



DWP Department for
Work and Pensions

Specialist disability employment programmes

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
July 2011

Cm 8126

£10.25



Specialist disability employment programmes

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
July 2011

© Crown Copyright 2011

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/sayce-consultation

For more information about this publication, contact:

**Sayce Consultation Team
Disability and Work Division
Department for Work and Pensions
Steel City House
West Street
Sheffield
S1 2GQ
Telephone: 0114 294 8239
Email: sayce.consultationresponses@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: 9780101812627

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

ID: 2440985 07/11

Printed on paper containing 75% recycled fibre content minimum.

Contents

Foreword by the Minister for Disabled People	3
Section 1 Introduction	5
Section 2 A new direction	7
Section 3 Access to Work	9
Section 4 Remploy	16
Section 5 Residential Training Colleges	21
Section 6 Work Choice and Work Programme	23
Section 7 Cross-government issues	26
Section 8 Other issues	27
Section 9 Summary of questions	28
Section 10 Language used in this consultation	31
Section 11 Equality	32
Section 12 Responding to this consultation	33

Foreword by the Minister for Disabled People

The Government has today published the response to the Sayce Review, *Getting in, staying in and getting on*.

I welcome the central theme of the Sayce Review, that resources for supporting disabled people into employment should be focused on disabled people themselves, rather than on specific institutions – this is very much in line with the Government’s drive towards greater personalisation in welfare provision. The review makes a range of important recommendations about how to turn this aspiration into reality.

When the Sayce Review was published, I confirmed that the Government would consult before taking any decisions on the future strategy for specialist disability employment programmes. That is the purpose of this consultation document. I will work with disabled people and their organisations to explore these recommendations, and I encourage responses to this consultation from disabled people, organisations of and for disabled people, employment service providers and all those who have an interest in this important topic.

This consultation is about how we ensure that the employment support that is available in the future meets the needs and aspirations of disabled people today and for the decades to come. The Government understands the importance of supporting each individual to reach their true potential in life, whether that person is disabled or non-disabled. We have already confirmed that the budget for specialist disability employment support is protected. Now we have to ensure that money is used to help the maximum number of disabled people achieve the best possible jobs and careers.



Maria Miller MP

Parliamentary Under Secretary of State and Minister for Disabled People

Introduction

1

The Government welcomes the Sayce Review which makes 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 range from principles that should govern the design of future disability employment programmes to practical ways in which current programmes can be improved.

We agree with the central theme that resources should be directed towards disabled people themselves, giving them maximum choice and control in the services they receive. We have already confirmed that the overall budget for specialist disability employment programmes in the current Spending Review period is protected, and that any resources released from reforms would be reinvested to fund improvements to the way disability employment support is provided, after investing in support to help those people and organisations affected through the transition. The responses to this consultation will inform decisions about the strategy for each programme.

The changes set out in the Sayce Review would represent a new direction for disability employment programmes. If implemented, they would have a major impact on some of the organisations that currently deliver employment services to disabled people, particularly Remploy and Residential Training Colleges. Before taking any decisions in these areas, we are seeking views on some of the specific recommendations in the Sayce Review – both on the recommendations themselves and, if accepted, how they should be implemented.

The Government agrees that disability employment is both a government priority and an area that requires close working and cooperation between Departments. We have already accepted the recommendation to establish a cross-government Ministerial group to oversee a new strategy for disability employment. That strategy will be informed by the outcome of this consultation.

6 Chapter 1 Introduction

In the case of Access to Work, the majority of the recommendations fit well with the already existing development plans for the programme. We agree that Access to Work has the potential to help a wider range of customer groups and to be delivered more efficiently. Some of the recommendations about Access to Work, for example the creation of a new web portal, will need further work to develop. Others would rely on resources being released from reforms to Remploy and Residential Training Colleges being redirected, over time, into Access to Work to expand the available funding, and so progress in these areas would be dependent on decisions on resource allocation following this consultation.

