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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>MI</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDDP</td>
<td>New Deal for Disabled People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NDLP</td>
<td>New Deal for Lone Parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ND25+</td>
<td>New Deal for 25 Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Public service agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL</td>
<td>Private Sector Led</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TPF</td>
<td>Transport Projects Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFI</td>
<td>Work Focused Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

This report presents the findings from a review of Action Teams undertaken by the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) for the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) from June 2005 to February 2006.

Action Teams for Jobs (referred to as Action Teams in this report) were first introduced in June 2000 in three pathfinder areas and are currently operating in 64 areas. Their aim is to work in small areas with particular problems of labour market disadvantage to tackle the causes of the differential employment rates between areas of deprivation and other areas, by increasing the employment rates among disadvantaged groups. The Action Teams programme is voluntary, providing an adviser-led service, often based in local communities, engaging with customer groups that have, in some cases, been reluctant in the past to access mainstream Jobcentre Plus services. Action Teams work in partnership with the private and voluntary sectors. There are currently 40 Jobcentre Plus Action Teams and 24 Private Sector Led (PSL) Action Teams.

Aims of the research

As part of its wider programme of research into the effectiveness of local approaches to welfare to work policies and flexible approaches to delivering them, DWP commissioned this research to investigate the current operation and efficacy of Action Teams for Jobs. The main objective of this research is to provide an in-depth analysis of the operation of Action Teams, examining the overall experience of Action Teams, now that Phase 3 is drawing to a close.

Methodology

As part of this research, a consultation exercise was conducted to gather information from all 65 Action Teams\(^1\), interviews were conducted with key national policy and operational staff, Management Information (MI) data was analysed, and six case studies were conducted to examine the experience of six different Action Teams.

\(^1\) There were 65 Action Teams operating at the beginning of this research. One PSL Action Team ceased operating in September 2005.
Key findings

Organisational background
The flexibility given to teams in Phase 3 to broaden the areas covered by the Action Team was seen as a positive change and as very important by all of the case study areas. It enabled teams to reach more beneficiaries and to help clients who lived in pockets of deprivation in more affluent areas, and had also been a popular move with partners, as it meant that partners whose services were delivered in broader areas could now refer any of their clients to the team. The skills and qualities of staff were seen to be much more important than the background they came from and a set of skills was identified that teams looked for in recruiting a good adviser. It was also emphasised that having a team with a wide skills mix was helpful.

The main advantage of outcome-related funding for PSL teams was seen to be the clear focus on moving clients into employment rather than focusing on soft outcomes. Conversely, the main disadvantage was felt to be that it incentivised working with easier-to-help clients, as there was little incentive to help those with multiple barriers closer to employment. In terms of the Action Team funding system as a whole, the main advantage seen by Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams was the flexibility, enabling teams to respond to client needs and to prioritise resources effectively for their local area. The main disadvantage cited by Jobcentre Plus teams related to recent decisions taken at District level to prioritise resources on areas of provision other than Action Teams. The main disadvantage of the funding system cited by PSL teams was the lack of funding for ‘distance travelled’.

Reaching target groups
Action Teams worked with a range of disadvantaged groups in selected wards, although due to recent changes in strategic direction there is now much more of a focus for all teams on clients that are currently in receipt of inactive benefits. Evidence from the MI data found that overall, Jobcentre Plus teams worked with clients from more traditionally ‘harder-to-reach’ groups than PSL teams, who had a greater proportion of clients that have been unemployed for less than six months and claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA).

In order to reach their target groups, all Action Teams highlighted the importance of being located away from Jobcentre Plus premises, which some clients found intimidating, and had set up outreach in the local community (including sessional outreach and mobile outreach). All teams felt that outreach had been very effective in reaching their target groups and making links with partners in the community. However, teams did raise a number of issues such as: problems with IT connections, resources and hardware, unsuitable outreach premises, lack of parking space for mobile units, and staff resources. Outreach was also seen as taking time to ‘bed-in’ and teams highlighted the importance of researching the area well before deciding where to be located.
Teams undertook a range of marketing measures to engage their target groups such as: handing out marketing materials (mugs, pens, etc.), leaflet drops, local sponsorship, coffee mornings, adverts in the local media and events with partners, etc. Teams were also keen to use their own distinctive branding to overcome any issues their clients may have with Jobcentre Plus. Overall, teams felt that by far the most effective form of marketing was word-of-mouth.

**Activities and support provided**

All Action Teams offered a range of flexible and individually tailored support to help clients overcome their various barriers. PSL teams offered more in terms of in-house courses and support to local employers. They also offered more formal in-work support to clients than Jobcentre Plus teams who felt they did not have the time or resources to do so. All teams felt that ‘support-for-travel-to-work costs’ and ‘high quality matching skills by advisers’ were most important in promoting the sustainability of job outcomes. Jobcentre Plus teams reported that they would have liked to have implemented a dedicated in-work support service for clients and would have also liked more funding for training provision and more time to spend with employers. PSL teams felt that more customised training and better off calculations should be offered to clients to improve sustainability and that more could be done to support clients during the first months of employment (by offering help with childcare and travel costs etc.).

Most teams had bid for additional funding through the Employment Projects Fund (EPF) and Transport Projects Fund (TPF) and some examples of recent EPF/TPF funding included: refurbishing a local training centre, building local neighbourhood nurseries and part-funding other workers to offer specialist advice to customers. All teams and partners felt that the funding had been very useful and had helped develop communities and local services, forge relationships with partners, market the Action Team and produce sustainable employment.

**Relationships and partnership working**

Action Teams, especially those from Jobcentre Plus teams, felt that EPF/TPF was important in helping them develop good relationships with partners. Teams also felt that it was very important to have a good relationship with the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP). Other important partners were seen as job-brokers, drug/substance counsellors and training course providers, and most teams felt they had achieved a good relationship with them. Conversely, teams did not feel that relationships with New Deal providers were as important and therefore, had not really developed strong links with them.

Establishing and maintaining good relationships with Jobcentre Plus mainstream was regarded as very important by all teams, although most teams had experienced initial teething problems (such as lack of awareness and understanding of the role of Action Teams by Jobcentre Plus staff and, therefore, a lack of referrals), which had since improved. Teams reported that a number of things could be done to improve
the relationship with Jobcentre Plus including: running workshops to improve the understanding and awareness of Action Teams, making sure there is a clear distinction between Action Teams and Jobcentre Plus and making sure Jobcentre Plus advisers were credited with points to encourage referrals.

Links with local employers differed between PSL teams and Jobcentre Plus teams. PSL teams had very good local employer links with dedicated members of staff to manage the relationship, whereas, Jobcentre Plus teams had not really developed strong links with employers.

Overall, all teams highlighted the importance of working with partners in the community and cited a wide range of partners they worked closely with. All teams were involved in the LSP and felt it had been very important in helping them form close working relationships with local partners. Benefits of partnership working were seen as: cross-referrals, joint funding, specialist help when needed, joined-up service, all round knowledge of provision in the area, and sharing of premises and, therefore, costs etc.

**Effectiveness of Action Teams**

The 25 PSL teams as a whole only met 78 per cent of their job entry targets in year one of Phase 3 of Action Teams, compared to the 40 Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, who achieved 140 per cent of their job entry targets. PSL teams, as a whole, achieved 69 per cent of their outcomes from non-JSA customers, compared to Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, who achieved 76 per cent (again, exceeding the target of 70 per cent). PSL teams, as a whole, moved into work proportionately more clients who had only been out of work for a short time than Jobcentre Plus teams. They were also proportionately more likely to work with clients with just one of the target disadvantages than Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, were.

Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, felt that the main success of Action Teams where they had given the most added-value was outreach, followed by partnership working. PSL teams, as a whole, felt that partnership working, the programme’s flexibility, and being able to offer one-to-one support and work with the hardest to help were the most successful features. Respondents from the case studies felt that no single issue had been the key to success, but rather, it was a range of factors that made them successful. The biggest barriers faced by Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, had been the funding and headcount restrictions being introduced in some Jobcentre Plus Districts, whilst securing outreach premises had also been difficult. In contrast, PSL teams saw the biggest difficulty they had faced as being the shift to securing 70 per cent of job outcomes from non-JSA customers, followed by paperwork requirements.

A number of lessons learned from Action Teams have already fed into the design of policy, both in terms of initiatives such as Ethnic Minority Outreach, the Working Neighbourhoods Pilots, Pathways to Work, flexibility in New Deal for Lone Parents (NDLP) and New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP), and on mainstream services.
through the introduction of the Adviser Discretionary Fund (ADF), the culture of mainstream advising and the development of partnership working for Jobcentre Plus.

Both Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams felt that the most important features of Action Teams that they would like to see continue were outreach, flexibility of funding, partnership working, and its voluntary nature. Case study respondents held a mixture of views as to whether Action Teams should continue in their current form, or whether successful aspects such as outreach and flexibility would be better delivered through other provision. The need for continuation of community outreach in some form was a widely held view. There was a general view that future provision of this type should take on board lessons learned from the Action Teams experience in terms of flexibilities, resource allocation, and staffing arrangements.

**Informing DWP’s deprived areas strategy**

There are a number of ways in which the lessons learned in the Action Teams’ experience can continue to inform the DWP deprived areas strategy in the future. Whether Action Teams continue, or whether they are replaced by other services, there are a number of key elements of Action Teams that this research suggests need to continue if the employment rate in disadvantaged areas is to be increased, and the difference between the rate in disadvantaged areas and overall rates is to be reduced. Having an outreach service, flexibility of funding, partnership working, and a voluntary programme to address worklessness in these areas were all seen as crucial features of Action Teams that needed to continue in the work of Jobcentre Plus in deprived areas. It is also important to ensure that any future programmes take on board the understanding of the extremely localised geography of worklessness, and tackle the pockets of worklessness found in a variety of labour markets including cities, seaside towns, rural areas, and ex-industrial areas.

This research aimed to capture lessons learned from the Action Teams’ experience in order that the best practice can be taken forward into future provision for disadvantaged areas.
1 Introduction

This report presents the findings from a Review of Action Teams undertaken by the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) for the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) from June 2005 to February 2006.

1.1 Background to Action Teams

Action Teams for Jobs (referred to as Action Teams in the rest of this report) were first introduced in June 2000 in three pathfinder areas. They were then rolled out across 37 more areas in October 2000, extended to a further 23 areas from October 2001, and finally extended to a further two areas from April 2004, bringing the total to 65 teams in all\(^2\). The aim of Action Teams is to work in small areas with particular problems of labour market disadvantage to tackle the causes of the differential employment rates between areas of deprivation and other areas, by increasing the employment rates among disadvantaged groups such as the long-term unemployed, people with health problems or disabilities, homeless people, refugees and ex-offenders.

The Action Teams programme is voluntary and designed to help people find work by using discretionary funding with imagination and innovation, and targeting areas and groups who are in need of the most help. Action Teams work in partnership with the private and voluntary sectors and typically provide an outreach service located in the community in shared or stand-alone premises. The range of services offered includes jobsearch advice, financial support including travel to work costs and childcare costs, as well as referrals to services such as debt counselling and training opportunities. Action Teams provide an adviser-led service engaging with customer groups that have, in some cases, been reluctant in the past to access mainstream Jobcentre Plus services.

\(^2\) There were 65 Action Teams operating at the beginning of this research. One PSL Action Team ceased operating in September 2005.
In line with the need for flexibility in delivery, and with the government’s view that private sector inputs can help to demonstrate novel approaches and encourage efficiency through competition, a substantial number of the Action Teams are led by private sector organisations. Currently there are 40 Jobcentre Plus Action Teams, and 24 Private Sector Led (PSL) Action Teams.

1.2 Aims and objectives of the study

As part of its wider programme of research into the effectiveness of local approaches to welfare to work policies and flexible approaches to delivering them, DWP commissioned this research to investigate the current operation and efficacy of Action Teams for Jobs. The main objective of this research is to provide an in-depth analysis of the operation of Action Teams for Jobs.

The research aims to identify the key factors that lead to successful, or unsuccessful, implementation of the Action Team approach, as well as examining what has constrained the effective operation, and expansion, of Action Teams. This will help to ensure that the lessons are learned from the Action Team experience and applied to the delivery of other Jobcentre Plus services in the future, particularly for the delivery of future area-based services, whether through mainstream or dedicated programmes. The main research questions are:

- Have Action Teams been effective in helping people to find jobs?
- How have Action Teams been innovative?
- Which groups were targeted and how were different approaches tailored to each group?
- What are the circumstances in which the Action Teams’ approach works best?
- What are the factors that hinder the success of the Action Teams’ approach?
- Did issues arise in the operation of Action Teams that were unanticipated at the time of design? If so, how were they resolved?
- How can lessons learned in the Action Teams’ experience inform the DWP deprived areas strategy?

To address these questions, a consultation exercise was conducted to gather information from all 65 Action Teams, interviews were conducted with key national policy and operational staff, Management Information (MI) data was analysed, and six case studies were conducted to examine the experience of six different Action Teams.
1.3 Structure of the report

This report begins by describing the methodology used to conduct this research (Chapter 2), before moving on to examine the evidence on a thematic basis. Chapter 3 focuses on the organisational background of Action Teams, examining their area focus, staff, and issues around funding and targets. Chapter 4 then focuses on how Action Teams reach their target groups, through outreach and marketing. The activities and support provided by Action Teams is the focus of Chapter 5, including details of projects funded through the Employment Projects Fund (EPF) and Transport Projects Fund (TPF) and details of in-work support. Chapter 6 examines the relationships that Action Teams have with Jobcentre Plus mainstream, employers and other partners, and the partnership working that they do. The overall effectiveness of Action Teams is then examined in Chapter 7, in terms of the job outcomes that Action Teams achieve, their successful features, the constraints that they face, the lessons that can be learned from the Action Team experience, and the views of participants of the research on Action Teams as an initiative. Chapter 8 draws some overall conclusions in reference to the research questions.
2 Methodology

2.1 Consultation exercise

In June 2005, a consultation exercise was conducted where a questionnaire was sent to district managers and Project Managers in the 65 areas with Action Teams in order to gather opinions from the field on what had been successful about Action Teams, and to advise Ministers on the future of Action Team type activity. The questionnaire consisted of open and closed questions (see Appendix A for the full questionnaire). For the closed questions, respondents were asked to rate a statement relating to Action Teams, where ‘5’ denoted very important/successful and ‘1’ denoted not important/not successful. The closed questions included questions on:

- design features;
- efficiency of operation;
- job outcomes;
- sustainability;
- partnership working.

The open questions included questions on:

- efficiency of operation
- job outcomes
- sustainability
- partnership working
- summary questions.

Response rates from the Action Team areas were extremely high. The Project Manager responded in 63 areas. In total, 89 responses were received, 20 from district managers and 69 from Project Managers, and/or ex-Project Managers in a
few cases (in some teams, both the Project Manager and the ex-Project Manager responded). Of these 89 responses, 28 were from Private Sector Led (PSL) areas, and 61 were from Jobcentre Plus led areas.

For closed questions, mean scores were calculated for all Jobcentre Plus Action Teams who responded, all PSL Action Teams who responded, and an overall score for all teams who responded. For open questions, an analysis was done of all responses to each open question, again, by whether the respondent was from a Jobcentre Plus or PSL team.

Before discussing the findings in detail later in this report, it is worth noting the high overall scores on all issues. The overwhelming majority of scores were over 4, which can be seen as a positive reflection on the features of Action Teams, given that respondents were asked to rate from 1 to 5 (with 5 denoting very important/successful).

2.2 Interviews with national policy-makers and operational staff

At the beginning of this research, interviews with key policy-makers and operational staff at the national level of Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), Jobcentre Plus, and PSL organisations who deliver Action Teams, were conducted. These interviews (with 13 respondents in all) were designed to gain insight into the policy and operational background of Action Teams, as well as to help develop a typology of Action Teams to select case studies, to discuss issues that should be covered in the research, and to discuss the types of job roles to see in each case study area.

These interviews included:

- Action Teams strategy lead;
- Action Teams operational manager for Jobcentre Plus;
- Management Information (MI) officer;
- assistant economist;
- Contract manager for PSL teams;
- senior contracts manager;
- policy manager;
- policy leads at two PSL organisations;
- implementation manager in the early days of Action Teams;
- other staff involved in the early days of Action Teams.
The full discussion guide is shown in Appendix B. These respondents also provided other background information including performance data, ministerial submissions, a list of Employment Projects Fund (EPF)/Transport Projects Fund (TPF) projects and guidance documents. Analysis of these interviews and other data from these respondents is used in the report, and was also used to brief researchers of policy and operational issues before visiting the case study areas.

2.3 Case studies

A typology was selected to choose the six case study areas using five main criteria:

- region;
- labour market characteristics;
- whether Jobcentre Plus or PSL Action Team;
- a new Action Team area;
- whether an Action Team had been particularly successful or had struggled.

From these criteria, six teams were selected. These included:

- a team from Scotland, the North East, the North West, the Midlands, the South East and London;
- a team from a large city, an inner-city area, a seaside town, an ex-industrial area with an urban/rural mix, a semi-urban area near a large labour market, and an isolated ex-industrial area;
- two PSL teams and four Jobcentre Plus teams;
- one new Action Team;
- two Action Teams that had been particularly successful and two that had struggled.

The purpose of using case studies was to enable the drawing out of general lessons from the Action Team experience that were based on a good cross-section of teams. They were not used so that the experience of an individual team would be reported on in-depth or compared to the performance and experience of other teams. In this report the case study Action Teams are, therefore, not identified individually, rather, respondents are referred to by their role (for example ‘Action Team Manager’) and the type of team they are from, whether Jobcentre Plus or a PSL team. When ‘Jobcentre Plus teams’ and ‘PSL teams’ are referred to within the evidence from the case studies, only the four Jobcentre Plus teams and the two PSL teams within the case studies selected for this research are being referred to.

Phase 1 of the research consisted of an introductory visit to each site, to conduct scoping and exploratory interviews with the Action Team Manager, one or two other key staff in each Action Team and the district manager of Jobcentre Plus in the
area. In part, these interviews were to gather information about the key research issues, but they were also organisational (to discover who should be seen in Phase 2 of the research and how can they best be contacted, etc.), exploratory (to gather any secondary data, and to discover if there were any individuals or organisations that ought to be included in the research), and political/diplomatic (to win the confidence of senior staff to ensure good co-operation, etc.).

In all areas, the Action Team Manager and the district manager (and/or Jobcentre Plus colleagues suggested by the district manager in a few cases) were interviewed. In a few cases, the district manager was interviewed by telephone due to being based a long way from the Action Team area, or due to restricted availability. In some areas, advisers, partners, adviser managers, team leaders, previous Action Team Managers, and Operations Managers (in PSL areas) were also interviewed as part of Phase 1 of the research.

Discussion guides were developed, one for Action Team staff, and one for district managers (see Appendix C for details). The first covered organisational background and delivery, funding and targets, activities and support provided, relationships and partnership working, and effectiveness of Action Teams. The second guide included some of these issues, but focused more on the role of Action Teams within the broader Jobcentre Plus agenda, and views on the future of Action Teams.

Phase 2 comprised a later and more extended site visit, when all the individuals and organisations identified as appropriate, interesting, or useful during Phase 1 were interviewed. Partners of Action Teams were interviewed at this stage, as were staff responsible for marketing, and outreach sites and projects were also visited. The discussion guides from Phase 1 were modified for use in Phase 2, with more emphasis on outreach, marketing, EPF/TPF projects and partnership working. The discussion guide used for partners is shown in Appendix C.

