

# **MAPPING EMPLOYMENT FOCUSED SERVICES FOR DISABLED PEOPLE**

**In-house report 93**

**Hilary Arksey  
Patricia Thornton  
Julie Williams**

# **MAPPING EMPLOYMENT FOCUSED SERVICES FOR DISABLED PEOPLE**

**A study carried out on behalf of the  
Department for Work and Pensions**

**By**

**Hilary Arksey, Patricia Thornton and Julie Williams  
Social Policy Research Unit**

Ó Crown copyright 2002. Published with permission of the Department for Work and Pensions on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationary Office.

The text in this report (excluding the Royal Arms and Departmental logos) may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium provided that it is reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the report specified. The DWP would appreciate receiving copies of any publication that includes material taken from this report.

Any queries relating to the content of this report and copies of publications that include material from this report should be sent to: Paul Noakes, Social Research Branch, Room 4-26 Adelphi, 1-11 John Adam Street, London WC2N 6HT

For information about Crown copyright you should visit the Her Majesty's Stationery Office (HMSO) website at: [www.hmsogov.uk](http://www.hmsogov.uk)

First Published 2002

ISBN 185197 974 3

ISSN 1368 244X

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

The authors would like to thank all those who responded to our requests for information. In addition, we would like to record our thanks to those individuals who organised large-scale requests for information on our behalf. The Department of Health kindly assisted us to obtain copies of Welfare to Work for Disabled People Joint Investment Plans. Thanks are also due to Sarah-Jane Lilley and Gary Mundy who managed the project for the Department for Education and Employment. This report and the Directory of Service would not have been possible without the hard work of the team of data-inputers and Sally Pulleyn at the Social Policy Research Unit.

# Contents

Acknowledgements

Summary	i
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Aims of the study	1
1.2 Growth of employment-focussed services for disabled people	1
1.2.1 <i>Government initiatives</i>	2
1.2.2 <i>European initiatives</i>	3
1.2.3 <i>Other stakeholder initiatives</i>	4
1.3 Information needs	5
2 Methods of Obtaining Information	7
2.1 Proforma	7
2.2 Existing sources of information	7
2.2.1 <i>Directories</i>	7
2.2.2 <i>Joint Investment Plans</i>	8
2.3 Approaches for information	8
2.4 Searches on the Internet	9
2.5 Services and projects in Scotland and Wales	10
2.6 Sources of information	10
2.7 Implications of methods for interpreting findings	11
3 Processing the Information	13
3.1 Creating the Access Database	13
3.2 Directory	13
3.3 Analysis	14
4 Findings	15
4.1 Introduction	15
4.2 Groups served	15
4.3 Types of service provided	17
4.3.1 <i>Distribution of services across disabled client groups</i>	20
4.3.2 <i>Distribution of client groups within service categories</i>	21
4.4 Routes to services	24

4.5	Regional distribution	24
	4.5.1 <i>Distribution of client groups across regions</i>	25
	4.5.2 <i>Distribution of client groups within regions</i>	26
	4.5.3 <i>Distribution of service categories across regions</i>	29
	4.5.4 <i>Distribution of service categories within regions</i>	29
4.6	Funding sources	32
5	Discussion	33
	5.1 The process	33
	5.2 Data limitations	33
	5.3 The findings	34
	5.3.1 <i>Generic services</i>	34
	5.3.2 <i>Private sector provision</i>	34
	5.3.3 <i>Disabled target groups</i>	34
	5.3.4 <i>The services</i>	35
	5.3.5 <i>Service combinations</i>	36
	5.3.6 <i>Regional distribution</i>	37
	5.3.7 <i>Access to services</i>	37
	5.3.8 <i>Funding sources</i>	37
	5.4 Conclusion	37
	References	39
	Appendix A Proforma	41
	Appendix B Example of an 'Invented Project'	43

## List of tables

Table 2.1	Sources of information	10
Table 2.2	Number of sources of information per project	11
Table 4.1	Disabled target groups	15
Table 4.2	Number of disabled groups targeted	16
Table 4.3	Target groups of projects aimed at one disabled group only	16
Table 4.4	Types of service provided	17
Table 4.5	Categories of services provided	19
Table 4.6a	Distribution of services across disabled client groups	22
Table 4.6b	Distribution of client groups within service categories	23
Table 4.7	Routes to projects for disabled people	24
Table 4.8	Regional distribution of projects	25
Table 4.9a	Distribution of client groups across regions	27
Table 4.9b	Distribution of client groups within regions	28
Table 4.10a	Distribution of service types across regions	30
Table 4.10b	Distribution of services within regions	31
Table 4.11	Sources of funding	32

# SUMMARY

## Introduction and background

The Social Policy Research Unit was commissioned by the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), with the Department of Social Security (DSS), to quantify employment-focussed services in England, Scotland and Wales, the client groups served, and the geographical distribution. For the purpose of the study, employment-focussed services were defined as 'services which focus on preparation for employment, assisting with take-up of employment opportunities, sustaining employment obtained, or retaining in employment people who become ill or acquire impairments'. There were two outputs: a Directory of Services and this report which contains an analysis of the information collected.

The study was undertaken in the context of huge growth in the last decade in employment-related services for disabled people. Growth has been stimulated by government policy to diversify service provision and to test out new ways of delivering services, by new UK and European funding streams which encourage non-governmental initiatives in the field, and by the activities of stakeholders such as disability organisations, charities and employing organisations. Information on the range and type of services had not kept pace with growth.

## Methods

Data were obtained on 2,520 projects meeting our definition. Direct provision by the Employment Service was excluded, as were residential services, services providing only advocacy or information, and support groups. Data collection took place between February and July 2001; projects that were understood to be 'live' at July 2001 were included.

A variety of approaches was used to collect data. Existing sources of information provided the starting point. These included directories, available either on the Internet or in printed format, and local authority Welfare to Work Joint Investment Plans for Disabled People (JIPs) which proved to be the main source. Requests for information were made to Government Offices for the Regions in England, Regional Development Agencies and equivalent bodies in Scotland and Wales. Managers of projects in specific government programmes were contacted. Some networks circulated our request for information amongst members, together with a specially devised proforma to collect standardised information. Internet searches were undertaken and the proforma distributed to relevant organisations or projects. Special efforts were made to search for information about relevant services in Scotland and Wales, given that local authorities there were not required to produce JIPs.



The information obtained varied in both quality and quantity; drawing on multiple sources of information served to increase confidence in the accuracy and reliability of the data. Existing sources of information and self-reported descriptions of projects categorised service models in different ways. For this project, a classification system of 42 options was developed. It encompassed:

- service inputs (such as education, training or work preparation)
- service processes (such as counselling, vocational guidance, help with job search)
- types of service delivery (such as supported employment or work preparation)
- types of work (such as self-employment or voluntary work)
- work settings (such as social firms, co-operatives or supported factories)
- employer-focussed services (such as disability awareness training or advice)

Data for each project were entered into a database designed to take account of the needs of both the Directory of Services and the accompanying analysis. The Directory was produced in Microsoft Access 2000 which permits customised searches. The statistical package SPSS was used for the data analysis to produce descriptive frequencies and cross-tabulations.

## **Findings**

*Groups served:* Under one in ten projects provided generic services aimed at both disabled and non-disabled people. Just 17 per cent of projects for which information is available were open to disabled people irrespective of type of impairment. The groups most commonly targeted were people with learning difficulties (53 per cent of projects for which information is available) and people with mental health problems (46 per cent). More than half of projects were aimed at one disabled group only. (Section 4.2)

*Types of service provided:* In total, 6731 services were provided by 2437 projects: vocational training was recorded for around four in ten projects; work placement and supported employment were each recorded for around one in four. Under one in three projects provided just one type of service; of these, three in ten were categorised as a supported/sheltered factory/business or workshop and one fifth as vocational training. Some 667 projects provided as many as four or more types of service. (Section 4.3)

*Distribution of services across disabled client groups:* For ease of analysis service types were collapsed into 22 categories. Of the ten user groups, the dominant one in each category of service was either people with mental health problems or people with learning difficulties. People with mental health problems were considerably over-represented in: transitional employment/club house/Intermediate Labour Market schemes; work rehabilitation/therapeutic work schemes; services providing work or

employment in special settings; and counselling and vocational guidance services. People with learning difficulties were also over-represented in services providing work or employment in special settings, but were considerably under-represented in transitional employment schemes. (*Section 4.3.1*)

*Routes to services:* Referral by a professional to access services was needed for at least three in ten projects. Data on referral routes are available for only 33 per cent of projects. ES, Disability Employment Adviser (DEA) or Jobcentre and social services or social work departments were sources in over half of these projects. NHS professionals were sources for nearly a quarter of projects where referral was needed, and community mental health teams specifically in just under one in five instances. Self-referral was an option for 11 per cent of services. (*Section 4.4*)

*Regional distribution:* The majority of projects, three out of ten, were located in London and the South East. Just four per cent and six per cent of projects were to be found in Wales and Scotland respectively. Variations in geographical distribution possibly reflect differences in the availability of information sources. (*Section 4.5*)

*Distribution of client groups across regions:* Scotland had the highest proportion of generic services, whilst Wales had the highest proportion of projects targeted at any disabled person. Wales and East Midlands and Eastern region had the highest proportions of services aimed at people with learning difficulties. Scotland had the highest proportion of projects aimed at people with mental health problems and Wales the lowest. Projects for people with a sensory or communication impairment were rather less likely to be found in London and South East region and South West region. (*Section 4.5.1*)