This consultation document follows on from the Sayce Review, but does not include all the evidence, analysis, and arguments presented in the full Sayce Review. A copy of the Sayce Review can be found at:

www.dwp.gov.uk/sayce-response

You may also wish to refer to the Government's response to the review. This can be found at:

www.dwp.gov.uk/sayce-response

A new direction

2

The Sayce Review calls 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.

Recommendation 1

The Department’s disability employment funding should be focused on supporting aspirations for sustainable work and career choices across all types of employment, as for other citizens, in every sector:

- whether as an employee, entrepreneur, self-employed, or working for a social enterprise, mutual or co-operative;
- with support to ‘get in’ work – through apprenticeships, internships, work experience, learning on the job programmes and work placements, to ‘stay in’ and to ‘get on’.

Money should follow the individual so they can work where they choose, rather than the Department funding disability-specific workplaces or facilities. Over time all specialist disability employment support should be made available through individual budgets so individuals can select the support that best meets their needs.

Support should be evidence based which means:

- a focus on supporting people into and in open employment, with ongoing and flexible support for employee (and employer) where needed to get in, stay in and get on;
- rapid job search rather than assuming a series of stepping stones are needed first; and
- rapid support and adjustments to aid job retention.

8 Chapter 2 A new direction

The Government agrees that disabled people should be supported to work in a wide range of careers and that support should be evidence based.

Some of our current provision for disabled people fits less well with the model that the Sayce Review envisages. To support disabled people to work in the widest possible range of jobs and careers, the Government, therefore, would be attracted to the idea of moving towards funding individual needs and away from funding 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?

Access to Work

3

Access to Work is a specialist disability 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** (not employers) who are entering, or already in, paid work, including self-employment. The support can be very 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 participating in permitted work can be eligible for support.

Employers share costs for 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.

Since December 2010, disabled job seekers have been able to find out immediately if they are eligible for Access to Work support by completing a short on-line questionnaire at Directgov. If eligible, they are then able to print off a Pre-Employment Eligibility Letter which will help build their confidence when applying for jobs and which can be shown to prospective employers. This meets a commitment in the Coalition Programme.

In the financial year 2009/10, the programme helped over 37,000 disabled people to get and keep employment. Further information about Access to Work can be found here:

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

Key messages from the Sayce Review

Access to Work is highly cost-effective and 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.

Recommendation 2

Access to Work should be transformed from being the best kept secret in Government to being a recognised passport to successful employment, doubling the number of people helped. Government should improve equity of access, use innovation to create efficiencies, remove unnecessary waste and mobilise the power of peer support.

Government agrees that Access to Work has the potential to help more disabled people and to be delivered more efficiently.

A large increase in customer numbers cannot be achieved without additional funding. The Sayce Review recommends that resources be released from reforms to Remploy and Residential Training Colleges, so that this funding could be used for Access to Work.

We have already confirmed that the overall budget for specialist disability employment programmes in the current Spending Review period is protected, and that any resources released from reforms would be reinvested to fund improvements to the way disability employment support is provided, after investing in support to help those people and organisations affected through the transition. The responses to this consultation will inform decisions about the strategy for each programme.

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?

Recommendation 2a

The Department should make Access to Work available through an internet-based portal that opens up knowledge of support, technology, services and “what works” to employees and employers. Suppliers could compete through the website thereby driving down unit costs and developing the market for disability employment support. The Department should investigate options for the website to operate independently – perhaps being opened up beyond Access to Work users – so that market forces push costs down further. This could work alongside a core advice and assessment service for Access to Work.

Further work will be required to develop the specification, but the portal should deliver:

- increased choice;
- improved customer experience; and
- reduced costs.

The portal might also offer:

- information on the range of supports, adjustments, and adaptations;
- on-line peer support, discussion forums and reviews of products and services; and
- information on rights and duties of employees and employers.

The Government supports innovative use of the internet to improve access to, and efficiency of, its programmes and has already been investigating the use by Access to Work advisers of price-comparison websites for some disability-related products and services.

More work needs to be done to develop the specification. In particular, we will need to ensure that information exchange is compatible with customer and commercial confidentiality.