2.4 Management Information data

DWP has collected MI about the activities of both the Jobcentre Plus led and PSL Action Teams throughout the lifetime of the project. The information contains basic demographic details of the clients that the Action Teams have had contact with and of those that they have assisted into work. For this review, DWP made available aggregated data for the number of total clients worked with and the number of job entries from April 2004 to March 2005 (year one of Phase 3 of Action Teams). This information was available at an aggregated level for all Jobcentre Plus teams, all PSL teams, and all Action Teams, and also for the six case study areas investigated in this review.

The aggregated data has been analysed to examine any patterns in the types of clients that the Action Teams had contact with, and of those that they helped to place into work. Job entries as a proportion of contacts have also been examined, to assess the likelihood that clients from specific demographic groups were helped into...
work, and also to explore how the funding system might have impacted on the nature and quality of the outcomes. Analysis of this information is detailed throughout the report and further detail and tabulations of the data is located in Appendix D. To maintain anonymity of the case study areas, within the MI data, teams have been labelled by whether they are Jobcentre Plus led or PSL, and as Team A, Team B, Team C. etc. (as labelling a team with its region or labour market made them identifiable).
3 Organisational background

This chapter examines the organisational background of Action Teams. It firstly examines the areas covered by Action Teams, moves on to look at the staff who work in Action Teams, and finishes by examining the funding of Action Teams and the targets that they have to meet.

3.1 Areas covered by Action Teams

3.1.1 Policy and operational background

Phase 1 (June 2000 to September 2001)

Three Pathfinders were introduced from June 2000 (in East Ayrshire, Thanet and Hartlepool), with 37 more areas being introduced in October 2000, bringing the total to 40 areas. These were selected on the basis of being areas of employment disadvantage, having a team in every Employment Zone (EZ) area, and having one in every European Social Fund (ESF) Objective One area, and areas granted Special Programme Status on losing Objective One status. Within these local authority areas, teams could decide which wards to work in based on what they determined to be local needs. There was little ward-level labour market information available, and partnerships had to be developed to ensure that teams targeted the right areas.

Phase 2 (October 2001 to March 2004)

The Chancellor announced in the Budget 2001, that Action Teams would be extended until 2004, and allocated more funds allowing them to expand to 63 teams in all. In this phase, wards were centrally selected. Where the wards that Action Teams had been working in during Phase 1 were not on the new centrally selected list, teams were allowed to continue to work in these areas as well as in the centrally selected wards.
Phase 3 (April 2004 to March 2006)

A further extension to Action Teams to March 2006 was announced in the Pre-Budget report in December 2003. Two additional Action Teams were introduced in Wear Valley and Barrow-in-Furness, bringing the number to 65 teams in all. The list of these 65 areas is shown in Appendix E.

Teams were given the flexibility, as long as they stayed within the Public Service Agreement (PSA) local authority areas, to operate in the wards of their choice, reflecting the recognition of the importance of their local knowledge. Teams worked with Local Strategic Partnerships (LSPs) to choose the areas that they would work in, and completed delivery plans for Phase 3 setting out their arguments for their choice of areas that the Action Team would cover. Almost all teams changed their target wards, expanded beyond the original wards, or decided to include the whole of the local authority area. This allowed teams to move into other areas they knew had pockets of deprivation even where these pockets were located within a more affluent ward. Many PSL teams went local authority area-wide so they could serve anyone within their target groups and do area-wide marketing.

3.1.2 Evidence from the case studies

The flexibility given to teams in Phase 3 to broaden the areas covered by the Action Team was seen as a positive change and as very important by all of the case study areas. Many respondents cited problems in the past where the service was restricted to certain wards and clients had to be turned away, for example, for living on the wrong side of the street:

‘We were having to turn people away because they lived in a different area.’

(Action Team Manager, PSL team)

As well as enabling teams to reach more beneficiaries, for example, by having a presence in a larger number of wards, this had also been a popular move with partners. Where relationships had been developed with partners who worked across a broader area, these could be used to increase referrals to the team from outside the original wards. Whilst Action Teams were not designed to rely on referrals from Jobcentre Plus mainstream, where a mainstream adviser felt that a client could benefit from Action Team services, not having to check that a client was in the right area made it easier for them to refer clients to the Action Team.

---

3 See footnote 1.

4 From the 1998 Comprehensive Spending Review, departments made ‘Public Service Agreements’ stating their objectives and setting targets for achieving them. In the 2000 Spending Review, the following PSA target was introduced: ‘Over the three years to 2004, increase the employment rates of disadvantaged areas and groups, taking account of the economic cycle – people with disabilities, lone parents, ethnic minorities and the over 50s, the 30 local authority districts with the poorest initial labour market position – and reduce the difference between their employment rates and the overall rate’.
Broadening the areas covered by the Action Team also allowed teams to reach more rural areas that were part of the district, or areas that have little welfare-to-work provision that is additional to mainstream provision. Their knowledge of the local area meant that managers and staff knew which wards they needed to have a presence in. Whilst it was sometimes challenging to expand to cover wider areas, teams could still maintain a spatial focus within a broader area, helping any client who approached them from the wider area, whilst focusing outreach in particular wards. Some case study teams had gone city-wide or District-wide on the basis of additional funding, for example, using Social Inclusion Partnership money in Scotland and regeneration money through the city council in a team in England.

In one area, the original wards had been chosen on the basis of the index of deprivation but were not where most of the Incapacity Benefit (IB) clients lived. This was because the wards chosen had high levels of council housing, whereas, many IB clients in the area were former employees of a major local industry who had been made redundant. In many cases they owned their own homes and were not, therefore, concentrated in the original wards. The team, therefore, broadened their area to cover the whole town and focused activity in wards with high numbers of IB clients.

One down-side mentioned in one team to broadening the area focus, was that the team was not able to work as intensively across the wider area as it had when the area was a more focused, smaller area.

3.2  Action Team staff

3.2.1  Evidence from the case studies

Teams varied in staff numbers reflecting their size in terms of job entry targets, but had a similar structure. Teams were led by a manager whose job title and responsibilities varied, although most had additional responsibilities as well as managing the Action Team. Larger teams also had adviser managers or team leaders responsible for the day-to-day management of advisers. The number of advisers varied, again with the size of the team. Teams also had access to administration and marketing support. In some teams, as well as their normal responsibilities, advisers had additional responsibilities for certain geographical areas, certain client target groups, or for co-ordinating Employment Projects Fund (EPF) or Transport Projects Fund (TPF) projects.

When recruitment had been done for teams, the focus was on the skills set needed and personalities and qualities required to work with these client groups, rather than the backgrounds staff came from. A number of similar qualities were identified by the Action Team Managers as crucial when recruiting advisers:

- good interpersonal skills;
- good communication skills;
• enthusiasm for the job;
• confidence;
• ability to use their initiative and to ‘think on their feet’;
• ability to work flexibly and being prepared to work out of hours;
• willingness to try something different;
• good team player;
• not having a fear of targets;
• being able to refer clients on for non-employment needs and not take on all of their problems;
• being approachable;
• being understanding of clients’ needs;
• being local – having local knowledge and being known and trusted by the community;
• reflecting the community served, eg having advisers from the same ethnic background who speak the same languages as clients.

It was emphasised that having a team with a wide skills mix was very helpful. For example:

‘One of us will excel at doing CVs, another will be really good at bringing people in, another will be good at doing in-work support, another one’s good at arranging courses, another is good at getting in touch with employers. We all have something that we put together and that is what makes it work. It’s being able to depend on each other for different aspects of the job. Not one of us is perfect and can do everything right, but one of us will be better than the other at something.’

(Action Team Adviser, PSL team)

In terms of the background of staff, many teams did have advisers who knew the local areas well, and in a few cases, staff members were from the targeted local areas. In these cases they felt that living in the area for a long time and being known by the local community was helpful in their role of attracting clients to the Action Team. In PSL teams, staff came from a range of backgrounds including, for example, Jobcentre Plus, recruitment agencies, care work, mental health nursing, customer services, the Probation Service, and administration.

In Jobcentre Plus teams there was a tendency for more staff to have come from a Jobcentre Plus background, whether from the Benefits Agency or the Employment Service part of the previous business. Some Jobcentre Plus teams had staff exclusively from a Jobcentre Plus background, whilst others had a mixture of Jobcentre Plus staff, secondees, and staff from other backgrounds such as training
and in one case, education. Staff with a Jobcentre Plus background had, in some cases, moved to the Action Team through internal promotions, and others transferred from mainstream advisory roles. Some staff interviewed expressed concern that Jobcentre Plus restructuring may limit their opportunities to move back into mainstream when new arrangements for area based initiatives are introduced.

Following the 2004 Spending Review, the Department for Work and Pensions faced a tighter budgetary environment which had an impact on the staffing of Action Teams. In two Jobcentre Plus led Teams advisers transferred to mainstream Jobcentre Plus where they felt that their future was more secure. A restriction on Jobcentre Plus headcount\(^5\) meant that some teams were using secondees who did not count towards the headcount, and could bring different skills and experience, and new ideas, to the teams. These secondees came from a range of backgrounds including city councils, community organisations and colleges. In one Jobcentre Plus team, secondees were managed by a Business Manager who had many years’ experience working for Jobcentre Plus and its predecessors, enabling her to explain Jobcentre Plus systems to secondees.

One Jobcentre Plus team had also been affected by its geographical isolation, restricting its ability to attract staff from other areas of the District. This meant that the Action Team was at risk of taking staff from the local jobcentre, which the deputy district manager felt might be risking performance (although some experienced staff did stay within the jobcentre). Ensuring that there were experienced staff both in the local jobcentre and in the Action Team was a difficult balancing act to achieve.

There were some examples of particularly good practice in terms of staffing. One team had a majority of advisers qualified to NVQ3 in Advice and Guidance, and others had placed strong emphasis on training and mentoring of staff, as well as on in-house quality assurance processes. Where advisers were not from a Jobcentre Plus background, other advisers within jobcentres or PSL organisations were utilised where specialist advice was needed, for example, on benefit rules. In one PSL and one Jobcentre Plus team, the original team had been replaced when performance had not been good enough, or when it was clear the team was not working well.

---

\(^5\) In the 2004 Spending Review an efficiency target was introduced: ‘DWP will realise total annual efficiency gains of at least £960 million by 2007-08, of which at least half will be cashable.’ As part of this programme of efficiencies, DWP plans, by 2007-08, to achieve a total reduction of 40,000 civil service posts, with redeployment of 10,000 of these posts to front-line roles, and ensure the relocation of at least 4,000 posts out of London and the South East. References to the ‘efficiency challenge’ in this report refer to this target, and references to ‘headcount restrictions’ refer to this reduction in the number of posts.
3.3 Funding and targets

3.3.1 Policy and operational background

Phase 1 (June 2000 to September 2001)

In Phase 1, Action Teams were given £1.5 million and ‘a blank sheet of paper’ to encourage them to think creatively about how to solve the problem of local worklessness. It was the first time that anything like this had been tried within the then Employment Service. No set time frame was put on working with clients, and unlike stages that clients move through on mandatory New Deals, Action Teams could work with them for as long as necessary and use funding creatively to meet individuals’ needs. This could include funding clothes for interview, tools for work, and bridging the gap between the last benefits received and the first pay cheque. In reality, few teams were able to spend the £1.5 million within the timeframe of Phase 1.

Phase 2 (October 2001 to March 2004)

In Phase 2, the funding regime changed and became £2,000 per job entry, with teams having different numerical job entry targets, based on their area. If these targets were not met teams could be re-contracted. Teams could use this £2,000 how they chose, on staff, premises, provision, and funding for individuals (with the bulk of funding usually spent on staff and premises). Taking into account the cost of set-up, new teams were also given £100,000 so that they would not be disadvantaged relative to teams that had already been operating for 12 to 15 months under the more generous funding regime. Small teams had their job entry targets adjusted so that they would get at least £400,000 to make them operationally viable. PSL teams get some funding up-front, but the majority on results, compared with Jobcentre Plus teams who get all their money up-front based on their targets (eg if a job entry target was 100, a team would get £200,000 before any outcomes were achieved).

Phase 3 (April 2004 to March 2006)

In Phase 3 of Action Teams, a 70:30 ratio was set so that 70 per cent of job entries achieved had to be from non-Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) customers, with up to 30 per cent of job entries coming from JSA customers. This ratio had to be maintained even when teams exceeded their job entry target. There were some initial problems with PSL teams adjusting to this change and its implications for the way that Action Teams would need to work to reach this economically inactive group.

There has also been an expectation (but not a hard target) relating to job retention, where it was expected that at least 50 per cent of customers moving into employment would remain in employment for 11 of the subsequent 13 weeks.
Funding issues raised by national policy and operational staff

National policy and operational expert respondents raised a few key issues related to the funding of Action Teams. Where a customer is referred from Jobcentre Plus mainstream to the Action Team and a job entry is then achieved by the Action Team, Jobcentre Plus mainstream are awarded the job points (even where the team is PSL). This should encourage referrals from Jobcentre Plus mainstream to Action Teams. However, mainstream did not understand this at first in some areas, leading to a shortage of referrals. In PSL teams, where referrals are made from mainstream provision, Action Teams can only claim an outcome if they can prove that they had significant input into the individual getting the job.

Funding streams have been subject to change. Action Team funding used to be ring-fenced – meaning that the pot of funding could only be used for Action Teams, not for other Jobcentre Plus activities. Following the DWP efficiency challenge, some districts chose to prioritise other areas of operation.

3.3.2 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked to score elements of the funding system from 1 to 5 (with 5 denoting very important/successful). Table 3.1 outlines these scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1 Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think outcome-related funding has been in promoting the operational efficiency of PSL Action Teams for Jobs (Question for PSL Action Teams only)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think the present funding system has been in promoting the operational efficiency of Jobcentre Plus Action Teams for Jobs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for Action Teams is based on an average cost estimate of £2,000 per job entry. In your view, how adequate is this level of funding on average?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Question for PSL teams only
Source: IES/DWP, 2005

PSL teams were asked to rate the importance of outcome-related funding in promoting the operational efficiency of PSL teams and the score was a positive 4.0. There was a marked difference between PSL and Jobcentre Plus teams on the scores given for the importance of the present funding system in promoting the operational efficiency of Jobcentre Plus Action Teams; with Jobcentre Plus teams giving a score of 4.2 for this issue, compared to a score of 2.4 given by PSL teams. When asked whether the level of funding (£2,000 per job entry) was considered adequate, Jobcentre Plus teams gave a score of 4.1 and PSL a much lower score of 3.4, with the overall score from all teams being 3.8.
Outcome-related funding for PSL teams

Respondents from PSL teams were also asked to describe what they thought had been the main advantages of outcome-related funding. The majority of responses reported the main advantage of outcome-related funding to be a clear focus on moving clients into employment and, therefore, enabling the Action Teams to focus on ‘hard’ rather than ‘soft’ outcomes. For example, the outcome targets incentivise working towards job entries rather than aiming to increase a client’s confidence, skills, or other forms of ‘distance travelled’ towards job readiness:

‘[Outcomes] focus the provider in supporting customers into work rather than concentrating on soft skills.’

One respondent reported that the focus on outcomes also helped to give a clear message to clients, as well as advisers, that the aim of the Action Team was to help them into employment. Outcome targets with payment by results were also felt to give advisers the focus, drive and motivation to achieve job entries, with some respondents feeling that it, therefore, improved overall performance. Having outcome targets focused on job entries was mentioned by several PSL respondents as encouraging teams to examine and focus on the critical success factors that could help them achieve the outcomes, and to target resources in order to best do this. Monitoring performance was felt to be important to ensure that there were not difficulties with cash-flow or budgeting and that targets could be met. A less frequently cited response of the advantages of outcome-related funding was increased accountability.

Respondents from PSL teams were also asked to describe what they thought had been the main disadvantages of outcome related funding. The most commonly cited disadvantage of outcome-related funding was of payment. Having a fixed amount of money per job entry was felt to incentivise ‘cherry-picking’ in order to get ‘quick wins’ and to help the most job-ready clients into employment, as there was no payment for ‘distance travelled’ (as mentioned above), for example, moving clients with multiple barriers to work a step closer to engaging with the labour market. Clients who were perceived to be the hardest to help or to have multiple barriers to employment may, therefore, miss out or not get the support they need as other clients are more ‘cost-effective’ to help. The pattern of client contact, in part created by these targets, can be seen in Section 4.1.2. For example:

‘In some situations, outcome-related funding can lead to a “quick-fix” scenario, not working with those most disadvantaged people within communities but within those who can provide an outcome when balanced with the commercial edge.’

‘The more “hardest to help” clients have been overlooked and may not of been receiving the level of support that is required due to advisers trying to hit their performance targets.’

The next most frequently cited disadvantage of outcome-related funding was that it incentivised getting a client any job, which in some instances could potentially lead to less regard as to whether it was the most suitable job for that client over the
medium- to long-term, or whether it was a job that the client was interested in. A hard target for retention alongside outcome targets was suggested by one respondent as a way of better gaining a balance of the quantity of job outcomes with the quality of outcome over the longer-term and with clients’ needs. Comments around this issue, on the disadvantages of outcome-related funding include:

‘Could send people to jobs that are unsuitable for them to get the outcome payment.’

‘The best interest of the customer was not being taken into account, ie teams were fulfilling short-term job goals rather than long-term ones. In other words, getting them into any job and not particularly one that they want.’

Other disadvantages of outcome-related funding included:

- seasonal factors affecting job entries which affected income; and
- income not being guaranteed over a set period.

**Advantages of the Action Teams funding system**

Respondents from both Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams were asked to describe what they thought had been the main advantages of the present Action Teams funding system. The overwhelming majority of Jobcentre Plus respondents reported that the main advantage of the funding system had been its flexibility in a range of ways. For example, flexibility:

- to respond to the needs of the client rather than to deliver from a fixed menu of options, and, therefore, being able to deliver a tailored and client-centred approach with no set limit of financial support;
- for advisers to work autonomously and independently, flexibility to second employees from specialist partners, and to work flexibly and effectively with partners;
- of funds between budget groups, such as ‘other current’ and ‘goods and services’. This flexibility was reported to allow the Action Teams to prioritise resources in a way suitable to the local labour market and needs of local client groups, and, therefore, to operate in a more cost-effective way.

The second most frequently reported advantage of the funding system by respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams was that the money had been ‘ring-fenced’ and, therefore, District level Jobcentre Plus structure and management were not able to use the money for other purposes. Having the funding coming straight to the Action Team from the national office of DWP was felt to be particularly important given the recent pressures of Jobcentre Plus due to the ‘Efficiency Challenge’\(^6\). For example:

---

\(^6\) See footnote 5.
‘Ring-fenced funding for Action Team has enabled Action Team aims and goals to be achieved even when District have been under pressure due to the Efficiency Challenge.’

‘The fact that the funding is separate from the district mainstream budget means that it can be efficiently managed and monitored to the penny. It also means that there is not a temptation to top-slice7 the budget by a hard-pressed District Office needing to supplement mainstream funding.’

