



DWP Department for
Work and Pensions

Disability employment support: fulfilling potential

Government's response to the consultation
on the recommendations in Liz Sayce's
independent review *Getting in, staying in
and getting on*

Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State
for Work and Pensions by Command of Her Majesty
March 2012

Cm 8312

£10.75



Disability employment support: fulfilling potential

Government's response to the consultation on the recommendations in Liz Sayce's independent review *Getting in, staying in and getting on*

Presented to Parliament by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions by Command of Her Majesty
March 2012

© Crown Copyright 2012

You may re-use this information (excluding logos) free of charge in any format or medium, under the terms of the Open Government Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/> or e-mail: psi@nationalarchives.gsi.gov.uk

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.

This publication can be accessed online at:

www.dwp.gov.uk/consultations/2011/specialist-disability-emp-prog.shtml

For more information about this publication, contact:

**Disability and Work Opportunities Division
Department for Work and Pensions
Ground Floor
Caxton House
6–12 Tothill Street
London
SW1H 9NA**

Telephone: 0207 449 7817

Email: sdep.signpost@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

Copies of this publication can be made available in alternative formats if required.

This publication is also available at **www.official-documents.gov.uk**

ISBN: 9780101831222

Printed in the UK by The Stationery Office Limited
on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office

ID 2480084 03/12

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

Contents

Foreword by the Minister for Disabled People	3
Section 1 Introduction and response	5
Section 2 The consultation	10
Section 3 A new direction	13
Section 4 Access to Work	17
Section 5 Remploy	23
Section 6 Residential Training Colleges	33
Section 7 Work Choice and Work Programme	37
Section 8 Other issues	42
Section 9 Summary of questions	45
Section 10 Language used in this document	48
Section 11 Equality	49
Annex Contributions and joint contributions from organisations to the public consultation on specialist disability employment programmes	51

Foreword by the Minister for Disabled People

The Government wants to support people to reach their true potential in life. An important part of achieving our potential comes from participating in fulfilling employment, and disability should not mean there are barriers to this. Some disabled people will require specialist employment support to enable them to get and keep jobs and to progress through fulfilling careers.

In asking Liz Sayce to conduct her review *Getting in, staying in and getting on*, we wanted a clear, expert and independent view of what specialist disability employment support should be. That review was published on 9 June 2011 and contained a wide range of recommendations for reforming specialist disability employment programmes. At the time I announced that the Government would consult before taking any decisions on the future strategy for specialist disability employment programmes. That full public consultation was launched on 11 July and ran until 17 October 2011.

We encouraged responses from disabled people, organisations of and for disabled people, employment service providers and anyone else who had an interest in the topic. We also ran a series of events around the country to explain the scope of the consultation and take informal views. During the course of the consultation I met many disabled people and their families, and heard how important specialist disability employment programmes can be to them. What they said emphasises that any changes we make to the programmes need to be right, but also that if they are right we should not shrink from making them.

By the close of the consultation more than 1,400 individuals and organisations had responded, and I am grateful to everyone who took the time to give us their views. Many of them are summarised in this document. There was an overwhelming consensus behind the central theme of the Sayce Review, that resources for supporting disabled people into employment should be focused on disabled people themselves.

I have repeatedly confirmed that the budget for specialist disability employment support is protected, but I also want to ensure that the employment support that is available to disabled people is used efficiently, effectively and equitably.

The reforms I am announcing here are ambitious and challenging. However, our ambition is to support more disabled people into work within our available resources. We will recycle monies freed from Remploy into Access to Work and other programmes as discussed with disabled people, where increased funding will enable more disabled people to meet their aspirations to enter and remain in work.

For this reason, I am announcing that the next stage in these reforms will be a period of co-production with disabled people to establish a clear set of priorities in terms of policy and delivery. This will build upon the co-productive approach to developing the disability strategy which seeks to involve disabled people in developing the measures needed to fulfil their potential and ensure they have opportunities to play a full role in society.

I am announcing that the Government proposes to implement the Sayce Review recommendations on reforming Remploy. As a first stage, Remploy will begin collective consultation on the future of Remploy factories that the Remploy Board considers (subject to consultation with their employee representatives) are unlikely to be able to achieve independent financial viability and is therefore proposing for closure. As part of the

4 Foreword by the Minister for Disabled People

consultation process, employees and employee representatives will, of course, be able to put forward proposals in relation to any viable aspects of non-viable businesses, along with other proposals for avoiding compulsory redundancies. The second stage of the process will be for us to work with the Remploy Board to identify if it is, indeed, possible to set free the remaining businesses, or parts of businesses, from government control and, if that should be possible, how this might be achieved. Where this is not possible, further closures would need to be considered.

Any Remploy staff affected by potential change will be guaranteed a comprehensive package of personalised and individually-tailored support and advice to meet their needs.

In the meantime, I am pleased to announce that the Government is introducing some more immediate measures in response to key issues emerging from the consultation. These include marketing Access to Work so that under-represented groups, such as those with learning disabilities or mental health conditions, are better able to participate. We will target small employers, where Access to Work support is less well known and could bring considerable benefits. We will also focus attention on young people – those leaving education and those already seeking work – to ensure appropriate support is available to them to enter and stay in employment.

I want to establish a system of specialist employment support that meets the needs and aspirations of disabled people now and in the future. I look forward to the support of disabled people as we undertake this task.



Maria Miller MP

Minister for Disabled People

Introduction and response

1

As we stated in our recent Disability Strategy discussion document, *Fulfilling Potential*, the Government is absolutely committed to removing barriers to enable disabled people to fulfil their potential and have the opportunity to play their full role in society. Central to this is our commitment to supporting disabled people to reach their aspirations for fulfilling employment. We want to realise the aim of independent living, and work is integral to this.

It is unacceptable that while many disabled people want to work, too few achieve this ambition, and that the life outcomes of young disabled people and those with special educational needs (SEN) are disproportionately poor. The SEN and Disability Green Paper consultation, *Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability*, proposed radical reforms to the SEN system. These include a much clearer focus on equipping disabled young people and those with SEN to make a better transition to adulthood, including employment. However, we recognise that we need to do more to enable disabled people to fulfil their ambition to work.

That is why, in December 2010, we asked Liz Sayce to review the specialist programmes which the Department for Work and Pensions funds to support disabled people into employment and make recommendations as to how we could improve this support and maximise the number of disabled people benefiting from it. Her report¹ started with the basic premise that money should follow individuals, rather than be channelled into institutions. This is completely in line with the Government's approach: a Work Programme which stresses personalised support and a flexible package of measures in Get Britain Working.

¹ Sayce, L, 2011, *Getting in, staying in and getting on* (CM 8081), TSO.

6 Section 1 Introduction and response

The Government welcomed the Sayce Review, *Getting in, staying in and getting on*, published on 9 June 2011, which made a large number of recommendations about how the Government can deliver more effective specialist disability employment programmes to help more disabled people move into and keep work. The recommendations ranged from principles that should govern the design of future disability employment programmes to practical ways in which current programmes could be improved.

The central theme that resources should be directed towards disabled people themselves, giving them maximum choice and control in the services they receive, is one which the Government embraces. In accepting the Sayce Review's principled call for reform, we confirmed that the overall budget for specialist disability employment programmes in the current Spending Review period would be protected. We have repeatedly stated that resources released from reforms would be reinvested as they become available, to enable improvements in the way disability employment support is provided, after investing in support to help those people and organisations affected through any transition.

The recommendations set out in the Sayce Review would represent a new direction for disability employment programmes and would have a major impact on some of the organisations that currently deliver employment services, particularly Remploy and Residential Training Colleges. Before taking any decisions in these areas, we therefore undertook a full public consultation. This consultation was launched on 11 July 2011 and ran for 14 weeks to 17 October 2011.

The consultation sought views from the widest possible range of respondents. To encourage responses, and to receive informal views, there were also a series of consultation events around the country, six aimed at Remploy employees, one covering Residential Training Colleges and two covering Access to Work.

There was a general consensus that the principle that funding should follow the individual, rather than institutions, was the correct one. However, there were understandable variations in views, depending upon people's personal circumstances and experience, on the specific recommendations. The following sections summarise these in more detail.

A number of additional issues were raised in consultation responses. For example, a number of respondents mentioned that the most disadvantaged may need support to ensure they do not miss out and are able to take advantage of the opportunities on offer. Some suggested that future arrangements might include a role of advocacy for those less able to represent their own interests. We are acutely aware of the need to ensure that disabled people with the greatest barriers are able to enjoy the same opportunities as other people, and that specialist support is particularly important for groups currently poorly represented in the labour market.

Consequently, in addition to the specifics outlined below, we will begin a period of co-production with disabled people to ensure that employment support and services meet their needs and are delivered in a way that makes them attractive and accessible. This work will build upon the co-productive approach we are taking to develop the disability strategy. We published a discussion document, *Fulfilling Potential*, on 1 December 2011 which asks for practical suggestions about what should be included in the strategy. We want disabled people, as well as the people and organisations that support them, to be partners in developing the strategy. We plan to publish the disability strategy in the spring.

We are particularly keen to ensure that disabled people have access to organisations that are led by service users – we must learn from the experience and insight of disabled people themselves. Evidence shows that where disabled people co-produce and co-deliver services, the outcomes are better for the people that use them.

It is vital too, that disability employment is recognised both as a government priority and as an area that requires close working and co-operation between Departments. The Minister for Disabled People has already established a cross-government Ministerial group with the aim of improving employment outcomes for disabled people.

The rest of this section outlines the Government's plans in regard to the three areas in scope of the Sayce Review: Access to Work, Remploy and Residential Training Colleges.