*Distribution of client groups within regions:* With the exception of Scotland, in all regions people with learning difficulties were the dominant group. People with mental health problems, the second largest group overall, comprised the largest group in Scotland. (*Section 4.5.2*)

*Distribution of service categories across regions:* London and the South East had somewhat fewer projects providing information and advice, and rather more offering job finding and work rehabilitation or therapeutic work. Generally, there were few striking differences in the regional distribution of other services. Information and advice services were over-represented in the North West; assessment and educational programmes were over-represented in East Midlands and Eastern region. (*Section 4.5.3*)

*Distribution of service categories within regions:* While the distribution of services in London and the South East broadly reflected the overall pattern there are

unexplained differences in the distributions within the other regions. (*Section 4.5.4*)

*Funding Sources:* Information on funding sources is available for half of the projects identified. The largest source, for over three in ten of these projects was a local authority social services department. The DfEE or ES was the second largest source (26 per cent of projects), and the European Commission the third (23 per cent). Whilst over half of projects where information is available had just one source of funding, 27 per cent had two funding sources and 12 per cent had three sources. Some five per cent of projects had four sources, and three per cent had five or more. (*Section 4.6*)

## **Discussion**

The process of identifying projects was not easy; problems met in local-level exercises were magnified in a project covering all of Great Britain. (*Section 5.1*) There are several limitations to the data, notably uneven geographical coverage. (*Section 5.2*)

Relatively few generic services were recorded. Whilst this could be a reflection of the study's specific focus on 'services for disabled people', it might also indicate that the European Commission's philosophy of 'mainstreaming' service provision is not being put into practice. (*Section 5.3.1*)

The work did not set out to identify private sector provision; even so, a surprisingly small number of private sector providers were found. As service provision for disabled people is opened up to the for-profit sector, it will be increasingly important to map such provision. (*Section 5.3.2*)

Our categorisation of target groups centres on type of impairment as this way of typifying people was used almost without exception by our main sources. Less than one in five of projects could be accessed by any disabled person, irrespective of type of impairment. The number of projects targeting people with learning difficulties is disproportionate to the incidence of this group in the general population, but perhaps warranted given their low employment rate. Very few projects aimed only at people with physical impairments but this group is comparatively well served by the Employment Service. (*Section 5.3.3*)

Possibly reflecting the data collection techniques, it appears that projects providing employment in special settings and supported employment with mainstream employers have comprehensive coverage. Overall, the majority of services focussed on the pre-employment stage. It proved hard to quantify services aimed at helping disabled people into paid work which were not operating some model of supported employment. Again, it was hard to distinguish services providing support on the job

outside supported employment. Services directed at employers are probably under-represented and fewer than expected projects providing support with self-employed were recorded. Very few services for job retention were found. (*Section 5.3.4*)

It is noteworthy that a third of projects provided four or more services. We cannot tell how far these projects offered a co-ordinated range of opportunities but it seems likely that having multiple services within one organisation allows disabled people a number of different options. (*Section 5.3.5*)

There is scope to standardise ways of collating information about services at regional and local levels. (*Section 5.3.6*)

As professionals are often gatekeepers to services it is important that they have accurate, up-to-date information on services in their area. Improving access to information would benefit disabled people who wish to make an independent choice. (*Section 5.3.7*)

Multiple funding sources suggest that a significant number of projects are investing time and effort in chasing funding as well as reporting to different funders. (*Section 5.3.8*)

# 1 INTRODUCTION

In February 2001, the Department for Education and Employment (DfEE), with the Department of Social Security (DSS), commissioned the Social Policy Research Unit at the University of York to map existing employment-focussed services for disabled people in England, Scotland and Wales. The research was commissioned to inform the Government's objective of helping disabled people to obtain and retain paid employment, in the context of the extension of the New Deal for Disabled People.

Employment-focussed services were defined as services which focus on preparation for employment, assisting with take-up of employment opportunities, sustaining employment obtained, or retaining in employment people who become ill or acquire impairments.

This Introduction explains the aims of the study and the background to it. Section 2 of the report outlines the methods used to map services. Section 3 explains how the information obtained was processed and analysed. The findings are presented in section 4. The report concludes with a discussion of the mapping exercise and its findings.

## 1.1 Aims of the study

The aim was to classify and quantify employment-focussed services and the client groups they serve, and to show the geographical distribution. No compendium of services had existed previously, and knowledge of the extent and type of provision was patchy. Some directories of services were available but were either not comprehensive or were confined to particular types of service or particular geographical areas. The intention was to draw on existing sources of information, supplemented by approaches to providing organisations themselves, rather than to conduct a survey.

Outcomes of the study were two-fold: a Directory of Services; and this report, based on an analysis of the information obtained.

## 1.2 Growth of employment-focussed services for disabled people

The last decade or so has seen a huge growth in employment-related services for disabled people. Growth has been stimulated by government policy to diversify service provision and to test out new ways of delivering services, by new UK and European funding streams which encourage non-governmental initiatives in the field, and by the activities of stakeholders such as disability organisations, charities and employing organisations.

Consequently, there is a profusion of services, both specific to disabled people and serving a range of client groups. We describe below the forces that have led to growth. It should be noted that the initiatives described are overlapping, and

providers of employment-focussed services for disabled people often draw on more than one source of financial support. The picture is dynamic as the nature of the services provided often evolves with changing funding environments and policy demands.

### **1.2.1 Government initiatives**

The main provider of services for disabled people traditionally has been the Employment Service (ES), through around 50 Disability Service Teams (DSTs). Disability Employment Advisers and Occupational Psychologists within DSTs provide work-related assessment, guidance and help to access or retain employment for disabled people who need support additional to that provided through mainstream Employment Services.

From the early 1990s, government policies have encouraged provision of vocational rehabilitation services for disabled people by contracted agencies rather than directly by the ES, contributing to an escalation in the number of agencies providing services. For example, the ES Work Preparation Programme is delivered by around 270 contractors and WORKSTEP by 250 voluntary sector organisations and local authorities. Other organisations contracting services for disabled people include Learning Skills Councils and Regional Development Agencies.

The New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) has furthered the shift towards independent sector provision. Initially, 24 NDDP Innovative Schemes and 12 NDDP Personal Adviser Service pilot projects were delivered by public sector, voluntary, private and employing organisations. In the extended NDDP pilot, a competitively tendered job broker service is being provided mainly by independent sector organisations and by a small number of ES teams. Job Retention and Rehabilitation pilot projects are also being operated by the independent sector.

The Department of Health (DoH) and Health and Safety Executive Back in Work initiative is supporting 19 projects addressing back pain in the workplace. Some projects direct their activities at workers, while others focus on awareness raising amongst the business community.

At local government level, the Welfare to Work Joint Investment Plans (JIPs), instituted by the DoH and led by local authorities, may stimulate new employment-related services for disabled people. JIPs are three year plans for re-shaping services, delivered to the DoH in April 2001. The plans identify the needs and resources that affect access to services that help people enter, or sustain, work or work-related activity. Needs analysis and resource mapping were intended to identify gaps in services and lead to an action plan for unmet needs.

Local authorities themselves offer employment-related services for disabled people, by contracting to local agencies and through direct services. The Department for the

Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR) Best Value initiative encouraged some local authorities to examine their own provision in the light of other services in their locality, in some cases leading to alternative provision.

Broader Government initiatives have stimulated independent sector projects focussed on promoting employment of disabled people amongst other target groups.

Health Action Zones (HAZs) are partnerships between the NHS, local authorities, voluntary and private sectors and community groups. The 26 HAZs cover some of the most deprived areas in the country. Their three strategic objectives are to: identify and address the health needs of the local area; modernise services through increasing effectiveness, efficiency and responsiveness; and develop partnerships. HAZs have developed programmes linking health and employment, supporting and stimulating local projects. These include projects for disabled people. Health Action Zones Employment Pilots were launched in December 2000. Three of the nine pilots target disabled people among other disadvantaged groups.

New Deals for young people, long-term unemployed and over fifties, as well as 15 Employment Zones, have catered for significant numbers of people with health problems or impairments. For example, 26 per cent of participants in the five Prototype Employment Zones were found to have health problems or disabilities expected to last for more than a year, rising to 37 per cent among those aged 50 plus (Trinh and Noble, 2000). Such programmes rely on the public, private and voluntary sectors for delivery and draw on local provision from independent sector projects. The contractor for four Employment Zones had a national partnership with a voluntary sector organisation serving disabled people. Three of the 20 New Deal Innovation Fund projects targeted disabled people.

Partnership has been central to many of the initiatives described above. The partnership approach to project management, delivery and funding (in cash and in kind) has attracted new players able to bring ideas from other arenas (such as business) and adds to the diversification of service approaches.

### ***1.2.2 European initiatives***

At the same time, independent sector projects have been stimulated by European funding opportunities.

HORIZON was one of the four strands of the European Commission's EMPLOYMENT Community Initiative, supported through the European Social Fund (ESF). The EMPLOYMENT initiative was launched in 1995 and was operational until the end of the year 2000. HORIZON was a programme targeting disabled people, testing and implementing new ideas for disabled people's training and employment. In GB, 66 projects were supported in the first round (1995-7) and 69 in the second round (1997-2000). Preceding HORIZON, the HELIOS Programmes (I and II)

supported employment-related projects for disabled people (24 projects in the UK in HELIOS II). Participation in HELIOS tended to lead to successful bids for HORIZON funding (Bolderson *et al.*, 1997). Focussing on training rather employment, the EU LEONARDO DI VINCI transnational programme funded GB projects involving disabled people. It should be noted that other strands of the ESF EMPLOYMENT programme (Now, Youthstart, Integra) and the ADAPT initiative focussed on other groups facing difficulties in preparing for, accessing and retaining employment. Although rarely explicitly recognised, substantial minorities within those groups (women, young people, socially excluded people) were people with long-term health problems or impairments.