The third most commonly cited advantage of Action Team funding by respondents from Jobcentre Plus Teams was that teams were not limited to sourcing supplies from Jobcentre Plus prescribed contractors. They felt that this enhanced the value for money, speed and flexibility with which they could respond to client needs. Jobcentre Plus mainstream have a list of approved providers through which advisers source the services and support their client’s need. The Action Teams did not have to use providers on this list and were, therefore, able to source a wider range of services. Other, less commonly cited, advantages of the funding system included:

- guaranteeing staff levels;
- easy to monitor and spend;
- ability to link with other funding;
- fair and effective formula;
- able to target non-traditional Jobcentre Plus clients;
- less red tape;
- having EPF and TPF as funding sources; and
- increasing innovation.

Similarly to the Jobcentre Plus teams, respondents from PSL teams overwhelmingly reported the flexibility of funding to be the greatest advantage of the funding system. Again, this was reported to be an advantage as advisers had flexibility to work with clients and tailor support packages to meet their needs. The benefits of funding flexibility were seen to extend into other areas, such as branded marketing and taking out short-term leases on premises. Other advantages of the funding system reported by respondents from PSL teams included:

- enabling an increase in outreach work to support non-JSA clients;
- enabling an increase in partnership working;
- the size of outcome payments allowing for an increased level of support.

7 In this context, top-slicing means the District not passing the full allocation of Action Team funding onto the Action Team.
Disadvantages of the Action Team funding system

Respondents were also asked to describe what they thought had been the main disadvantages of the present Action teams funding stream. The most common disadvantage cited by Jobcentre Plus led Teams was the lack of ring-fencing in financial arrangements. Some Action Teams reported pressure and constraints on their budgets from Jobcentre Plus mainstream. For example:

‘Issues around lack of ring-fencing... granted Action Team is a part of Jobcentre Plus and should be treated so, but the “level” playing field has been somewhat tilted.’

‘No longer having control, and have to apply to District to be allowed to spend the funding.’

‘We do not get our full allocation after district has “top-sliced”.’

After a lack of ring-fencing there were three disadvantages reported by equal numbers of respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams: Action Teams had greater flexibility than mainstream in funding arrangements, however some respondents felt that there was not enough freedom to move funding between budget headings in order to meet local needs. First, some respondents felt that there was not enough freedom to move funding between budget headings in order to meet local needs. Second, over the course of the project’s lifetime it was felt by some respondents that funding allocations did not keep pace with increases in salary and IT costs, and therefore, over time, the funding fell in real terms. Lastly, some respondents felt that the system of payment to clients was too slow, particularly given the nature of the client group and their likely cash-flow. The following disadvantages were also cited by a small number of respondents:

- inconsistent funding allocations;
- lack of enough funding to be innovative;
- bureaucracy and having to create a paper trail;
- unable to pump-prime (as had been possible during Phase 1 of Action Teams)\(^8\);
- market price for rental of accommodation not considered in funding allocation;
- funding formula made targets too low;
- overachievement creates a strain on budgets;
- uncertainty over future funding.

---

\(^8\) Although this was still possible through the use of EPF/TPF until new bids were stopped in spring 2005.
The most commonly reported disadvantage of the funding system from the PSL teams was the point made previously about the lack of funding for ‘distance travelled’ – that they did not receive funding for a client they had worked with and spent time with, and who may have become more job-ready, but who did not enter into employment. For example:

‘It may be of benefit to look at a tier funding system, providing drop-down payments for referrals, starts, job outcomes, training outcomes and jobs sustained and being able to claim for clients being placed in subsidised apprenticeships, etc.’

‘Working with the H2H [hard to help] group can often result in losing members’ [clients’] job outcomes due to their chaotic lifestyle, so expenses may be incurred but no outcome gained but the member [client] may have achieved a huge step closer to employment with the actions taken.’

Having outcome-related funding led to the second most commonly cited disadvantage of the overall funding system, which was a focus on quick wins (as mentioned above). The JSA/non-JSA split was also felt, in some instances, to restrict the types of clients the Action Teams could work with who may have been able to benefit from the Action Team’s services. Other responses to the disadvantages of the funding system included:

• uncertainty;
• not enough funding for innovative projects;
• annual funding could not always be shifted between financial years.

Reducing the programme with the least effect on outcomes

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked to describe what, if any, aspects of the programme could be reduced with the least effects on outcomes. Some respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams could not think of any aspects of the programme which could be reduced without an effect an outcomes. However, other respondents did note areas where savings could be made. Although reported as essential to the effectiveness of the outreach element of the programme, one of the most commonly reported aspects of the programme which could be reduced with the least effect on outcomes was the IT costs associated with mobile IT equipment.

Reducing premises costs was also felt to be an area where savings could be made without an effect on outcomes. Respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams suggested that the administrative functions of the Action Teams could be located in Jobcentres or other DWP-owned property. For example:

‘Consider relocating Action Team administrative bases into Jobcentres (saving on premises, IT and telephony costs).’
Other respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams suggested that the EPF/TPF funding could be reduced\(^9\). However, two of the respondents who reported this went on to note that their Action Teams had not bid for funding from the funds, and it is likely that the EPF/TPF funding would not as readily be cited as an area for reduction among those that had successfully bid for it. There was a wide range of other suggestions, usually made by only one respondent. Listed below are some of these:

- Rationalise use of outreach sites.
- Share central resources between Action Teams.
- Decrease the ‘other current’ budget.
- Decrease the ‘work and training grants’ budget.
- Funding only IB and Income Support (IS) customers and not funding JSA customers.
- Goods and services budget could be reduced with no impact after teams have funded set up costs.

Among the respondents from PSL teams where any reductions were suggested, a reduction of paperwork was the most frequently cited aspect of the programme which could be reduced without an effect on outcomes. For example:

‘The amount of evidence required puts extra demands on consultants [advisers], eg Participation Forms, amount of evidence re ID, etc., which is not required on other contracts. This puts the Action Team contract at a disadvantage against other similar programmes.’

Other than a reduction in the amount of evidence PSL teams were required to collect, there were no other issues highlighted by more than one respondent. Issues highlighted by one respondent included only funding long-term employed clients, and changing the 70:30 split to include long-term JSA clients in the 70 per cent.

### 3.3.3 Evidence from the case studies

A number of issues were raised among respondents about funding and targets. In Jobcentre Plus teams, when advisers from Jobcentre Plus mainstream services refer a client to the Action Team and an outcome is achieved with that client, the job points are attributed to that adviser, helping the adviser meet their personal target. In PSL teams, when advisers from Jobcentre Plus mainstream services refer a client to the Action Team and an outcome is achieved with that client, the job points are attributed to the Jobcentre, rather than the individual adviser, thus, not helping the adviser reach their personal target. In both PSL case study areas, systems to ensure the job points were attributed back to the adviser were, therefore, being tested, to ensure advisers were incentivised to refer clients to PSL Action Teams.

\(^9\) Although this had in fact already happened. See footnote 8.
For all teams, the bulk of Action Team spending went on staff costs, followed by costs relating to premises, and then direct assistance for clients. Teams all felt that the flexibility around how the funding could be used was very important, so that, for example, under-spends on premises could be used for additional salaries. The flexibility within the pot for direct assistance for clients was also very important, enabling teams to spend more on a client who needs more expensive help such as training, and less on others who need less costly financial support such as interview clothes. In a couple of teams it was mentioned that advisers were always aware of exactly how much remained in the client assistance pot to enable them to make decisions on how to spend the money.

Some teams had gained additional funding from local authorities or local community partnerships.

3.4 Chapter summary: operational background of Action Teams

The flexibility given to teams in Phase 3 to broaden the areas covered by the Action Team was seen as a positive change by all of the case study areas. Many respondents cited previous problems where the service was restricted to certain wards and clients had to be turned away, for example, for living on the wrong side of the street. As well as enabling teams to reach more beneficiaries, this had also been a popular move with partners, as it meant that partners whose services were delivered in broader areas could now refer any of their clients to the team. Broadening the areas covered by the Action Team also allowed teams to reach more rural areas that were part of the district, or areas that had little welfare-to-work provision other than mainstream services.

The skills and qualities of staff were seen to be much more important than the background they came from. It was emphasised that having a team with a wide skills mix was helpful. Budgetary constraints following the 2004 Spending Review settlement for DWP, and uncertainty over the future of Action Teams, were raised by Jobcentre Plus teams as having an impact on the staffing of Action Teams, with staff leaving in some cases. A restriction on Jobcentre Plus headcount meant that some Jobcentre Plus teams were using secondees. There were some examples of particularly good practice in terms of staffing. One team had a majority of advisers qualified to NVQ3 in Advice and Guidance, and others had placed strong emphasis on training and mentoring staff, as well as on in-house quality assurance processes. In one PSL and one Jobcentre Plus team, the original team had been replaced when the team had not met its performance targets.
The main advantage of outcome-related funding for PSL teams was seen to be the clear focus on moving clients into employment rather than focusing on soft outcomes. Conversely, the main disadvantage was felt to be that it incentivised working with easier-to-help clients, as there was no incentive to help those with multiple barriers closer to employment. In terms of the Action Team funding system as a whole, the main advantage seen by Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams was the flexibility, enabling teams to respond to client needs and to prioritise resources effectively for their local area. The main disadvantage cited by Jobcentre Plus teams was the lack of ring-fencing for Action Team funding. Some districts chose to prioritise areas other than Action Teams. The main disadvantage of the funding system cited by PSL teams was the lack of funding for ‘distance travelled’. When teams were asked what aspect of the programme could be reduced with least effect on outcomes, Jobcentre Plus teams cited IT and premises, whilst PSL teams suggested a reduction in paperwork requirements.
4 Reaching target groups

This chapter looks at Action Teams’ target groups and how they reach them. It firstly examines the groups targeted by Action Teams, and then goes on to look at how teams reach their groups through outreach and marketing.

4.1 Target groups

4.1.1 Policy and operational background

In Phase 1 of Action Teams, teams could choose which customers they worked with and in Phase 2 the target group was more tightly defined: as workless individuals living in the selected wards who have one or more of the following disadvantages:

- ex-regulars in Her Majesty’s Forces;
- people with health problems;
- ex-offenders;
- those with serious drug or alcohol problems;
- those lacking basic skills;
- lone parents;
- rough sleepers, including hostel and foyer sleepers;
- those whose first language is not English;
- refugees;
- people with a disability;
- people who have left local authority care homes within the last three years;
- people who have completed Employment Zone (EZ) or New Deal for 25 Plus (ND25+) and face the prospect of returning to benefit;
- the over 50s;
• ethnic minorities;
• those jobless for more than 12 months.

Teams could choose which groups to target within the list of 15, reflecting the characteristics of their selected wards. These more focused lists are set out in their delivery plans.

The policy intent of Action Teams is that teams should not help clients that mainstream services can assist, so that Action Teams supplement and complement mainstream services rather than replace them.

4.1.2 Evidence from the Management Information

In year one of Phase 3 (April 2004 to March 2005), the Action Teams throughout the United Kingdom had contact with over 88,000 clients, over 23,500 of which were through PSL teams, and over 65,300 with Jobcentre Plus led teams. The Management Information (MI) shows that these clients were from a wide range of backgrounds and target groups, and included clients of a range of ages, ethnicities, people claiming a variety of benefits and also people not claiming benefits, but nevertheless out of work.

The demographics of the clients that each of the six case study Action Teams worked with show very different patterns. This may be expected as diversity in the make-up of the local labour market across the studies was one aspect of how they were selected. For example, in Team E (Jobcentre Plus) nearly all their clients described themselves as ‘White’, whereas in Team D (Jobcentre Plus), fewer than one in five of their clients described themselves as ‘White’.

At least to some extent, the breakdown of client characteristics will be reflective of the demographics of the local labour market in which the Action Teams were operating. Although, in some instances, specific groups may have been specifically targeted and hence, make up a larger proportion of contacts than might be expected. For example, Team A (PSL) worked with a high proportion of young people, with just under one in three of their contacts with people aged 16 to 17. This team had actively chosen to target this group as they were a key disadvantaged group in the target wards. This compares to one in ten clients worked with across all the Action Teams being aged 16 to 17.

As a proportion of all contacts, 34 per cent of clients that the PSL teams had contact with were claiming Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA). Whereas, as a proportion of all client contact the Jobcentre Plus led teams worked with 26 per cent of JSA claimants. The balance of contact between JSA and non-JSA claimants is important because of the requirement to have no more than 30 per cent of all job entries as JSA claimants.

Overall, the Jobcentre Plus led teams had proportionately more clients who had been out of work for over three years, with 25 per cent of all contacts falling into this
group. This compares with 17 per cent of PSL teams’ contacts. Conversely, the PSL teams had worked with a greater proportion of clients that had been unemployed for less than six months, 49 per cent of contacts, compared to 41 per cent of Jobcentre Plus teams’ contacts.

The Jobcentre Plus teams also had proportionately more contact with clients with two or more of the target characteristics, such as people with health problems, ex-armed forces and lone parents. Sixty-three per cent of Jobcentre Plus clients had two or more of the identified characteristics, which compares to only 45 per cent of PSL teams’ clients. This, in combination with the MI for duration of joblessness, perhaps indicates that Jobcentre Plus led teams were able to attract and work with proportionately more clients from traditionally ‘harder to reach’ groups.

More specifically, the Jobcentre Plus Action Teams were proportionately more likely to have had contact with clients with health problems or those who were lone parents than the PSL teams. As each of these is a client group that has specific programmes and advisers within Jobcentre Plus mainstream, the relationships and volume of referrals from mainstream to the Action Teams are likely to be key in facilitating working with these key groups. However, a crucial part of the role of Action Teams is in reaching these clients through outreach, rather than just relying on referrals from Jobcentre Plus mainstream.

For the financial year 2004-05, data on the number of contacts and job entries was available on a month-by-month basis. Figure 4.1 shows that there is a seasonality to the volume of contacts and also to the number of clients that are placed in work throughout the year. December and March seem to be times when the number of contacts falls significantly, as does the number of job entries. In 2005, the Christmas and Easter holidays fell in December and March respectively. The seasonality of the volume of business was also mentioned by interviewees in the case studies, and as one explained, it is dependent, to some extent, on the school holidays.

The seasonality of outcomes may present particular difficulties for the PSL teams which are paid a proportion of their income on the basis of the job entries achieved. Therefore, if in some months the number of job placements is significantly lower than in others, and where there are fixed monthly costs and outgoings, such as staff salaries, then this may have encouraged ‘quick wins’ and placing clients who are closest to the labour market into work in order to ensure revenue. It perhaps also meant that it was important to plan and manage cash-flow over the year.
4.1.3 Evidence from the case studies

The list of 15 disadvantaged customer groups which was introduced in Phase 2 of Action Teams, had no impact on the teams in the case studies as it covered the groups they were working with previously (ie long-term unemployed, ethnic minorities, ex-offenders and young people) and let them continue to focus on the priority groups specific to their area. However, due to a change in strategic direction there is now much more of a focus (for all Action Teams) on clients that are currently in receipt of inactive benefits or no benefits.

All teams have similar target groups, although both of the PSL teams refer the majority of lone parents on to their local EZ which has more money per lone parent to spend than Action Teams. One PSL team mentioned that as they hold the contract for both the Action Team and the EZ, they can make the decision as to whether the customers should be referred onto the EZ or remain with the Action Team. This is usually based on whether the lone parent would be comfortable with a more intensive, structured approach, in which case they are referred to the EZ, or whether they may need less intensive and longer-term help, in which case they may remain with the Action Team.
4.2 Outreach

4.2.1 Evidence from the case studies

As most of the Action Team target groups may not be used to using Jobcentres or may have negative perceptions about them, most teams stressed the importance of being separate from the Jobcentre Plus office, and nearly all were located in outreach sites in the wards or/and with a mobile unit that visited local targeted sites.

‘We do think we are there to go out into the community and tackle their barriers to employment and for some people their barrier is actually walking through the door of a jobcentre.’

(Action Team Adviser, Jobcentre Plus team)

Outreach centres and sites had been set up in a variety of locations and most teams use a mixture of outreach provision:

- Most teams are co-located with other organisations who provide services/advice for their target groups – in a Jobcentre Plus large city team all outreach advisers are co-located with other organisations, eg with a learndirect centre, with housing officers, health officers, Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) or other community groups.

- Some teams, in more rural areas or areas with poor transport links, are located in (or have additional) mobile outreach centres which cover more remote areas or harder to reach groups.

- Other teams, particularly those with no fixed outreach premises, conduct sessional outreach/surgeries in community centres, with partners or local Jobcentre Plus.

- Both PSL teams are situated in a lone outreach base located centrally, in a particular ward or city centre. These teams take part in sessional outreach with partners (which includes jointly running ‘breakfast clubs’ or ‘job clubs’) and Jobcentre Plus. They also go out to local events (job fairs etc.).

Two Jobcentre Plus teams had their management and administration team located at their local jobcentre to ‘save costs’ but emphasised that they never see their customers there. One Jobcentre Plus inner city team is presently located in Jobcentre Plus premises (although they do conduct sessional outreach in other community locations). They did conduct outreach in all their wards (they had their own shop and co-located with partners) but were called back to the Jobcentre to help with the Jobcentre Plus rollout. Now all team advisers are based at the Jobcentre Plus office and customers come into the jobcentre to see them. This is a temporary situation and they hope to get back out into the community soon. They do not think that being in the Jobcentre has caused any problems; they think their profile is good enough to encourage people to come in.

Most Action Team Advisers conducted outreach (ie they were either based in an outreach site or conducted sessional outreach), although one PSL Action Team found that their advisers did not really have the time both to maintain an active
presence in the community and manage their caseloads. To overcome this they started to use ‘engagement consultants’ to conduct their outreach work. The engagement consultants provided a more consistent presence in the community and would refer clients on to the advisers for more intensive help and guidance.

4.2.2 Effectiveness of outreach

All teams felt that their outreach work had been very effective in terms of reaching their target groups and making links with partners. In particular, teams that had the use of a mobile unit felt this had worked extremely well in reaching customers in more rural areas and in promoting the Action Team itself (by taking it along to events or by using it to signpost outreach sites).

Nearly all teams felt that outreach had taken time to ‘bed in’ and stressed the importance of researching the area well before deciding where to be located. One Jobcentre Plus team, who were setting up outreach in an area with a high minority ethnic population, consulted with elders from one of the local temples, which proved to be very beneficial. For example, they were informed that if they had a single Asian female member of staff in the shop, Asian males would not be able to visit the site:

‘This we hadn’t thought about. I mean, obviously, we thought of the language, and would have put in someone who could speak the right language but we had not thought about gender.’

(Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)

Other issues raised in relation to outreach included:

• Location: outreach should be somewhere easily accessible with a lot of passing footfall and in a non-threatening/intimidating environment.

‘People feel more comfortable coming into a local centre rather than the Jobcentre, especially one as well run as this one. They’re more comfortable in this environment.’

(Action Team Adviser, Jobcentre Plus team)

• Timing of sessional outreach: It was suggested that it was not a good idea to do outreach sessions in the morning as customers are ‘not always up at that time’.

• Co-locating with other organisations who provide support and advice for the target groups was seen as key, as: running costs can be shared; health and safety aspects can be taken into account (ie having more than one person on site at a time); and cross referrals can be made.

