Hawkhill, Grindlay Court&lt;br&gt;Bonnington, Woodhall&lt;br&gt;Dearbank</td>
<td>Stevenson College, Edinburgh’s Telford College and Jewel &amp; Esk Valley College&lt;br&gt;<strong>Full Time Extension Courses</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Day Release Provision</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Learning Support</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Get Ready for Work</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Career Guidance Link</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Action Group</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported Employment</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>ENABLE</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Workstep</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>The Engine Shed</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Occupational training</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported Employment</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Capability Scotland</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Work Preparation</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Workstep</strong>&lt;br&gt;<strong>Supported training in a commercial context</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Main Programme Options**<br>- Work Preparation<br>- Workstep<br>- Access to Work<br>- Job Introduction Scheme<br>- New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP)<br>- Other New Deal options

- **Health & Social Care Supported Employment Team (SET)**<br>- Supported Employment<br>- Workstep<br>- The Open Employment Scheme

- **Other Council Services & Linked Initiatives**<br>- Public Sector Academy<br>- Area Employment Initiatives<br>- The Advice Shop<br>- Community Education<br>- Blindcraft

- **Careers Scotland**<br>- Occupational information and advice, programme referral etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statutory</th>
<th>Local Authorities</th>
<th>FE Sector</th>
<th>Voluntary Sector</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre Plus</td>
<td>Midlothian Council</td>
<td>Jewel &amp; Esk Valley College</td>
<td>The Action Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Centre (A4 for Jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assistence through</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Disability Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Advisors and New Deal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Capability Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal Assistants</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported training in a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>commercial context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaw Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Programme Options</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNIB Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Occupational / technical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>assessment and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sammy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brain injury Work Prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EUS Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Midlothian Health &amp; Social Care</td>
<td>Full Time Extension</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day Centre Network</td>
<td>Courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Cherry Road</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• John Chant Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Midlothian Training Services (MTS)</td>
<td>Get Ready for Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Midlothian Welfare Rights</td>
<td>• MiTech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Community Education</td>
<td>• PAVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New Leaf</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory</td>
<td>Local Authorities</td>
<td>FE Sector</td>
<td>Voluntary Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre Plus</td>
<td>East Lothian Council</td>
<td>Jewel &amp; Esk Valley College</td>
<td>Capability Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance through DEAs and New Deal Personal Assistants</td>
<td>Social Work Day Centre Network</td>
<td>• Full Time Extension Courses</td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tynebank, Haddington</td>
<td>• Mansfield, Musselburgh</td>
<td>• Day Release Provision</td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Port Seton Resource Centre, Port Seton</td>
<td>• East Lothian Vocational Opportunities Service (ELVOS)</td>
<td>• Learning Support</td>
<td>• Supported training in a commercial context</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Supported Employment</td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
<td>• Get Ready for Work</td>
<td>- RNIB Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other New Deal options</td>
<td>• A4E (Action for Employment)</td>
<td>• Career Guidance Link</td>
<td>• Occupational / technical assessment and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Occupational information and advice, programme referral etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Employment Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RNIB Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Occupational / technical assessment and advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shaw Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SAMH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intowork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Brain Injury Work Prep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>EUS Community Learning Centre (A1 for Jobs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Workstep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NDDP job broker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### All Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City of Edinburgh Council Health &amp; Social Care Supported Employment Team (SET)</th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
<td>Assistance through LEAs and New Deal PAs, referral on to other services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midlothian Council Midlothian Training Services (MTS)</th>
<th>Capability Scotland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Get Ready for Work</td>
<td>Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Supported training in a commercial context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shaw Trust</th>
<th>Intovork</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>NDDP Job Broker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>East Lothian Council East Lothian Vocational Opportunities Scheme (ELVOS)</th>
<th>EUS Community Learning Centre (A1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>NDDP Job broker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Opportunities</th>
<th>NDDP Job broker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Learning Disabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A4E (Action for Employment)</th>
<th>the Action Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NDDP Job Broker</td>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMploy (Interwork)</td>
<td>ENABLE Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDDP Job broker</td>
<td>The Engine Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupational training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers Scotland</td>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational and career guidance</td>
<td>Midlothian Council Systems for Training and Employment in Midlothian (STEM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sectoral Academies</td>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational based training and work experience</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Specialist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RNIB Scotland</th>
<th>SAMH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupational / technical assessment and advice</td>
<td>Work Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Impairment</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Preparation</td>
<td>Forth Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intovork</td>
<td>Supported Employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Employment - Autistic Spectrum</td>
<td>Social Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquired Brain Injury</td>
<td>NSF Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brain Injury Work Prep</td>
<td>Employment advice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mental Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women into Work</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal / skills development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Figure 26: Disability & Employment Service Provision by Disability Type
# Appendix 2: Training and Development for Supported Employment Practitioners