Access to Work

The consultation responses show clear support for Access to Work in terms of the support it currently provides disabled people to enter and remain in employment. There were also positive responses to the recommendations in the review around how else Access to Work provision might be used in the future, including the additional support that more disabled people might receive. Implementing recommendations made in the Sayce Review has the potential to release funding, currently expected to be from 2014. Government will recycle resources into Access to Work so that more disabled people can be supported to enter and remain in employment.

There is clearly more we can do to make the Access to Work programme more efficient and to place more control in the hands of individuals. The current programme only goes so far. It tends to help those who require physical adaptations such as British Sign Language (BSL) interpreters, office equipment and travel-to-work support. For example, in 2010/11 22 per cent of the budget was spent on BSL interpreters, 28 per cent on travel-to-work support and around 11 per cent on special aids and equipment. It has also tended to focus support on people working for larger employers – the 20 employers with the highest number of employees who received an Access to Work award in 2010/11 were predominantly large public or third sector organisations. If we are to make Access to Work work for more people, for a wider range of people, and with a wider range of employers, we need to specify clearly what it should do and how it should do it, so that we retain the programme's strengths while extending its range.

We will undertake feasibility studies and work with disabled people to establish how we can make some of the improvements recommended. These include building on the pre-employment eligibility letter, which the Government has already introduced; making Access to Work available via an internet portal; and making it easier to transfer awards between employers. We will also work with disabled people to see how we might streamline the Access to Work assessment process, and consider how to make support available to disabled people moving towards employment. We will work with both employers and disabled people to ensure disabled employees receive the support they need.

8 Section 1 Introduction and response

We will work with the Department for Education on the proposal for supported internships in the SEN and Disability Green Paper to ensure that Access to Work provision would be in place to support young disabled people accessing these opportunities. This will help to develop continuous support from education to employment for those young people for whom supported internships result in the offer of a job.

The consultation asked respondents to prioritise issues for change in Access to Work. Although there was more notable support for improving people's knowledge of what they may be entitled to, paying for temporary replacement workers, extending cover to work experience, and involving user-led organisations (ULOs), there was no clear consensus on which reforms to prioritise.

There are some reforms we can embark on immediately. The Department has already begun activity to ensure the current budget works more effectively. We have started work on targeted marketing for the programme and we are particularly keen to ensure we reach under-represented groups, such as those with mental health conditions and learning disabilities, as well as reaching smaller employers. On 16 January 2011, Jobcentre Plus rolled out support planning, which will help in leading some customers towards independent travel after a period of support from Access to Work.

In addition, the Inter-Ministerial Group on Disability Employment is looking at how we can further improve central government support to ensure that the Government is an exemplar in making adjustments.

Remploy

The recommendations on Remploy attracted a great deal of interest during the public consultation.

The Government supports the principle set out in the Sayce Review of moving towards funding the needs of individuals and away from funding specific workplaces or facilities. We will therefore implement the Sayce Review recommendations that viable Remploy businesses could be given the opportunity to exit government ownership, including under employee-led alternative business models such as employee-led mutuals, or sold; and non-viable businesses should be sold or closed.

As a first stage, Remploy will begin collective consultation on the proposed closure of Remploy factories that the Remploy Board considers (subject to consultation) are unlikely to be able to achieve independent financial viability. As part of the consultation process, employees will of course be able to put forward proposals in relation to any viable aspects of non-viable businesses, along with any other proposals for avoiding compulsory redundancies. The second stage of the process will be for the Department to work with the Remploy Board to identify if it is, indeed, possible to exit the remaining businesses, or parts of businesses, from government, and if that should be possible, how this might be achieved. Where this is not possible, collective consultation on further closures would need to be considered by the Remploy Board.

Subject to the outcome of consultation, any employees made redundant would be offered a comprehensive personalised package of support to help them into alternative employment and help meet individual needs. We are working closely with key partners to identify the full range of support that is available in each location, and staff representatives will be consulted on the package of support being put in place.

Subject to the outcome of consultation, any employees made redundant would be offered a comprehensive personalised package of support to help them into alternative employment and help meet individual needs. We are working closely with key partners to identify the full range of support that is available in each location, and staff representatives will be consulted on the package of support being put in place.

It has been suggested that staff in Remploy factories would not find work in mainstream employment. We think this sells short the experience of disabled people working in Remploy. In 2010/11 Remploy Employment Services supported over 20,000 disabled and disadvantaged people into work across England, Scotland and Wales, including people with the same support needs as employees in Remploy factories. Remploy Employment Services provide personalised support and work in partnership with over 2,500 employers at national and local level.

Some Remploy factory sites, the CCTV business and Remploy Employment Services appear to be more likely to be able to continue to operate free from government control. We will work with the Remploy Board to identify whether these Remploy businesses can be freed from government control, including employee-led commercial exit and/or open market sales, and how this might be achieved.

In line with its consultation obligations, Remploy will work closely with trade unions on these proposals and welcome their contributions.

The Remploy Pension Scheme will continue to be run by the Trustees while the proposed reforms take place. If at the end of the reforms Remploy leaves Government control the pension scheme would close. The Government has no intention that this would cause a wind up of the pension scheme, and we will work closely with the Trustees to ensure that the scheme could continue to be run as a closed scheme. The accrued benefits of all scheme members will be fully protected.

Residential Training Colleges

The consultation drew relatively few responses to the questions on Residential Training Colleges. Those that did respond mainly provided or received these services, and the services were clearly valued by those who did respond. As *Getting in, staying in and getting on* recognised, the colleges provide a highly-specialised and important service. However, it is a relatively costly service and one which addresses much more than a person's employment needs. In particular, the colleges deal with vocational training, independent living skills and adapting to being disabled.

In comparison to the level of the Department's Specialist Disability Employment Programmes (SDEP) budget, Residential Training Colleges help relatively few people into employment at relatively high cost. However, we are keen to ensure that government explores fully the best way to fund and utilise the clear expert and specialised services offered by Residential Training Colleges.

While the Government considers how to proceed, and to support the colleges through any period of transition, we have committed to funding provision through to the end of the academic year ending summer 2013. During the intervening period, we will work with the colleges to further reduce unit costs and improve employment outcomes. We will also work across government and with key stakeholders, including the colleges, to examine how best to diversify funding streams and explore how to utilise mainstream provision more effectively.

The consultation

2

On 11 July 2011, the Government published *Specialist disability employment programmes* (Cm 8126), a public consultation that sought views on the recommendations from the independent review conducted by Liz Sayce, *Getting in, staying in and getting on*.

To make our proposals as accessible as possible, the consultation document was produced in a wide range of formats. These included easy read, audio CD and cassette, large print, and Braille. A summary, including consultation questions, was produced in BSL on DVD. PDF versions of the main paper, easy-read versions, and the BSL version were also made available online at www.dwp.gov.uk/sayce-consultation or by request to the Department.

The consultation closed on 17 October 2011. During the consultation period, the website was visited more than 1,400 times and the PDF version of the document was viewed more than 4,000 times. We received nearly 1,200 responses from individuals, of which many were standard responses (defined as two or more emails or letters that contained the same text, but were signed by different individuals), and around 200 responses from organisations, of which about 100 were national organisations and the remainder were smaller local bodies.

Responses to the consultation were received through our online consultation site and via email, post, and telephone.

It has been difficult to identify a precise figure for the number of organisations that responded to the consultation because, for example, some organisations collaborated with others to provide joint responses on behalf of a single umbrella organisation. In some cases, it has also been unclear whether contributions reflect the views of individuals within an organisation or the corporate view. Nevertheless, Annex 1 lists the organisations responding as accurately as has been possible (unless they asked for their response to be kept confidential).

The consultation applied to England, Wales and Scotland. We received responses from individuals and organisations from all three countries. We received one response from Northern Ireland.

Consultation events

To ensure as many people as possible knew of the consultation and understood the issues being consulted on, we held a series of events with different people around the country. The location and focus of each was as follows:

Date	Location	Focus
19 July 2011	London	Residential Training Colleges – Principals/representatives
12 September 2011	Leeds	Remploy employees – Yorkshire and The Humber and North-East
13 September 2011	Manchester	Remploy employees – North-West
14 September 2011	Glasgow	Remploy employees – Scotland
19 September 2011	Coventry	Remploy employees – Midlands
20 September 2011	Cardiff	Remploy employees – Wales/South-West
21 September 2011	Reading	Remploy employees – London and South East
26 September 2011	Manchester	Access to Work – recipients and employers
11 October 2011	London	Access to Work – employers and suppliers

Breakdown of responses

It was common for respondents to concentrate on questions most relevant to them. Of those individuals who indicated their background, the vast majority were Remploy employees and they tended to concentrate on the Remploy recommendations, but there were also some responses from individuals benefiting from Access to Work, which tended to focus on the questions relating to that programme.

Of the responses from organisations, more of them covered the full range of questions: even so, there was a concentration on those questions most relevant to them, with shorter answers to more peripheral issues.

Not all respondents chose to answer the specific questions asked: some preferred to provide their views on the Sayce Review in fairly general terms, often commenting on their personal circumstances and their concerns about the possible consequences arising from any changes. Where possible, we have tried to include these responses in the appropriate sections. Responses that did not fall easily under the specific questions have been summarised under Question 12: ‘Do you have any other suggestions for improving or changing specialist disability employment support not covered by any of the above questions?’

Structure of this document

This publication summarises the main points made by respondents against each question, where appropriate illustrating them with quotes from the responses. It also attempts to convey the weight of respondents against the respective views. Due to the nature and structure of the consultation it is not possible to conduct a robust quantitative analysis of responses.