Recommendation 2b

The Department should undertake a targeted information-sharing campaign about Access to Work, concentrated on:

- growth sectors, to enable disabled people to have a fair chance of securing new jobs as the economy grows;
- small- and medium-sized enterprises;
- the professional groups and trade unions who have most contact with disabled people – in particular health and social care staff;
- BME, learning disability, mental health, neuro-diversity and multiple impairment networks – to reach people who are under-served and/or have low employment rates.

The Department should be transparent about the limited budget and manage it in the most equitable way possible. The campaign should utilise existing structures such as Direct Gov and work in partnership with trade unions, professionals and user-led organisations.

We agree that Access to Work needs to be targeted at those who can most benefit from specialist disability employment support and that some impairment groups and people from ethnic minority backgrounds are under-represented on the programme.

We also agree that small- and medium-sized employers are less likely to have the resources and capability to fund adjustments, and that we should continue to focus support on these employers.

We will review our communications strategy in light of this recommendation, working through existing networks and user-led organisations as the Sayce Review recommends.

We welcome the recognition that there is a defined budget for Access to Work and that delivery needs to be managed equitably within this. We will monitor the impact of improved communication carefully to manage the risk of generating demands that cannot be met from within existing resources.

Recommendations 2c to 2g

This group of recommendations proposes more detailed changes to the services and delivery of the Access to Work programme.

- 2c** **The Department should increase employer confidence in employing people with fluctuating conditions by making Access to Work available to part-fund temporary cover for an employee of a small business who is off sick for a significant period of time.** Funding might only be available for smaller employers, for prolonged condition-related absences. Individuals should be able to draw down support when required.
- 2d** **The Department should increase employer and employee confidence by strengthening the indicative pre-employment Access to Work eligibility,** based on work likely to be undertaken, to be finalised once the exact role is known.
- 2e** **The Department should train Jobcentre Plus advisers to support and, where necessary, constructively challenge employers, where they are not willing or confident to make adjustments or introduce accessibility features to enable an individual to work successfully.** This would help avoid placing the onus for negotiation wholly on the newly employed individual.
- 2f** **The Department should strengthen the role Access to Work plays in supporting independent travel where appropriate,** engaging with individuals to take advantage of training and confidence-building in public transport or driving. It should then consider time-limiting – in some cases – payments for taxis. However, adequate protections must be in place for people who do need taxis long term to ensure they are not forced to stop using taxis where this would put them at significant disadvantage.
- 2g** **The Department should work with user-led organisations to provide services and peer support for people using Access to Work.** This could include assessment and delivery – so the process is fully informed by what others have found most helpful.

We welcome these recommendations which are aimed at making Access to Work more responsive to the needs of customers and employers.

In considering whether and how to implement these recommendations we will need to consider outcomes on other areas of this consultation which will affect availability of resources and manage the risk that some recommendations may put additional pressure on funding.

We are therefore seeking views about how improvements to Access to Work could be prioritised. Questions about this are at the end of the section.

Recommendation 2h

Over the long term the Department should significantly expand funding for Access to Work. This could be achieved by applying the AME-DEL switch principle to release money to invest in the programme in recognition of the benefit savings it generates.

The Government is actively encouraging the use of innovative funding models that pay by results, including in the Work Programme, the biggest ever payment by results employment programme seen in Great Britain. Launched in June 2011, it includes a ground-breaking arrangement that uses the benefit savings it generates to pay providers. In addition, after the third year of the contract, the Work Programme will be 100 per cent outcome based.

The Government is also strengthening and improving cost-benefit analysis to include a wider assessment of the full social impact of policy decisions.

We agree that Access to Work is a good candidate for payment by results funding models in the longer term and we will keep the position under review.

Recommendations 2i to 2k

These recommendations focus on improvements to assessments for Access to Work support.