• It was seen as important not to have too many outreach sites as it wastes resources and leaves clients confused as to where to go for help.
4.2.3 Outreach constraints

Although all teams felt that their outreach had been very effective, most of them had experienced either initial set-up problems or other constraints:

- IT connections and connections with Labour Market System (LMS)\(^{10}\): one Jobcentre Plus team mentioned that IT equipment and telephone lines needed to be in place and working properly for outreach to work effectively. They initially had to work from mobiles which meant slow connections to LMS or no connection at all: ‘because we have to rely on these laptops working through a mobile ‘phone, they haven’t always got a signal for Orange in that area’ (Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus). This has since been sorted out, and most advisers now have broadband access.

- IT hardware: one Jobcentre Plus team mentioned that their reconditioned laptops constantly needed servicing or repairs. This was a problem, as the adviser had to bring the laptop into the Jobcentre Plus to be repaired, which meant they were unable to conduct any outreach for a couple of days.

  ‘If an adviser hasn’t got use of the laptop for two or three days that’s no customers for two or three days. That’s no contact for two or three days. That’s an adviser having to bring their laptop in here, because engineers won’t visit them on outreach sites either, so they have to bring them in here, and the engineer gets it fixed within the Jobcentre.’

  (Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)

- IT health and safety: one Jobcentre Plus team manager mentioned that laptops were very uncomfortable when used for long periods of time (such as outreach). They tried to get laptops with either docking stations or a separate mouse and keyboard to make them more comfortable for their advisers but to no avail. They felt this was because their supplier did not really know what they needed the equipment for.

  ‘Perhaps not knowing the business fully and when these contracts are agreed at head office level, they don’t really fully understand their Action Team.’

  (Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)

- Availability of IT resources: advisers from one PSL team mentioned that they do not have access to their own computer system when they are conducting sessional outreach at Jobcentre Plus (they do not have their own laptops). This meant they had to come back to the office and log information retrospectively, which in turn, increased their workload.

- Unsuitable premises: a couple of Jobcentre Plus Action Team staff mentioned that some of their outreach sites were not ideal, but it was the only place they could find in that particular area. The sites were located in areas that were off-putting and intimidating (eg in a ‘rough’ part of the neighbourhood).

\(^{10}\) Jobcentre Plus’ computer system.
• Jobcentre Plus premises off-putting: in relation to the point above, a PSL adviser who conducted sessional outreach from a local Jobcentre Plus office, felt that it could be hard meeting clients at Jobcentres because the location was off-putting for her clients.

‘…a lot of the clients don’t like going to the jobcentres because they intimidate them and it’s a big barrier to get them through there. It is a big factor, you have to find somewhere they’re quite happy to go to.’

(Action Team Adviser, PSL team)

• Lack of parking space for mobile unit: one Jobcentre Plus team has had problems finding the right place to park their mobile unit. Parking outside shops can upset shop owners as the unit is quite large:

‘…we were getting a bit of animosity from some of the residents on the shop fronts where we parked and because it’s a large unit we do need quite a bit of space and I think they find we’re encroaching a lot of their customers’ parking space. It has happened on a couple of occasions where we’ve been asked to move on because we’ve taken up too much space. The shopkeepers seem to get on their high horse as if we’re encroaching on their trade.’

(Action Team Adviser, Jobcentre Plus team)

• Staff resources: most teams have experienced problems with not having enough staff to cover outreach slots in the event of any absence. This is also the case for those Jobcentre Plus teams with mobile units. One adviser from a Jobcentre Plus team reported that their mobile unit needs two drivers at all times (they only have three in total) so if more than one driver is off ill or on holiday they cannot go out on their allocated slots.

4.3 Marketing

4.3.1 Evidence from the case studies

All teams pursued a range of marketing measures to engage target clients. Most Jobcentre Plus teams had an adviser who took on the marketing responsibilities for the whole area or advisers who look after certain areas. One Jobcentre Plus Action Team had a dedicated full-time marketing officer. The marketing for both of the PSL teams was undertaken by a central marketing team for their particular company.

Main marketing activities for all teams included the following:

• handing out a variety of marketing materials such as pens, key rings, t-shirts, mugs, wallets, beer mats and even teddy bears, each with their own distinctive logo on;

• mail-shots: these worked well when IB clients were targeted and then mail-shots were followed-up with a telephone call;
• leaflet drops: including targeted club-culture style flyers for young people; leaflet drops to whole estates; leaflet drops at schools and community centres;
• visiting local supermarkets;
• sponsorship: local football teams, local schools, etc;
• events with partners: a PSL Action Team put on an event last year to celebrate getting their thousandth client into work; had awards for clients and invited partners and the local MP. Another PSL Action Team held a balloon launch to celebrate the organisation, as a whole, getting 2,500 clients into work in that area;
• events such as bingo night and stalls at road shows and job fairs;
• coffee mornings;
• adverts in the local media – success stories;
• adverts in school newsletters and local council community newsletters;
• adverts on local buses;
• local radio shows and adverts;
• charity events – marathon;
• specific customer events such as lone-parent ‘pamper’ events with entertainment for children;
• Christmas cards designed by local children. One Jobcentre Plus Action Team asks their local primary school children to design the Action Team Christmas card for them. The children are given prizes and their design is put in print.

4.3.2 Branding
Branding was considered ‘very important’ by all respondents and most of the teams distanced themselves from Jobcentre Plus and used their own distinctive branding. Again, negative perceptions held by the customer group about Jobcentre Plus were given as the reason behind this. Jobcentre Plus teams had either tried not to emphasise the Jobcentre Plus logo, where possible, or would make sure that they explained to the customer the key differences between themselves and Jobcentre Plus:

‘We do tell people we are part of the jobcentre but stress that we are a special project. We explain we’re voluntary and not interested in making you go for something you don’t want. It’s the softly, softly approach with us.’

(Team Leader, Jobcentre Plus team)

PSL teams were in a better position to distance themselves from Jobcentre Plus and they reported that they made sure they did so:
We are always branded as [organisation name], we don’t want anything to do with the Jobcentre.’

(Operations Manager, PSL team)

4.3.3 Effectiveness of marketing

Nearly all of the teams reported that the marketing they had undertaken had worked well, although it had taken a fair amount of time to build up a presence. By far the most effective form of marketing cited was ‘word-of-mouth’. All respondents felt that a personal recommendation by a friend or family member was key to a customer using their service.

Most of the Action Teams had made changes to their marketing strategies over time, which had greatly improved their customer take-up. They had found that marketing needed to:

- use language that target-groups would understand, ie clients may not categorise themselves as an ‘ex-offender’ or ‘on incapacity benefits’. One Action Team adviser felt that questions were better rephrased as ‘have you spent time in prison?’ or ‘do you have a health problem?’;

- have a more customer/area targeted approach – to promote individual outreach sites rather than the Action Team as a whole. A Jobcentre Plus Action Team with many outreach premises used to market the whole team and mention all the wards and sites in one leaflet. This led to confusion amongst the customer groups who did not know which site to visit. They now promote individual outreach sites which includes a picture of the adviser working at that site, which ‘works well’. In addition, a PSL Action Team (who also runs the local EZ) initially conducted broad marketing to attract clients for a range of contracts and at the time of the interview were changing their marketing materials to focus more on Action Team target customer groups;

- better plan the timing of events, ie not to hold lone parent events in the evening or over the summer holidays when childcare issues mean that they may be unable to attend;

- advertise ‘success stories’ rather than just place adverts as people are better able to relate to success stories.

‘We do more success stories now. We always used to say this is the Action Team, aren’t we lovely, with lots of stars on, but now it’s: “Would you like to be the next Action Team success?”’. Usually we try and encourage customers as well, who have got a success story that’s a little bit different, where they seem to have the most barriers, but also where they’re willing to have a photo taken. Which is a bit difficult. If you think about our customers, we’re saying that they live in the worst wards, they’ve got more barriers than most. But you’d be surprised how many we do.’

(Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)
4.4 Chapter summary: reaching target groups

Action Teams work with a range of disadvantaged groups in selected wards. Although, to some extent, the type of client they work with is down to the demographics of the local labour market in which they operate, some specific groups have been actively targeted. Overall, it appears that Jobcentre Plus teams work with clients from more traditionally ‘harder-to-reach’ groups than PSL teams. Jobcentre Plus teams were more likely to have had contact with lone parents or clients with health problems than PSL teams. Conversely, PSL teams have more contact with clients on JSA as compared to Jobcentre Plus teams.

Particular target groups may not readily use mainstream services either because they are not eligible for benefits or because they are intimidated by, or have negative perceptions of, Jobcentre Plus. For these reasons, all teams (in the case studies) highlighted the importance of being located away from the Jobcentre Plus and in the local community. Outreach centres had been set up in a variety of locations and most teams used a mixture of outreach provision. All teams felt that outreach had been very effective in reaching their target groups and making links with partners. Teams stressed that outreach takes time to ‘bed-in’ and to become known and trusted in the community, and highlighted the importance of researching the area well before deciding where to be located. Most teams raised a number of issues concerning outreach such as: problems with IT connections, resources and hardware, unsuitable outreach premises, lack of parking space for mobile unit and staff resources.

Teams undertake a wide range of marketing measures to engage their target clients and most of the teams were keen to use their own distinctive branding to distance themselves from Jobcentre Plus (because of customers’ negative perceptions of mainstream services). Teams felt that the marketing they had used had worked well, although most had made changes to their marketing strategies over time. All Action Teams felt that by far the most effective form of marketing was word-of-mouth, which built up over time.
5 Activities and support provided

This chapter explores the activities and support provided by Action Teams. It looks at what type of general support is provided, moves on to look at what type of in-work support teams offer and finishes by considering the types of projects funded through the Employment Projects Fund (EPF) and Transport Projects Fund (TPF).

5.1 Policy and operational background

Where Action Teams work with mainstream Jobcentre Plus services they have to be additional to, rather than replicating, them. For example, providing extra funding for individuals before their first pay cheque, or addressing barriers that are not addressed locally through mainstream services (eg debt counselling, or specialist training that leads to a job).

5.2 General support provided

5.2.1 Evidence from the case studies

All teams stressed the importance of providing flexible and individually tailored support for their customers, who may have a wide variety of problems, and offered a range of different activities/support to do so. The main types of support provided includes the following:

- Moving people towards work:
  - confidence building/motivational training/guidance support/in-house training and workshops;
  - refer to other providers for specialist advice, eg drug rehab.
• Finding clients jobs:
  – job search – CVs, speculative letters;
  – provide job matching/job search assistance;
  – arrange practical work experience.

• Financial assistance to find work:
  – support with travel costs;
  – support with childcare provision;
  – daily travel cards to attend job interviews;
  – support grant to pay for work clothing, tools to enter employment, certification for particular jobs, etc.

• Financial assistance upon entering employment:
  – shopping vouchers;
  – travel passes for buses or trains;
  – in-work grant;
  – continuing to pay benefits for all customer groups until they receive their first pay cheque;
  – job retention grant, payable after 13 weeks’ employment.

In addition, both of the Private Sector Led (PSL) teams offered specialist in-house training and courses. One PSL team offered a one-week course to help with self-confidence and motivation building. During this time, the team brought in a specialist to hold a session on interview techniques and at the end of the course, clients took part in mock interviews with advisers which were recorded onto video. The client then watched the video with their adviser to find out what went well and what did not. The PSL team also offered a follow-on course where local employers were invited in to explain what they were looking for and the vacancies they have. The other PSL team offered an in-house package which provided their clients with confidence building tips and interview techniques.

Both of the PSL teams examined for this report also offered specialist support to local employers in terms of employee pre-screening. Companies could refer people who enquire about vacancies to the team who, in turn, would vet the person for them. This had been ‘working quite well’:

‘It has proved very beneficial…we tell employers that we can offer them a free service that they don’t get from high street recruitment agencies and a screening service, so we’re not going to offer them any old Tom, Dick and Harry, we’re going to make sure they’re the right people for the job, which builds the employer’s confidence and makes sure that they keep coming back to us.’

(Team Leader, PSL team)
They also offered bespoke training to some employers. For example, one PSL team offered a ‘call-centre course’ in partnership with another organisation. It took place over three days, and participants visited three different types of call-centre, did role-plays, and had tests.

Most teams ran a type of ‘job club’ with their clients. In particular, one of the Jobcentre Plus teams ran an employability workshop with Connexions which offers 16 and 17 year olds (in their target areas) a chance to take part in a type of job club where they can get help with CVs, interview techniques, etc. They are also given a free job-hunting pack (from the Action Team) which includes ten first class stamps, writing paper, envelopes, a pen, CV hints, Jobcentre CV hints flyer, local AT site leaflet and a free monthly bus pass. They can also take part in mock interviews. It proved to be very popular with the customers and had received favourable coverage in the local press.

5.3 In-work support

5.3.1 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked how important they thought a number of features of Action Team provision had proved in promoting sustainability of job outcomes. The results are shown in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Sustainability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for travel-to-work costs</th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus 4.7</th>
<th>PSL 4.4</th>
<th>All 4.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality job-matching skills by advisers, ie right person/job match</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help/advice/support in identifying and applying for appropriate in-work benefits</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing customer access to personal adviser for ongoing in-work support, advice, etc.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/support for childcare (or other caring) costs</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate and comprehensive ‘better-off’ calculations prior to job entry</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers able to guide customers towards better quality jobs and away from temporary/casual vacancies</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers maintaining liaison with employer to offer support mediation, advice, etc.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Respondents were asked to score sustainability from 1 to 5 (with 5 denoting very important-successful).

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.
In promoting retention and progression in employment, the most important facets of the Teams’ work were ‘support for travel-to-work costs’ and ‘high quality job-matching skills by advisers’ (scored by respondents overall as 4.6 and 4.5 respectively). Although there was a fairly positive overall score of 4.4 with regard to the importance of ‘help, advice, and support in identifying and applying for appropriate in-work benefits’, in promoting sustainability of outcomes, it was scored as 4.6 by respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams, compared to only 3.9 by respondents from PSL teams. The view on the importance of ‘accurate and comprehensive ‘better-off’ calculations prior to job entry’ also differed between Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams, with respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams scoring it as 4.3, compared to PSL teams (score of 3.7) who do not usually offer these services. Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams also differed in their views about the importance of advice and support for childcare in securing job outcome sustainability, scoring it as 4.5 and 4.0 respectively.

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were also asked to describe whether there were activities or provision they would like to have implemented, done more of, or done differently, to secure improved sustainability of employment. Amongst Jobcentre Plus respondents, the most commonly cited activity that teams would like to have done more of, was to have implemented a dedicated in-work support service for Action Team clients. This service could help sort out any problems encountered when clients first start work and be proactively offered to all clients rather than just those who contact the Action Team for in-work support. Respondents highlighted how, at the time of interviewing, advisers were dealing with other clients to help them find work so did not always have the time, and they had not had the resources to offer a comprehensive in-work support service. It was suggested that teams could have a Job Retention Officer to visit individuals in their place of work on a regular basis during the first 13 weeks of employment.

There were a number of suggestions made by respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams of more support that could be provided to individuals to help increase sustainability. Teams would have liked to have more funding for training provision, citing the following as examples: HGV license training, driving lessons, asbestos stripping training, and skills for life training including confidence building. It was also suggested that it would be useful to be able to use temporary work as a route to increase employability and retention in the longer-term, and that clients should get retention payments or an in-work grant that was spread over time to encourage retention. The ability to help clients to move into a better job after their first job and to start to develop a career was also suggested as something that would improve retention and prevent clients dropping back out of the labour market if they encountered problems or became dissatisfied with their first job.

Respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams also suggested more that could be done with employers to help improve sustainability. They felt that employers would benefit from advice on employing people with barriers such as drugs and offending, and that more support could be given to employers who took on Action Team clients, particularly with workforce development issues, so that ongoing training
needs in the first few weeks of employment could be addressed. It was also felt that a more in-depth analysis of sustainability trends and data, as well as a greater emphasis upon the sustainability target would improve retention rates.

Respondents from PSL teams felt that pre-employment support, in-work support and work with employers could improve sustainability. In terms of pre-employment support, it was suggested that more customised training and motivational seminars could be provided to groups of clients. For example, it was suggested that a week-long job preparation and confidence building course would help clients have more realistic expectations of the workplace when they start work, which would, therefore, help them take up and stay in appropriate employment. High quality better-off calculations were also felt to be necessary, particularly when dealing with the complexities of the benefit system in relation to Incapacity Benefit (IB) clients, as well as closer working with the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) to ensure Action Teams have fast-track access to their services so that they can get assistance with debt and housing issues.

The additional in-work support that PSL teams felt was necessary included being able to provide more financial support for the costs incurred during the first month of employment, including travel and childcare costs; and being able to give a more personalised support service to clients once they enter employment, including visiting them at their place of work during the first 13 weeks of employment. Additional work with employers was also felt to be necessary to improve sustainability. This included having work trials available for all Action Team clients, and more direct links with employers who offer training opportunities for young people. One team suggested that this was particularly important for young males who they felt experienced the most difficulty in securing suitable employment. Teams also felt that they needed more time for the development of employer relationships.

5.3.2 Evidence from the case studies

Whether or not teams offered in-work support to their client varied. Most of the case study Jobcentre Plus teams did not offer any formal in-work support, but mentioned that informally, the customer would sometimes ‘pop in’ and tell them how it was going or they would occasionally bump into them in the street. Respondents felt that they really did not have the time or resources to keep in touch with clients.

PSL teams appeared to offer more formal in-work support. Respondents reported that they had regularly kept in touch with their client once they had started work (via email, telephone or text message) to ensure they satisfied their 13 week retention target:

“We try to make sure the job we’ve found them or that they’ve found is going to last, in fact our employers sign a form that says we are expecting the job to last at least 13 weeks, but our members can decide not to go or stop going so we provide in-work support to make sure they are going along and see if they need any help.’

(Action Team Leader, PSL team)
One PSL team conducted aftercare calls through their dedicated telephone line (open 8am to 8pm Monday to Friday). Customers were introduced to the telephone line once they started their new job. The telephone-line staff then telephoned, wrote, texted or emailed the client every fortnight, once they started work, and asked them about tax credits, Housing Benefit and other things clients may have been worrying about. The clients themselves could call free with any problems. They found that this had worked well although there were some clients who wanted to disassociate themselves from the Action Team once they were in work.

5.4 Projects funded through Employment Projects Fund and Transport Projects Fund

5.4.1 Policy and operational background

In Phase 2 of Action Teams, the EPF and TPF were introduced (in 2001-02) to reflect the fact that teams still needed to be able to do one-off projects as they had done in Phase 1 when funding had been more flexible. These funds provided the opportunity for Action Teams to support, co-fund or ‘pump-prime’ (start up or enhance) initiatives that would have direct or indirect employment-raising effects for the wider community. Spend to date for the EPF is around £4 million and around £2.2 million for the TPF. Projects of over £250,000 are not usually funded, and teams were more likely to be successful in their bids where partners were involved, where they had matched funding, and where they had a positive exit strategy where partners (for example, a bus company in a TPF project) could continue the project after EPF/TPF funding ends. Funding pressures within Jobcentre Plus resulted in the withdrawal of the EPF/TPF funds and Jobcentre Plus stopped taking bids for projects in the spring of 2005; existing contracts will continue to be funded until March 2006.