Both the *Specialist disability employment programmes* (Cm 8126) consultation and this response are available at www.dwp.gov.uk/consultations/2011/specialist-disability-emp-prog.shtml

If you would like to receive this response in a particular format, for example large print, Braille, audio, easy read or Welsh, please contact:

Disability and Work Opportunities Division
Department for Work and Pensions
Ground Floor
Caxton House
6–12 Tothill Street
London
SW1H 9NA

Telephone: 0207 449 7817

Email: sdep.signpost@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

You may also wish to refer to the Government's response to the review (Cm 8106), or to the independent review conducted by Liz Sayce *Getting in, staying in and getting on*. Both of these can be found at www.dwp.gov.uk/consultations/2011

A new direction

3

The Sayce Review called for a new direction for employment programmes to support disabled people into work.

Key messages from the Sayce Review

A shift in policy is needed: money should be used to support individuals to achieve their employment aspirations in the widest range of jobs and careers, rather than to fund disability-specific workplaces or facilities.

Question 1

Do you agree that funding should follow the individual so they can work where they choose, rather than the Department funding specific workplaces or facilities?

Summary of responses to consultation

General support for the principle of funding following the individual came from many organisations, including local authorities and the third sector, and from a small number of the individuals who responded to the consultation. This was often considered to be a fundamental component of effective employment support provision.

Some respondents suggested that if funding were to follow the individual it could remove some of the barriers that are created by having multiple funding streams, and may ultimately improve the efficiency of how funding is used.

“Disabled people should have the same choice and opportunities for work as non-disabled people have. Funding for support that follows individuals rather than being targeted at specific workplaces is an important element of creating this opportunity for disabled people. The way funding is used to deliver support must be timely, effective and simple to access.”

(Sense for deafblind people)

Alongside a general support for the principle of funding following the individual were a number of specific issues which respondents felt were important to consider and improve upon in order to implement individualised funding effectively. These included improved counselling and support services to help disabled people use individualised funding as effectively as possible, and extending the boundaries of individualised support which would enable disabled people to take up internships, work experience and work placements.

“The Commission recommends that further consideration is given to retaining and developing advice and support services that provide information, advice and support to disabled people in negotiating with employers and dealing with potential discrimination.”

(Equality and Human Rights Commission)

These issues were thought to be particularly important for individuals who have not worked outside of sheltered employment for some time, or for individuals with a mental health condition or learning disability.

However, some respondents stated that this advocacy network should not be paid for through individualised budgets, but should be an additional service provided by government.

Another issue raised by a small number of respondents was a concern that allowing individuals the freedom to become commissioners of their own support may not necessarily allow them to receive the most appropriate provision at an affordable price because of economies of scale. It was felt that safeguards need to be put in place by government to ensure individuals are able to make the best and most effective use of available funding.

“For some individuals with low prevalent health conditions and geographically dispersed across the UK, such as blind and partially sighted people, their collective purchasing power will remain small and thus the market may not wholly meet their needs or do so at a price that is affordable. The emerging market is likely to thus require support, oversight and intervention by the Government in order to optimise the ability of many groups such as blind and partially sighted people to obtain services.”

(Royal National Institute of Blind People)

Furthermore, it was suggested that some individuals may not want, or be suitable for, the added responsibility associated with choosing how to use their individualised funding, and that some individuals may still choose to have their individualised funding directed at a specific workplace. In these instances it was felt that individuals should be able to leave commissioning decisions to another party, or be able to direct individualised funding towards specific workplaces.

“This reform assumes disabled people are skilled up and able to make their own decisions of their career, their abilities, what job or course they would like. Some cannot, or find it difficult.”

(Individual respondent)

Despite the general support for the idea that funding should follow the individual, there was strong opposition to this from some respondents, particularly from a large number of individuals working for Remploy, and from trade unions. This seemed to be linked to the notion that if funding were to follow the individual it could mean that some people may not be able to continue to work in their current job as their employer could potentially face closure. Many of these respondents were worried about finding a job elsewhere in the current economic climate, or concerned that the jobs available in mainstream employment do not have the same understanding of disability as their current employer. Some individuals also argued that if they were able to choose where their funding was directed then they would direct it at their existing employer anyway, which in these instances appeared mainly to be Remploy.

“I don’t agree with this [Question 1 in consultation document]. I feel I get a lot of support from the management here [current workplace] and they help me with my disability. The job I am given to do is always within my capabilities and this would not be the case if I worked somewhere else. I choose to work here and want funding to stay within the factories.”

(Individual respondent)

“Unite believes that the Government’s proposals for funding to follow the individual are far too simplistic. Individuals should have the freedom to choose the type of work they want to do. This has long been a demand of disabled campaigners. Unite members believe that this choice has to also include specific Government funded supported workplaces like Remploy and not be used as a way to outsource responsibility for service cuts to service users.”

(Unite)

There was also concern among some respondents that the evidence base being used to inform decisions about individualised funding is limited, so the implications of proposed changes are not known.

“...whilst there is considerable evidence to support the delivery of personalised services as a key element of effective supported employment provision, the evidence on individual budgets for employment support is less clear.”

(Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion)

It was sometimes felt that tailored support may be better provided through the use of improved audits and inspections as there is evidence to suggest these systems have been successful in improving quality of support.

“It is increasingly proposed that the use of personal budgets is the only means of ensuring individualised service delivery. We would question this proposition. There is ample evidence that the use of audits and inspections has greatly improved the quality of service provision. We believe that there is far too great a gap between the theoretical design of personal budgets and the reality of their implementation.”

(British Association of Supported Employment)

4

Access to Work

Access to Work is a specialist disability employment programme delivered by Jobcentre Plus. It can help meet the costs of such things as workplace adjustments, support workers and travel to work to help a disabled person take up or retain paid work, above and beyond the adjustments and support employers would be expected to make themselves. Applications for support are made by individual disabled people who are entering, or already in, paid work, including self-employment. The support is flexible and personalised to meet individual need, and there are no upper limits on support or any maximum duration for support.

Access to Work is available to disabled people whose jobs are temporary and/or part time, and people who are getting benefits and participating in permitted work can be eligible for support.

Employers share the costs of some elements for applicants who have been in a job for more than six weeks, with larger employers paying more than smaller employers. No contribution is required from very small employers or from self-employed people.

In December 2010, the Government reformed the rules to enable disabled job seekers to find out immediately if they are eligible for Access to Work support by completing a short online questionnaire at Directgov. If eligible, they are then able to print off a Pre-Employment Eligibility Letter to use when applying for jobs and which can be shown to prospective employers. This meets a commitment in the Coalition Programme.

In the financial year 2010/11, the programme helped over 35,000 disabled people to get and keep employment. Further information about Access to Work can be found at

www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/Emplimentsupport/WorkSchemesAndProgrammes/DG_4000347

Key message from the Sayce Review

Access to Work is highly cost-effective^{2,3}: it should be made more widely available and funding should be increased as resources are released from the reform of less-effective programmes. The delivery of Access to Work should be modernised, using internet-based technology to share information and drive down the costs of delivery.

Question 2

Do you agree that any funding which may be released from reforms to specialist disability employment programmes should be used to expand the Access to Work programme?

If not, please say how you think the money should be spent to help more disabled people into work.

Summary of responses to consultation

There was widespread agreement among respondents that the expansion of the Access to Work programme would be a positive step towards enabling greater numbers of disabled people to participate in the labour market. This support came mainly from third and private sector organisations, as well as local authorities, although a large number of individuals also supported this idea.

“BACP agrees that funding released should be used to expand the Access to Work programme, with particular attention paid to expanding the information sharing recommendations of the Sayce review.”

(British Association for Counselling and Psychotherapy)

There was also widespread agreement among respondents that there was a general lack of awareness of the Access to Work programme, by both individuals and employers. Many respondents suggested that increasing awareness about the programme was a priority, and that this would enable more people to benefit from it and thus to realise their potential.

² Thornton P, and Corden A, 2002, *Evaluating the Impact of Access to Work: A Case Study Approach*, DWP. http://php.york.ac.uk/inst/spru/research/summs/impact_atw.php

³ The Disability Employment Coalition, 2004, *Access to Work for disabled people*, The Disability Employment Coalition. <http://www.disabilityalliance.org/access.pdf>

“Access to Work is indeed ‘the best kept secret in government’ and needs to be more widely publicised and used. It is an invaluable service to people with disabilities to help them find, obtain and remain in employment and its effects on the lives of these people can not be overstated.”

(Merthyr Tydfil Trades Council)

“As noted in the Sayce Report, many employers are not aware of Access to Work, and better promotion of the service to employers would help facilitate retention. However, it is also important to ensure that there are adequate resources in the pre-employment provision to support people to prepare for and enter work.”

(British Psychological Society)

Overall though, this support was often coupled, notably in responses from Remploy factory employees and in some responses from third sector organisations, with concerns about the possible impact of diverting funding away from other provision to fund an expansion of Access to Work. These concerns were particularly noticeable from providers and the third sector, who suggested that careful consideration needs to be taken about the effect of a shift in funding on those currently receiving other forms of support.

Additionally, as was the case with support for funding following the individual, support for expanding Access to Work, again predominantly but not exclusively from Remploy employees and trade unions, was often on the condition that sheltered employment be maintained so that individuals could choose to work there if they so wished.

“Access to Work only improves the job you are already in or provides transport to and from your place of work, it does not provide a job for a disabled person, whereas Remploy does and also supplies training and good job prospects.”