The new EU EQUAL initiative is expected to influence the direction of projects aimed at people disadvantaged in the labour market away from provision for specific groups such as disabled people. The aim is to explore new ways of tackling common problems of discrimination and inequality in the labour market, rather than focussing on a specific target group (as in the EMPLOYMENT programme). The philosophy of the programme is likely to influence attitudes to innovative practice in relation to services for disabled people within the UK.

The ESF Objective 3 Programme is also relevant. It aims to help young people and the unemployed, including disabled people, to integrate more effectively into the labour market. Participants take advantage of either discrete activities, such as training, or integrated packages of support tailored to individual needs which draw on a range of local providers. Evaluation of the UK ESF Objective 3 programme showed that integrated packages work better for disabled people and suggested that future programmes should encourage the development of integrated programmes for the most disadvantaged groups (Allen *et al.*, 1999).

Further European funding is available for regeneration projects, through the Regional Development Agencies. Some Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) funding is used for employment projects, and disabled people are defined as a target group.

### **1.2.3 Other stakeholder initiatives**

Stimulated in part by the direction of Government policy and by national and European opportunities for new developments, several national voluntary sector providers have expanded from a predominantly care-oriented approach into provision of employment focussed services. National voluntary organisations already active in the employment field have increased and diversified their project-based activities. Non-governmental national organisations increasingly offer direct services to disabled people, some as alternatives to ES provision.

Non-governmental funding programmes within the UK, notably the National Lottery Funding Board (now the Community Fund) and Charity Projects, and leading charities have stimulated local projects in the field of employment of disabled people.



Employing organisations have become active players in the field, particularly in the late 1990s when they took on leading roles in NDDP Innovative Schemes. The Employers' Forum on Disability has been instrumental in encouraging employer-led projects for disabled people, as have some national voluntary organisations.

The number of projects led by disabled people themselves is increasing, though still a small proportion, and a number of organisations of disabled people (such as local coalitions of disabled people) have moved into a service-provision role in the area of employment.

### **1.3 Information needs**

The picture drawn above shows a profusion of projects and services. Providing organisations are diversifying into providing multiple services. The picture is dynamic as lack of secure funding leads to closure, and as new funding sources and policy demands influence the nature of services provided.

Reviews of employment projects for disabled people nationally have concentrated on 'good practice' (Smythe and Maynard Campbell, 1997), joint working (Pozner *et al.*, 2000) and areas for development (Barnes *et al.*, 1998; Pozner *et al.*, 1996). While funding bodies might hold lists of employment-focussed services for disabled people which they themselves fund (though, surprisingly, systems do not always allow for such information to be accessed) and there is a handful of directories covering particular types of service or discrete geographical areas, prior to this research there was only one nationwide database of services (the ERMIS database) but by no means comprehensive. None of these directories has been analysed.

A number of developments have increased the demand for information on employment-focussed services for disabled people.

- The JIP process in England has focussed attention at local authority level on the need for information on existing employment-related services for disabled people, both to make potential users aware of services open to them and also to identify gaps in provision and plan ways of filling those gaps.
- Major contractors of services, such as the Department for Work and Pensions and ES, wish to attract new providers and fresh approaches to provision.
- The growth of case-managed approaches, notably in the NDDP, has led to a demand for specific services to contribute to meeting the wide-ranging needs of the client group.



## 2 METHODS OF OBTAINING INFORMATION

We collected data on 2,520 projects providing employment-focused services for disabled people in England, Scotland and Wales; projects based in Northern Ireland were not included because of the different institutional context and funding regimes. Data collection took place between February and July 2001. Projects that we understood to be 'live' at July 2001 were included (but may have since ceased). For inclusion, projects had to meet the fairly broad criteria adopted, namely 'providing services that focused on preparing for paid employment, assisting with take-up of employment opportunities, sustaining employment obtained or retention of people who became ill or impaired'. We excluded direct provision by the Employment Service, residential services, services providing only advocacy or information, and support groups. We did not set out to look specifically at the private sector.

Before proceeding to outline the different methods we used to obtain information, it is important to describe the data collection tool we created.

### 2.1 Proforma

A proforma was designed to collect and record standardised information about projects and their services (see Appendix A). The information comprised: scheme name, address and other contact details; scheme description; client group(s); eligibility criteria; referral routes; annual targets; funding arrangements; area covered; and start and end dates. These categories became the fields used in the Access database that was later created to record project details (see Section 3.1).

The proforma was available both on paper and electronically. It was distributed to projects we knew about, and also adapted for inclusion in relevant umbrella organisations' newsletters (see Section 2.4). Some respondents passed the proforma to other relevant projects they were aware of. For these reasons, we are unable to calculate the response rate.

### 2.2 Existing sources of information

#### 2.2.1 Directories

Existing sources of information, such as directories, were the starting point for compiling information on relevant projects and services. An important source was the *Ermis Database* that had just been updated and was available on the Internet ([www.ermis-database.org](http://www.ermis-database.org)). Because of data protection difficulties, we could not extract information directly from Ermis. To overcome this problem, the Ermis database manager undertook a special mailing on our behalf to all members of Ermis in England, Scotland and Wales asking them to contact us if they did *not* wish to be included in the database we were creating for this project. Paper directories already available from which we extracted information included the Directory of Supported Employment Opportunities (DISS, 2001). Paper directories were not always

accurate. For instance, *The Social Firms Directory* (Higgins and Gianniba, 1999) was in the process of being up-dated, and we were asked not to use this as a source of information. However, we were able to include the proforma in a large-scale mailing that was already planned for Social Firms UK members and so collect information in this way (see Section 2.4).

We also approached some organisations listed in the reviews cited in Section 1.3).

### **2.2.2 Joint Investment Plans**

At the same time as we were collecting information on employment-focussed services, all local authorities in England providing social services (150) had to submit a Welfare to Work for Disabled People Joint Investment Plan (JIP) to the Department of Health (DoH). This meant authorities had to undertake their own resource mapping exercise to identify local services and activities. With the assistance of the DoH, we approached local authorities to ask for a copy of their JIP. As a consequence of follow-up and persistence on the part of both ourselves and the DoH, by the end of the data collection period, only 11 JIPs, from authorities in the south of England, were missing.

In the course of this element of the data collection, we discovered that some authorities and organisations had produced their own local directory of services to support disabled people into employment which they kindly passed on to us (East Sussex County Council, 2000; East Riding of Yorkshire Council, 2000; Surrey Employment Access Forum, 2000).

### **2.3 Approaches for information**

We approached Government organisations we believed were likely to hold the sort of information we were seeking. These included the nine Government Offices (GOs) for the Regions in England, the Welsh European Funding Office and the Scottish Objective 3 Partnership to identify those ESF Objective 1 and Objective 3 Projects where disabled people were a target group. The ESF databases mostly have no search facility and differences in the accessibility of the information led to regional disparities in response to our request. Some GOs were able to retrieve the information quite easily to pass on to us, whilst for others it was more difficult and time-consuming because it meant undertaking manual searches. Some GOs were unable to extract the required information, and others felt unable to devote limited staff resources to the exercise.

We also approached Single Regeneration Budget (SRB) managers in six of the Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) in England (no contacts could be made for three), to find that RDAs did not hold details of projects on the ground. (One RDA held details on the World-Wide-Web, but this was not searchable on key terms.) As with the GOs, the RDAs varied in the level and type of cooperation they volunteered to the study. For instance, one RDA circulated our request for information and the

proforma to all SRB Partnerships; another provided contact information for all Partnerships, and yet another provided contact details for Partnerships identified as likely to have projects including disabled people.

We made direct contact with national voluntary organisations, such as Mencap, the Shaw Trust, National Schizophrenia Fellowship and the Arts Council, to tell them about the study and to ask for their help in collecting information. Organisations responded differently. Whilst one or two forwarded names and addresses of individual projects so that we could make contact ourselves, others asked their regional organisers to collate information to pass on to us. We also approached leading charitable funders. Unfortunately, the Community Fund's (previously the National Lottery Charities Board) database was not designed to allow for searching on the relevant key terms.

Some organisations we contacted acted as a conduit to information about relevant projects and services. For instance, we asked a number of networks to circulate our request for information and proforma. These included the National Vocational Rehabilitation Association, Social Firms UK, the Scottish Union of Supported Employment, Worknet (the employment arm of Mind), and Disability Wales.

Another direct source of information was Remploy, for up-to-date contact details of all Remploy factories and Interwork schemes.

Managers of projects in specific programmes were contacted for details of relevant, current activity. These included the New Deal for Disabled People Innovative Schemes, Health Action Zones, Back in Work and the New Deal Innovation Fund. Although the HORIZON programme had come to an end in 2000, all second round projects were written to.

#### **2.4 Searches on the Internet**

Internet searches were undertaken to identify directories and databases of service providers and organisations whose work involved supporting disabled people to obtain, and retain, employment. Individual projects were also searched for at the same time. Once organisations or projects had been identified as potentially relevant, we then made contact and asked for more detailed standardised information using the proforma.