### Figure 27: Training and Development for Supported Employment Practitioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Equivalent Qualification:</th>
<th>SE Qualification</th>
<th>SVQ / NVQ Level</th>
<th>Other Training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVQ Level 4</td>
<td>Diploma in Supported Employment - 2 years</td>
<td>NVQ 4</td>
<td>Relevant to but not formally linked: Other professional management qualifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care: Social Care</td>
<td>Online / Distance Learning Vocational Degree / Diploma Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVQ Level 3</td>
<td>Certificate in Supported Employment - 1 year</td>
<td>NVQ 3</td>
<td>Relevant to but not formally linked: TSI QUEST RICKTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care: Health Care or Promoting Independence</td>
<td>Online / Distance Learning National Certificate Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVQ Level 2</td>
<td>Scottish Progression Award Supported Employment</td>
<td>SVQ SPA</td>
<td>Relevant to but not formally linked: TSI QUEST RICKTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>Mandatory Group of 6 SVQ Modules Progression towards SVQ Level 2 or 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What is presently available?

‘The Certificate and The Diploma in Supported Employment

The Certificate – 1 year

An introduction to the fundamental practices and principles of supported employment through the use of an e-learning model. The Certificate normally takes 12 months to complete and requires the candidate to commit to 3 to 4 hours of study and assessment per week. There is an assessment of competence against a Level 3 NVQ in Learning & Development by Oxford, Cambridge and RSA, who will also award the Certificate in Supported Employment.

Cost: £1,375 + VAT per person

The Diploma – 2 years

Meets the continuing professional development needs of those of those individuals who have established a career in supported employment, and wish to enhance their knowledge, skills and practices in all aspects of their work. The Diploma normally takes 2 years to complete and requires the candidate to undertake about 350 hours of study and assessment activity. There is an assessment of competence against a Level 4 NVQ in Learning & Development by Oxford, Cambridge and RSA, who will also award the Certificate in Supported Employment.

Cost: £2,750 + VAT per person

The SQA Route

Scottish Progression Awards (SPA)

Introductory award designed to provide candidates with the necessary skills and knowledge to work in the area of Supported Employment.
6 Mandatory Units:

- Foster People’s Equality, Diversity and Rights
- Establish, Sustain and Disengage from Relationships with Clients
- Promote, Monitor and Maintain Health, Safety and Security in the Workplace
- Planning and Securing Jobs Supported Employment
- Facilitate Individual Learning through Coaching

This SPA provides progression towards SVQ Care (Level 2) or SVQ Promoting Independence (Level 3). From this the candidate can move onto SVQ Care (Level 4) if desired. The SVQs in Care don’t have a particular SE focus.

- Care Level 2 – 4 mandatory units, 5 optional units
- Care Level 3 – 5 mandatory units, 7 optional units
- Care Level 4 – 8 mandatory units, 6 optional units

Other Bespoke Training

TSI – Training in Systematic Instruction

Generally a 3 day course

- Identifying people’s job interests and aspirations
- Matching people and jobs
- How to analyse and break down specific tasks
- By use of analysis of tasks, designing appropriate training methods etc. etc.