5.4.2 Evidence from the case studies

Whether teams had sought additional funding through the EPF and the TPF varied depending on their area and when the Action Team was set up. A Jobcentre Plus inner city team said they had not bid for any funding because they had not needed to do so, as their area received funding for many different projects and initiatives. The new Action Team had not bid for any funding as they were too busy setting up and had not had time until the funding for that year was no longer available. One PSL team had bid for EPF only once – to pump-prime a local ‘after school club’ – and had not needed to use it since. The rest of the teams had bid and been successful in receiving EPF and TPF. Examples of recent EPF/TPF funding included:

- refitting/refurbishment of a local training centre to provide training for all local residents in the community;
- supporting local community centres such as homeless centres and local neighbourhood nurseries;
• the opening of an Internet café at a local school;
• the opening of an employment suite in a women’s refuge to help women who are fleeing domestic violence find employment, get support with careers advice and take part in courses to improve self-esteem, etc;
• part-funding other workers to offer specialist advice to customers. For example, a team in a semi-urban area have part-funded work with an occupational therapist in a health centre to work with people claiming IB;
• supporting a local housing association by providing funding so they can run an ‘employment ladder’ training project that helps local people build housing association homes.

Benefits
All respondents who had received money from the funds reported that it had been useful and had impacted on their area in a variety of ways:
• brings money into the area and helps the communities develop local services:
  ‘We’re in a building we may not have if it hadn’t been for their [the Action Team’s] willingness to work with us to help source some money.’
  (EPF Partner, PSL Action Team)
• produces sustainable employment;
• helps forge relationships with partners;
• improves reputation of Jobcentre Plus (for Jobcentre Plus Action Teams) with partners and community as a whole;
• markets the Action Team brand effectively and gets them known in the area;
• leaves a ‘lasting community legacy’ (Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team).

Constraints
Although all Action Teams were pleased with the extra funding and the benefits it brought to their area, one or two Action Teams mentioned that it had been a time-consuming process and had experienced problems with the process of turning the successful EPF application into an EPF contract:

  ‘There hasn’t been a problem with the bidding process, the form itself was fine, the panel process was fine. It’s when you try to turn it from a concept into reality and you hit the governance and procurement issues that it becomes a nightmare, it’s too long.’
  (Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)
5.5 Chapter summary: activities and support provided

All Action Teams offered a range of flexible and individually tailored support/activities to help clients overcome their many and varied barriers. Examples of support included: confidence building, finding jobs, financial assistance to find work, and financial assistance upon entering employment. PSL teams also offered specialist in-house courses and support to local employers in terms of employee pre-screening, and bespoke training. PSL teams were more likely to have offered formal in-work support.

All Action Teams felt that ‘support-for-travel-to-work costs’ and ‘high quality job matching skills by advisers’ were most important in promoting sustainability of job outcomes. Jobcentre Plus teams also felt that ‘help, advice, and support in identifying and applying for appropriate in-work benefits’ and ‘accurate and comprehensive ‘better-off’ calculations prior to job entry’ were key to promoting sustainability of job outcomes, as compared to PSL teams who do not usually offer these services. Jobcentre Plus teams would have liked more funding for training provision and more time to spend with employers to give them advice and support on employing people with barriers. PSL teams felt that more customised training/motivational courses and better-off calculations should be provided to customers to improve sustainability. PSL run teams also felt that more could be done in terms of financial support incurred during the first months of employment.

All teams had the option of bidding for additional funding through EPF/TPF and whether they had done so depended on the area they were in and when their particular team was set-up. All respondents felt that the funding had been very useful and had helped to develop communities and local services, to forge relationships with partners, to market the Action Team and to produce sustainable employment.
6 Relationships and partnership working

This chapter explores Action Teams working with partners and examines teams’ relationships with Jobcentre Plus mainstream, local employers and other partner organisations they used for specialist help. The chapter starts with evidence from the consultation exercise.

6.1 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, teams were asked about their views on partnership working and the importance of good working relationships. Respondents were initially asked how important Employment Projects Fund (EPF)/Transport Projects Fund (TPF) funding had been in helping Action Teams develop good relationships with partners. The results are shown in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1 Partnership working

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How important do you think EPF and/or TPF have been in helping Action Teams to develop good partnership/stakeholder relationships?</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of good relationship with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job brokers</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/substance councillors</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training course providers</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal for Communities</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal providers</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieved good relationship with:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Strategic Partnerships</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
All Teams reported that EPF/TPF funding had been important in helping them develop good relationships with partners, with an overall score of 4.0. As reported in the previous chapter, this may be because it enabled teams to bring money to the area and helped the local communities develop local services. There was, however, a marked difference between Jobcentre Plus and Private Sector Led (PSL) teams with the former scoring the importance of EPF/TPF funding at 4.3 and the latter at 2.8.

Teams were also asked to comment on the importance of good relationships with a range of partners, and whether they felt they had achieved good relationships with these partners. Overall, all teams felt that it was most important to have a good relationship with the Local Strategic Partnerships (an overall score of 4.4), with other important partners being job brokers, drug/substance counsellors and training course providers. There was a relative lack of importance placed on the relationships with New Deal providers. The scores of 3.1 and 3.2 given by Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams respectively for the importance of good relationships with New Deal providers are in contrast with the results for other partners, most of which score over 4.0.

Both Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams felt that they had achieved the best working relationship with Local Strategic Partnerships with scores of 4.4 for Jobcentre Plus teams and 4.1 for PSL teams. Whether they had achieved a good relationship seems to be related to the importance they place on needing a good relationship with a partner; with better relationships having been achieved with drug/substance counsellors, training providers and job brokers than with New Deal for Communities and New Deal providers.

6.2 Evidence from the case studies

6.2.1 Relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream

Relationships with Jobcentre Plus mainstream were regarded as very important by all Action Teams in terms of cross-referrals, although relationships varied significantly between teams. Both of the PSL teams reported initial difficulties in forming good relationships with the district manager and Jobcentre Plus offices, which one team
put down to conflicts with previous Action Team Managers and the fact that they were an external team, and the other team felt it was due to reorganisation within Jobcentre Plus. However, these teams did report that there had been recent signs of improvement. Relationships between Jobcentre Plus and Jobcentre Plus led Action Teams were much better, especially for those teams with long-running established managers who are well known in Jobcentre Plus. One Project Manager from a Jobcentre Plus team reported:

‘With me as Project Manager, having been around for quite a number of years I know all the players and they all know me – which helps.’

Most teams had also experienced initial teething problems with Jobcentre Plus mainstream, which seemed to have improved over time. Problems included:

- poor buy-in to the Action Team initiative;
- tainted relationship because of previous Action Team employee and over-promising:
  ‘The guy who did my job before me used to promise a lot and never deliver so when I started we had to overcome a lot of initial barriers.’
  (Operations Manager, PSL team)
- lack of understanding of role of Action Team by Jobcentre Plus staff:
  ‘Jobcentre Plus will say, “You’re due to start next week, do you want to pop down to the Action Team, they’ll get you a shirt or an outfit”. We are trying to get away from that mentality. Yes the money is there, but it’s your discretion as to whether or not that customer genuinely needs it.’
  (Adviser, Jobcentre Plus team)
  ‘Some advisers get hold of the wrong end of the stick of what we do.’
  (Team Leader, PSL team)
  ‘Jobcentre Plus mainstream still do not understand or appreciate what an Action Team is all about, the softer side to it.’
  (Action Team Adviser, Jobcentre Plus team)
- resentment about their ‘free/easy tie-less approach’: a district manager from an area with a PSL team felt that people and other organisations see Action Teams as being more flexible and less authoritarian compared to Jobcentre Plus:
  ‘Action Team staff are seen as good Samaritans, whereas, Jobcentre Plus staff are not.’
  (District Manager, PSL team)

The frequency of contact between Jobcentre Plus mainstream and Action Teams also varied between PSL and Jobcentre Plus led teams. The Jobcentre Plus service
delivery manager and the district manager in an area with a PSL Action Team both reported that they had a ‘hands-off’ relationship with the Action Team.

‘…we don’t have a lot of contact with external providers generally. We have more of a relationship (meetings etc.) with the PSL, who run the EZ, because we have a contract with them but we don’t have a contract with the PSL Action Team so we are more hands-off.’

(Jobcentre Plus service delivery manager, PSL team)

This may be because PSL Action Teams are managed centrally by the DWP, and, therefore, do not liaise with Jobcentre Plus districts or regions about contracting issues, unlike Jobcentre Plus teams. This is reflected in the finding that Jobcentre Plus mainstream had more of a ‘hands-on’ approach (ie regular meetings and contact) with Jobcentre Plus Action Teams who are managed by them.

There were a number of examples raised by respondents of ways to develop a good relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream:

- Run internal workshops or presentations to improve Jobcentre Plus’ understanding and awareness of Action Teams;
- make sure that district and senior management are behind the initiative to prioritise, resource and manage it effectively.
- make sure there is a clear distinction between Action Teams and Jobcentre Plus.

‘We are getting sucked into Jobcentre Plus, we are getting sucked in more and more into the Jobcentre Plus way of working, which Action Teams weren’t set out to do…they should have their own identity and this is slowly but surely being picked away at.’

(Adviser manager, Jobcentre Plus team)

- Make sure Jobcentre Plus advisers are credited with points to encourage referrals. One adviser from a PSL team felt that when teams get their job entry figures they should try to find out which clients the Jobcentre Plus referred and give points to that adviser.

6.2.2 Relationship with employers

Although some teams had undertaken marketing measures specifically for employers (such as sending out letters, mail-shots etc.), most had not really developed strong links with them. Some Jobcentre Plus teams only had contact with employers when they were placing their customers in vacancies, although one Jobcentre Plus team had made initial links with the Chamber of Commerce, and another had links with local supermarkets. Both PSL teams had very good local employer links and had either a specific dedicated team member (Account Manager) or employer consultants to manage the relationships. These Action Teams also offered local employers a fee-free service so they could use their team like a recruitment agency (see Section 1.5.1 for more details). The team would vet potential employees and only send the best
person to the employer. One PSL team also ran application workshops for certain employers where they work through (with the client) what the employer is looking for, go through the application form, discuss what the interview will involve, and what they should wear. The Team Manager felt that this worked for all concerned, the employer got the right person for the job and the Action Team got repeat business from the employer.

6.2.3 Relationships with other partners

All teams highlighted the importance of working with partners in the community and most reported that they had sought out partnerships for both strategic (e.g., cross-referrals) and problem-solving reasons (sharing premises etc.). Respondents cited a wide range of organisations they worked closely with including:

- local charities;
- local homeless and bail hostels;
- job-brokers;
- voluntary organisations;
- local housing providers/trusts;
- the local council;
- the careers service;
- health centres;
- faith projects;
- neighbourhood nurseries;
- the local college;
- Connexions.

All teams were also involved in some way with the Local Strategic Partnerships. Teams felt that this relationship had been key in giving them access to a wide range of partnership services and, for one large city Jobcentre Plus team, ensured it attracted external secondees as community-based advisers. In addition to this, many of the teams had set up a steering group/advisory body when they were first introduced with external agencies to help shape and inform them.

‘Any new Action Team must ensure it engages its Local Strategic Partnership, to ensure it works closely with partners to develop an initiative that meets the local agenda for helping workless people back into employment.’

(District Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)

Most partners had, therefore, come into contact with their local Action Team through existing local partnership groups and strategic committees. Partnerships were made with organisations that deliver similar, but slightly different, services to the teams’ target groups. All Action Team respondents highlighted the importance of making partnerships with organisations that reflected their target groups,
otherwise it would be a waste of time for all concerned. Partner organisations target groups included:

- young people;
- people with health conditions or disabilities;
- ex-offenders, ex-drug users;
- homeless people;
- lone parents;
- long-term unemployed.

Partners reported that they usually pass clients on to the Action Team when they are perceived to be job-ready. The Action Team then helps in a variety of ways including help with interview techniques, additional training, job search help and more flexible funding to help with travel and clothes for interviews. One partner also mentioned that their local Action Team had links and contacts with local employers that other providers/services may not have:

‘The Action Team also has access to some of the hidden jobs and apprenticeships through their knowledge of local employers that we wouldn’t necessarily see on the Jobcentre notice boards.’

(Partner, PSL Action Team)

Benefits of partnership working

All of the teams generally felt they had been successful in building good working relationships with partners and recognised the importance of partnership working. Respondents from one PSL run team felt that the Action Team would not have worked without partnerships. They saw partnership working as a ‘win-win’ situation. Similarly, partners also felt that the teams had been successful in building good working relationships. Most partners reported that they liked to work with their local Action Team because it is voluntary for their clients to take part and, more importantly for some clients, seen as separate from Jobcentre Plus and, therefore, not as intimidating. Main benefits were seen by all as:

- cross-referrals:

  ‘...because I travel all over the area I come across people who the Action Team have never worked with before, and likewise, they come across people who’ve never worked with myself. By introducing them to both organisations we can really help each other a lot.’

  (Partner, PSL Action Team)

- joint funding for projects/events;
- getting specialist help with particular issues (such as drug issues, etc.);
• a joined up service, which avoids duplication and makes it a simpler process for the client;
• knowledge of provision in the area;
• increases profile in the area;
• sharing and organising events;
• sharing outreach premises and, therefore, costs and health and safety issues;
• having the right people for the job. One Jobcentre Plus manager felt that secondee advisers from community organisations are beneficial because they bring different skills and experience and new ideas to the team.

**Issues raised around partnership working**

On the whole, most teams felt that there were no major problems with partnership working, although a couple of teams (one Jobcentre Plus and one PSL) mentioned that there had been initial teething problems. They felt that one or two organisations initially viewed them with suspicion: ‘they thought we were going to poach their clients’ (Action Team Manager, PSL Team). Indeed, one partner reported that:

> ‘We did have initial concerns about the AT [Action Team] at the beginning before we developed the relationship….we were worried that the AT were going to take over, that there was going to be overkill. People were concerned about whether there would still be a need for us.’

(Partner, PSL Action Team)

However, all parties involved felt that this type of concern was soon sorted out by regular meetings to overcome any misunderstandings and to explain, in more detail, the aim of Action Teams.

There was one issue particular only to the Scottish Action Team. Respondents mentioned that they have had issues with conflicting agendas, particularly with differences between Scottish Executive funded partners and UK central government funded partners. Having devolved responsibility can create problems when looking at deprivation, as areas are deprived in relation to Scotland, but not in national terms. It can also affect the areas within which partners operate which can cause confusion in the funding process.

An issue particular to one Jobcentre Plus team concerned secondee advisers. The Action Team Manager felt that it could sometimes be difficult sorting out staffing problems because the community organisation their advisers were seconded from had a different approach to staff and procedural issues.

> ‘There have been issues with individuals that, if they were Jobcentre Plus, I would have handled in a certain way, but because they are a secondee I can’t, I find it frustrating as they do things differently.’

(Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)
The manager also mentioned that partner organisations take longer to implement things, which again she finds difficult.

‘So there’s a way of dealing with the community groups and with the people within those community groups that you have to detach yourself from Jobcentre Plus a bit and deal with them a little bit differently. And it can, and has, caused us some issues while we’ve been waiting for things, you’re thinking how many times can I ask for this? Because we’ve still got a relationship here and I don’t want to upset that relationship. I really need what I need, but it’s not going to come at all if I now push too far.’

(Action Team Manager, Jobcentre Plus team)

More recent concerns were in relation to operational issues. One PSL team had stopped running a joint event (a type of job club) with Connexions because of the change to the 70:30 split. Because of the increase in the inactive client target, they no longer needed the volume of young people on Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA). They maintained a presence at the ‘job club’, but in more of a signposting role rather than a ‘hands-on’ role. Connexions were disappointed with this change as they felt that young people who are eligible for JSA may be the very ones who need support from the Action Team.

Effective partnership working

Both Action Team respondents and partners felt that a number of points needed to be taken into account to ensure an effective and long-lasting working relationship:

‘Evaluate which organisations to link up with to make sure both parties get something from the partnership. One Team Leader from a PSL team felt that some partners are in it “for their own ends”.’

‘...and if they’re not getting referrals or getting anything out of it for themselves then they don’t contact us or help us, but if they need help they’ll be straight on the ‘phone to us.’

(Team leader, PSL Action Team)

• Ensure regular contact/communication to ensure partners understand what the team does and to overcome any concerns. The Operations Manager from a PSL team felt that the key element to partnership working is regular contact and meetings. PSL run Action Teams either have a dedicated member of staff to look after their partners, or give each member of staff a certain number of partners to look after and to keep in contact with.

‘I would suggest that the communication’s key, team meetings and general involvement. I think we’re lucky with that, and there’s a good partnership with managers at the high level, so they’re involved too.’

(Partner, Jobcentre Plus Action Team)
‘I think relationships are good, they’re friendly which is good. That’s a bonus, not just professionally. We work well together. And the fact that we’ve also got it at the high level as well.’

(Partner, Jobcentre Plus Action Team)

- Make sure that you don’t over-promise, by being honest and up-front. Better to under-promise and over-deliver.

- Establish strong agreements and have a clear outline of responsibilities with partners so that both parties are clear. Know each other’s outcome targets so that you can help each other to achieve them.

‘I think it’s sitting down at the beginning and finding out what both parties need; it’s a two-way relationship. Getting it down on paper so everyone understands it.’

(Partner, Jobcentre Plus Action Team)

6.3 Chapter summary: relationships and partnership working

Action Teams, especially those from Jobcentre Plus teams, felt that EPF/TPF was important in helping them develop good relationships with partners. Teams also reported that it was very important to have good relationships with the Local Strategic Partnerships as it helped them form relationships with a range of local partners. Other important partners were seen as job brokers, drug/substance counsellors and training course providers. There was a relative lack of importance placed on the relationships with New Deal providers. Whether teams had achieved a good relationship with partners tended to be related to the importance they placed on needing a good relationship with them.

In the case studies, both Jobcentre Plus and PSL Action Teams stressed that good relationships with Jobcentre Plus mainstream were very important. The two PSL Teams reported initial difficulties with Jobcentre Plus. Although most Action Teams reported initial teething problems these had improved over time. Suggestions to improve relationships included: running workshops or presentations to improve Jobcentre Plus’ understanding of Action Teams, making sure there is a clear distinction between Action Teams and Jobcentre Plus and making sure Jobcentre Plus advisers are credited with points to encourage referrals.

Most Jobcentre Plus teams had less developed links with local employers. However, both PSL teams had very good employer links and either had a specific dedicated team member or employer consultants to manage the relationship. These teams offered local employers a fee-free service where they vet potential employees for them.

All teams in the case studies highlighted the importance of working with partners in the community and most cited a wide range of organisations they worked closely
with. Benefits of partnership working were seen (by both Action Teams and partners) as: cross referrals, joint funding, specialist help when needed, joined-up service, all round knowledge of provision in the area, sharing of premises and therefore, costs etc., increasing the Action Team profile in the area.

Action Team respondents and partners felt that to ensure an effective and long-lasting working relationship partners should: evaluate which organisations to link up with to make sure both parties get something from the partnership; ensure regular communication to help partners understand what the team does and to overcome any concerns; make sure not to over-promise, establish strong agreements and have a clear outline of responsibilities.
7 Effectiveness of Action Teams

This chapter examines the effectiveness of Action Teams. It begins by looking at the extent to which Action Teams have moved people into work. It then goes on to examine the successful features of Action Teams, the constraints that they face, and the lessons that have been learned by the Action Team experience. It finishes by examining overall views on Action Teams, and issues that the Action Team experience raises for future area-based initiatives.