The Internet searches were time-consuming, in that frequently sources had what appeared to be useful links to other employment-related organisations and service providers. The time spent trailing the links to try to find out whether or not they were relevant to the study was quite considerable. Whilst every effort was made to ensure the searches were systematic, the Internet's size, scope and fluidity made this task difficult.

It is worth mentioning that we know of at least two instances where people we had contacted spontaneously put information about the study and requests for contributions on their website.

## 2.5 Services and projects in Scotland and Wales

Reflecting the fact that local authorities in Scotland and Wales were not required to produce JIPs, additional efforts were made to search for information about relevant services and projects located in these two countries. Initially, we approached the Scottish Executive and the National Assembly for Wales, but these strategies did not prove especially useful.

After further Internet searches and following up the few contacts we had been given, we identified relevant organisations to approach. In Scotland, these included Capability Scotland, Lead Scotland, the Scottish Enterprise New Futures Fund and the Scottish Union of Supported Employment. The Scottish Development Centre Employment Programme was in the process of creating an on-line database containing details of mental health employment services in Scotland, and they kindly volunteered to share available, relevant information with us. For Wales, we were given details of umbrella organisations such as Disability Wales, the Standing Conference of Voluntary Organisations for People with a Learning Disability in Wales and the Association of Supported Employment Agencies in Wales.

## 2.6 Sources of information

Table 2.1 below summarises the main sources of information for the 2,520 projects identified. It demonstrates the major contribution of the JIPs.

*Table 2.1* Sources of information

Source	N	%
Welfare to Work for Disabled People Joint Investment Plan	1,346	55
Ermis Database	432	18
Directory of Employment Supported Employment Opportunities	324	13
Organisation itself	698	28
Government Offices for the Regions	85	3
Other	149	6

The percentages above add up to more than 100 because information about some projects was obtained from more than one source. Table 2.2 shows the number of information sources per project.

*Table 2.2* Number of sources of information per project

Number of sources	N	%
1	2,004	80
2	377	15
3	76	3
4	12	*

## 2.7 Implications of methods for interpreting findings

A note of caution needs to be sounded when interpreting the findings. In terms of service models, for instance, existing sources of information (the Ermis Database and the Directory of Supported Employment Opportunities) already used their own classification system. The proforma we developed allowed respondents to use their own terminology to describe the support offered to clients. This meant that we had to interpret other people's conceptualisations of provision and then classify these according to our own chosen range of types of support. Our classification system was developed from Pozner *et al.*'s (1996) profile of service models, and totalled 42 different options. The classification encompasses:

- service inputs such as education, training or work preparation
- service processes such as counselling, vocational guidance or help with job search
- types of service delivery such as supported employment or work preparation
- types of work such as self-employment or voluntary work
- work settings such as social firms, co-operatives or supported factories
- employer-focussed services such as disability awareness training or advice.

Inconsistent or ambiguous use of terminology could give rise to confusion. For instance, the term 'supported employment' was used differently, on occasions in relation to the Employment Service's Supported Employment Programme and at other times referring to the 'American model' where the prime focus is on supporting people on the job, often with the help of a 'job coach'.

We were reliant on organisations providing us with the full information we required. Given the problems of self-reporting, there is potential for the findings not to provide as comprehensive a picture as we would wish. There may be gaps in regional coverage, reflecting the problems in accessing information from the RGOs and the

RDAs. Having said that, we were able to obtain JIPs for nearly all the English local authorities, apart from some in the south and, as noted, JIPs constituted 55 per cent of all information sources.

Drawing on multiple sources of information, although time-consuming, was a way to increase confidence in the accuracy and reliability of the data. At the same time, the information we collected varied in terms of both quality and quantity. This was particularly the case with the JIPs. In some instances, we were able to fill the gaps by extracting further information from alternative sources of information.



## **3 PROCESSING THE INFORMATION**

### **3.1 Creating the Access database**

A database was constructed using Microsoft Access 2000 software. It was designed taking into account the needs of the Directory and also the data analysis. The latter was intended to shed light on distribution and/or variations in current provision in terms of type of services provided, main client group(s) and location of providers.

As indicated earlier, fields in the Access database matched the questions asked in the proforma. There were some additional ones, including specifying sources of information. The information that could be stored in the database included both 'yes/no' fields and text. The database was designed to allow for cross-checking of entries; it was important to ensure there were no duplicate entries, given the different sources of information we were drawing on.

The volume of entries was large; data entry was time-consuming and lengthy (approximately four months). Only one person could work on the database at one time.

### **3.2 Directory**

The Directory was intended for use by service providers, and disabled people themselves looking for information about local services which support disabled people to obtain and retain work. It was produced in Microsoft Word from the Access database. Appendix B is an example of an 'invented' project, to illustrate the type of information contained in the Directory.

The first full version of the Directory included just over 3000 entries; reviewing it revealed that there was a considerable number of double and even triple entries, even though every effort had been made during the data entry stage to avoid this. A particular problem was caused by projects operating under more than one name. At this stage, we embarked on a thorough check, looking for duplicates and other types of data entry errors. The final version was rather smaller, containing details of 2,520 projects.

It was decided to organise the Directory according to the nine Employment Service regions. Projects were then ordered by postcode within each of the nine regions. Centrally-based national projects, that is those operated from a central base and open to disabled people or employers in any part of Great Britain, England or Scotland featured in a separate section. The Directory is available in Microsoft Access 2000 which permits customised searches.

### **3.3 Analysis**

SPSS, a commonly used statistical package, was used for the data analysis to produce descriptive frequencies and cross-tabulations. For ease of analysis, some variables such as 'Funding Sources' and 'Types of Service', were collapsed into fewer categories.

Overall, the study generated a range of quantitative, descriptive information about the distribution of projects, the services provided, target groups, geographical location, and funding sources. These data are shown in the following section.

## 4 FINDINGS

### 4.1 Introduction

The methods described in Section 2 identified a total of 2,520 projects providing employment-focussed services for disabled people. We report in turn on the groups they aimed to serve, the types of services they provided, the ways in which users could access services, the regional distribution, and their funding sources.

### 4.2 Groups served

We were interested in identifying 'generic' services (services provided to a number of groups including disabled people) as well as projects providing a service only for disabled people. Only nine per cent of the projects identified were known to serve both disabled and non-disabled people. There is little information on the non-disabled groups they aimed to serve; long-term unemployed and 'disadvantaged' people were the groups reported most frequently

Turning to projects providing a service for disabled people only, information on the groups they targeted is available for 81 per cent of projects. Table 4.1 shows that only 17 per cent of projects for which we have information were open to any disabled person regardless of type of impairment. The remainder specialised in providing services for people with specific impairments. The groups most commonly aimed at were people with learning difficulties (53 per cent of projects for which we have information) and people with mental health problems (46 per cent).

*Table 4.1* Disabled target groups

	N	% of services
Any disabled person	347	17
Mental health problems	936	46
Learning difficulties	1074	53
Physical impairments	639	31
Visual impairments	252	12
Hearing impairments	262	13
Communication impairments	189	9
Sensory impairments	204	10
Brain/head injury	24	1
Other	128	6

Well over half of the projects for which we have information targeted one disabled group only (55 per cent) and a further 15 per cent targeted two groups only, as shown in Table 4.2.

*Table 4.2* Number of disabled groups targeted

	N	%
1	969	55
2	265	15
3	169	10
4	136	8
5	93	5
6	114	6
7	6	*
8	4	*
Total projects	1,756	100

Table 4.3 gives the breakdown for the 969 projects which specialised in providing a service for one disabled group only. Over four in ten (43 per cent) catered for people with mental health problems only and a similar proportion (41 per cent) catered for people with learning difficulties only.

*Table 4.3* Target groups of projects aimed at one disabled group only

Target group	N	%
Mental health problems	415	43
Learning difficulties	399	41
Physical impairments	49	5
Visual impairments	37	4
Hearing impairments	27	3
Sensory impairments	15	2
Brain/head injury	13	1
Other	14	1
Total projects	969	100

### 4.3 Types of service provided

Section 2.6 explained how a 'long-list' of services was compiled. A total of 6731 services was identified. Table 4.4 shows the detailed breakdown. Information was provided for all but four per cent of projects (83).

*Table 4.4* Types of service provided

Type	Number	%
Information and advice	429	18
Counselling	190	9
Vocational guidance; career mapping	376	15
Pre-employment assessment of abilities/personal strengths	131	5
Building self-confidence/self-esteem	124	5
Interpersonal skills development; social skills	78	3
Increasing independence/personal effectiveness	25	1
Educational programme including literacy or numeracy	265	11
Pre-vocational training	90	4
Vocational training; work skills development; work towards qualifications, eg NVQs	999	41
Employment preparation training; work awareness training	216	9
Job training	172	7
Job club; job search/finding/matching	257	11
Job interview skills	92	4
Employment agency	21	1
Work placement	646	27
Job taster	79	3
Work preparation	158	7
Job coaching	225	9

Continued overleaf/...

Table 4.4 (continued)

Natural support	2	*
Mentoring/job support	80	3
Open paid employment	41	2
Supported employment/placement; Remploy Interwork	588	24
Supported/sheltered factory/business/workshop	352	14
Social firm/emerging social firm	120	5
Co-operative	30	1
Community/social enterprise	94	4
Workshop	65	3
Clubhouse	11	1
Transitional employment	6	*
Intermediate labour market	5	*
Therapeutic work	60	3
Voluntary work	174	7
Work rehabilitation	185	8
Job retention support	65	3
Self employment	16	*
Training/awareness of disability issues	68	3
Advice service/helpline/general support for employers	103	4
Access surveys/workplace audits	3	*
Financial support	51	2
Wide range of employment services	6	*
Other	78	3
Total services	6,731	

---

It should be noted that under one in three projects (695) provided one type of service only, while in a slightly smaller number of projects (667) as many as four or more types of service were provided. In a quarter of projects (625) two types of service were provided and in one in five instances (450) three types were provided.