Cost: approx. £400 per person

QUEST Supported Employment Agency

The Complete Job Trainer

Generally a 4 or 5 day course

Workplace and job assessment, applicant assessment including voc. Profile, referral systems, benefits issues, planning for long term support/additional challenges, structured training and withdrawal etc. etc.
Cost: approx. £400 per person

**The Complete Job Finder**

Generally a 1 day course

Developing a corporate image, identifying potential employers, making contact with employers, presenting a structured positive proposal etc. etc.

Cost: approx. £100 per person

**The Rickter Company**

**The Rickter Scale**

The Rickter Scale is an easy to use assessment tool that measures soft outcomes and distance travelled when working with people. The scale itself is a ‘sliding’ whereby users can measure their responses on a scale of 1 to 10 to a series of questions, which vary according to their circumstances. Topics can include employment, education, accommodation, personal finance, relationships, stress, and how big a part alcohol or drugs play in their life and their general health and happiness. There are now around 300 different frames of reference so there are many applications for the system which can be customised to suit particular client profiles.

Training is undertaken by the Rickter Company and is based around a customisation process, so the version devised or used suits the target client group.

Cost: Variable, as it is based on individual need and specification

**Beyond ‘The Diploma’ in Supported Employment**

Through Cardiff University / The Welsh Centre for Learning Disabilities

**2 Postgraduate Diploma MSc Courses**

- Supported Employment
- Positive Approaches to Challenging Behaviour
Each diploma course is organised in 14 x 3 day teaching modules with students passing the diploma able to extend for a further 4 x 3 day modules (in research and design methods) to gain an MSc.

Cost: £2,408 tuition fees (an additional £1,204 for the MSc) plus travel and accommodation

Venue: Welsh Centre for Learning Disabilities, Cardiff

Eligibility: Over 25s (GCSE or equivalent in English) working in the field of Learning Disability and related fields, under 25s must have a first degree.
Appendix 3: Case Studies

Introduction

Participating organisations provided the following illustrative case studies to demonstrate the financial benefits of a return to work. People with disabilities and health conditions face a number of barriers to employment and often find themselves consigned to entry level jobs at minimum wage. This is often exacerbated by a lack of qualifications and work record, and a continued unwillingness of many employers, despite legislation, to risk employing someone with a disability.

People with disabilities or health conditions are sometimes reluctant to obtain employment because of the fear that securing employment could worsen their financial situation. Any loss of benefits may fail to be fully compensated by the income procured, particularly if a person is unable to secure a position above entry level. A return to work can mean, although not always, an additional loss of free healthcare, prescriptions and travel passes. Inactive benefits often provide a passport to these items, and the additional costs of purchasing these items can be a disincentive.

It is not only the person with the disability who can be affected by any changes in employment status, but others within their household. A change in employment circumstances can have an adverse affect on any housing benefit claims or council tax payments of those sharing the house, placing an added burden on the disabled person when considering work.

Despite these disincentives, many people with disabilities actively desire the opportunity to work, not solely for the economic benefits, but also for the social and psychological benefits of work. Work enables all of us to be more involved with society, avoiding the isolation associated with disability and illness. Work provides social networks and opportunities for integrating with people who do not necessarily face the same barriers or share the same difficulties. Positive employment experiences undoubtedly raise self esteem and increase confidence. In monetary terms, there are savings to government through increased tax revenues and reductions in benefit costs, and wider benefits to society in terms of more inclusive communities.
The following case studies attempt to illustrate the financial benefits and other considerations which are part of any return to work. These case studies are based on approximate figures, and although they draw upon the real circumstances of a particular individual, some additional factors would have to be considered in any conclusive back to work calculation. As such, the conclusive back to work calculation could vary slightly from the case study information.