7.1 Achieving job outcomes

7.1.1 Evidence from the Management Information

Data was available on the Action Teams performance for year one of Phase 3, i.e., April 2004 to March 2005 (see Table 7.1). The teams that formed the basis of the case studies included some that had exceeded the job entry target and others who did not reach it, and also some teams that achieved the 70:30 non-Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) split and others that did not. In year one of Phase 3, Action Teams, overall, over-achieved their targeted number of job entries by over ten per cent, and they also achieved the 70:30 split, with 74 per cent of job entries for non-JSA claimants. However, there are differences in the achievement of targets between the Private Sector Led (PSL) teams and Jobcentre Plus led teams. Overall, PSL teams did not meet their target number of job entries (achieving 78 per cent overall), and were just slightly under the 70:30 split, with 69 per cent of job entries for people not claiming JSA. Taken as a whole, the Jobcentre Plus led Action Teams over-achieved their job entry target by 40 per cent, and also achieved their 70:30 split, with 74 per cent of job entries for people not claiming JSA.
Table 7.1  Phase 3 performance: April 2004 to March 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Team</th>
<th>Percentage of total job entries achieved</th>
<th>Non-JSA job entries as a percentage of all job entries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Team A (PSL)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team B (PSL)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team C (Jobcentre Plus)</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team D (Jobcentre Plus)</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team E (Jobcentre Plus)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team F (Jobcentre Plus)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSL Total</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobcentre Plus Total</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All AT Total</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.

The following information and analysis presented in this section refers to aggregate data from year one of Phase 3 of Action Teams (April 2004 to March 2005). In this period, the Action Teams as a whole had helped over 27,000 clients into work. Just over 8,800 of these job entries were through PSL teams, and nearly 18,400 were via Jobcentre Plus led Action Teams.

A diverse range of clients were helped into work including people of a wide range of ages, ethnicities and with specific characteristics thought to disadvantage them in the labour market (see Tables D4.8 to D4.14 for further information). Evans and Harkness (2005) show that between 1999 and 2003 in areas where Action Teams operated, and also where they were in combination with New Deal for Communities or Employment Zone (EZ) area-based initiatives, there was a small fall in the employment penalty associated with living in deprived areas.11

There were significant differences between the profile of clients the six case study teams helped into work. For example, over one in four of job entries (26 per cent) in Team A (PSL) were among the 16 to 17 age group. This compares to just two per cent of job entries in this age group in Team C (Jobcentre Plus) – see Table D4.8 for more information. Overall, the PSL teams were more likely to have placed clients from ethnic minority backgrounds than Jobcentre Plus teams. This is likely to stem from the history of the PSL teams, which are based in EZ areas which have high levels of long-term unemployment and often have high ethnic minority populations. Therefore, it may be a reflection on the demographic make up of the population in these local labour markets.

---

Of the clients that Jobcentre Plus helped to find work, 24 per cent were claiming JSA, compared to 31 per cent of PSL led team’s clients (see Figure 7.1). The 70:30 split was not in place initially, but was brought in during April 2004, so given that this data runs from Phase 1, it will not be an accurate reflection of whether or not teams met their 70:30 target. Figure 8.1 also illustrates that when compared to PSL teams, Jobcentre Plus led teams secured job entries for a greater proportion of clients claiming Income support (IS) and Incapacity Benefit (IB), and were less likely to place clients into work who were not claiming any benefit.

**Figure 7.1  Job entries by benefit type (April 2004 to March 2005)**

Section 4.1 illustrated that compared to Jobcentre Plus led teams, the PSL teams tended to have proportionately more contact with people who had been out of work for a short period of time, and less with those who had been out of work for over three years. Figure 7.2 shows how this pattern also holds for the distribution of job entries between clients out of work for short and longer periods of time. Generally speaking, clients who have been out of work for a longer period of time are likely to face more difficulties returning to work than people who have only been out of work for a short duration. Therefore, shorter-term jobless clients are likely to be relatively easier and quicker to help place into work, and under the funding arrangements more ‘cost effective’ to work with, given that a flat rate of £2,000 was paid for each job entry, regardless of the nature of the client.
The difference in the way that payments were made between PSL and Jobcentre Plus teams, with the former being paid when a job entry had been made, and the latter getting an annual up-front payment, may have encouraged the PSL teams to work with clients closer to the labour market. For example, given set costs, such as staff salaries, PSL teams needed to ensure monthly income to meet those outgoings and therefore, perhaps, were encouraged to take a shorter-term perspective than their Jobcentre Plus colleagues who had payment for the year secured, meaning that it would not have been so critical when in the year their clients were able to progress into work. This may have been the same issue that influenced the extent of clients that PSL teams placed into work who had two or more of the Action Teams’ target disadvantages. Figure 7.3 shows that PSL teams were proportionately more likely to work with clients with just one of the Action Teams’ 15 target disadvantages, than Jobcentre Plus led teams.

The proportion of all contacts that the Action Teams helped to place in work by a range of variables has also been examined, and this will give some indication of the degree of equity in the Action Teams’ outcomes. For example, if the proportion of contacts with people from ethnic minority backgrounds was 20 per cent, then equity of outcomes would mean that 20 per cent of all clients helped into work were also from ethnic minority backgrounds.
Examining data for Action Teams as a whole relating to April 2004 to March 2005, 31 per cent of clients that teams had contact with were helped into work. This ratio is slightly higher for PSL teams who helped 37 per cent of their contacts into work compared to 28 per cent of Jobcentre Plus teams. PSL clients may have been more job-ready or it may be to do with the extent of employer linkages which are often strong in PSL organisations.

In terms of gender, although proportionately fewer women than men were in contact with Action Teams, women were more likely to be helped into work than men. This was particularly the case for Jobcentre Plus led teams where 25 per cent of male contacts and 32 per cent of female contacts were helped into work. This imbalance is perhaps due to the nature of the jobs available in the local labour markets and could be reflective of the changes in the skill requirements by companies within the types of occupations that jobless people are likely to move into when they first enter or re-enter the labour market. For example, a long-term trend in the UK labour market has been a decline in demand for manual workers and an increase in demand for customer service occupations, which are typically undertaken by women.

The PSL teams were more likely to place short-term jobless clients into work: 43 per cent of contacts out of work for less than six months were helped into work by PSL Action Teams. The longer a client had been out of work, the less likely they were to be helped into work by the PSL teams: 29 per cent of contacts out of work for more than three years were helped into work by the PSL Action Teams. This is in contrast to the Jobcentre Plus led Action Teams which show a more equitable distribution of the likelihood of clients being placed in work, with 29 per cent of contacts jobless for less than six months helped into work, and 26 per cent of contacts out of work for more than three years helped into work.
In accordance with DWP’s ‘Race Equality Strategy’, ethnic minorities now include people describing themselves as ‘White Irish’ or ‘other White’. Using this definition, and excluding clients who have chosen not to give details of their ethnic background, 34 per cent of all Action Team contacts were with people from ethnic minority backgrounds, and 29 per cent of job entries were from within these groups. This suggests that there is not complete parity in outcomes by this measure.

Overall, the fewer of the 15 disadvantaged targets that clients had, the more likely the Action Team would be able to move them into work. Figure 7.4 shows that as a percentage of all the people with one or more of the target characteristics that the Action Teams had contact with, clients who were lone parents were more likely to be helped to move into work, than people with other characteristics. Conversely, clients with drug/alcohol problems and those with English as a second language were least likely to be moved into work. This could illustrate the extent to which each of these characteristics represents a barrier to finding work. Equally it could be an indication of the ease with which Action Team Advisors are able to access services and support for these individuals, or it could be due to the focus of priority for Action Teams.

**Figure 7.4** Job entries as a percentage of contacts by characteristic (April 2004 to March 2005)

![Figure 7.4](image)

**Source:** Department for Work and Pensions, Action Teams Management Information

### 7.1.2 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked how important they thought a number of features of Action Team provision had been in promoting and securing job entries for a variety of customer groups, for example, customers as a
whole, ‘job-ready’ customers, ‘least job-ready customers’ and ‘erratic/job hopping customers’. Respondents were asked to score elements of these features from 1 to 5 (with 5 denoting very important/successful).

Taking firstly customers as a whole (see Table 7.2), the highest scoring aspect of provision (at 4.6), and, therefore, the aspect seen as most important, was the ability of Action Teams to provide flexible financial support to enable job entry. The next most important aspect for customers as a whole was ‘ongoing one-to-one advice and support from personal advisers’ (scoring 4.5), with PSL teams rating this aspect even more highly than flexible financial support (scoring 4.8, compared to 4.6 for flexible financial support), and Jobcentre Plus teams scoring it at 4.4. The main difference between Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams was in the importance given to the commitment from employers in supporting the work of Action Teams. On this issue, Jobcentre Plus scored 3.9 and PSL 4.4.

The more job ready the customers, the more importance was attached to vacancy information, flexible financial support and assisted jobsearch. Conversely, for the least job ready, personal support, addressing personal barriers and support for both employability and vocational training were more prominent.

**Table 7.2  Job outcomes for all customers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible financial support to enable job entry</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from ‘their own’ personal advisers</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseloading volumes that allow sufficient time for personal advisers to engage fully with customers</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to a sufficient volume, and variety of, vacancy notifications</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and personal support to improve jobssearch</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary use of funding for employer subsidies, customer grants and purchase of ‘one-off’ training provision</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to specialist providers of support/advice</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from employers to support work of Action Team</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to basic employability training and support</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.

With regard to ‘job-ready customers’ (see Table 7.3), two issues were seen as particularly important. Ready access to a sufficient volume and variety of vacancy notifications was viewed with similar importance to both Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams, with scores of 4.2 and 4.3 respectively. Flexible financial support to enable job entry was also seen as important (with an overall score of 4.2), more so by PSL teams (scoring it 4.4) than by Jobcentre Plus teams (scoring it 4.0). The importance of resources and personal support provided to improve jobsearch reveals a starker
difference between team types, with Jobcentre Plus scoring it at 3.6 and PSL at 4.3. The issue which scored the lowest rating (2.7 overall) was ‘ready access to basic employability training and support’, presumably because job-ready customers did not need this type of support.

**Table 7.3  Job outcomes for job-ready customers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to a sufficient volume, and variety of, vacancy notifications</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible financial support to enable job entry</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and personal support to improve jobsearch</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from employers to support work of Action Team</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseloading volumes that allow sufficient time for personal advisers to engage fully with customers</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from ‘their own’ personal advisers</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary use of funding for employer subsidies, customer grants and purchase of ‘one-off’ training provision</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to specialist providers of support/advice</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to basic employability training and support</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.

The most important feature for ‘least job-ready’ customers (see Table 7.4) is ‘ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from personal advisers’, scored at 4.9 overall. ‘Caseloading volumes that allow sufficient time for personal advisers to engage fully with customers’ was also seen as important, with an overall score of 4.8. Marked differences between types of team occurred with the question about flexible financial support to enable job entry, with Jobcentre Plus teams scoring it as 4.8, and PSL teams at 4.4. Similar discrepancies are revealed regarding ‘discretionary use of funding for employer subsidies, customer grants and purchase of one-off training provision’, again with Jobcentre Plus teams and PSL teams scoring it at 4.8 and 4.4 respectively.

For ‘erratic/job-hopping customers’ (see Table 7.5) the most important feature was seen as ‘ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from personal advisers’ (scoring 4.7 overall). A similarly high score of 4.6 overall was given to the importance of flexible financial support to enable job entry. The same overall score of 4.6 was given to the importance of ready access to specialist providers of support/advice.

Other valuable activities or kinds of provision believed to be helpful in promoting job entries were:

- job trials and work tasters;
- intermediate labour markets;
• short job preparation courses;
• English for speakers of other languages (ESOL) specifically related to groups of refugees;
• Information and Communications Technologies (ICT) lessons;
• basic skills assessments.

Table 7.4  Job outcomes for least job-ready customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from ‘their own’ personal advisers</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseloading volumes that allow sufficient time for personal advisers to engage fully with customers</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible financial support to enable job entry</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary use of funding for employer subsidies, customer grants and purchase of ‘one-off’ training provision</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to specialist providers of support/advice</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and personal support to improve jobsearch</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to basic employability training and support</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from employers to support work of Action Team</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to a sufficient volume, and variety of, vacancy notifications</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.

Table 7.5  Job outcomes for erratic/job-hopping customers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from ‘their own’ personal advisers</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible financial support to enable job entry</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to specialist providers of support/advice</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseloading volumes that allow sufficient time for personal advisers to engage fully with customers</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discretionary use of funding for employer subsidies, customer grants and purchase of ‘one-off’ training provision</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and personal support to improve jobsearch</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to basic employability training and support</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment from employers to support work of Action Team</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready access to a sufficient volume, and variety of, vacancy notifications</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.
7.1.3 Evidence from the case studies

Two case study teams had met neither their job entry target, nor the 70 per cent of outcomes from non-JSA clients target, in year one of Phase 3: one a PSL team and one a Jobcentre Plus team.

The Jobcentre Plus team had since made significant changes, including putting in place a largely new team, and having a tight focus on performance. Problems that had been experienced had been ironed out. For example, there was initially a lack of referrals from Jobcentre Plus mainstream, who saw the Action Team as competition. The Action Team resolved this issue by conducting internal Jobcentre Plus workshops to explain, in more detail, their client groups. It was also suggested that the district had chosen to prioritise areas other than Action Teams. With new staff, and a focus on performance and initiatives like these, this team was back on track to meet its job entry target for year two of Phase 3.

The PSL team had introduced a range of in-house provision that Action Team clients could access, and had brought in the new role of engagement consultants to concentrate on outreach so that advisers could focus on working intensively with clients. The manager of this team felt that it had been hard to achieve the 70 per cent target as the local labour market had a high proportion of JSA claimants and the relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream had also not been good initially. This was being resolved by Action Team staff presenting the work of the team to mainstream advisers and doing outreach in Jobcentres one day a week.

One new Jobcentre Plus team, although they met the 70 per cent target in year one of Phase 3, had initially found it hard to meet this target. A rolling intake of staff and issues of securing premises made it hard to achieve this target quickly at the beginning of year one of Phase 3, putting pressure on advisers who already felt that they had taken a risk in moving from Jobcentre Plus mainstream to the Action Team. It had also been difficult to get Jobcentre Plus mainstream advisers to stop referring JSA customers to the team. This was especially the case when the team was initially building up its client base and did not have many clients. To ensure that it gained referrals of IB clients from Jobcentre Plus mainstream, the team placed a member of staff in the local benefit processing site to get IB clients referred, so that it was not seen as an extra thing the jobcentre had to do for the Action Team.

The fact that most Jobcentre Plus Action Teams were overachieving their job entry target was felt to be demotivating by some respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams, and they suggested that once targets had been met, they should be extended with additional funding attached, or should not have to ensure that 70 per cent of additional outcomes were from non-JSA clients. There was a feeling that consistent overachieving meant that targets had, in some cases, been set too low.
7.2 Successful features of Action Teams

7.2.1 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked to describe what the main successes of Action Teams had been, and where they had given the most added value.

There was consensus amongst respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams about what the main successes had been. The component cited by Jobcentre Plus respondents much more often than any other was community-based outreach. Community engagement through outreach was seen to give added value in a number of ways:

- by engaging people that Jobcentre Plus might not otherwise be able to reach through mainstream services;
- by engaging those furthest from the labour market;
- by being able to serve ‘unserviced communities’ and areas of ‘high worklessness’;
- by bringing mainstream services closer to the customer;
- by engaging those who did not like the jobcentre environment or who were disillusioned with Jobcentre Plus.

The importance of community-based service delivery is shown by these two respondents:

‘The main success and added-value has been the community-based approach operating in areas of high worklessness and welfare dependency.’

‘I feel that the Action Teams’ work within the communities that we are based in has led overall to an increase in the standing of Jobcentre Plus.’

The next most successful component was partnership working, which respondents felt had changed the way Jobcentre Plus worked, and raised the profile of Jobcentre Plus so that it was now viewed as a key part of the community. Partnership working had gone beyond making cross-referrals, and had led to the sharing of knowledge and good practice, and community involvement in service provision where the needs of the community were discussed and solutions developed to meet those needs.

Another widely cited important component of the success of Action Teams was described as their ability to break down the mistrust and misconceptions about Jobcentre Plus in the community. Action Teams were able to operate as ambassadors of Jobcentre Plus services, raising their profile, enhancing their reputation and credibility by being informal and because they are not seen as ‘Big Brother’. Comments from respondents included:
'[Action Teams are] Accepted as part of the local community by residents and local officials alike.'

‘Have become the helpful, friendly and supportive face of Jobcentre Plus.’

Their voluntary nature and flexibility were both widely cited as being very important to their success. For example:

‘Voluntary, flexible, community-based services equals jobs!’

Funding flexibility, to deliver what is needed most, and being able to pay clients in-work grants to help with costs of living expenses whilst waiting for their first pay cheque, was also seen as extremely important to the success of Action Teams, particularly in the light of cut-backs to the Adviser Discretionary Fund (ADF). Being able to serve hard-to-help clients and having the time to work with clients were also seen as key successes. There were a number of other elements described as successes for Action Teams. These included:

- the EPF and TPF;
- being able to be creative and innovative and to give things a try which might not work;
- the focus on getting people the right job, which leads to good retention rates;
- not using Jobcentre Plus branding;
- advisers managing their own diaries so that they can give time to partners, providers, employers and clients;
- advisers working with prison and probation to increase employment rates and reduce re-offending rates;
- being able to give added support to those using mainstream Jobcentre Plus services;
- working with young people before they become long-term unemployed;
- working in communities where people thought they had been ‘given up on’;
- moving whole families into work.

Overall, there was a great deal of strength of feeling amongst respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams about the success of Action Teams generally and the importance of keeping the successful elements of Action Teams in future provision. For example:

‘Action Teams are a realised ideal of how to deliver an employment-based advisory service and the work completed with all involved is outstanding and continues to lead where others follow, particularly Jobcentre Plus.’

‘The Action Team has changed people’s lives.’
PSL teams described partnership working, the flexibility of funding, being able to offer one-to-one support, working with hard-to-help people, and the general flexibility of the programme as the main success of Action Teams. Other elements cited as successes of PSL Action Teams included:

- the voluntary nature of Action Teams;
- being able to see clients from day one of unemployment;
- not being Jobcentre Plus;
- being innovative;
- not having time limits on support;
- helping people involved in the black economy to legitimise their employment;
- being able to provide in-work aftercare.

7.2.2 Evidence from the case studies

When respondents were asked what had been successful about their Action Teams, no single issue was cited as being the key to success, rather it was the range of design factors. The following factors were cited as being successful features of Action Teams:

- **Flexibility** of funding and in choosing target groups and areas allows teams to focus on local needs and to experiment and respond rapidly to changing needs.

- **Focus on the individual**: having time to work with clients empowers advisers to focus in depth on their needs, having more money than is available in the ADF enables advisers to meet clients’ needs.