- 2i The Department should introduce a stronger triage system for Access to Work applicants.** People who understand their support needs should not have to go through detailed assessment unless what is asked for is disputed.
- 2j The Department should ensure Access to Work awards are transferable from one employer to another.** Reassessments should be avoided unless necessary, and should take place only if requested by the disabled person or the type of work changes significantly.
- 2k Government should, longer term, radically simplify assessment, thereby saving time, money and bureaucracy.** There should be an aspiration to a single, portable assessment covering employment, health and social support needs as well as benefit entitlement.

We welcome these recommendations aimed at improving the assessment process for disabled customers. We recognise that many disabled people experience numerous assessments to receive the services they need enabling them to live independently and take up employment. Our aim is to minimise unnecessary assessments and to streamline processes wherever possible, however, this must be balanced with the need to ensure that taxpayers' money is being targeted effectively and spent appropriately.

We will review the assessment process for Access to Work to ensure that customers whose support needs are straightforward and have not changed do not have to go through unnecessary detailed assessments.

We will also clarify the ownership of equipment made available through Access to Work, aiming to move to a position where ownership rests clearly with the customer wherever possible. We will need to look carefully at the situation where an employer has contributed to the cost.

Recommendation 21

Government should act as an exemplar in making adjustments. As Access to Work is not available for central Government:

- government departments should move towards centralising the budget for adjustments to ensure there is no disincentive to employing people with complex adjustment needs;
- Access to Work advice and assessments should continue to be available to employees and employers in government departments; and
- government departments should continue to fund adjustments for their employees to a level equivalent to that provided by Access to Work.

We agree with the recommendation that central government departments, and the public sector as a whole, should lead the way in the employment of disabled people. The Department for Work and Pensions has already centralised the system for making adjustments for disabled employees, supporting Line Managers with a central Reasonable Adjustments Specialist Team who can help develop effective and efficient solutions. Working through the New Generation Human Resources project we will establish and promote best practice within central government departments.

Policy on funding and support for central government departments has not changed. Access to Work advisers will continue to provide advice and assessments for employees and employers in central government departments, and those departments will continue to fund adjustments for their employees to a level equivalent to that provided by Access to Work. Working through the New Generation Human Resources project we will ensure that all departments are provided with updated guidance about their responsibilities and the support available.

Recommendation 2m

Government should ensure adjustments are funded for internships, work experience, learning on the job programmes and work placements. This can be through ring-fenced budgets within programmes, plus a ring-fenced budget within Access to Work.

We recognise the importance of making sure that disabled people can benefit from work experience, internships and other ways to gain experience of the workplace. Existing programmes already take into account the support needs of disabled customers, which are built into the service specification and guidance.

Paid interns, people on a work trial organised by Jobcentre Plus, and some people who are ‘learning on the job’, for example, during a probationary period, can already qualify for Access to Work support.

We will review the relationship between Access to Work and mainstream employment programmes, to check that the right support is available for disabled people at all stages of their journey into employment.

Extending support available through Access to Work to cover new circumstances, for example, some forms of work-related training, would require additional resources. In considering whether and how to implement these recommendations we will need to consider outcomes in other areas of this consultation, which will affect the availability of resources, and manage the risk that some recommendations may put additional pressure on funding at a time when resources are limited.

We are therefore seeking views about how improvements to Access to Work could be prioritised.

Question 3

As funding levels are set, 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:

- 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 before they get a job what Access to Work support they could get.
- 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.

Remploy

4

Remploy is a non-departmental public body and public corporation limited by guarantee, sponsored by the Department for Work and Pensions and its predecessors since its creation in 1945. 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.

Remploy’s strategy and delivery model was the subject of a major review undertaken in 2006/07 culminating in the Modernisation Plan, covering the five-year period from April 2008.

Remploy Enterprise Businesses (the factory network), currently operate in fifteen 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 over 2,800 people, of which around 2,000 are disabled people working in factories.

Over the first three years of the Modernisation Plan, Enterprise Businesses has failed to meet the majority of 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. The Sayce Review noted that in 2010-11, Enterprise Businesses operated at an estimated loss of £63 million and, on average, around half of employees had no work to do.