(Individual respondent)

“We would agree that it would seem sensible to reinvest funding released from less effective employment programmes into a programme that is widely supported by disabled people and is regarded as an effective approach, providing good value for money. Mencap very much supports Access to Work. However, it is important to recognise that Access to Work is essentially currently an ‘in work’ programme and does not traditionally provide for the pre-work preparation and support offered by supported employment organisations – and recognised through the modular Work Choice approach (e.g. soft skills training, job search, work experience placements and so on).”

(Mencap)

A number of individuals, especially those working in Remploy factories and their trade unions, were strongly against the proposal to use funding freed up from existing provision to fund an expansion of Access to Work. Many of these concerns were similar to those mentioned previously, such as the impact of diverting funding away from supporting individuals in sheltered employment and the likelihood of disabled people finding employment in the current economic climate. A number of people also expressed concern that Access to Work does not provide employment opportunities in itself.

“We do not agree that funding should be released from specialist disability employment programmes including supported employment factories and businesses such as Remploy. Access to Work does not provide jobs, it supports access to work and is time limited. Remploy has the means to create direct and sustainable jobs.”

(GMB European Office)

Furthermore, there was the concern among some that the decision to increase funding for Access to Work and the assumptions about increased take up of employment among disabled people are not evidence based.

“...we believe that any funding released from savings should be used to fund evidence based best practice supported employment provision.”

(Merthyr Tydfil Institute for the Blind)

Other concerns noted by many respondents included the fact that Access to Work is not able to support individuals prior to taking up employment, nor does it provide support to individuals who are furthest away from the labour market. However, these were all seen to be areas where the programme can be improved going forward to better support the needs of disabled people. Further areas where Access to Work could be improved are explored through responses to Question 3.

Question 3

As resources are limited, it may not be possible to implement all of the recommended improvements to Access to Work straight away. Which ones do you think should be the priority as funding becomes available?

- Paying for a temporary replacement worker for a small- or medium-sized business when a disabled person is off sick because of their disability.
- Creating a system so that disabled people could know the value of Access to Work support they could get before they get a job.
- Training Jobcentre Plus advisers to give more support and advice to employers.
- Helping customers to develop independent travel skills so that some people will need Access to Work travel support for a shorter time.
- Working more closely with user-led organisations to improve the service.
- Extending Access to Work support to cover more work-related training, for example unpaid work experience.

Not all respondents actually ranked these recommended improvements to Access to Work, but all the recommendations had some degree of support. However, bullets 1, 2, 5 and 6 were seen as being particularly important priorities among many respondents.

“Papworth Trust supports all of the recommended improvements to Access to Work. We believe that the priority should be to create a system which shows disabled people what Access to Work support they are eligible for before applying for a job. We believe this simple change would make it easier for, and encourage more, employers to employ disabled people, while in turn increasing the uptake of Access to Work.”

(Papworth Trust)

The extent to which the proposed improvements to Access to Work were supported by respondents sometimes related to the interests of organisations, with the relative value of each recommendation being considered within the context of their specialism.

Frequently recommended by organisations and a large number of individuals was the idea that disabled people should be able to get a much firmer idea of what Access to Work can do for them before applying for a job. This may help to alleviate customers’ concerns about not having the support in place when they make the leap and come off benefit.

“Creating a system so that disabled people could know in advance the support they would get when they get a job. This promotes independence and gives a prospective employer confidence that support will be in place from day one.”

(Individual respondent)

Equally widespread support, particularly from organisations in the third sector and several of the local authorities that responded, believed that Access to Work needed to expand its remit to include pre-work support. Respondents in favour of this recommendation believed Access to Work should be made available for internships, work experience, learning-on-the-job programmes and work placement.

“The support required by individuals in an employment situation will also be required for an unpaid work placement; therefore the BPS recommends that funding is made available to allow individuals to participate in work experience. Opportunity to engage in work placements is a strong predictor of successful return to paid employment.”

(The British Psychological Society)

Those in favour of more work-related training being available were particularly concerned that disabled people should be remunerated fairly and equitably. The terms and conditions for work-experience for disabled people or those with long-term health conditions should be the same as for other people.

Working with user-led organisations was also recommended, as long as these are truly representative of user experience and voice.

“User led disabled people’s organisations have direct experience of working with employers and employees, and some have 24/7 helplines. Therefore not to use user-led organisations already providing the services, in our opinion, is a duplication which will result in waste of resources.”

(Association of Disabled Professionals)

It was thought to be important that Access to Work listens and responds to the stated needs of disabled people. Some respondents felt that Access to Work staff and Jobcentre Plus advisers have little understanding of the level and range of barriers faced by disabled people, especially for those with mental health conditions and hidden impairments. However, it was generally felt that up-skilling and raising awareness among Jobcentre Plus staff is something that should occur as a standard business practice and not be funded through employment support schemes.

“‘Training Jobcentre Plus advisers...’ and ‘Working... with user led organisations...’ were both felt to be very important but were strongly viewed to be a part of Jobcentre Plus core business and therefore should not be funded from Access to Work.”

(Newcastle City Council)

Despite the support of many organisations, there were also concerns among some that expansion of Access to Work to cover sick leave may lead to inaccurate perceptions about disability because sickness absence is not always caused by someone’s impairment, and this could further create a negative stereotype of disability.

“We do not support the recommendation of paying for a temporary replacement worker. This could give rise to a presumption that all disabled people are off sick because of their disability, which is not always the case, may lead to sickness being wrongly attributed to disability, and gives a negative message in relation to employing people with disabilities.”

(Durham County Council)

Views from consultation events

As noted, officials held two meetings focused on Access to Work. The first one, in Manchester, was mainly attended by individuals receiving Access to Work, although some employers also attended. The general views coming from this event were that the programme was very helpful in supporting disabled people in work, and could usefully be made bigger, and be marketed more extensively. There was also strong support for extending the programme towards interns and volunteers. The later event in London was attended by employers and by some disability organisations. The view from this event was similar with regard to expanding the programme, and they also emphasised the desirability of ensuring the programme integrated well with disabled student allowances, so that the transition from education to employment for disabled people was as seamless as possible.



Remploy is a non-departmental public body, public corporation and company limited by guarantee, sponsored by the Department and its predecessors since its creation in 1945, principally to provide sheltered employment, rehabilitation and training for disabled ex-servicemen. Its mission is to “increase the employment opportunities of disabled people and those who experience complex barriers to work”.

Remploy receives Grant-in-Aid each year to deliver a range of employment and development opportunities to disabled people under the Government’s Work Choice programme. The company has also bid for, and is contracted to deliver, other employment programmes for disabled and disadvantaged people.

In 2005, a National Audit Office report concluded that many of Remploy’s factories were not sustainable in economic terms and that Remploy Employment Services offered a more cost-effective service. In 2007, a five-year modernisation plan was agreed from April 2008 that looked to increase substantially the numbers of disabled people in work at a much lower cost per person.

Remploy’s strategy and delivery model was the subject of a major review undertaken by the previous administration in 2006/07 culminating in the Modernisation Plan, covering the five-year period from April 2008. The Government continued with the Modernisation Plan in full despite challenging fiscal conditions.

The Remploy business is split into:

- **Remploy Enterprise Businesses** (the factory network) currently operates in 12 business sectors including furniture, logistics, and recycling industries, as well as extended supply chain and higher added-value manufacturing. Work is carried out in a network of 54 local business sites and around 30 Closed-Circuit Television services spread across Great Britain employing around 2,500 people, of which around 2,200 are disabled people.

Over the first three years of the Modernisation Plan, Enterprise Businesses has failed to meet its Modernisation Plan targets, which have proved to be unrealistic. Crucially, it has made no significant progress towards reducing the subsidy per job to the desired figure of less than £10,000 for each supported disabled person. Instead, it remains at almost £25,000 for each supported disabled person. The Sayce Review noted that in 2009/10, all Remploy's Enterprise Businesses operated at a loss which totalled £63 million and that, on average, half of its employees had little or no work to do.

- **Remploy Employment Services** support disabled people into work with mainstream employers. They operate through a network of around 60 branches and offices, offering support and guidance to disabled people and employers.

The cost for each job outcome is around £3,300. The Modernisation Plan envisaged a four-fold increase over five years in the numbers of job outcomes for disabled people and that, by 2013, a total of 20,000 disabled people each year would be found sustainable employment. In the first three years of the plan, Employment Services has increased, year on year, the numbers of disabled people's job outcomes from 6,698 in 2008/09 to 9,125 in 2009/10 to 15,292 in 2010/11.

Further information about Remploy can be found at www.Remploy.co.uk/

Key message from the Sayce Review

The review recommended that, by the end of the current Spending Review, the Department should have introduced a new model for Remploy, and Government funding should be invested in effective support for individuals rather than subsidising factory businesses. It suggested that, where potentially viable, Remploy businesses should be given the opportunity to become successful, independent businesses, with employees and other organisations encouraged to put forward business plans to form new businesses or to acquire existing ones. Where businesses are not viable, the review recommended that employees should receive a comprehensive support package to find alternative employment. The review suggested that stakeholders, including trade unions, should be involved.

The review recommended that Remploy Employment Services should also be freed from government control and should compete for contracts like any other provider.

Question 4

Do you agree that change is needed to Remploy, as part of an overall approach of redistributing available funds? Do you agree that the best way to achieve this is to allow viable parts of Remploy to leave the public sector and for direct government funding of Remploy to be phased out?

Question 5

Do you agree that disabled people working within Remploy's Enterprise Businesses should be given the opportunity to own and run these businesses free of government control and funding? Do you have any views on how to support this transition?