In nearly one in three (28 per cent) of the 695 instances where only one type of service was provided the service was categorised as a supported/sheltered factory/business or workshop, and in one in five (19 per cent) as vocational training. Supported employment was the only service provided in one in ten instances, reflecting the multiple facets of supported employment.

The long-list of 42 service types was grouped into 22 categories, as shown in Table 4.5. As before information is missing for only four per cent of projects.

By far the largest category of service was 'vocational training', recorded for around four in ten projects. Work experience was recorded for nearly three in ten (28 per cent). Some model of supported employment or supported placement was provided by one in four. One in four projects provided employment or work opportunities in a setting designed specifically to provide support to disabled people; that is, a supported factory, workshop, social firm, social or community enterprise or co-operative (referred to hereafter as 'special settings').

*Table 4.5* Categories of services provided

Category of service	Number	%
Information and advice	429	18
Counselling and vocational guidance	400	16
Pre-employment assessment of abilities/personal strengths	131	5
Personal development	204	8
Educational programme	265	11
Pre-vocational and employment awareness training	287	12
Vocational training	999	41
Job training	172	7
Job finding	300	12

Continued overleaf/...

Table 4.5 (continued)

Work preparation	158	7
Work experience	672	28
Workplace support	300	12
Supported employment/placement	588	24
Social firm or emerging social firm, co-operative, community or social enterprise, supported factory, workshop	619	25
Transitional employment, clubhouse, intermediate labour market	20	1
Work rehabilitation and therapeutic work	244	10
Job retention	65	3
Self-employment	16	1
Voluntary work	174	7
Employer-focussed services	155	6
Financial support	51	2
Other	78	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>6,243</b>	

#### **4.3.1 Distribution of services across disabled client groups**

Table 4.6a shows the distribution of each of the 22 categories of service across the 10 client groups. As people with mental health problems and people with learning difficulties were the two largest groups of service users (46 per cent and 53 per cent of projects were targeted at these two groups respectively) it is not surprising that one or other group was the dominant user group in all service categories. It is striking, however, that people with mental health problems were considerably over-represented in transitional employment/club house/Intermediate Labour Market schemes and work rehabilitation/therapeutic work schemes (67 per cent in both cases). This group was also over-represented in services providing work or employment in special settings and in counselling and vocational guidance services (60 per cent in both instances). People with learning difficulties were also over-represented in services providing work or employment in special settings (68 per cent) but were considerably under-represented in transitional employment schemes (13 per cent).



### **4.3.2 *Distribution of client groups within service categories***

Table 4.6b shows how each client group is represented within each of the 22 service categories. Rather surprisingly, high proportions of people with visual, hearing and communication impairments are targeted by services in special settings.

Table 4.6a Distribution of services across disabled client groups

	Any disabled person		Mental health problems		Learning difficulties		Physical impairment		Visual impairment		Hearing impairment		Communication impairment		Sensory impairment		Brain/head injury		Other		Total projects	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information and advice	71	19	164	44	139	38	105	28	27	7	20	5	6	2	57	15	11	3	24	7	370	19
Counselling and vocational guidance	41	12	203	59	167	49	127	37	27	8	22	6	16	5	49	14	5	2	22	6	342	17
Assessment	14	13	45	43	47	44	30	28	18	17	7	7	4	4	14	13	3	3	11	10	106	5
Personal development	30	17	80	47	74	43	36	21	14	8	14	8	6	4	24	14	3	2	17	10	172	9
Educational programme	34	16	86	42	112	54	65	31	15	7	7	3	6	3	43	21	6	3	20	10	207	10
Prevocational and employment awareness training	37	16	98	43	121	53	53	23	8	4	7	3	1	*	27	12	5	2	13	6	229	11
Vocational training	121	15	405	48	447	53	265	32	67	8	51	6	34	4	105	13	10	1	54	7	837	42
Job training	74	48	39	26	61	40	25	16	10	7	13	9	8	5	9	6	1	1	10	7	153	8
Job finding	61	26	88	38	101	43	55	24	23	10	26	11	14	6	18	8	2	1	19	8	234	12
Work preparation	40	34	41	35	54	46	23	20	3	3	5	4	3	3	14	12	1	1	8	7	118	6
Work experience	125	22	258	45	292	50	146	25	43	7	43	7	35	6	46	8	8	1	27	5	579	29
Workplace support	80	29	96	35	135	50	62	23	23	8	22	8	19	7	25	9	5	2	19	7	273	14
Supported employment/ placement	115	22	219	42	286	55	144	28	47	9	49	10	36	7	49	10	5	1	23	4	517	26
Social firm or emerging social firm, co-operative, community or social enterprise, supported factory, workshop	38	7	338	60	382	68	267	48	149	27	175	31	139	25	31	6	2	*	15	3	560	28
Transitional employment, clubhouse, Intermediate Labour Market	4	27	10	67	2	13	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	15	1
Work rehabilitation and therapeutic work	10	5	135	67	76	37	70	35	16	8	9	4	10	5	21	10	8	4	10	5	203	10
Job retention	10	20	14	29	10	20	8	16	10	20	11	22	3	6	4	8	2	4	2	4	49	2
Self-employment	7	64	4	36	2	18	2	18	0	0	1	9	0	0	3	27	0	0	1	9	11	1
Voluntary work	23	16	71	50	74	52	34	24	4	3	2	1	1	1	19	13	1	1	6	4	142	7
Employer focused services	38	28	37	27	45	33	25	18	21	15	23	17	4	3	11	8	5	4	13	10	136	7
Financial support	15	44	10	29	13	38	6	17	0	0	1	3	0	0	5	15	1	3	3	9	34	2
Other	13	17	33	44	40	53	17	23	9	12	7	9	4	5	8	11	0	0	6	8	75	4
Total client groups	343	17	918	46	1,061	53	634	32	249	12	260	13	188	9	202	10	24	1	124	6		

*Table 4.6b* Distribution of client groups within service categories

	Any disabled person		Mental health problems		Learning difficulties		Physical impairment		Visual impairment		Hearing impairment		Communication impairment		Sensory impairment		Brain/head injury		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information and advice	71	21	164	18	139	13	105	17	27	11	20	8	6	3	57	29	11	48	24	20
Counselling and vocational guidance	41	12	203	22	167	16	127	20	27	11	22	9	16	9	49	25	5	22	22	18
Assessment	14	4	45	5	47	5	30	5	18	7	7	3	4	2	14	7	3	13	11	9
Personal development	30	9	80	9	74	7	36	6	14	6	14	5	6	3	24	12	3	13	17	14
Educational programme	34	10	86	10	112	11	65	10	15	6	7	3	6	3	43	22	6	26	20	17
Prevocational and employment awareness training	37	11	98	11	121	12	53	8	8	3	7	3	1	1	27	14	5	22	13	11
Vocational training	121	36	405	45	447	43	265	42	67	27	51	20	34	18	105	53	10	44	54	45
Job training	74	22	39	4	61	6	25	4	10	4	13	5	8	4	9	5	1	4	10	8
Job finding	61	18	88	10	101	10	55	9	23	9	26	10	14	8	188	9	2	9	19	16
Work preparation	40	12	41	5	54	5	23	4	3	1	5	2	3	2	14	7	1	4	8	7
Work experience	125	37	258	28	292	28	146	23	43	17	43	17	35	19	46	23	8	35	27	23
Workplace support	80	24	96	11	135	13	62	10	23	9	22	9	19	10	25	13	5	22	19	16
Supported employment/placement	115	34	219	24	286	27	144	23	47	19	49	19	36	19	49	25	5	22	23	19
Social firm or emerging social firm, co-operative, community or social enterprise, supported factory, workshop	38	11	338	37	382	36	267	43	149	60	175	68	139	75	31	16	2	9	15	13
Transitional employment, clubhouse, Intermediate Labour Market	4	1	10	1	2	*	1	*	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Work rehabilitation and therapeutic work	10	3	135	15	76	7	70	11	16	7	9	4	10	5	21	11	8	35	10	8
Job retention	10	3	14	2	10	1	8	1	10	4	11	4	3	2	4	2	2	9	2	2
Self-employment	7	2	4	*	2	*	2	*	0	0	1	*	0	0	3	2	0	0	1	1
Voluntary work	23	7	71	8	74	7	34	5	4	2	2	1	1	1	19	10	1	4	6	5
Employer focused services	38	11	37	4	45	4	25	4	21	9	23	9	4	2	11	6	5	22	13	11
Financial support	15	4	10	1	13	1	6	1	0	0	1	*	0	0	5	3	1	4	3	3
Other	13	4	33	4	40	4	17	3	9	4	7	3	4	2	8	4	0	0	6	5

#### 4.4 Routes to services

We know that in at least three in ten projects (31 per cent) referral by a professional was necessary to access their services. ES, Disability Employment Adviser (DEA) or Jobcentre and social services or social work departments were the main sources (53 and 55 per cent of projects respectively). NHS professionals were sources for nearly a quarter of projects for which referral was necessary, and community mental health teams specifically in just under one in five instances. The next most common source was schools and colleges.