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

The services provided by Remploy Employment Services, which supports its disabled customers in finding employment in the open labour market, meet the criteria suggested in the review of shifting resources from supporting institutions towards supporting disabled people themselves. The cost for each job outcome is around £3,600. 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. Employment Services is on track to meet these targets, with 33,000 job outcomes in the first three years of the plan by the end of 2010/11.

Further information about Remploy can be found here: <http://www.remploy.co.uk/>

Key messages from the Sayce Review

In relation to Remploy factories, the review found that, notwithstanding the commitment and contribution of those employed by Remploy, there was a total consensus among disabled people’s organisations and charities that the factories were not the model for the 21st Century. The Sayce Review concluded that 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.

The review suggests that current Enterprise Businesses should be freed from government control and encouraged and supported to develop alternative models, such as employee-owned mutuals. Employees and other organisations should have the opportunity and support to put forward proposals to form new businesses or to acquire existing ones. Where businesses are not viable, employees should receive a comprehensive support package to find alternative employment. Wider support needs in the family and community must also be considered. Stakeholders including trades unions should be fully involved.

Employment Services, which achieves over 10,000 jobs for disabled and disadvantaged people each year, should also be allowed to leave government control.

The Sayce Review concluded that resources released by the reform of Remploy, after accounting for the costs of transition, should be redirected to Access to Work.

Recommendations 3 to 3e set out how a new model for Remploy could be delivered.

3 The Department should, by the end of the current Spending Review, have introduced a new model for Remploy, and Government funding should be invested in effective support for individuals, rather than subsidising factory businesses:

- Remploy Enterprise Businesses should be given the opportunity – with expert support – to become successful businesses free from Government control.
- Where this is not an option, and businesses cannot continue, individual employees should be offered guaranteed and active support to secure employment, training, or other community activity.
- Remploy Employment Services should in future secure Government funds only by competing for contracts like other providers.

- 3a** The Department should ensure resources released from Remploy reform (after accounting for the costs of reform) are spent on employment support that fits disabled people's aspirations for work in all types of employment settings.
- 3b** The Department should ensure existing employees in Remploy Enterprise Businesses are offered the opportunity and expert entrepreneurial and business support over a decent time period to develop businesses into independent enterprises, where viable – whether mutuals, social enterprises, companies limited by guarantee or other models. The Department should actively pursue partnership working between Remploy, local authorities, businesses, disabled people's organisations and others to achieve this. Trade unions should be fully involved.
- 3c** The Department must ensure disabled individuals working in Remploy Enterprise Businesses which are not potentially financially viable, or who wish to seek open employment, are offered comprehensive support, to be agreed between Remploy, Government, trade unions and employees, to include individual resources for a guaranteed place in Work Choice, Remploy Employment Services or alternative employment support of their choice. Remploy should ensure that practical support for wider family and community life is on offer. There should be support and life planning actively offered at least six months prior to any business change and the package should recognise people's long-standing work with Remploy. The Department and Remploy should actively pursue links with employers to provide alternative employment opportunities.
- 3d** The Department should ensure Remploy employees' accrued pension rights are fully protected.
- 3e** Remploy Employment Services should be freed to operate as a social enterprise, mutual, co-operative or other structure. Taken together with the recommendation for a new model for Remploy Enterprise Businesses, this recommendation envisages that Remploy's future should be as an organisation independent of Government, focused on supporting disabled people to find and sustain work across the range of roles in the economy.

Government is minded to accept the recommendations of the Sayce Review on Remploy. This would mean that the Modernisation Plan would be ended before the current end date of March 2013 and replaced by a new model for Remploy.

If implemented, the recommendations would have an impact across the whole of the Remploy structure, and all staff would be affected:

- a. Remploy would no longer be owned by government;
- b. Offers would have been invited from organisations or groups of staff who wished to acquire Enterprise Businesses or parts of businesses or form social enterprises from existing businesses, after having received expert support to develop their plans;
- c. These offers would be considered by an independent panel, which would take decisions on which businesses were viable for the future;

- d. Individual factories or businesses which were not viable would have been closed, and employees provided with a comprehensive package of support to find alternative employment;
- e. Employment Services would have been sold and transformed into a mutual, social enterprise or other model, and in its new form would bid for employment programme provision in the same way as any other provider;
- f. Grant in aid funding for Remploy would end.