**Case Study One – Specialist Services**

R. is 48 – he was brain injured in a road accident when he was 18. He lives with his parents and would need support to live independently. He was out of work for almost 10 years prior to starting work under permitted work rules in 2004; he increased his hours to 16 in 2005 and is now in receipt of working tax credit. He was turned down for DLA last year but has recently reapplied. He does not pay rent or bills but gives his mum £20 per week towards his keep.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not working</th>
<th>Permitted work</th>
<th>Working 16 hours per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>£76.45</td>
<td>£76.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£72.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>£75.00</td>
<td>£75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>£76.45</td>
<td>£151.45</td>
<td>£147.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Outgoings**        |             |                |                           |
| Housing              |             | £20.00         | £20.00                    |
| Council Tax          |             |                |                           |
| Transport            |             | £6.00          | £6.00                     |
| Prescriptions etc    |             |                |                           |
| **TOTAL**            | £0.00       | £26.00         | £26.00                    |

**Income minus Outgoings**

|                      | £76.45      | £125.45        | £121.00                   |
Case Study Two – Job Broker Services

T was severely injured in a house fire 10 years ago and has undergone a series of operations over the years to improve mobility. He has only recently decided that he would like to return to work and is currently doing voluntary work while we look for paid employment. He is not keen to do permitted work as this will have a severe effect on his housing benefit but his DEA has done a back to work calculation which shows that even working part-time would improve his situation (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Not working</th>
<th>Permitted work (estimated)</th>
<th>Working 16 hours (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>£78.50</td>
<td>£78.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>£3.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>£16.50</td>
<td>£16.50</td>
<td>£16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>£116.20</td>
<td>£66.00</td>
<td>£70.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CounTaxRebate</td>
<td>£10.38</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£91.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td>£80.00</td>
<td>£90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£225.03</strong></td>
<td><strong>£241.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>£267.64</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outgoings</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>£116.20</td>
<td>£116.20</td>
<td>£116.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Tax</td>
<td>£10.38</td>
<td>£10.38</td>
<td>£10.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>£10.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>£10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriptions etc</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£2.50</td>
<td>£2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>£126.58</strong></td>
<td><strong>£139.08</strong></td>
<td><strong>£139.08</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Income minus Outgoings | £98.45 | £101.92 | £128.56 |
Case Study Three – Mental Health Services

J is a 55 year old man with long term mental health difficulties in receipt of Incapacity Benefit for his medical condition. J is a single man who lives alone in an unfurnished housing association rental flat. Recently J has begun to feel that his medical condition has reached a level of stability which would allow him to consider a return to work. Before considering his working options J must consider the implications on his financial situation of any return to work. The following back to work calculation has been done (see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not working</th>
<th>Permitted work (estimated)</th>
<th>Working 16 hours (estimated)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>£78.50</td>
<td>£78.50</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td>£33.00</td>
<td>£33.00</td>
<td>£33.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HB</td>
<td>£50.00</td>
<td>£13.00</td>
<td>£14.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CounTaxRebate</td>
<td>£22.47</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WTC</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£0.00</td>
<td>£104.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>£80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>£183.97</td>
<td>£204.50</td>
<td>£233.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Outgoings**        |             |                             |                               |
| Housing              | £50.00      | £50.00                      | £50.00                        |
| Council Tax          | £22.47      | £22.47                      | £22.47                        |
| Transport            | Pass Provided | £12.00                      | £12.00                        |
| Prescriptions etc    | £6.00       | £6.00                       | £6.00                         |
| **TOTAL**            | £78.47      | £90.47                      | £90.47                        |

*Income minus Outgoings*  
£105.50 | £114.03 | £142.74
Case Study Four – Learning Disabilities

A 22 year old woman with learning disabilities lives with her parents.

Learning difficulties result in her having problems with reading, writing, concentration and memory and this affects her ability to work.