Self-referral was an option for 11 per cent of services. Otherwise disabled people could access services by a range of routes, as shown in Table 4.7. Missing information means that data are available for only 33 per cent of projects.

*Table 4.7* Routes to projects for disabled people

	N	% of projects
ES/DEA/Job Centre	471	53
SSD	491	55
NHS	200	23
Careers officer/Connexions	95	11
School/college	143	16
Disability organisations	96	11
Rehabilitation officer	59	7
Community Mental Health Team	159	18
Carer	39	4
Employer	11	1
Other	202	23

The prevalence of ES, Disability Employment Adviser (DEA) or Job Centre as a referral source reflects the number of projects providing WORKSTEP (previously the Supported Employment Programme) and Work Preparation services under contract to ES, where DEA referral is necessary.

#### 4.5 Regional distribution

Data on the distribution of projects across regions should be treated with caution, as variation may be associated with differences in the availability of information sources.

Table 4.8 shows that one in three projects were in London and South East Region, perhaps not surprisingly given the population of that region.

*Table 4.8* Regional distribution of projects

Region	N	%
Wales	98	4
Scotland	150	6
London and South East	819	33
North West	284	11
West Midlands	264	11
East Midlands and Eastern	334	13
Northern	150	6
South West	227	9
Yorkshire and Humberside	194	8
Total	2,520	100

#### **4.5.1 Distribution of client groups across regions**

As already noted, we found rather few generic services; that is, services including other groups alongside disabled people. Scotland had the highest proportion of generic services.

As shown in Table 4.9a, looking across regions, Wales had the highest proportion of projects targeted at any disabled person; 29 per cent compared with an average of 19 per cent.

Overall, 53 per cent of projects specifically for disabled people were targeted (not necessarily exclusively) at people with learning difficulties. When we look across regions, we find that Wales and East Midlands and Eastern region had the highest proportions of services targeted at these groups (64 per cent and 61 per cent respectively).

Overall, 46 per cent of projects were targeted (not necessarily exclusively) at people with mental health problems. In Scotland 57 per cent of projects were targeted at this group and only 32 per cent in Wales.

It is hard to interpret data about the distribution across regions of projects open to people with sensory and communication impairments. Overall, 12 per cent of projects were targeted at people with visual impairment yet 30 per cent of these were in Wales and 19 per cent in Scotland. A similar pattern emerges with respect to projects for people with hearing impairments; while 13 per cent of projects were targeted at this group overall, 29 and 22 per cent were in Wales and Scotland respectively. However, these results should take into account the category 'sensory impairments'. Overall, one in ten projects were for people with sensory impairments while Wales and Scotland had only five per cent and West Midlands had the highest proportion (18 per cent). Wales and Scotland also had the highest proportion of projects for people with communication impairments. It appears that projects for people with a sensory or communication impairment were rather less likely to be found in London and South East region and South West region.

#### ***4.5.2 Distribution of client groups within regions***

Table 4.9b shows the distribution within each region of the different client groups targeted by projects. As already reported, people with learning difficulties were the largest group overall (53 per cent) and it is therefore not surprising that in all regions, except one, people with learning difficulties were the largest group; the exception was Scotland where people with mental health problems, the second largest group overall, predominated. Wales had the highest proportions of projects open to people with visual, hearing and communication impairments, while London and the South East had the lowest.

Table 4.9a Distribution of client groups across regions

	Wales		Scotland		London and South East		North West		West Midlands		East Midlands and Eastern		Northern		South West		Yorkshire and Humberside		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Any disabled person	26	29	20	14	92	15	55	24	30	15	31	12	28	26	36	18	29	19	347	17
Mental health problems	29	32	82	57	301	48	110	47	91	44	118	44	45	42	93	46	67	44	936	46
Learning difficulties	58	64	72	50	318	50	116	50	115	56	163	61	50	46	98	48	84	55	1074	53
Physical impairments	35	39	53	37	196	31	64	28	67	32	87	33	31	29	61	30	45	29	639	31
Visual impairments	27	30	28	19	52	8	32	14	24	12	28	10	19	18	20	10	22	14	252	12
Hearing impairments	26	29	31	22	59	9	31	13	24	12	29	11	20	19	23	11	19	12	262	13
Communication impairments	22	24	22	15	31	5	25	11	19	9	19	7	17	16	15	7	19	12	189	9
Sensory impairments	5	6	7	5	71	11	20	9	37	18	36	13	8	7	14	7	6	4	204	10
Brain/head injury	0	0	3	2	2	*	5	2	4	2	8	3	1	1	1	1	0	0	24	1
Other	3	3	7	5	50	8	16	7	5	2	30	11	2	2	6	3	9	6	128	6

Table 4.9b Distribution of client groups within regions

	Wales		Scotland		London and South East		North West		West Midlands		East Midlands and Eastern		Northern		South West		Yorkshire and Humberside	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Any disabled person	26	29	20	14	92	15	55	24	30	15	31	12	28	26	36	18	29	19
Mental health problems	29	32	82	57	301	48	110	47	91	44	118	44	45	42	93	46	67	44
Learning difficulties	58	64	72	50	318	50	116	50	115	56	163	61	50	46	98	48	84	55
Physical impairments	35	39	53	37	196	31	64	28	67	32	87	33	31	29	61	30	45	29
Visual impairments	27	30	28	19	52	8	32	14	24	12	28	10	19	18	20	10	22	14
Hearing impairments	26	29	31	22	59	9	31	13	24	12	29	11	20	19	23	11	19	12
Communication impairments	22	24	22	15	31	5	25	11	19	9	19	7	17	16	15	7	19	12
Sensory impairments	5	6	7	5	71	11	20	9	37	18	36	13	8	7	14	7	6	4
Brain/head injury	0	0	3	2	2	*	5	2	4	2	8	3	1	1	1	1	0	0
Other	3	3	7	5	50	8	16	7	5	2	30	11	2	2	6	3	9	6



#### **4.5.3 Distribution of service categories across regions**

Table 4.10a shows where the 22 categories of service were located. As London and South East had the highest proportion of projects overall (33 per cent) it is not surprising that this proportion is reflected in most service areas. However, that region had rather fewer projects offering information and advice, and rather more providing job finding and work rehabilitation or therapeutic work. There were few striking differences in the regional distribution of other services: information and advice services were over-represented in the North West; and assessment and educational programmes were over-represented in East Midlands and Eastern region.

#### **4.5.4 Distribution of service categories within regions**

Table 4.10b shows the distribution of the different service categories within regions. Key findings are:

- Counselling and vocational guidance, personal development, job finding and work experience were over-represented in Scotland. Educational programmes were under-represented, probably because information on such programmes was obtained primarily from English JIPs.
- Work or employment in special settings and job training were considerably over-represented in Wales and vocational training and educational programmes under-represented.
- Vocational training, supported employment and counselling and vocational guidance were over-represented in the West Midlands.
- Work rehabilitation and therapeutic work was over-represented in Northern region and counselling and vocational guidance under-represented.
- Information and advice services were over-represented in North West and South West regions.
- Services in London and the South East broadly reflected the overall pattern.

Table 4.10a Distribution of service types across regions

	Wales		Scotland		London and South East		North West		West Midlands		East Midlands and Eastern		Northern		South West		Yorkshire and Humberside		Total services	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information and advice	16	4	20	5	105	25	74	17	56	13	58	14	21	5	59	14	20	5	429	18
Counselling and vocational guidance	12	3	46	12	125	31	37	9	65	16	46	12	14	4	35	9	20	5	400	16
Assessment	2	2	11	8	50	38	10	8	19	15	23	18	4	3	9	7	3	2	131	5
Personal development	7	3	22	11	70	34	18	8	12	6	23	11	11	5	19	9	22	11	204	8
Educational programme	4	2	5	2	98	37	24	9	23	9	55	21	11	4	21	8	24	9	265	11
Prevocational and employment awareness training	7	2	9	3	95	33	35	12	42	15	26	9	9	3	32	11	32	11	287	12
Vocational training	28	3	60	6	319	32	94	9	135	14	131	13	64	6	96	10	72	7	999	41
Job training	16	9	13	8	58	34	22	13	10	6	17	10	14	8	11	6	11	6	172	7
Job finding	6	2	28	9	122	41	41	14	27	9	26	9	12	4	20	7	18	6	300	12
Work preparation	4	3	4	3	68	43	6	4	16	10	19	12	15	10	18	11	8	8	158	7
Work experience	31	5	60	9	217	32	59	9	72	11	67	10	48	7	64	10	54	8	672	28
Workplace support	17	6	28	9	93	31	28	9	29	10	55	18	12	4	24	8	14	5	300	12
Supported employment/ placement	25	4	48	8	184	31	73	12	87	15	44	8	26	4	55	9	46	8	588	24
Social firm or emerging social firm, co-operative, community or social enterprise, supported factory, workshop	43	7	46	7	183	30	62	10	55	9	70	11	54	9	50	8	56	9	619	25
Transitional employment, clubhouse, Intermediate Labour Market	2	10	3	15	5	25	2	10	1	5	3	15	0	0	2	10	2	10	20	1
Work rehabilitation and therapeutic work	4	2	6	3	98	40	25	10	19	8	27	11	28	12	22	9	15	6	244	10
Job retention	5	8	7	11	13	20	9	14	8	12	11	17	5	8	3	5	4	6	65	3
Self-employment	0	0	0	0	8	50	5	31	1	6	0	0	1	6	1	6	0	0	16	1
Voluntary work	1	1	3	2	54	31	13	8	20	12	31	18	13	8	21	12	18	10	174	7
Employer focused services	5	3	7	5	49	32	31	20	13	8	25	16	6	4	13	8	6	4	155	7
Financial support	0	0	1	2	24	47	10	20	4	8	5	10	2	4	5	10	0	0	51	2
Other	1	1	0	0	25	32	10	13	4	5	3	4	13	17	17	22	5	6	78	3
Total projects	94	4	147	6	799	33	274	11	263	11	300	12	148	6	224	9	188	8		