In the process of restructuring, it is likely that a number of staff, particularly in Employment Services, will move to a new employer, and other staff will be made redundant, for example where a business is not viable and will close. The Sayce Review highlights the importance of a comprehensive package of individual support for employees where a business cannot continue.

If the recommendations for change are accepted following consultation, this transitional or employment support would form part of the normal statutory consultation between Remploy, trades unions and the management forum.

The terms of the Modernisation Plan indicated that the plan would not involve making any disabled people compulsorily redundant. Around 250 disabled staff, who did not wish to accept voluntary redundancy or transfer to another Remploy factory, were left without a job (the ‘modernisation group’). These staff continue to be employed directly by Remploy, and have retained their Remploy terms and conditions, although the majority are working in other organisations.

While over 80 per cent of those staff are now in work, in a wide range of sectors from large private sector employers to charities, they have not transferred to their new employer and remain directly employed by Remploy. In the main, these employees enjoy more favourable terms and conditions than their colleagues and while employers have been very supportive in providing job opportunities for ex-Remploy staff, they are understandably unwilling to pay ex-Remploy staff on more favourable terms than their own employees.

The implication of the recommendations in the Sayce Report is that, if accepted, Remploy in its current form would not exist in the future. The Government will therefore not be able to give undertakings that staff will not be made compulsorily redundant as a result of such changes, including the modernisation group.

The modernisation group would therefore be offered the same redundancy terms as other Remploy staff whose jobs are ending, and Remploy would discuss with current employers the opportunity for people to become directly employed. If this is not possible, then the modernisation group will receive a comprehensive package of support to find alternative employment.

If a new model for Remploy is adopted as set out above, then the Remploy pension scheme would close. The accrued benefits of members of the Remploy pension scheme will be fully protected.

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.

Residential Training Colleges

5

The origin of the network of Residential Training Colleges 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 attendees 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: 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 here:

http://www.direct.gov.uk/en/DisabledPeople/Emplimentsupport/WorkSchemesAndProgrammes/DG_4011789

Key messages 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 for Work and Pensions.

Recommendation 4

The Department should not directly fund Residential Training as a distinct facilities-based programme. RTCs should be encouraged to seek funding from a range of sources including the Skills Funding Agency, and Work Choice and Work Programme providers funded by the Department. Colleges should be supported by the Department to make this transition.

Recommendation 4a

The Department should encourage RTCs to explore options for:

- developing as centres of excellence and sharing their expertise on accessibility, learning, employment, independent living skills, and adaptation to impairment through partnership working with FE and training providers, the NHS commissioning board and local authorities; and
- adapting their provision and seeking new opportunities to operate directly in provider markets including:
 - education and training;
 - welfare-to-work;
 - independent living and adaptation to acquired impairments;
 - advising on accessibility; and
 - diversity training and workforce development.

Recommendation 4b

The Department should use the budget currently allocated to funding Residential Training to open-up opportunities for work experience, including internships, work placements and on-the-job learning. This could be through ring-fenced funding under Access to Work.

The Government recognises the unique and very valuable function which the colleges perform, for example in supporting disabled people to achieve qualifications and to adapt to disability. We agree with the need to work with Residential Training Colleges to improve provision so that it can offer a more employment-focused service providing better value for money.

Question 8

Do you agree with the recommendation that the Department for Work and Pensions should not directly fund Residential Training 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 could be achieved?

Work Choice and Work Programme

6

The Work Programme, launched in June 2011, will help a wide range of disabled people and people with health conditions in flexible and innovative ways which will respond to each individual’s personal circumstances to address the barriers they face in the labour market. 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.

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 messages 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.

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.