- Its **voluntary nature** is seen as really important, especially when working in rough areas. This means that the teams are seen as supportive rather than ‘the enemy’, evidenced by the lack of violence or tension that is sometimes evident with mandatory provision. For example:

  ‘To get people into work there’s got to be, I feel, a will to do it. And I think if you made it mandatory, then you might lose clients because of that.’

  (Partner, Jobcentre Plus team)

- **Quality and commitment of manager**: the drive and enthusiasm of the manager and their ability to make things happen was seen as important.

- **Quality and commitment of staff**: for example, putting in extra hours to do events on Saturdays or attending community meetings in the evening. Recruiting advisers from the target groups served was also seen as important. The importance of staff was highlighted by a Business Manager from a Jobcentre Plus team:

  ‘They have got to be people who want to work in the community and understand what community working means. And it means being out in location, in an office and maybe not seeing any of your colleagues week to week.’
• **Partnerships**: it is crucial to engage with local organisations to aid referrals, provide added value, and ensure clients can access other services. This can also enhance Jobcentre Plus’ reputation and credibility amongst partners. Having money to bring to the table helped aide partnership working. For example:

> ‘Although some of us were apprehensive about them coming, we’re now apprehensive about them going, particularly in the communities because over the period of time that they’ve been there they have become well established, they have got integrated with the community, it has been seen that they provide a vital service and certainly for us they’ve been a staff for us to lean on quite often in terms of joint funding.’

*(EPF Project Manager, PSL team)*

• **Outreach**: bringing Jobcentre Plus’ services closer to the communities they serve is important; so it being able to experiment with outreach to find the right (and the wrong) locations.

• **A non-threatening environment** is key to building up a relationship of trust with the community. Payment of benefits being separated from help is very important, as is the fact that missing an appointment with the team does not lead to being sanctioned. It was argued that advisers having casual clothes, using first names, and teams not being seen as the jobcentre was all important in creating a non-threatening environment. For example:

> ‘A lot of people are frightened by suits. It’s too much like the Jobcentre. They know we’re not like that, we’re not as formal as that, we’re quite informal, laid back.’

*(Action Team Adviser, PSL Team)*

• Focus on **getting people the right job**: focus on retention and time to work with clients means that advisers help clients to find the right job rather than just any job.

• **Building a momentum**: having the time to develop visibility through, for example, word-of-mouth is an important factor.

The following examples show how the success of Action Teams was summarised by respondents:

> ‘It’s the best job I’ve done in the 15 years I’ve been in the jobcentre. I’ve worked my way up. They gave us the money and said look at the problems, what does the customer need to help them move back into work. There was consultation all the way through with customers, it’s built up and up. You’re taking it out into the community, right to the doorstep, they have no excuse. If they really want a job there’s help there.’

*(Action Team Leader, Jobcentre Plus Team)*
7.3 Constraints faced by Action Teams

7.3.1 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked to describe what had been the main barriers, obstacles or difficulties that they had faced. Some respondents highlighted issues that had initially been barriers for them, such as working in a restricted number of wards, or the initial difficulties of gaining the trust of the local community, which had since been overcome. In general though, they commented on issues that were currently or more recently acting as barriers or difficulties for them.

The biggest barrier for Jobcentre Plus teams was funding and headcount restrictions being imposed on them by their Jobcentre Plus district. Being answerable to both the district and head office made it difficult to fulfil both delivering the policy intention of Action Teams and to contribute to efficiencies cutbacks for the district. No longer having a ring-fenced budget meant, in some cases, having to get permission to spend anything, which was time-consuming, and in other cases meant that there was less money to spend. One respondent commented that:

‘Budgets need to be ring-fenced or it will be impossible for us to deliver.’

The next biggest constraint was securing outreach premises. Respondents raised the issue of the cost of using Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) estates contractors, a lack of affordable outreach, problems maintaining and refurbishing outreach and the bureaucracy of risk assessments which was said to be ‘crushing innovation’. Another major barrier was problems with unreliable and expensive IT.

A number of other barriers, constraints or difficulties were also raised. A group of these were around contracting. Barriers included restrictions in procuring provision, inadequate contracting processes, being tied into costly contracts for mobile buses, and training providers not always being able to respond to needs quickly enough. There was another set of barriers around outcomes, including not having a measure of distance travelled, not being able to claim secondary job outcomes until Phase 3 of Action Teams, a lack of referrals from mainstream due to misunderstanding of how job outcome points are allocated, and the recent move in some districts to giving Action Team Advisers individual job entry targets so that they become direct competition with mainstream advisers, which discourages referrals. Other barriers raised included:

• convincing Jobcentre Plus colleagues of the benefits of Action Teams;
• the complexity of the EPF/TPF bidding process;
• not being able to bid to EPF/TPF after spring 2005 due to budgetary constraints stopping new bids, and the negative impact this has on relationships with partners;
• uncertainty over the future of Action Teams making it hard to plan;
• restrictions on formalising the informal economy;
• not being able to bend benefit rules;
• a lack of suitable jobs in the travel-to-work-area.

The biggest barrier to the effective operation of PSL teams was the move to 70 per cent of job outcomes being from non-JSA customers. In some cases, teams felt that this target did not reflect their local labour market where there was a high JSA population, others felt that it was more costly to work with inactive clients but that there was no recognition of this in the funding. Some PSL teams had found it hard to recruit inactive clients, particularly in areas where Jobcentre Plus had not been rolled-out and where WFIs with IB customers were behind, as it meant less referrals of inactive customers to the Action Team from local jobcentres. Another big issue cited by PSL teams as a barrier was the paperwork requirements, with the need for evidence of an individual’s right to work being a barrier for some teams, as not all clients had such evidence. One respondent from a PSL team commented that there had been a move from Action Teams having a culture of ‘bashing bureaucracy’ to a culture of ‘embracing bureaucracy’.

Other issues raised by PSL teams as barriers were:

• the lack of communication between Jobcentre Plus mainstream and the Action Team;
• local labour market conditions making it hard for clients to sustain work;
• uncertainty over the future of Action Teams making it hard to plan;
• the DWP definition of basic skills not adequately encompassing all clients (eg those with GCSE English who may have poor numeracy skills).

7.3.2 Evidence from the case studies

A range of constraints or difficulties were cited by respondents that had been experienced by teams whether they were Jobcentre Plus or PSL.

• A **long set-up time** is needed before targets begin to be achieved – time is needed to experiment.

• **Premises/outreach**: could be hard to secure, knowing where to do sessional outreach takes local knowledge and experimentation, there can be problems securing good IT access and telephone lines in outreach premises.

• **Staff**: recruiting to the right high quality can take time. Having poor quality staff can impact on performance, and so can not having enough staff.

• The **relationship with Jobcentre Plus** mainstream must be good – a poor relationship at jobcentre level can lead to a lack of referrals; a poor relationship at district level can lead to teams not having strategic support, having other initiatives prioritised over Action Teams in terms of selecting staff for Action Teams, or can lead to Action Team funding or headcount not being passed on to the team.
• **Time getting a contract for EPF project** after the bid had been successful had been frustrating for one team.

• **Context of Jobcentre Plus changes**: uncertainty about the future of Action teams had led to staff leaving some teams, affecting performance. In one team, advisers had been pulled back from outreach into jobcentres. In another team, a number of changes in the manager has made sustaining relationships with external partners more difficult, and partners were not keen on joint projects when the longer-term future of Action Teams was unclear.

• **Mismatch between the labour market and the target groups** made it difficult for one team as not all clients were suited to the restricted opportunities of care work, retail and hospitality available in the local labour market.

• **Achieving the target that 70 per cent of outcomes are from non-JSA customers** had been initially hard for two teams.

• **Jobcentre Plus teams not being able to claim secondary job outcomes** until Phase 3 of Action Teams meant in Phase 2 not being able to help a customer again who might have first been helped two years ago.

Some additional constraints placed on the operation of Action Teams were cited by PSL teams. Jobcentre Plus teams and PSL teams have the same legal requirement to ensure clients have the right to work. However, PSL teams felt that they were obliged to collect copies of birth certificates and passports. This adds an additional administrative burden on PSL teams, and could also mean losing a job outcome if a client they helped gets a job before birth certificates that have been requested arrive (even when birth certificates are requested online it can take ten days for them to arrive).

PSL teams also raised the issue of Jobcentre Plus mainstream advisers not being able to refer customers on the Labour Market System (LMS) computer system, and the mainstream adviser not being automatically rewarded the job points if the client gets a job with the help of an Action Team, was also a problem. General paperwork was a concern for PSL teams who had to gather evidence of job outcomes, and document every intervention with the client, taking up time that teams felt could otherwise be used for delivering services. One marketing manager of a PSL team felt that chasing employers for confirmation of employment could damage relationships with employers. He also felt that the system was inflexible as some small businesses did not have a till receipt stamp, a website or headed paper needed for an official confirmation of employment. The time it took to get confirmation of employment also put pressure on advisers who have targets to meet on the number of clients they move into work in a month, which was frustrating when they knew that one of their clients had moved into work, but that they could not claim an outcome for them until confirmation had been received.
7.4 Lessons learned from Action Teams

7.4.1 Evidence from interviews with national policy and operational staff

National policy and operational staff highlighted how a number of mainstream and pilot initiatives have been developed based, in part, on the lessons learned from Action Teams. These include:

- Ethnic Minority Outreach (EMO);
- the Working Neighbourhoods Pilot;
- New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) and New Deal for Lone Parents (NDLP) services becoming more flexible.

It has also impacted on mainstream services in other ways, including:

- the introduction of the ADF;
- the culture of Action Teams that has found its way into mainstream advising, as Action Team staff have gone on to manage other initiatives and taken on other roles in Jobcentre Plus;
- partnership working with other organisations that has built on the success of partnership working in Action Teams.

7.4.2 Evidence from the consultation exercise

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked how important they thought a number of design features had been in meeting the main objectives of Action Teams for Jobs. Table 7.6 outlines the scores given to each design feature. Respondents were asked to score these features from 1 to 5 (with 5 denoting very important/successful).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7.6 Design features</th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having flexibility and local discretion in the choice of support to meet individual customer's needs and circumstances</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a customer engagement strategy that reaches effectively into disadvantaged/disenfranchised communities</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having some local discretion about the exact locations/areas to focus the Team's work on</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to deal with customers largely on a voluntary basis</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying a sufficient volume of advisers to allow time to work with each customer</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Jobcentre Plus</th>
<th>PSL</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating as an additional resource in districts (in financial, headcount, and performance terms)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being perceived by customers/potential customers to be separate from/additional to Jobcentre Plus’ mainstream operation</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying experienced advisers to assess and deal constructively with clients’ needs and circumstances</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having access to specialist providers to address particular client’s needs</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having local discretion about particular customer groups on whom to concentrate</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: IES/DWP, 2005.

There were a number of areas where the design features of Action Teams scored particularly highly. With regard to flexibility and local discretion, the overall mean score was 4.8, indicating that flexibility and discretion in the choice of support to meet individual customer’s needs and circumstances, was an important feature. Similarly, having a customer engagement strategy that was seen to reach effectively into disadvantaged or disenfranchised communities, was also seen as an important issue for all teams (with an overall score of 4.8).

Having local discretion over which areas to focus on was also seen as an important design feature among both types of teams. This scored 4.6 overall, as did the ability to deal with customers on a largely voluntary basis. The two other areas which also scored 4.6 were: ‘Deploying a sufficient volume of advisers to allow time to work with each customer’ and ‘Operating as an additional resource in Districts’. However, whereas the issue of being able to deploy a sufficient volume of advisers was not viewed very differently between team types, the issue of operating as an additional resource in districts highlighted a discrepancy between team types, with Jobcentre Plus scoring it at 4.7 and PSL at 4.1. This may reflect the closer relationship between Jobcentre Plus teams and Jobcentre Plus districts.

There are several other design features, which, although gaining high overall scores, were not seen as important as the features discussed above: Firstly, the importance of being perceived by customers/potential customers to be separate from/additional to Jobcentre Plus’ mainstream operation, which scored 4.3 overall. Similarly, the importance of deploying experienced advisers to assess clients’ needs gained a positive overall score of 4.2. The importance of ‘having access to specialist providers to address particular clients’ needs’, and having local discretion about particular customer groups on whom to concentrate also gained an overall score of 4.2.
7.4.3 Evidence from the case studies

Respondents suggested a number of areas where lessons had been learned about how to make the Action Team approach most successful:

- **Getting staff with the right skill sets and attitudes** is more important than their background.

- **Turning around poor performance** can be done by bringing in the right staff and manager who have an understanding of the client group, closely monitoring performance, and improving the relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream.

- **Districts** must be supportive of Action Teams.

- **Premises/outreach:** it takes time to experiment with outreach premises. Mobile buses can overcome not having any suitable premises in an area, or only having premises that only certain sections of the community use.

- **Marketing** needs to be targeted and to use language that target groups identify with.

- **Working with clients:** different approaches are needed for different client groups. Working with IB clients can require a ‘softly, softly’ approach that takes time.

- **Paying in-work grants:** one Jobcentre Plus team found that the payment of in-work grants was taking up to four weeks, making it ineffective in providing financial support to clients in the first few weeks of employment. The team, therefore, changed the system so that a shopping voucher is sent as soon as verbal confirmation is gained from an employer that someone has started work.

- **Partnership working** needs to benefit both partners, there needs to be good communication and clear agreements between partners.

- **Partnership working between Action Teams:** this can be very helpful and can include sharing administration support, joint work about how to engage IB clients, and help with EPF/TPF bids. Learning from other teams can be facilitated by internal Jobcentre Plus workshops, by PSL organisations sharing internal best practice, and by initiatives such as the Scottish Network on Action Teams that existed in the early stages of Action Team operation. Some respondents commented on the lack of this recently.

There was a strong feeling that many of the lessons from Action Teams had already been learned in the way that Jobcentre Plus was now delivering other services. Action Teams were seen to have moved Jobcentre Plus forward in working with local communities, and helped influence the design of other initiatives such as EMO and Pathways to Work. There were, however, suggestions for a number of potential improvements that could be made to Action Teams:

- one district manager felt that Action Teams should not be working with JSA clients at all;
• Action Teams should always be offered at the second Work-Focused Interview for IB clients;
• there is still work to be done to learn how to attract IB clients, some of whom see themselves as permanently out of the labour market;
• targets should take into account outcomes such as voluntary work and qualifications;
• more sharing of good practice between Action Teams should be facilitated.

7.5 Overall views on Action Teams

7.5.1 Evidence from interviews with national policy and operational staff

National policy and operational staff felt that there were a number of pressures that would adversely affect the operation of Action Teams, or a similar initiative, in the future. Budgetary and headcount constraints within Jobcentre Plus, as well as contracting and procurement processes, were seen as being increasingly constraining of flexibility. There was a feeling that flexibility must be maintained in an initiative of this kind. Maintaining voluntary provision to address inactivity alongside mainstream mandatory provision to address unemployment was also highlighted.

7.5.2 Evidence from the consultation exercise

Important features to continue

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked to describe what had been the three or four most important features of Action Teams which they would like to see continuing when Phase 3 of Action Teams comes to an end.

The most commonly reported feature of Action Teams that respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams felt should be continued was the outreach work. Working within the communities that they are trying to assist was perceived to have helped to build up trust and to break down some of the barriers associated with finding work. Comments made about the importance of outreach included:

‘Working out in the community where the customers feel most comfortable.’

‘Based in local community outreach venues. Seen as very important with local residents and other agencies, as more accessible and less daunting than Jobcentre Plus offices.’

‘Outreach working – some of the most vulnerable groups will not visit the main site (fear of officialdom).’
The second most commonly reported feature that respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams felt should be continued was the flexibility of the funding and hence, the flexibility of support that could be offered and tailored to individual clients. Having the flexibility to tackle barriers on a one-to-one basis was felt to be a key success factor.

The third most frequently cited feature from respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams that should be continued was partnership working. Action Teams had the time and resources to be able to work with a wide range of partners to help meet the needs of their communities, and this was an area where initially, at the programme outset, Jobcentre Plus had little experience. The partnerships that have been developed were found to be very valuable and helped to improve the referral system. Information gleaned from the case studies shows that considerable time and effort has gone into developing partnerships between Action Teams and a wide range of other agencies and that they have provided a wide range of benefits in order to help achieve outcomes and success. Comments from the consultation exercise about keeping the partnership aspect of the programme included:

‘The relationships/links with partners must be maintained to continue to encourage referrals for, and deliver help to, the most vulnerable individuals in the community.’

The voluntary aspect of Action Teams, with clients not forced into seeing an Action Team Advisor, but approaching and working with advisers voluntarily, was also seen as an aspect that would be important to continue. Other features cited by a number of respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams were the ring-fencing of funding for customer support and the way the system had facilitated innovation, whilst features that fewer respondents felt it was important to keep included:

- post-employment support;
- Employment Projects Fund (EPF)/Transport Projects Fund (TPF);
- the time spent per client;
- individual branding;
- adviser autonomy;
- 70:30 ratio;
- being able to use secondees;
- local decision-making.

Similarly to the Jobcentre Plus teams, the PSL respondents reported the flexibility of funding and community outreach were the two most important features of Action Teams. Maintaining partnership working was also seen as important, as was the voluntary nature of involvement with the programme. Other features that continued to be commonly cited by respondents from PSL teams were the targeting of non-JSA clients and the extent of one-to-one support and time that could be spent with
clients, particularly given that many faced multiple barriers to employment. Other comments also included:

- the flexibility of timing for clients, ie being able to drop in as and when;
- the outcome focus;
- EPF/TPF;
- aftercare services and in-work support;
- having outcome-related payments.

**Doing things differently**

As part of the consultation exercise, respondents were asked to describe if there were things that they would do differently if they were repeating the Action Team initiative.

Perhaps because of the flexibility of the programme and subsequent variety of interventions, there was a very wide range of suggestions of things that Action Teams could have done differently from respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams. The three most commonly cited things are described below, with many of the other features mentioned being shown in the bulleted list.

The most common thing to have done differently cited by respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams was increased investment in better and more reliable IT systems. Given the mobile nature of much of the work, with staff working flexibly between different sites, adequate and reliable IT is likely to have been critical to the ease with which advisers could do their job. Comments around the issues of IT included:

‘More investment in the IT side of the job. Advisers look unprofessional when they are provided with a laptop but still have to telephone the base office to access the jobs database. We need a much faster system that we can access every time, not now and again.’

‘Allows us to have external IT sources – cheaper and better value for money.’

The second most commonly cited thing to do differently by respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams was to ensure Action Teams remain managed centrally and were not affected by pressures from the districts. Restrictions imposed by some Jobcentre Plus districts were seen to be affecting some of the main success factors of the Action Teams, such as flexibility and autonomy. For example:

‘Action Teams should not be part of the Jobcentre Plus district structure and should be managed centrally from Head Office.’

‘Less intervention from the district – Action Teams should have always remained ring-fenced and autonomous. District’s interventions of late have been a real distraction and de-motivating for team morale, impacting greatly on the service we take pride in delivering.’
It was also argued by respondents from Jobcentre Plus teams that there could have been increased sharing between teams of both good practice and things that had not worked so well. While some Action Teams were in contact with other Action Teams, this tended to be on an ad hoc and informal basis. Several respondents felt that better sharing of good practice, in order to gain a better understanding of how the successful projects delivered large numbers of job entries, would have provided a useful source of learning. In addition to the issues cited above, there were a wide range of other suggestions, including:

- more flexibility with the headcount;
- increased funding in line with inflation;
- certainty about the project’s lifetime;
- increased in-work support;
- measure intermediate outcomes for the most disadvantaged;
- speed up payments for customers;
- staff to reapply for jobs when the agenda changes (for instance when the 70:30 target was introduced);
- having a separate employer engagement team;
- better promotion of the Action Team concept to internal Jobcentre Plus staff.