Table 4.10b Distribution of services within regions

	Wales		Scotland		London and South East		North West		West Midlands		East Midlands and Eastern		Northern		South West		Yorkshire and Humberside	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Information and advice	16	17	20	14	105	13	74	27	56	22	58	20	21	14	59	27	20	11
Counselling and vocational guidance	12	13	46	31	125	16	37	14	65	25	46	16	14	10	35	16	20	11
Assessment	2	2	11	8	50	6	10	4	19	7	23	8	4	3	9	4	3	2
Personal development	7	8	22	15	70	9	18	7	12	5	23	8	11	8	19	9	22	12
Educational programme	4	4	5	3	98	13	24	9	23	9	55	19	11	8	21	10	24	13
Prevocational and employment awareness training	7	8	9	6	95	12	35	13	42	16	26	9	9	6	32	15	32	17
Vocational training	28	30	60	41	319	41	94	34	135	53	131	45	64	44	96	43	72	38
Job training	16	17	13	9	58	7	22	8	10	4	17	6	14	10	11	5	11	6
Job finding	6	7	28	19	122	16	41	15	27	11	26	9	12	8	20	9	18	10
Work preparation	4	4	4	3	68	9	6	2	16	6	19	6	15	10	18	8	8	4
Work experience	31	33	60	41	217	28	59	22	72	28	67	23	48	33	64	29	54	29
Workplace support	17	18	28	19	93	12	28	10	29	11	55	19	12	8	24	11	14	7
Supported employment/placement	25	27	48	33	184	24	73	27	87	34	44	15	26	18	55	25	46	25
Social firm or emerging social firm, co-operative, community or social enterprise, supported factory, workshop	43	47	46	31	183	23	62	23	55	21	70	24	54	37	50	23	56	30
Transitional employment, clubhouse, Intermediate Labour Market	2	2	3	2	5	1	2	1	1	*	3	1	0	0	2	1	2	1
Work rehabilitation and therapeutic work	4	4	6	4	98	13	25	9	19	7	27	9	28	19	22	10	15	8
Job retention	5	5	7	5	13	2	9	3	8	3	11	4	5	3	3	1	4	2
Self-employment	0	0	0	0	8	1	5	2	1	*	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Voluntary work	1	1	3	2	54	7	13	5	20	8	31	11	13	9	21	10	18	10
Employer focused services	5	5	7	5	49	6	31	11	13	5	25	9	6	4	13	6	6	3
Financial support	0	0	1	1	24	3	10	4	4	2	5	2	2	1	5	2	0	0
Other	1	1	0	0	12	2	5	2	3	1	0	0	3	2	5	2	4	2

## 4.6 Funding sources

Information on funding sources is available for 52 per cent of projects and is shown in Table 4.11.

The largest funding source was a local social services authority, found for over three in ten projects for which we have information. The DfEE or ES was the second largest source (26 per cent of projects), closely followed by European Commission funding (23 per cent).

Table 4.11 Sources of funding

	N	% of projects
DfEE/ES	334	26
English, Scottish, Welsh Governments	148	11
Social Services, Social Work, Community Services	409	31
NHS Trusts/HAs and PCG/PCTs	181	14
European Commission	297	23
FETC, TEC/LECs, LSCs	86	7
NLCB and charitable trusts, fund raising	170	13
Local authority	271	21
Employers/employers' organisations	59	5
Income generation through commercial trading	141	11
Other including City Challenge and Urban Initiatives	228	18

Over half of projects for which we have information had one source of funding only (52 per cent). More than a quarter (27 per cent) had two funding sources, 12 per cent had three sources, five per cent had four and three per cent had five or more.

## 5 DISCUSSION

We conclude with a critical discussion of the process of identifying services and the limitations of the data, and a commentary on the findings.

### 5.1 The process

As Section 2 made clear, the process of identifying and recording employment-focussed services for disabled people was hard work and very time-consuming. Even in exercises carried out at local level information proved hard to gather. Many of those involved in English local authority Welfare to Work for Disabled People Joint Investment Plans (JIPs) commented on the difficulties in identifying services on the ground, and on the surprise of finding services about which they were previously unaware. It should be noted that considerable effort could go into trying to make contact with some organisations that did not respond.

The time lag between our call for information and sources responding with information meant that some project information arrived too late to be included.

### 5.2 Data limitations

As explained in Section 2, we were reliant to a large extent on secondary sources. This presented a number of problems in obtaining a comprehensive picture of services in Great Britain.

- The Welfare to Work JIPs were an invaluable source of projects in England, and accounted for 55 per cent of information sources overall, but coverage of projects in Scotland and Wales is less comprehensive.
- Some organisations held databases that were not designed to be searched on the variables we sought. This problem contributed to uneven geographical coverage of employment-focussed services in this report.
- Not all sources were up-to-date and, where project details were available from more than one source it was not always clear which were the most recent. Moreover, some projects operated under more than one name, making it hard to weed out duplicate records.
- Some secondary sources lacked details of the services provided or the disabled client groups served. While organisations themselves were generally helpful in providing fuller information, the study lacked the resources to search out missing information in a systematic way.
- There was no uniformity in ways of describing and categorising projects and services.
- Some of the information we sought, notably referral routes and funding sources, was included in some sources but not others.
- We have very limited data on the number of people served by projects. Consequently, the picture we have presented on the types of services, the

client groups and the geographical distribution does not reflect the number of people served.

### **5.3 The findings**

#### **5.3.1 Generic services**

We were disappointed to record relatively few generic services; that is, services which included but were not targeted exclusively at disabled people. As noted in Section 1.2.2, the European Commission's 'mainstreaming' philosophy is encouraging integrated service provision where disabled people are not singled out from other people facing barriers to employment. Unfortunately there is no hard evidence of this from our study. This may be a consequence of our explicit focus on 'services for disabled people'. A number of projects providing generic services observed that they did not *exclude* any disabled person who wished to participate, but such projects were not included in this study as they did not set out specifically to target disabled people.

We reported in Section 1.2.2 an evaluation of the UK Objective 3 programme which showed that integrated packages worked better for disabled people (Allen *et al.*, 1999). We recommend that future research investigates the benefits of mainstreaming of disabled people within employment-related services.

#### **5.3.2 Private sector provision**

While we did not set out to identify private sector provision, we were surprised to identify very few for-profit providers, although the data we collected did not differentiate between not-for-profit and for-profit providers. This finding may reflect variously our reliance on directories which focus on the voluntary and local authority sectors, the Employment Service and local authority tradition of contracting from the not-for-profit sector and, as just noted, the absence in our study of generic providers who are possibly more likely to be found in the for-profit sector. As policy begins to open up provision of services for disabled people to the for-profit sector (in the NDDP and the recent extension of WORKSTEP, for example) it will be increasingly important to map private sector provision.

#### **5.3.3 Disabled target groups**

Our categorisation of disabled target groups centres on type of impairment as this typology was used almost without exception in the sources upon which we drew. It is remarkable that less than one in five projects for which we have information were open to any disabled person regardless of type of impairment. A small number of projects responding to our request for information reported that they did not distinguish disabled people according to their impairments, believing that disabled people face common employment barriers regardless of impairment. We had hoped to find services which were 'impairment-blind' and focussed on people's

circumstances, such as receiving incapacity benefits or facing difficulties in retaining employment, but we found rather few examples.

Well over half of the projects for which we have information targeted one disabled group only; of those around four in ten catered for people with mental health problems and a similar proportion were aimed at people with learning difficulties. Many of these projects probably served small numbers only, although we lack good information about the number of clients served. Nevertheless, the number of projects serving people with learning difficulties (53 per cent overall) is disproportionate to the incidence of this group in the general population. It could be argued that the relatively high occurrence of projects serving people with learning difficulties - and of projects for people with mental health problems - is warranted given that these groups of disabled people have the lowest employment rates and historically have been under-represented in employment services for disabled people.

We were not able to present data on groups served according to their funding sources because of missing information, but it appears likely that a high proportion of projects for people with learning difficulties and for people with mental health problems were funded by social services departments, and that health trusts are also leading funders of projects for people with mental health problems. This reflects the tradition within social services departments and health bodies of providing services for specific impairment groups.

The Social Services Inspectorate report on welfare to work for disabled people in eight local councils (Griffiths, 2001) commented that little attention was paid to people with physical impairments, with employment schemes focussing on people with learning difficulties or mental health problems. In our study only five per cent catered *specifically* for people with physical impairments. This may at first seem surprising given the prevalence of this group in the population at large but it should be remembered that people with physical impairments are major users of services provided directly by the Employment Service. For example, 43 per cent of users of Access to Work have musculo-skeletal complaints (Thornton *et al.*, 2001) and a 1996 survey of Disability Service Team (then PACT) clients found half had musculo-skeletal problems of some kind, compared with about one in seven reporting mental health problems and nine per cent learning difficulties (Beinart, 1996).