Question 6

Do you agree that Remploy's Employment Services should be sold and transformed into a mutual, social enterprise or other model? Do you have any views on how to support this transition?

Summary of responses to consultation

Questions on Remploy in the consultation generated the largest number of responses. Opinions relating to the future of Remploy were split, which seemed to reflect whether the respondent was employed at Remploy or a representative of someone who was, such as a trade union or parent or carer; or were independent of Remploy.

A large number of Remploy employees responded to the consultation and did not agree with the proposed changes to Remploy funding, although they did often acknowledge that change is needed to the organisation. This was echoed by the majority of trade unions. A number of Members of Parliament also disagreed with the proposed cessation of government funding, citing concern about the potential impact this would have upon their constituents.

"We believe that closing sheltered employment facilities such as Remploy factories would deepen inequalities for the most disadvantaged disabled people, and Welsh Government will vigorously oppose such closures."

(Welsh Government)

"I do not agree with the Sayce review recommendations, jobs are hard to come by especially if you are disabled, the government should continue to support Remploy."

(Individual respondent)

"The result of taking Remploy out of Government Control will achieve nothing more than the closure of factories, the increase in the number of disabled people on benefit with the attendant problems that would also bring."

(Remploy Trade Union Consortium)

Despite widespread concern about the future for Remploy employees, many of the third sector organisations and local authorities who responded to the consultation and gave their views on the future of Remploy were broadly supportive of proposed changes to the model. They were generally of the opinion that the model of segregated employment is now outdated. In line with the Sayce Review, they stressed that any changes to the current model should be handled sensitively and with a careful transition plan in place which would support those affected by the changes into alternative employment.

“We agree that Remploy should be radically reformed, with high quality support for everyone affected by this.”

(Mind)

“We appreciate that the Sayce Review has caused some concern for disabled people and their trades union representatives working in Remploy factories. However, we believe segregated employment for disabled people is unacceptable.”

(Disability Rights UK)

“Disability Wales endorses the promotion of fully integrated services and does not see Remploy as either progressive or forward thinking in their approaches to service provision. Although they may once have been seen as providing opportunities for disabled people, they are now standing in the way of full integration and indirectly hampering individuals’ chances of progression.”

(Disability Wales)

“Overall, yes [agree with question four in consultation], but many people who will subsequently be made unemployed will need specialist support in looking for a new job as they may be reluctant to start anything new which is outside their comfort zone. We do believe the change will help with diversity and inclusion in the workplace as long as the new jobseekers get the support they need into the jobs they want. We firmly believe in the need to promote choice, independence, inclusion, acceptance, and raise people’s confidence and status within their own society.”

(Cornwall County Council)

“Hampshire County Council Adult Services agrees that change is needed to Remploy, as part of an overall approach of redistributing available funds: however this should be done with the full involvement and consultation of the current users of Remploy services.”

(Hampshire County Council)

“The MS Society recognises the contribution that sheltered Remploy factories make to providing people with disabilities facing complex barriers to work with employment. However we also realise that reform is required so that the needs of disabled people can continue to be met.”

(MS Society)

“Papworth Trust believes the factories played an important role for disabled people in the distant past but the current model is no longer sustainable or effective.”

(Papworth Trust)

Some organisations suggested that Remploy should compete for contracts in the same manner as all other organisations.

“SUSE members would like to see the playing field levelled with Remploy Employment Services having to compete for government contracts in the same way as other agencies do: direct funding should be phased out in a timely and sensitive manner. Given SUSE’s commitment to open employment, SUSE agrees that the factory approach is outmoded. The cost, at £25,000, is high and the rate of movement of individuals is low (note the reports from the unions in the Sayce review).”

(Scottish Union of Supported Employment)

Many respondents were of the view that employees at Remploy factories should be given the opportunity to own and run Remploy as their own business, although this was often on the condition that government continued to fund the organisation. It was also often felt that if government ceased funding Remploy factories they would not be able to continue.

Nevertheless, others thought that if the business was financially viable without government funding then it should be possible for its employees to own and run the business free from government control and funding.

“Yes I do agree that disabled people working within Remploy’s Enterprise Business should be given the opportunity to own and run these businesses free of government control but only to a certain extent. I do not agree that it should be totally free from government funding, and there are concerns with regards to how this could actually be achieved.”

(Individual respondent)

“We agree that sheltered work elements of Remploy should be enabled to float off as social enterprises, if they are expected to be viable in this form, or closed down. Where services do not continue, this must be accompanied by intensive support for the people affected.”

(Centre for Mental Health)

Respondents, in particular from the third sector and individuals, were often against the idea of Remploy employees owning and running the business without government funding. The reasons for this were because they felt that the employees did not have the specific skills to run the factories as their own businesses, and that if it was not financially sustainable at the moment it was unlikely to become so under their ownership. There were also concerns about setting up a business in the current economic climate.

“Now isn’t the time to start a business. Also, we don’t have the business know how.”

(Individual respondent)

Respondents were often concerned with the prospect of Remploy Employment Services being transformed into a mutual, social enterprise or other model. This very often centred on worries about the impact on Remploy Enterprise Businesses should a financially profitable arm of Remploy be taken away, with individuals often worried that this would put further pressure on their factories.

“Employment Services is Remploy’s most profitable business and should not be sold off. Dividing of company assets will only weaken the structure of the company.”

(Individual respondent)

A number of individuals also discussed the benefits of having a joined-up enterprise business and employment service within Remploy as this enables disabled people to work in a segregated environment, but also choose to seek mainstream employment.

Additionally, respondents from some trade unions felt that having separate business structures was disadvantageous, and that the two arms of Remploy should be brought together. This approach was seen to allow closer working between the two arms of Remploy and be a more efficient use of resources.

“No, Employment Services and Enterprise Business should be working hand in hand to provide training places as well as full-time jobs.”

(Individual respondent)

“Unite’s view is that Employment Service should, where possible, be reintegrated into factory sites; this would reduce costs for all and lead to a closer working arrangement, similar to that which previously existed. Where there is no factory in the vicinity, lower cost premises should be considered in the community where better links could be developed and resources could be used to assist the community.”

(Unite)

However, there was also support for the idea of transforming Remploy Employment Services into a mutual or social enterprise.

“I do not believe that Remploy ES should be sold, or turned into a profit making organisation. However I do support the idea of a Mutual or Social Enterprise.”

(Individual respondent)

“We think this section of Remploy should compete for Government contracts in the same way as the private and voluntary sector do now. Yes, it should be sold.”

(Scottish Union of Supported Employment)

Question 7

If you do not agree with the proposals in the Sayce Review, please tell us your ideas for the future of Remploy.

Summary of responses to consultation

There were very few suggestions from respondents with ideas for the future of Remploy. Nevertheless, some respondents thought that detailed business and wider social analysis should be conducted to ascertain the best way forward for Remploy.

“Remploy is a diverse producer with a turnover of £130 million with 54 factories operating across a wide range of markets. Therefore the business prospects in each market should be evaluated individually alongside current productive capacity. New opportunities for better sales and marketing and investment in productivity should be considered on a case by case basis in order to focus on greatest potential.”

(Geraint Davies MP)

“Prior to any decision being taken an independent comprehensive review of each Remploy factory is vital as to its viability as it would appear they each offer different trades. We believe part of the problem is Remploy has too many managers and some employees not having work to do which is one reason why it is a costly operation. Additionally an audit into the skill set in each factory should be undertaken. Individual employees and managers views together with a social cost/benefit analysis needs to be taken into account.”

(Association of Disabled Professionals)

Questions were also raised by many respondents regarding the way in which the organisation has been run, citing an inefficient and top heavy management structure, as well as the constraining impact the Department for Work and Pensions' governance of Remploy has had upon the organisation's ability to operate effectively. It was often felt that if structural changes were made to the way Remploy is run then this would be sufficient to allow the organisation to become more productive.

"The management should be a stripped down tight and focused core."

(General Federation of Trade Unions)

There were also respondents who argued for treating each factory independently and allowing them to have their own management structure, as well as their own level of funding based upon the individual circumstances of each factory, but still within overall government ownership.

"Changes need to be made so that each Remploy factory is funded individually and not centrally so that staff can work for their own business."

(Merthyr Tydfil Trades Council)

"The Remploy Trade Union Consortium believes that every factory should have its own internal support structure and every factory, or perhaps small groups of factories, should be autonomous."

(Remploy Trade Union Consortium)

Some respondents also suggested utilising the Enterprise Business arm of Remploy more effectively as a training and work experience facility, which could offer temporary support and opportunities to some, yet still offer others full-time segregated employment.

"NIACE believes that there is a role for disability specific workplaces where these support the transition to unsupported employment for disabled people who face the greatest labour market disadvantage who, without these workplaces, would be unlikely to be given this transition opportunity elsewhere. Government funding should be available for these disability specific workplaces if necessary to ensure they are viable."

(National Institute of Adult Continuing Education)

In addition to addressing the questions set out in the consultation document, a number of responses addressed wider issues which relate to the impact Remploy has upon their lives. Many of these individuals who raised wider issues are employed in Remploy factories, or are relatives of people who are employed at Remploy, while some were once employed within Remploy but currently are not.

Many respondents who work within Remploy mentioned a sense of community, respect and friendship at their place of employment which some suggested they have not found outside Remploy. This working environment has also been viewed as having a positive effect upon employees' health and well-being.

“It has been there for me [Remploy] and it is like a family and we all get on together.”

(Individual respondent)

“As a mother, I was resigned to the fact that [my son] would never work. I was completely wrong thanks to Remploy. My son has gone through a total transformation. He's brimming with a new found confidence, and has a sense of humour I would have never thought possible a few years ago.”