- She was on Incapacity Benefit at £95 a week and also received Disability Living Allowance of £33 a week (low rate mobility and low rate care); this gave her a weekly income of £128.
- She decided to work and remain on her incapacity related benefit because she was unsure how she would cope with working, so she did supported permitted work.
- She was able to work 15 hours a week at the minimum wage (£5.05 an hour) earning £75 a week.
- She was able to keep her incapacity benefit because she did not exceed the permitted work earnings limit of £81 a week.
- She also kept her DLA because this is not affected by employment. Her total weekly income increased to £183.73 net.

In time if she felt she could cope with working more hours she could work full time and come off her incapacity related benefit.

- If she was working at least 16 hours a week she could claim working tax credit instead.
- Her wages and tax credit award would vary depending on the hours worked (the maximum is usually £74.60 a week tax credit on top of wages if working less than 30 hours.)
- If she worked 30 hours a week her income would be around £230 a week (including tax credits).
- She would still keep her DLA on top of this.
- Total weekly income would be around £263.
- Most disabled single people can get tax credit if their earnings are less than £15,500.

NB The person’s earnings can have an effect on their parent’s housing benefit or council tax benefit.
### Appendix 4: Abbreviations and Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CCP</td>
<td><strong>Capital City Partnership</strong> - A coalition of statutory, voluntary and community agencies in Edinburgh working together to promote social inclusion and achieve social justice for local people. The Partnership focuses on jobs, health, housing, learning and community safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEC</td>
<td><strong>City OF Edinburgh Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEA</td>
<td><strong>Disability Employment Advisor</strong> - A Job Centre Plus employee who provides assistance to those who are recently disabled or whose disability or health condition has deteriorated and who need employment advice. Most Job Centres have a disability employment advisor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLA</td>
<td><strong>Disability Living Allowance</strong> - this allowance covers the extra costs incurred by the disability. If you have a severe disability you are able to claim disability living allowance or attendance allowance regardless of occupational status.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DWP</td>
<td><strong>Department for Work and Pensions</strong> - The Department for Work and Pensions is a department of the Government of the United Kingdom, created on June 8, 2001 from the merger of the Employment part of the Department for Education and Employment and the Department of Social Security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRfW</td>
<td><strong>Get Ready for Work</strong> – This programme is aimed at 16 – 18 year old school leavers. The programme provides vocational training to equip them with skills to compete in the labour market. Trainees receive a training allowance whilst on the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td><strong>Incapacity Benefit</strong> – Incapacity Benefit is a set rate of benefit given to people who are currently unable to work because of ill health or disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td><strong>Job Seekers’ Allowance</strong> - Jobseeker’s Allowance is the main benefit for unemployed people. It can provide financial help during periods when you are unemployed and looking for work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
JUFJs  
**Joined Up for Jobs** – a CEC strategy that sets out how Edinburgh aims to help people who need work get a job and enjoy long-term employment - especially those who are furthest from the jobs market. It is delivered primarily through CCP.

LEF  
**Lothian Employability Forum** – a network of organisations providing employment support services to people with disabilities. LEF is a registered charity.

LEND  
**Lothian Employers Network on disability** – a network of local employers (mainly larger public sector employers) for whom we provide information and training events, information materials and a website.

LFS  
**Labour Force Survey** - The Labour Force Survey (LFS) is a quarterly sample survey of households living at private addresses in Great Britain. Its purpose is to provide information on the UK labour market that can then be used to develop, manage, evaluate and report on labour market policies.

MEAN  
**Midlothian Employment Action Network** – similar to LEF but based in Midlothian for agencies that provide employment support services to people with differing disadvantages. E.g. substance abusers, homeless, women returners, young people, disabled people, etc.

MHSG  
**Mental Health Specific Grant** – MISG was introduced under the NHS and Community Care Act 1990, providing from April 1991 revenue grant for the development of social care services for individuals with mental health problems.