#### **5.3.4 The services**

The picture of services is distorted by our reliance on directories. As a result, projects providing employment in special settings and supported employment with mainstream employers have comprehensive coverage.

A quarter of services focussed on employment in 'special settings', that is forms of employment specifically for disabled people. Special settings include 'occupational' schemes as well as businesses where disabled people earn a regular wage. In many

special settings disabled people may work for many years; progression to open employment more rarely is an intrinsic aim. It would be wrong to think of special settings as necessarily segregated. Within this broad category, we have included 'community' or 'social' enterprises, small businesses such as cafés and horticultural centres, where disabled workers meet the public, and social firms where non-disabled people work alongside disabled employees.

Overall, the majority of services focussed on the pre-employment stage. Vocational training was provided by over four in ten projects. JIPs tended to report educational and training programmes, which biased the picture in favour of pre-employment services.

In commissioning the study, the Department had hoped that we would identify services aimed specifically at helping disabled people into paid work. It proved hard to quantify such services because of the classification systems used by our sources. It was difficult to identify services that 'brokered' employment apart from as part of supported employment schemes. A quarter provided some form of supported employment with mainstream employers.

The extent of support on the job - such as mentoring, job coaching and natural support in the workplace - was hard to quantify because of the overlap with supported employment but our data suggest that only around 12 per cent of projects aimed to provide this type of support. Services directed at employers are probably under-represented, in part because private sector providers of such services are rarely included. Several projects said they provided support to employers, but often within the context of supported employment. Very few services for job retention were found.

Fewer than expected projects providing support with self-employment were found.

### **5.3.5 Service combinations**

It should be remembered that over two-thirds of projects provided more than one service. Indeed, a third of projects provided four or more services. It is not possible to tell how far these projects offered a co-ordinated range of opportunities but it seems likely that having multiple services within one organisation allows disabled people a number of different options.

### **5.3.6 Regional distribution**

Data on the regional distribution of projects and services should be treated with caution because of variation in information sources. For example, as a consequence of devolution, there was no standardised way of collating and accessing information about projects managed by Government Offices for the Regions though we understand that steps are being taken to remedy this.



JIPs proved to be an invaluable source and as result we probably have a more accurate map of services in England. However, despite guidance on the formulation of JIPs (Jones and Waddington, 2000) there was considerable variation in the usefulness of JIP information. JIPs are three-year plans. If the exercise is to be repeated, we recommend more stringent guidance on the details to be collected.

### **5.3.7 Access to services**

Data on routes to services is limited but it is significant that in at least three in ten projects referral by a professional was necessary. Accordingly, it is important that professionals have accurate, up-to-date information on services available in their area. Some English social services departments were planning to make the information gathered through their JIPs available as a directory. Such directories might also be valuable to disabled people wanting to find out about services, particularly for those who wish to make an independent choice.

### **5.3.8 Funding sources**

It is likely that the number of funding sources was under-reported and we are dubious about the finding that over half of the projects for which we have information had only one funding source. At least one in five had three or more funding sources, suggesting that a significant minority of projects are investing time and effort in pulling together finance to maintain their services, as well as having to report to different funders.

## **5.4 Conclusion**

The ambitious aim of the research was to produce a picture of employment-focussed services for disabled people in Great Britain. In this we have been moderately successful. We know a great deal about the types of services provided and who they are aimed in terms of impairment. However, we know a lot less about the labour market and other circumstances of the client groups, the numbers of clients projects are able to serve and ways of accessing services, although such information can be searched for in the Directory of Services. Where this research has been less successful is in producing a reliable map of the regional distribution of projects.



## REFERENCES

Allen, J., Hansbro, J. and Mooney, P. (1999) 'Pathways to Employment: The Final Evaluation of ESF Objective 3 in Britain (1994-99), *DfEE Research Brief*, No 164, <http://www.dfee.gov.uk/research>.

Barnes, H., Thornton, P. and Maynard Campbell, S. (1998) *Disabled People and Employment: A Review of Research and Development Work*, Bristol: The Policy Press.

Beinart, S. (1996) *A Survey of PACT Clients and Services*, London: SCPR.

Bolderson, H. and Youll, P. with Gains, F. and Tarpey, M. (1997) 'Participation in the Third European Action Programme for Handicapped People Living Independently in an Open Society (HELIOS II): An evaluation of the United Kingdom's experience', Report to the Department of Health, Brunel University.

Davies, V. and Johnson, C. (2000) 'Using ESF with New Deal: The opportunities, reality and added value' *DfEE Research Brief*, No 237, <http://www.dfee.gov.uk/research>.

Disability Information Service Surrey (DISS) (2001) *Directory of Supported Employment Opportunities*, Dorking: Disability Information Service.

East Riding of Yorkshire Council (2000) *Working it Out: A guide to local work, training and educational opportunities*.

East Sussex County Council and Employment Access Project Partners (2000) *The Employment Directory 2000: A directory of employment support and training organisations for disabled people living in East Sussex and Brighton and Hove*.

Griffiths, G. (2001) *Making it Work: Inspection of Welfare to Work for Disabled People*, London: Social Services Inspectorate, Department of Health.

Higgins, G. and Gianniba, P. (1999) *The Social Firms Directory*, Dorking/Redhill: Netherne Printing Services/Social Firms UK.

Jones, N. and Waddington, E. (2000) *Joint Investment Plans Welfare to Work for Disabled People*, Leeds: Nuffield Institute for Health.

Pozner, A., Ng, M.L., Hammond, J. and Shepherd, G. (1996) *Working it Out: Creating work opportunities for people with mental health problems. A development handbook*, Brighton: Pavilion Publishing.

Pozner, A., Hammond, J. and Ng, M.L. (2000) *Working Together: Images of Partnership*, Brighton: Pavilion Publishing.

Smyth, K. and Maynard Campbell, S. (1997) *Disabled People into Employment: The report of a UK wide survey of good practice in projects with disabled people and employment informing ideas for the development of a strategic framework for action*, Nottingham: Nottingham City Council, Greater Nottingham TEC, the Employment Service.

Surrey Employment Access Forum (2000) *A Directory of all the projects and organisations that make up the Surrey Employment Access Forum*.

Thornton, P., Hirst, M., Arksey, H. and Tremlett, N. (2001) *Users' Views of Access to Work*, Research Report 72, Sheffield: Employment Service.

Trinh, T. and Noble, J. (2000) 'Prototype Employment Zones: Survey of Participants and Leavers,' *DfEE Research Brief*, No 233, <http://www.dfee.gov.uk/research>.

# APPENDIX A PROFORMA

## EMPLOYMENT-FOCUSSED SERVICES FOR DISABLED PEOPLE

SCHEME NAME: .....

NAME OF LEAD BODY: .....

SCHEME ADDRESS: .....

.....

TEL NO: ..... FAX NO: .....

E-MAIL: ..... WEB ADDRESS: .....

CONTACT NAME: .....

POSITION: .....

SCHEME AIMS (please state briefly): .....

.....

.....

ACTIVITY (eg, supported employment, social firm, job coaching, work placement, training job retention):

.....

.....

TARGET GROUPS: DISABLED PEOPLE (please place a 'X' against all those which apply)

- |                           |                          |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| any disabled persons      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| persons with:             |                          |
| mental health problems    | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| learning difficulties     | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| physical impairments      | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| visual impairments        | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| hearing impairments       | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| communication impairments | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| other (please state)      | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR DISABLED PEOPLE ACCESSING THE SCHEME (eg age, in receipt of particular benefits; length of time out of work; area of residence):

.....  
.....

REFERRAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR DISABLED PEOPLE:

**yes**                      **no**  
                             

Is a referral necessary to access the scheme?

If yes, please explain (eg from DEA, social services department): .....

.....

OTHER TARGET GROUPS (eg, long-term unemployed, women returners, leaving school or college):

Please state: .....

.....

ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA FOR OTHER GROUPS ACCESSING THE SCHEME (eg, youth; older workers; length of time unemployed; in receipt of particular benefits; area of residence):

.....

.....

ANNUAL TARGETS (capacity, intake, outputs): .....

.....

.....

SCHEME START DATE: .....

SCHEME END DATE (if known): .....

SOURCE(S) OF FUNDING: .....

.....

LOCAL AUTHORITY AREA COVERED: .....

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION: Feel free to attach any information about the scheme not already asked for.

Please return to: Social Policy Research Unit, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD. Tel. 01904 432626. Fax. 01904 433618. E-mail pat3 [@york.ac.uk](mailto:pat3@york.ac.uk)

## Appendix B Example of an 'Invented Project'

### Vocational Assessment

ES Region: London and South East

Brixton Road  
London  
SW9 7AA

**Contact:** Helen Jones  
**Position:** Manager  
**Tel:** 020 1234 5678  
**Fax:** 020 1234 5679  
**E-mail:**  
**Website:**

**Name of lead body:** South East Training Consortium

**Area covered:** London

---

**Description:** To assess the vocational abilities of people with disabilities and to offer vocational counselling and guidance.

**Support:** Counselling. Vocational and career guidance. Assessment.

**Funding:**

**Use groups:** Mental health problems. Learning difficulties. Physical impairments. Sensory impairments.

**Eligibility restrictions:** People claiming DLA, SSP, DPTC, IB and JSA.

**Entry routes:** ES/DEA/Job Centre. SSD. NHS. Disability organisations.

**Other target group(s):**

**Source(s):** JIP.

**Start date:** 1999

**End date (if known):** 2004

**Numbers:** 350 in target group