(Individual respondent)

There was also the view, notably from factory employees and their carers (usually parents), that it would be very difficult for individuals employed within Remploy to find employment elsewhere and that they are happy to remain working within a sheltered environment. Respondents often suggested that sheltered employment was the only suitable option for some disabled people. Many organisations and individuals alike acknowledged the rationale behind the closure of the factories, but there was overwhelming concern about how the Remploy (ex-) employees would manage to find future employment in competition with non-disabled people who are unemployed and seeking work in the current economic climate.

Some felt that the culture at Remploy was one of understanding towards disability and fluctuating health conditions, which may not be present at other employers. This flexibility was felt to be important for individuals who had experienced the need to take time off for health-related reasons, and were then able to return to their job without having to face difficulties with the employer.

Views from consultation events

As noted, during September 2011 officials held a series of meetings around the country with Remploy employees, from the Enterprise Business, Employment Services, and central services areas. The views from the people attending these events were generally that Remploy was a very important part of their lives, providing employment that they could not have secured elsewhere, and Remploy was thus providing an important social service to them and their communities. They felt very strongly that government should continue to support Remploy so it could continue. Further, they felt that the Remploy business could be made much more self-sustaining with changes to the way it was run and with more support in procuring business from the public sector.

Residential Training Colleges

6

The origin of the network of Residential Training College providers (five pan disability, three visual impairment and one hearing impairment) is varied. Some were established for the purpose of rehabilitating disabled war veterans, some were set up as charitable foundations before World War 2, and others were established as schools for disabled children which subsequently progressed to training for disabled adults. They are concentrated in the East and South of England, and until recently had no representation in North West England, Scotland, or Wales. One of the colleges has, however, recently established satellites in the North West and South Wales. Provision is provided on both a residential and daily attendee basis – the overall ratio is about 50:50, though individual colleges vary. Eighty per cent of participants are men.

The colleges aim to provide holistic support designed to cater for all of the clients' needs, including condition management where this is appropriate.

Residential Training Colleges are not funded exclusively by the Department for Work and Pensions: in some cases the funding provided by the Department can form a high percentage of a college's total budget, in others it is a very small proportion.

Further information on Residential Training can be found at

www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/Employmentsupport/WorkSchemesAndProgrammes/DG_4011789

Key message from the Sayce Review

Residential Training Colleges should seek funding from a range of sources for their expertise in learning, independent living and employment, and no longer be funded as a distinct employment programme directly by the Department.

Question 8

Do you agree with the recommendation that the Department for Work and Pensions should not directly fund Residential Training Colleges as a distinct facilities-based programme?

Question 9

If you agree that the Department should no longer fund the Residential Training Colleges directly, how do you think that a transition to alternative sources of funding should be achieved?

Summary of responses to consultation

The future of Residential Training Colleges generated fewer responses than some of the other areas of the consultation. Nevertheless, there was a very strong consensus among those who did discuss Residential Training Colleges that the support these facilities provide is very important to maintain in some format. This type of support was felt to be particularly important for individuals with the most complex barriers to employment.

“Our main concern is that disabled people are provided with the practical support they require to gain employment. In some cases we believe this support is best provided through residential facilities which can provide an excellent service for those with multiple disadvantages and complex barriers to employment. The focus on mental health conditions is particularly vital given the high rate of unemployment amongst this group.”

(Capability Scotland)

However, when the issue of who should fund Residential Training Colleges was raised, the general view was one of supporting a move away from the Department for Work and Pensions’ funding towards other sources. The transition to alternative sources of funding was felt to require careful consideration, with individual support needs placed at the forefront of arrangements.

“Whilst we welcome the proposals to develop alternative funding streams and models for Residential Training Colleges, we feel that DWP should continue to fund courses that improve outcomes and life chances for disabled people until such alternative funding is secured. We also believe that, given the importance of these colleges and their courses for some disabled people, DWP should commit to continuing to fund provision of courses through Residential Training Colleges where alternative funding models fail to provide sufficient funding to allow the courses and/or colleges to continue.”

(Diverse Cymru)

There were many respondents putting forward suggestions of who should be responsible for funding of Residential Training Colleges, and often this involved sources in the education sector or the Skills Funding Agency. Opinion as to whether funding should be the sole responsibility of one agency or a combination of several was split, with some suggesting the use of a single funding stream, while others mentioned using contributions from many agencies to provide an overall approach. In some instances the respondents suggested that the Department could continue to be one of these co-funding agencies.

“We would expect this vocational training to be under the control of the Skills Funding Agency and the relevant bodies within the devolved governments.”

(Merthyr Tydfil Institute for the Blind)

“I think that other agencies, including health, education, DWP and voluntary and community sector should pool funding to ensure a holistic approach that meets individual needs.”

(Individual respondent)

However, some respondents did not support any move away from the Department for Work and Pensions’ funding of Residential Training facilities and, furthermore, expressed concerns that using multiple funding streams would be difficult and costly to administer, ultimately leaving less funding available to support the individual directly.

“As with all public services, multiple funding streams mean a more complex and expensive process, with greater bureaucracy and cost. This would lead to more risk of funding being lost that would be destabilising to disabled people.”

(Unite)

An alternative model for Residential Training Colleges was put forward by a number of respondents. The suggestion was that the support currently offered to individuals at Residential Training Colleges could instead be offered in mainstream colleges. It was also felt that this would be beneficial in terms of increasing access to specialist support because it moves away from a segregated environment.

“A lot of these colleges have highly trained staff and their specialisms would be lost, e.g. for Braille tuition. Could the colleges have a mixture of students, those with disability and mainstream students so that youngsters can mix and get used to a more real environment?”

(Southampton City Council)

Despite the general support in principle for a move away from the Department for Work and Pensions’ funding of Residential Training Colleges, there were some strong opponents to the proposal, including individuals, trade unions and other organisations. Concern generally centred on the possible loss of the support offered by Residential Training Colleges should alternative funding fail to be secured.

“We have serious concerns about this recommendation as we believe it could lead to the closure of this provision. Both the review and the Government have acknowledged the ‘unique and very valuable function which the Residential Training Colleges perform’ and that ‘we would not want to lose the expertise the colleges provide’. However, this proposal is very high risk, as there is no guarantee of funding through any other agency or any suggestion that funding should transfer to another department to support this provision.”

(Natspec)

Others were worried that because of the relative high cost per person of Residential Training Colleges, it would be difficult to make their services available to individuals involved in programmes such as Work Choice or the Work Programme because of the nature of their funding model and the relative high cost of Residential Training College provision.

“The Sayce led review raises alternative options for funding but has failed to demonstrate the feasibility of these. Firstly, Work Choice started on October 25th last year and contracts were awarded to providers with established supply chains. Similarly the Work Programme, which started on June 13th. In both instances the college’s costs would not be attractive to these providers even with outcomes being rewarded as in the Work Programme via differential payments.”

(Royal National Institute of Blind People)

Responses from consultation event

On 19 July 2011, officials met with a number of Residential Training College principals and other senior staff. The view from this event was that Residential Training Colleges were providing a valuable and unique service that should continue to be supported by the Department for Work and Pensions. There were, however, suggestions that the funding model could change, with moves towards a more output-based system.

They recognised the possibility of securing funding from other sources, and indeed many of them had been very successful in doing so, but felt this should be to supplement the Department’s funding rather than to replace it.

Work Choice and Work Programme

7

In October 2010, the Government launched Work Choice – a new programme of specialist support designed to help customers facing complex disability-related barriers find and sustain work. The Work Programme, launched in June 2011, is helping a wide range of disabled people and people with health conditions in flexible and innovative ways, which respond to each individual’s personal circumstances to address the barriers they face in the labour market.

A fundamental review of these programmes was outside the scope of the Sayce Review, but they form the context in which other specialist disability employment programmes operate, and the Sayce Review makes some recommendations about the monitoring and future development of these programmes.

Key message from the Sayce Review

The Work Programme and Work Choice should be carefully monitored to ensure they are delivering a high quality and effective service to disabled customers.

When Work Choice contracts expire, supported business places should not receive ongoing special protection. Any funds released as a result could be used on other aspects of specialist disability employment support.

In the longer term, as Work Choice contracts expire, government should consider integrating Work Choice and Access to Work into a single employment programme delivered through individual budgets. This would sit alongside the Work Programme.

Question 10

Do you agree that supported business places should not receive special protection after the current Work Choice contracts expire?

Summary of responses to consultation

Despite fewer respondents focusing on the question of supported businesses after the current Work Choice contract expires, there were strong opinions both in favour of the recommendation and against, with a fairly even split.

Many of those who were against the proposed changes to supported businesses funding arrangements cited similar concerns to those expressed in relation to proposed changes to Remploy. These are discussed below.

“We believe that the supported business places within Work Choice should not receive special attention and that the whole Work Choice programme should be reviewed and resources diverted to the provision of personalised support in time-limited training, work experience and internships.”

(Equality 2025)

“Special Protection should continue to enable the long term viability of supported work/business places.”

(Ann Clywd MP)

Some respondents seemed to take the view that the time had come to stop trying to improve the performance of supported businesses and that if they were not operating effectively by the end of the current Work Choice contracts they would be unlikely to improve substantially after this time.

“Durham County Council does not have supported businesses, but firmly believe that protection should be removed from them when the Work Choice contract expires in 2015. During the development of the Work Choice programme and its predecessor Workstep, DWP Workstep Modernisation Funding was provided to enable supported businesses to develop, become economically viable and plan progression. Through Work Choice contracts they have a further four years to do this. If they are unable to achieve this in that time, it would be reasonable to assume that an extension in protection would be nothing other than a subsidy and create an artificial business environment.”