MLC  
**Midlothian Council**

NDDP  
**New Deal for Disabled People** is a voluntary programme delivered by Jobcentre Plus for people with health conditions or disabilities.

PIMS  
**Primary Intermediary Models Project** – This is the name of our two-year ESF funded project. Confusingly it is also the name of the mini-project funded by CEC that links into our bigger project. This mini-project is focusing on an Action Research project mapping the capacity of the disability employment services sector and looking at gaps in current provision.

SDA  
**Severe Disablement Allowance** – An allowance paid to those who had been out of work for at least 28 weeks and unable to claim Incapacity Benefit. Since April 2001 it has not been possible to make a new claim for SDA.
SUSE  Scottish Union of Supported Employment - The Scottish Union of Supported Employment is an umbrella organisation for public, private and voluntary bodies interested in supported employment, social inclusion and the changeover from traditional resource centre based day services to programmes in the community.

TERU  Training and Employment Research Unit - TERU is part of the University of Glasgow’s Department of Business and Management within the Faculty of Social Science.

TfW  Training for Work – Training for work is a programme open to anyone 25 and over who has been unemployed for at least 6 months and generally though not exclusively in receipt of Job Seekers Allowance.
Appendix 5: Participating Organisations

Employment Intermediaries

The following agencies provided significant statistical information for analysis. It is upon their information that the findings are based.

A4e Scotland
www.a4e.co.uk

East Lothian Vocational Opportunities Scheme – East Lothian Council
www.eastlothian.gov.uk

Edinburgh University Settlement – A1 for Jobs
www.eus.org.uk

Employment Opportunities Scotland
www.opportunities.org.uk

Enable Scotland
www.enable.org.uk

Forth Sector
www.forthsector.org.uk

Intowork – Job Brokers Service
www.intowork.org.uk

Midlothian Training Services
www.midlothian.gov.uk

Moving Intowork
www.intowork.org.uk/moving

NHS Lothian Primary Care Organisation, Adult Mental Health Work Rehabilitation Services
Occupational Therapy Rehabilitation Unit
28-32 Howden Street
Edinburgh
EH8 9HL
National Schizophrenia Fellowship (Scotland) Employment Support Service
www.nsfscot.org.uk

Nisus Scotland
www.nisusscotland.co.uk

Remploy Interwork
www.remploy.co.uk/realjobs/

Scottish Association for Mental Health
www.samh.org.uk

Supported Employment Team (Health and Social Care Dept, City of Edinburgh Council)
www.edinburgh.gov.uk

The Action Group (Real Jobs)
www.actiongroup.org.uk

The Engine Shed (Garvald Community Enterprises Ltd)
www.engineshed.org.uk

Waverley Care – Future Plus Project
www.waverleycare.org

The following agencies provided additional information.

Women onto Work
www.womenontowork.org

**Sectoral Employment Academies**

Academy of Retail
www.edinburghretailacademy.co.uk

Access to Industry
www.accesstoindustry.co.uk

Childcare Academy
www.northedinburghchildcare.co.uk

Construction Academy
www.employmentacademies.co.uk
Healthcare Academy
www.employmentacademies.co.uk

Public Sector Academy (Deal Me In)
www.employmentacademies.co.uk

Social Care Academy (Midlothian)
www.midlothian.gov.uk

Springboard Scotland – Hospitality and Tourism Academy
www.springboard.org.uk

Area Based Initiatives

Employment Access South Edinburgh
www.ease-southedinburgh.net

West Edinburgh Action
17 Hailesland Place
Wester Hailes
Edinburgh
EH14 2SL

Working Links
www.workinglinks.co.uk

Worktrack
www.worktrack.co.uk

Business Support Organisations

Chamber of Commerce
www.edinburghchamber.co.uk

Statutory Providers

Careers Scotland
www.careers-scotland.org.uk

Job Centre Plus
www.jobcentreplus.gov.uk
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