Recommendation 5

The Department should commit to ongoing monitoring and continuous review of Work Choice and the Work Programme. This should include:

- publication of key performance information, including a breakdown by impairment type, qualification level and length of time out of work systematically collected across all the Department's programmes. It is also important to gain a better understanding of disabled people's career progression. This should help ensure all disabled people are well served, including people facing greatest labour market disadvantage;
- groundwork, using this information, for improved gatekeeping and pricing of different types and levels of support, so that those with the greatest support needs or disadvantage secure greater support. The Department should keep the differential pricing model under continuous review to ensure providers are encouraged to work with the full range of people;
- close monitoring of supply chains of prime providers to ensure that specialist organisations are being used effectively; and
- reviews to ensure that Work Choice meets disabled people's aspirations and is evidence-based.

This monitoring will provide information in support of the Public Sector Equality Duty to advance equality of opportunity for disabled people.

Recommendation 5a

The Department should, when existing Work Choice contracts expire, cease any specific guarantee of funding to supported business places, so that funding follows people rather than facilities. Learning and evidence should be used to help a transformation to support in viable enterprises or mainstream employment. Any savings should be used to support more individuals through evidence-based support.

Recommendation 5b

When existing Work Choice contracts expire, the Department should consider rolling Work Choice funding into individual budgets with Access to Work. This would simplify the system into one general Work Programme and one individual budget-based programme so individuals have a choice over the support that they most need. This would build on learning from the Right to Control trailblazers.

Robust plans are already in place to monitor the delivery and impact of both the Work Programme and Work Choice. The Sayce Review recommends some specific improvements in the collection of data on disability, and we will examine the feasibility of publishing this information more systematically across the Department's employment programmes.

The Work Choice programme already moves away from the direct funding of supported business places, for example, phasing out the direct financial subsidy of supported business places in local authority-owned businesses. Future decisions about the strategy for supported businesses and the strategy for Work Choice after the current contracts expire will be informed by the results of this consultation.

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?

7

Cross-government issues

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.

Recommendation 6

The Department should make employment of disabled people a cross-government objective with joint ministerial responsibility. A cross-departmental ministerial group, including all departments with responsibilities that impact on employment outcomes, should drive a new cross-Government strategy on disabled people's employment, incorporating the Government's response to this review. There should be regular reporting and tracking progress externally on the Cross-Government Strategy. The cross-Government group should work closely with business and disability leaders.

The Government agrees that disability employment is both a government priority and an area that requires close working and co-operation between departments. We have 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.

Other issues

8

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 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 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 College 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 consultation

10

Specialist disability employment programmes

Used to describe employment programmes and support services designed to help 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 for Work and Pensions.

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 consultation document the ‘Department’ refers to the Department for Work and Pensions unless otherwise stated.

The Sayce Review

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



1 Equality

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

Further information about how we will make sure the needs of disabled people are taken fully into account when new policies are developed and implemented can be found at:

www.dwp.gov.uk/sayce-consultation

2 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 (e.g. the Work Programme and Work Choice) to all of our customers, including those with health conditions and disabilities; and,
- consult on all major changes to this provision, as demonstrated by this consultation.

Further information about the Equality Act can be found at:

<http://www.equalityhumanrights.com/legal-and-policy/equality-act/>

Responding to this consultation

12

The consultation period

This formal consultation will last for 14 weeks from 11 July 2011. Responses must be received by close of business on 17 October 2011.

Where to send your response

Please send your response:

by post (letter or audio) or email to:

Sayce Review Consultation Team
Disability and Work Division
Department for Work and Pensions
Steel City House
West Street
Sheffield
S1 2GQ
Telephone: 0114 294 8239

email: sayce.consultationresponses@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

Who should respond to this consultation?

This public consultation applies to England, Wales, and Scotland.

We welcome responses from anyone with personal experience of, or an interest in, the Department's employment services for disabled people and people with health conditions, particularly:

- disabled people, their colleagues, friends, families, and carers;
- young disabled people seeking to make their transition from education to employment;
- disabled employees who have received or are receiving employment support, or who may need employment support in the future;
- older workers and people seeking to work beyond pension age;
- employers and their representative organisations;
- trades unions;
- organisations delivering employment services and those who may be interested in providing such services in the future;
- organisations run by or for disabled people; and,
- any other people or organisations with an interest in our employment services for disabled people.