(Durham County Council)

However, there were other respondents who strongly disagreed with the view that sufficient improvement efforts have already been made and thought that more effort needed to be placed on understanding and improving the current supported businesses to make them economically viable. It was felt that some could become a social enterprise while others remain a supported business, but become more competitive with the help of the Government. Some organisations also requested the opportunity to work closely with the Department to try and do this.

Another area where it was felt improvements in the model of supported businesses could be made were the use of training and work experience placements, utilising the environment of a supported business for a short period of time with the goal of individuals moving through this towards open employment.

“It is clear that Government, local authorities and providers need to work better to help supported businesses that can make a transition to a social enterprise model do just that, but also better support those that can’t in providing adequate resource to enable them to become more competitive.”

(Shaw Trust)

“It may be premature at present to judge the effectiveness of the Work Choice programme in resolving this issue. Pluss has developed a new model, ‘Pluss Enterprise’, which partly utilises the protected funding to create an Intermediate Labour Market within its Supported Businesses. The model generates throughput whilst offering permanent employment for those who require and choose that working environment. Pluss are eager to engage with the Department to develop this model more fully across the existing supported business sector including social firms and social enterprises.”

(Pluss)

Other respondents agreed with the principle of moving away from segregated businesses, but were of the view that this may require a transitional period after the Work Choice contracts expire. It was felt that any transition to alternative support arrangements should place the needs of the individual as the most important consideration and make arrangements around such needs.

“We do not agree with the principle of segregated businesses, but funding should be related to the individual needs and wants of the person and in the transition period there may be occasions where support will be needed after the Work Choice contracts expire. Generally there was a feeling that the businesses should be able to operate in a free market and become viable without additional protection.”

(Joint response prepared by disabled people with experience of Access to Work from Surrey Coalition of Disabled People, Surrey Independent Living Council and Surrey Disabled People’s Partnership)

“I strongly agree that supported business places should not receive special protection. However supported businesses that are likely to fail should receive limited transitional support and help at the end of a contract to move them to a viable business model.”

(Individual respondent)

Other respondents were supportive of phasing out funding for supported businesses, but only once support outside segregated employment, such as Access to Work or Work Choice, is effective and meets the needs of all disabled people in a personalised and tailored way.

“Only once disabled people are receiving individualised and appropriate support and thereby equitable outcomes through these programmes should funding for supported business places be ended.”

(Diverse Cymru)

Some respondents were against the proposal to stop financial support after the current Work Choice contracts, citing similar concerns to those expressed about the future of Remploy. There were uncertainties about the suitability of many supported business employees for mainstream employment and the possibility of these individuals ending up unemployed should their supported business close.

“I believe that the supported businesses need some financial support otherwise hundreds of disabled people who cannot work in mainstream employment will be left to claim benefits and feel worthless.”

(Individual respondent)

Question 11

Do you agree that in the longer term Work Choice and Access to Work should be merged into a single programme delivered through individual budgets?

Summary of responses to consultation

There were fewer responses to the question of merging Work Choice and Access to Work than some of the other topics in the consultation. Nevertheless, a number of organisations and individuals provided their views and there was a strong consensus among most that it was a good idea to merge Work Choice and Access to Work into a single programme delivered through individual budgets. It was generally thought that a single programme could be cost effective and reduce bureaucracy.

“Delivering a single programme could result in more coherent support which is more straightforward for individuals to access and more cost-effective in terms of administration. Delivering through individual budgets also offers a more personalised and flexible approach.”

(British Psychological Society)

“This would streamline and clarify the specialist employment support that is available to disabled people, make it more flexible, enhance clients’ independence, offer the potential for more consistent contact and enable advisers and their clients to deepen their expertise.”

(Welsh Government)

Support for merging Work Choice with Access to Work into a single programme delivered through individual budgets was often cited with similar conditions to those in responses to Question 1 and Question 2 of the consultation. These included ensuring that individuals are well informed and have adequate support to make informed decisions about their funding, and that appropriate support is available to all, not just those closest to the labour market.

Despite the general view of respondents that Work Choice and Access to Work should be merged, there was some concern about using individual budgets, which was generally centred on the same themes as came up in response to Question 1 in the consultation. These included concern that individuals may not want or be capable of managing their own support budget.

There were also issues raised by some organisations that Work Choice has only been operating for a short time, and as such is not fully understood yet. The Department for Work and Pensions is currently conducting an evaluation of Work Choice: however the programme has not been running long enough to give a robust indication of the impact it is having upon disabled people's employment. Furthermore, some respondents thought there is also limited evidence on the advantages of individual budgets. The use of individual budgets is being explored through the Department's evaluation of the Right to Control. The interim evaluation on Right to Control (Right to Control Trailblazers process Evaluation: Wave 1) was published on 16 February 2012⁴.

“We strongly support the kind of user control that Access to Work [AtW] facilitates – although we agree that this level of control in AtW could be increased, and that AtW in general needs to be expanded, well-funded and that recent restrictions on supports imposed should be lifted. However, we think there needs to be a fuller assessment of Work Choice before a radical change of this sort is introduced.”

(Inclusion London)

Key messages from the Sayce Review

Employment must be a cross-government objective – equality in employment depends on wider system enablers. Policies in areas from health to skills will simply be more effective if disability is considered from the outset, especially in growing areas such as apprenticeships and well-being at work.

The Government agreed that disability employment is both a government priority and an area that requires close working and co-operation between departments. Further, it had already accepted the recommendation to form a cross-government Ministerial group to oversee a new strategy for disability employment, and the group has now been established.

This area was not, therefore, the subject of a question within the consultation.

⁴ <http://odi.dwp.gov.uk/docs/wor/rtc/rtc-process-evaluation.pdf>

8

Other issues

Question 12

Do you have any other suggestions for improving or changing specialist disability employment support not covered by any of the above questions?

Summary of responses to consultation

There were few suggestions for improving or changing specialist disability employment support that were not covered by any of the existing questions. One of the most common was the need to tackle society's negative attitude towards disability, which was felt to act as a barrier to disabled people fully participating in the labour market. Some respondents cited the need for better engagement with employers and training, as well as incentivising organisations to employ a disabled person. Often this was felt an essential component to improve upon if the changes proposed in this consultation are to prove successful.

"I think, especially in the current economic situation, that employers need a real incentive to employ people with disabilities."

(Individual respondent)

"Funding for employment-focused Deaf Equality Training (not the standard off-the-peg Deaf Awareness) and specialist Employment Support who provide advice and support during the initial employment period and later on an ad hoc basis is critical."

(Association of Sign Language Interpreters)

A number of respondents also discussed the need for more coherence between different support mechanisms and departments. It was often felt that the transition from education to employment is one of the weak links in the system, and better joining up of these support agencies would be beneficial.

“Direct more funding at education level to supporting schools with pupils that have a disability/health condition and find the right path for getting them into employment and staying in employment. [There is a] huge gap in support for the transition from education to employment. Provide the support at the beginning of the journey and the higher the likelihood of success.”

(Individual respondent)

As with the discussions around Access to Work, the notion of better training for Jobcentre Plus staff and closer working with user-led groups came up throughout many different areas of the consultation. Used together, they would provide a useful standpoint for a detailed observation of the good practices that go on in the third sector and would give Jobcentre Plus staff a much better idea of the complex barriers experienced by disabled people. Working out policies with and alongside the voluntary sector would benefit not just disabled people, but would improve and expand the skills base of Jobcentre Plus personnel.

“As a DEA, and being the first point of contact for people in some cases, I would like to be trained to assist employers and to help determine what support customers may need prior to becoming employed. In my opinion, this would be more cost effective than paying an external organisation and the customer would continue to work with one person throughout their journey rather than being referred to various providers. Excellent customer service all round! Having worked with this particular customer group for many years, the trust that you build over a period of time becomes an essential part of the journey forward.”

(Disability Employment Adviser)

Another issue that arose throughout the response by both organisations and individuals alike, but that did not really fit within any specific question area, was the perceived lack of provision in any Department for Work and Pensions programme for people with mental health conditions, many of whom want to work. One individual recommended that the National Health Service’s Improving Access to Psychological Therapy (IAPT) programme should be embedded within the Department’s programme of provision. This could provide specific help for those with mild to moderate mental health conditions who are experiencing barriers to employment. An evaluation of these IAPT areas with employment advisers working alongside the therapists has been piloted and will report in mid 2012.

“It would be sensible, cost effective and robust to ensure that the NHS IAPT programme is embedded within DWP and Work Programme provision. It would also be sensible to work with Mental Health Trusts to develop the Individual Placement and Support programme to deliver real job outcomes using funding effectively.”

(Individual respondent)

Throughout the responses to the consultation there was often the call for improved evidence on the effectiveness of proposed policy decisions, and organisations were sometimes apprehensive to go beyond support for propositions in principle because they were not convinced they understood the implications of the changes suggested.

Summary of questions

9

Question 1

Do you agree that funding should follow the individual so they can work where they choose, rather than the Department funding specific workplaces or facilities?

Question 2

Do you agree that any funding which may be released from reforms to specialist disability employment programmes should be used to expand the Access to Work programme?

If not, please say how you think the money should be spent to help more disabled people into work.

Question 3

As resources are limited, it may not be possible to implement all of the recommended improvements to Access to Work straight away. Which ones do you think should be the priority as funding becomes available?