Northern Ireland

Social Security is a devolved matter in Northern Ireland. The Government will continue to work closely with the devolved administration in Northern Ireland to seek to maintain a single system across the United Kingdom.

What questions should you answer?

You can respond to some or all of the questions. There is a final question that allows you to add anything else that is relevant that you would like us to consider.

What will happen to the replies we receive?

All responses will be fully considered, but we are unable to provide a personal reply to specific questions or issues raised by individual respondents. When the consultation is complete and the findings have been analysed, we will publish a summary of the responses, and information on what happens next.

The summary will be available through the Department's website:

www.dwp.gov.uk/resourcecentre/des-consultation.asp

If you have queries about the consultation process

If you have any queries about this consultation, or would like to receive the consultation document in an alternative format, for example, large print, Braille, audio, or Easy Read, please contact:

Sayce Consultation Team
 Disability and Work Division
 Department for Work and Pensions
 Steel City House
 West Street
 Sheffield
 S1 2GQ

Telephone: 0114 294 8237

email: sayce.consultationresponses@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

Freedom of information

The information you send us may need to be passed to colleagues within the Department for Work and Pensions, published in a summary of responses received and referred to in the published consultation report.

All information contained in your response may be subject to publication or disclosure if requested under the Freedom of Information Act 2000. By providing personal information for the purposes of the public consultation exercise, it is understood that you consent to its disclosure and publication. If this is not the case, you should limit any personal information provided, or remove it completely. If you want the information in your response to the consultation to be kept confidential, you should explain why as part of your response, although we cannot guarantee to do this.

More information about the Freedom of Information Act can be found on the Ministry of Justice website *Ministry of Justice: FoI Guidance*.

The consultation criteria

The consultation is being conducted in line with the Government Code of Practice on Consultation and its seven consultation criteria:

- **When to consult.** Formal consultation should take place at a stage when there is scope to influence the outcome.
- **Duration of consultation exercises.** Consultations should normally last for at least 12 weeks, with consideration given to longer timescales where feasible and sensible.
- **Clarity of scope and impact.** Consultation documents should be clear about the consultation process, what is being proposed, the scope to influence, and the expected costs and benefits of the proposals.
- **Accessibility of consultation exercises.** Consultation exercises should be designed to be accessible to, and clearly targeted at, those people the exercise is designed to reach.

- **The burden of consultation.** Keeping the burden of consultation to a minimum is essential if consultations are to be effective and if consultees' buy-in to the process is to be obtained.
- **Responsiveness of consultation exercises.** Consultation responses should be analysed carefully and clear feedback should be provided to participants following the consultation.
- **Capacity to consult.** Officials running consultation exercises should seek guidance in how to run an effective consultation exercise, and share what they have learned from the experience.

Feedback on this consultation

We value your feedback on how well we consult. If you have any comments on the process of this consultation, for example, how it could be improved, but not about the issues raised, please contact our Consultation Coordinator

by post (letter or audio) or email at:

Roger Pugh
DWP Consultation Coordinator
1st Floor
Crown House
2, Ferensway
Hull
HU2 8NF

email: Roger.Pugh@dpw.gsi.gov.uk



information & publishing solutions

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

Customers can also order publications from:

TSO Ireland
16 Arthur Street, Belfast BT1 4GD
Telephone orders/general enquiries:
028 9023 8451
Fax orders: 028 9023 5401

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

For more information about this publication,
contact:

**Sayce Consultation Team
Disability and Work Division
Department for Work and Pensions
Steel City House
West Street
Sheffield
S1 2GQ**

Telephone: 0114 294 8239

Email: sayce.consultationresponses@dwp.gsi.gov.uk

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

Department for Work and Pensions
11 July 2011

www.dwp.gov.uk

ISBN 978-0-10-181262-7



9 780101 812627