- Paying for a temporary replacement worker for a small- or medium-sized business when a disabled person is off sick because of their disability.
- Creating a system so that disabled people could know the value of Access to Work support they could get before they get a job.
- Training Jobcentre Plus advisers to give more support and advice to employers.
- Helping customers to develop independent travel skills so that some people will need Access to Work travel support for a shorter time.
- Working more closely with user-led organisations to improve the service.
- Extending Access to Work support to cover more work-related training, for example unpaid work experience.

Question 4

Do you agree that change is needed to Remploy, as part of an overall approach of redistributing available funds? Do you agree that the best way to achieve this is to allow viable parts of Remploy to leave the public sector and for direct government funding of Remploy to be phased out?

Question 5

Do you agree that disabled people working within Remploy's Enterprise Businesses should be given the opportunity to own and run these businesses free of government control and funding? Do you have any views on how to support this transition?

Question 6

Do you agree that Remploy's Employment Services should be sold and transformed into a mutual, social enterprise or other model? Do you have any views on how to support this transition?

Question 7

If you do not agree with the proposals in the Sayce Review, please tell us your ideas for the future of Remploy.

Question 8

Do you agree with the recommendation that the Department for Work and Pensions should not directly fund Residential Training Colleges as a distinct facilities-based programme?

Question 9

If you agree that the Department should no longer fund the Residential Training Colleges directly, how do you think that a transition to alternative sources of funding should be achieved?

Question 10

Do you agree that supported business places should not receive special protection after the current Work Choice contracts expire?

Question 11

Do you agree that in the longer term Work Choice and Access to Work should be merged into a single programme delivered through individual budgets?

Question 12

Do you have any other suggestions for improving or changing specialist disability employment support not covered by any of the above questions?

Language used in this document

10

Specialist disability employment programmes

Used to describe employment programmes and support services designed to support people with disability-related barriers to work to secure and keep employment. Access to Work, Residential Training Colleges, Remploy, and Work Choice are specialist disability employment programmes and services funded by the Department.

Mainstream employment programmes

Used to describe the Work Programme and initiatives such as Get Britain Working, whether these are provided by Jobcentre Plus, delivered by local community networks, or commissioned from provider organisations.

The Department

In this document the 'Department' refers to the Department for Work and Pensions unless otherwise stated.

The Sayce Review

The Sayce Review refers to the independent review of specialist disability employment services conducted by Liz Sayce, *Getting in, staying in and getting on*.

Equality

11

1 Equality

The consultation was fundamental to enabling us to undertake rigorous equality analysis to understand the potential impact of our policies on equality and to pay due regard to the public sector Equality Duty.

2 Equality impacts

The Department has carried out an equality impact assessment on implementing improvements to specialist disability employment programmes, as set out in this Command Paper. It has assessed the proposal in line with all the current public sector equality duties and not only the positive impacts on employment support for disabled people. The Equality Impact Assessment is published alongside this Command Paper.

Remploy, which is impacted by the changes set out in this Command Paper, is a public body and has a duty of care responsibility for its employees. It has therefore completed its own full Equality Impact Assessment which will be provided on the Remploy website at www.remploy.co.uk/

3 Equality Act

In line with our responsibilities under the Equality Act 2010, we are committed to improving access for disabled people, and people with health conditions, to our employment services. We will continue to:

- review training and guidance for all our staff, so they are able to guide customers to the most appropriate provision;
- work with all our providers to increase the accessibility of provision (for example the Work Programme and Work Choice) to all of our customers, including those who are disabled or have health conditions; and
- consult on all major changes to this provision, as demonstrated by this consultation.

Further information about the Equality Act can be found at

www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/

Annex

Contributions and joint contributions from organisations to the public consultation on specialist disability employment programmes

Total: 150⁵

A4e

Acquired Brain Injury Forum for London

Action for M.E.

Action on Hearing Loss⁶

Ambitious About Autism

Aspire

Association of Disabled Professionals

Association of Sign Language Interpreters

Association of National Specialist Colleges

Barclays Bank PLC

BASE

Border Links

Bournemouth Community Employment Services

Breakthrough UK

British Assistive Technology Foundation

British Association for Counselling & Psychotherapy

British Psychological Society

Bromley Physical Disability Sensory Impairment Partnership Group

Camphill, Scotland

⁵ It has been difficult to identify a precise figure for the number of organisations which responded to the consultation because, for example, some organisations collaborated with others to provide joint responses on behalf of a single umbrella organisation. In some cases, it has also been unclear whether contributions reflect the views of individuals within an organisation or the corporate view.

⁶ Formerly known as RNID.

Capability Scotland
Carers Northumberland
Centre for Mental Health⁷
Children in Wales
Choices Advocacy
Choices & Rights
City Building (Glasgow) LLP
CLARITY
Community Union
Mencap Dilston College
Disability Action
Disability Dynamics Ltd
Disability Rights UK
Disability Wales
Disabled People Against Cuts
Diverse Cymru
Doncaster Deaf Trust
Durham County Council
DWP Employer Engagement Steering Group
Ealing Trades Union Council
Elite Supported Employment Agency Ltd
Employers' Forum on Disability
Employment Related Services Association
Enham Trust
Equality 2025
Equality and Human Rights Commission
Essex Coalition of Disabled People (ecdpc)
Essex County Council
Finchale Training College
Flexi Equipment Ltd
Foundation for People with Learning Disabilities
Friends of Supported Businesses
Fujitsu
Gateshead Council
General Federation of Trade Unions
GMB in Europe
GMB Shop Stewards Sheffield
GMB Swansea R06 Branch
GMB Union L14 Composite Branch
Gravitas International Ltd
Greater London Trades Council
Greater Manchester Coalition of Disabled People
Hammersmith and Fulham Action on Disability

⁷ Includes response from MIND.

Hampshire County Council Adult Services
 Hull and East Riding Institute for the Blind
 Hull City Council
 Human Resources, Adult Social Care, Leeds City Council
 Inclusion
 Inclusion London
 Inclusion Scotland
 Industrial Communities Alliance
 Ingeus UK⁸
 Inspire Communities
 KPMG
 Learning Disability Wales
 Lower Incomes Tax Reform Group
 MacIntyre and Derbyshire County Council Reps on Board for Chesterfield
 Macmillan Cancer Support
 Mencap
 Mersey Disability Federation
 Merthyr Tydfil Institute for the Blind
 Merthyr Tydfil Trades Council
 Motor Neurone Disease Association
 MS Society
 National Aids Trust
 National Institute of Adult Continuing Education
 Neath Port Talbot Council for Voluntary Service
 Newcastle City Council
 NIACE
 North Bank Forum
 North Tyneside Council
 Northumberland Care Trust
 Northumberland Children's Services
 Northumberland County Council
 Northumberland County Council's Employability and Transitions Team
 Northumberland County Council's Employability and Work Service
 Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust
 Northumbria Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust LD Supported employment service
 Nottingham County Council
 Nottinghamshire Deaf Society
 Nuneaton Against the Cuts
 Papworth Trust
 Partnership in Enablement
 Pluss
 Portland College
 Queen Alexandra College

⁸ Formerly Work Directions.

Queen Elizabeth's Foundation for Disabled People
RehabGroup
Remploy Accounts Team
Remploy Employment Services Board
Remploy Enterprise Business Board
Remploy Trade Union Consortium
Rhondda Cynon Taf County Borough Council
RNIB College
RNIB Group
Royal British Legion
Royal British Legion Industries
Royal National College for the Blind
Scottish Council on Deafness
Scottish Disability Equality Forum
Scottish Independent Advocacy Alliance
Scottish Trades Union Congress
Sense
Shaw Trust
Shout Out
Social Firms UK
Southampton Centre for Independent Living
Southampton Health and Adult Social Care
Speak Out in Hounslow
St Loye's Foundation
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Suffolk County Council
Surrey Coalition of Disabled People
Surrey County Council's Employment Service
Surrey Disabled People's Partnership
Surrey Independent Living Council
Surrey Social Information on Disability
SUSE
Swansea Remploy R06 Branch
The Trustee Corporation Limited
Trades Union Congress
Turning Point
UNISON
Unite
United Response Cornwall Supported Employment Team
Visually Impaired Forum
Vocational Rehabilitation Association
Watford Sheltered Workshop Ltd
Welfare to Work Team, Lincolnshire County Council
Welsh Refugee Council
Wiltshire Group



Published by TSO (The Stationery Office)
and available from:

Online

www.tsoshop.co.uk

Mail, telephone fax and email

TSO

PO Box 29, Norwich, NR3 1GN

Telephone orders/general enquiries

0870 600 5522

Order through the Parliamentary Hotline

Lo-Call 0845 7 023474

Fax orders: 0870 600 5533

Email: customer.services@tso.co.uk

Textphone: 0870 240 3701

The Parliamentary Bookshop

12 Bridge Street, Parliament Square,
London SW1A 2JX

Telephone orders/general enquiries:

020 7219 3890

Fax orders: 020 7219 3866

Email: bookshop@parliament.uk

Internet: <http://www.bookshop.parliament.uk>

TSO@Blackwell and other Accredited Agents

This publication can be accessed online at:
www.dwp.gov.uk/sayce-consultation

For more information about this publication,
contact:

**Disability and Work Opportunities Division
Department for Work and Pensions**

Ground Floor

Caxton House

6-12 Tothill Street

London

SW1H 9NA

Telephone: 0207 449 7817

Email: sdep.signpost@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

Copies of this publication can be made
available in alternative formats if required.

Department for Work and Pensions

March 2012

www.dwp.gov.uk

ISBN 978-0-10-183122-2



9 780101 831222