The most commonly cited area to change highlighted by PSL respondents was the level of funding. There was a feeling that the income earned for the outcomes achieved did not reflect the increased effort needed in order to engage with certain clients, for example, those claiming IB.

‘I would like to see the pricing policy reflect the additional work required for this particular client group of IB and IS customers. Currently NDDP are paid in excess of £2,000 per job placement for undertaking work to move this client group into work.’

‘I feel that any new programme following on from the current Action Team contract should be heavily focused on Incapacity and Income Support clients. In my opinion this is a much more difficult group to place than the other type of clients that the Action Team currently deal with and as such, to recognise this, the monetary value of the outcome should be on a par with Lone Parents and NDLP.’

‘The main focus needs to be on IB and IS customers but these are a difficult client group to find employment for and as it has been recognised that single parents need a greater amount of help and this is recognised in the amount paid per job outcome. I feel this should be mirrored with this group.’
The second most frequently cited response of respondents from PSL teams was the 70:30 non-JSA: JSA split between clients. This was felt, among some respondents, to create barriers to the types of clients they could work with, and therefore longer-term JSA claimants were often not helped. This is also supported by the Management Information (MI) data analysed in Section 7.1.1 which shows that, given set monthly outgoings on wages, outcome payments and the subsequent uncertainty about cash-flow, it may have led to PSL Action Teams working with proportionately less long-term unemployed people than Jobcentre Plus Action Teams. On the other hand, one PSL respondent would have liked the remit to focus on 100 per cent non-JSA clients. Other suggestions for things to do differently from respondents from PSL teams included:

- increasing links to Primary Care Trusts to contact IB clients;
- simpler methods of collecting identification that proves that a client has a right to work;
- increasing sharing of information from the Jobcentre Plus LMS system;
- measuring ‘distance travelled’;
- exploring good practice across the country;
- less bureaucracy and paperwork;
- fewer contract visits and more time spent with advisers on these visits;
- being managed locally via the Jobcentre Plus district in order to improve relationships with Jobcentre Plus.

7.5.3 Evidence from the case studies

The impact that Action Teams have had in terms of meeting their job entry targets and the lessons learned fed into mainstream provision and other pilot initiatives are discussed earlier in this chapter. Respondents were also asked what impact Action Teams had on the local labour markets where they were situated, or on deprivation levels in their area. Respondents felt that it was not possible to say that Action Teams had a large impact in terms of increased employment rates or reduced deprivation rates in the areas they served, as the job entry targets are small within the broader context of these local labour markets. The impact of Action Teams on employment rates in an area also needs to be examined in the context of recent employment change, for example, large-scale redundancies that have occurred in some areas since the Action Team was set up. It was felt that some teams had left a lasting legacy on their target areas through investment from the EPF and TPF.

Views varied about the importance of Action Teams within the broader Jobcentre Plus district, level agenda. Whilst Action Teams were small compared to mainstream provision such as New Deals or EZs, they were seen by one district manager in an area with a Jobcentre Plus team as key in delivering performance for the district. Others felt that the agenda had moved on and that other provision was better
placed to work with inactive groups. There was a mixture of views over whether Action Teams should continue in their current form, or whether their successful aspects (such as outreach and flexibility) would be better delivered through other provision, such as Pathways to Work.

The need for the continuation of community-based outreach in some form was a widely held view. It was suggested by some that there should only be one outreach service in a district, with districts making decisions about the spatial and client target groups needed for that area, rather than having, for example, an EMO and an Action Team operating in the same area. Others felt that Action Teams should continue but should be more tightly focused on fewer target groups, or that Action Teams needed to continue at least until 2008 to tie in with Neighbourhood Renewal Fund timeframes. One Action Team Manager expressed concern about the prospect of ‘mainstreaming’ Action Team services, as they felt that the most important thing about Action Teams was that they were different and seen to be different, and that they needed to maintain a separate identity to retain their uniqueness and innovation. Another team emphasised the importance of reporting directly to DWP head office rather than the Jobcentre Plus District to protect their funding and autonomy.

There was a general view that whatever form future provision of this type took, that there was a danger of the lessons learned from Action Teams being lost because of budgetary constraints within Jobcentre Plus as an organisation. In some cases, budgetary constraints were already having an impact, with staff being pulled back from outreach into jobcentres, and staff leaving for greater job security and not being replaced. The elements that make Action Teams work, such as committed staff, flexibility, generous resources, and having enough time with the client, seemed, to some respondents, contrary to the current direction of strategy.

7.6 Chapter summary: effectiveness of Action Teams

In year one of Phase 3 (April 2004 to March 2005), PSL teams, as a whole (all 25), only met 78 per cent of their job entry targets, compared to all Jobcentre Plus teams (40 in all) who achieved 140 per cent of their job entry targets. Overall, PSL teams achieved 69 per cent of their outcomes from non-JSA customers, compared to all Jobcentre Plus teams who achieved 76 per cent. PSL teams, as a whole, moved into work proportionately more clients who had only been out of work for a short time than Jobcentre Plus teams. They were also proportionately more likely to work with clients with just one of the target disadvantages than Jobcentre Plus teams as a whole. PSL teams helped a higher proportion of their client base into work than Jobcentre Plus teams.

Across all Action Teams, although proportionally fewer women than men were in contact with Action Teams, women were more likely to be helped into work than men. A higher proportion of the client base was from an ethnic minority than the proportion of job entries achieved with clients from an ethnic minority. The fewer disadvantages that clients had, the more likely Action Teams would be able to move them into work.
The features that Action Teams felt were most important in securing job outcomes for clients were flexible financial support to enable job entry, ongoing, one-to-one advice and support from advisers, and having sufficient time to engage with customers. For job-ready customers, the features seen as most important were access to a sufficient volume and variety of vacancies, and flexible financial support. For the least job-ready clients, one-to-one support and having sufficient time were seen as most important, whilst for erratic/job-hopping customers, one-to-one support, flexible financial support and ready access to specialist providers were all seen as particularly important.

Jobcentre Plus teams as a whole felt that the main success of Action Teams where they had added the most value was outreach, followed by partnership working. PSL teams, as a whole, felt that partnership working, and the programme’s flexibility were the most successful features. Respondents from the case studies felt that no single issue had been the key to success, but rather it was a range of factors that made them successful. These factors included: flexibility, the voluntary nature of the programme, the quality and commitment of managers and staff, partnerships, and outreach.

The biggest barriers faced by Jobcentre Plus teams as a whole had been the funding and headcount restrictions in some Jobcentre Plus districts. In contrast, PSL teams saw the biggest difficulty they had faced as being the shift to securing 70 per cent of job outcomes from non-JSA customers, followed by paperwork requirements.

A number of lessons learned from Action Teams have already fed into the design of policy, both in terms of initiatives such as EMO, flexibility in NDLP and NDDP, and impacted on mainstream services through the introduction of the ADF. Case study respondents felt that a number of lessons had been learned, including: that staff’s attitudes and skills are more important than their background; the importance of a good relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream; and that time is needed to experiment with outreach premises.

Both Jobcentre Plus and PSL teams reported that the features of Action Teams they would like to see continue were outreach, flexibility of funding, partnership working, and its voluntary nature. There were a range of things teams felt that they would do differently if they were repeating the Action Team initiative. The most common thing cited by Jobcentre Plus teams was to have increased investment in better and more reliable IT systems, whilst PSL teams felt that the level of funding needed to be increased. Case study respondents held a mixture of views as to whether Action Teams should continue in their current form, or whether successful aspects such as outreach and flexibility would be better delivered through other provision. There was a general view that whatever form future provision of this type took, there was a danger of the lessons learned from Action Teams being lost due to budgetary constraints within Jobcentre Plus as an organisation. The elements that make Action Teams work, seemed to some respondents to be in stark contrast with the current direction of Jobcentre Plus.
8 Overall conclusions

This chapter draws together evidence throughout the report to address the research questions in turn.

8.1 Have Action Teams been effective in helping people to find jobs?

As analysis in this report has shown, Action Teams have been effective in helping people find jobs. In year one of Phase 3 (April 2004 to March 2005), Action Teams, as a whole, helped over 27,000 clients into work. Just over 8,800 of these job entries were through Private Sector Led (PSL) teams, and nearly 18,400 were via Jobcentre Plus Led Action Teams. From the inception of Action Teams in 2000 to September 2005, over 150,000 clients had been helped into work.

In terms of achieving job entry targets, there were differences between Jobcentre Plus teams and PSL teams. Action Teams in year one of Phase 3 achieved 111 per cent of their job entry targets in year one of Phase 3, with Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, achieving 140 per cent, compared to PSL teams as a whole achieving 78 per cent. Action Teams have also been successful at helping non-JSA clients find work. Overall, 74 per cent of job entries in year one of Phase 3 were from non-JSA clients; 76 per cent in Jobcentre Plus teams compared to 69 per cent in PSL teams.

In terms of the types of clients helped into work by Action Teams from April 2004 until March 2005, PSL teams, as a whole, moved into work proportionately more clients who had only been out of work for a short time than Jobcentre Plus teams. They were also proportionately more likely to work with clients with just one of the target disadvantages than Jobcentre Plus teams as a whole were.

In terms of parity of outcomes, comparing the proportion of a group helped into work against the proportion of that group in the client base, shows that there has not been equity in the outcomes for some groups. Across all Action Teams, although proportionally fewer women than men were in contact with them, women were more likely to be helped into work than men. For ethnic minorities, a higher proportion of the client base were from an ethnic minority than the proportion of job
entries achieved with clients from an ethnic minority. The fewer barriers that clients had, the more likely Action Teams were to be able to move them into work.

8.2 How have Action Teams been innovative?

Action teams have been innovative in both their design and delivery. In terms of design, they were the first initiative to target local pockets of worklessness and, in Phase 3, were allowed to operate in the wards of their choice. This allowed teams to move into other areas they knew had pockets of deprivation even where these pockets were located within more affluent wards. Action Team funding has also been innovative. In Phase 1, teams were given £1.5 million and ‘a blank sheet of paper’ to encourage them to think creatively about how to solve local worklessness, this was the first time anything like this had been done; and in Phase 2, the £2,000 per job entry was introduced and teams were allowed to be flexible in the way they spent it.

Action Teams have been innovative by being located away from Jobcentre Plus mainstream and using outreach (including mobile units, sessional outreach with community partners, and co-locating with partners) to reach their target groups and deliver services. They were also allowed to use advisers seconded from community organisations who bring different skills and experience to the team. They could also decide their own marketing measures and used their own branding.

Teams were innovative by offering flexible support and activities to their clients and using their funding creatively to meet individuals’ needs. Teams could spend a flexible amount of time with clients to meet their needs. In Phase 2 of Action Teams, the Employment Projects Fund (EPF)/Transport Projects Fund (TPF) were introduced which provide the opportunity for teams to support, co-fund and pump-prime initiatives that would have direct or indirect employment-raising effects for the wider community. This type of funding had not been available before and proved to be successful as well as innovative.

Teams were also innovative in their strategy to link up with organisations from the local community, and most work with a wide range of partners. Partnerships have proved to be beneficial as they can cross-refer clients, joint fund courses/training/events, offer specialist help when needed, share premises and, therefore, costs, and have an all-round knowledge of provision in the area.

8.3 Which groups were targeted and how were different approaches tailored to each group?

Teams targeted a range of disadvantaged groups from the list of 15 target groups. The types of client groups a team chose to work with, to some extent, depended on the demographics of the local labour market in which they operated, but specific groups were also actively targeted. Overall, it appears that Jobcentre Plus teams work with clients from more traditionally ‘harder-to-reach’ groups than PSL teams.
Jobcentre Plus teams had proportionately more clients who had been out of work for over three years, had more contact with clients with two or more of the target characteristics, and were more likely to have had contact with lone parents or clients with health problems.

Marketing and outreach were generally designed broadly for all possible clients, although particular partnerships were developed to engage with particular target groups, and specific events were held to attract target groups. The one-to-one service offered meant that support was individually tailored and focused on each individual’s particular set of barriers. In this sense, different approaches were not tailored to different groups.

8.4 What are the circumstances in which the Action Teams’ approach works best?

The results that Action Teams have had, in terms of getting people into work, show that the approach of Action Teams worked well in a number of different local labour market contexts, and have been successful in moving a number of different disadvantaged groups into work. There are, however, a few key circumstances in which Action Teams seem to work best. Having the right staff and manager was crucial to the success of the Action Team approach, as was working in outreach locations. Having an accessible and non-threatening environment was crucial to the success of the Action Teams approach, and so was being able to experiment with the right outreach locations and having good IT support.

To ensure the Action Team approach worked at its best, it was also important to have a good relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream, aiding referrals, ensuring that the team has strategic support and is given a high priority, and that its resources for staff and funding remain ring-fenced. A good relationship with partners was also very important, again to: aid referrals, enable the joint funding of initiatives in the community, get specialist help when needed, ensure the team has knowledge of provision and services in the area, enable the sharing of premises and costs and increase the profile of the Action Team in the area. Teams also cited the importance of having good links with other Action Teams, so that good practice could be shared, and practical advice and support could be obtained.

8.5 What are the factors that hinder the success of the Action Teams’ approach?

Most Action Teams highlighted issues that had acted as barriers to the success of their approach. The biggest barriers faced by Jobcentre Plus teams, as a whole, had been the funding and headcount restrictions imposed by Jobcentre Plus districts. In contrast, PSL teams felt that the shift to securing 70 per cent of job outcomes from non-Jobseeker’s Allowance (JSA) customers hindered their success as it either did not reflect their local labour market, was too costly to work with inactive clients, or
too hard to recruit inactive clients. Paperwork requirements, with the need for evidence of an individual’s right to work, were also seen as a constraint by PSL teams. Other factors that can hinder the Action Team approach include: the set-up time – longer time is needed before targets can be achieved, securing outreach premises and IT access, not having the right staff or management, having a poor relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream, the delay in the decision about the future of Action Teams, and not being able to claim secondary job outcomes until recently.

8.6 Did issues arise in the operation of Action Teams that were unanticipated at the time of design? If so, how were they resolved?

Various issues arose in the operation of Action Teams that were unanticipated at the time of design: Firstly, when certain areas were imposed in Phase 2, Action Teams found they could not help people outside their ward or clients that were located in certain pockets of deprivation in more affluent areas. Partners also worked in broader areas than the Action Teams, which meant they had to double check eligibility before referring any clients onto the team. This was resolved in Phase 3 by giving the teams the flexibility to broaden the areas they covered. This enabled teams to reach more beneficiaries and partners and they could now refer any of their clients to the team.

A second issue relates to the relationship and referrals from Jobcentre Plus mainstream. Jobcentre Plus staff initially had a lack of understanding of the role of Action Teams which led to a shortage of referrals. Some teams also reported a poor relationship at district level, which led to teams not having strategic support or having other initiatives prioritised over them. This has been resolved by teams giving presentations to Jobcentre Plus staff to improve understanding and awareness and, therefore referrals, and ensuring buy-in from district and senior management.

A further issue for Jobcentre Plus teams concerned the recent lack of ring-fencing of Action Team funds. Due to recent headcount and funding cuts, some Action Teams appear to have experienced pressure and constraints on their budgets from Jobcentre Plus mainstream. This has not been resolved.

Outcome-related funding was raised as an issue for PSL teams. It was felt, by some teams, to incentivise working with easier-to-help clients, as there was little incentive to help those with multiple barriers closer to employment. This may have been anticipated as an inevitable downside from the beginning, but does work against the policy intent of Action Teams to work with the most disadvantaged.

One final point relates to outreach issues. There have been many examples of constraints in delivering outreach including: access to IT connections and hardware, suitable premises and staff resources etc. This may or may not have been anticipated, but it has certainly proved to be a problem.
8.7 How can lessons learned in the Action Teams’ experience inform the Department for Work and Pensions deprived areas strategy?

A number of lessons have been learned from the experience of Action Teams, many of which have already led to changes to the delivery of Jobcentre Plus’ services. However, there are a number of ways in which the lessons learned in the Action Teams’ experience can continue to inform the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) deprived areas strategy in the future. Whether Action Teams continue, or whether they are replaced by other services, there are a number of key elements of Action Teams that this research suggests should continue if the employment rate in disadvantaged areas is to be increased, and the difference between the rate in disadvantaged areas and overall rates is to be reduced. Having an outreach service, flexibility of funding, partnership working, and a voluntary programme to address worklessness were all seen as crucial features of Action Teams that need to continue in the work of Jobcentre Plus in deprived areas. It is also important to ensure that any future programmes take on board the understanding of the extremely localised geography of worklessness, and tackle the pockets of worklessness found in a variety of labour markets including cities, seaside towns, rural areas, and ex-industrial areas.

This research has shown that important lessons learned from the Action Teams’ experience relating to outreach, partnership working and the usefulness of flexibility in finance and delivery should be taken forward in future area-based initiatives.
Appendix A
Consultation exercise questionnaire
This questionnaire is designed to capture your views and perceptions about the distinctive value-added, and lessons, of the Action Teams for Jobs initiative. It is unfortunate that we will need you to input your views in a very short period of time, if they are to be taken into account in this Consultation. For PSL Teams please return this completed questionnaire to [contact]@dwp.gsi.gov.uk. For Jobcentre Plus Action Teams please return this completed questionnaire to [contact]@jobcentreplus.gsi.gov.uk. Please ensure that forms are returned by Wednesday 8 June. Replies received after that date cannot be included in the Consultation. If you require any further information about this exercise, the questions we are asking you, etc, please call Tim Willis 0114 209**** or Julie Whyte 0114 259 ****.

We invite your inputs in two forms

1. Where possible, we ask you to summarise your views on a numerical scale. This is consistent throughout, with a standard ranking scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 = bad, unimportant, useless, 5 = good, important, useful, 0 = can't say, don't know, not relevant).

2. Where this is not sensible, we ask you to summarise your view, experiences, assessments, etc by completing a text box. You may say as much, or as little, as you wish, but we would appreciate brevity and incisiveness on your part, as this will help us in collating and analysing your collective responses.

Please answer as many questions as you feel qualified to answer
Please now go to the next sheet, ‘About you’

About You

The information which we invite you to provide will be completely anonymous (ie no individual, or particular Action Team's, inputs will be singled out or identified in the analysis). Nevertheless, it will be extremely useful for us to be able identify those of you completing the questionnaires, so that we can assess the coverage, and ensure as many Action Teams as possible are represented. Therefore we ask you to insert here:

Your name ________________________________

Your Action Team Area ________________________________

Your Job Title ________________________________

Is your Action Team

Jobcentre Plus Led

Private Sector Led

Sharing your experiences with us will make the consultation exercise more useful to us in understanding the most effective elements of Action Teams, and its limitations and room for improvement. If you have not been in post long, please feel free to consult with colleagues, or your predecessor(s) in arriving at an assessment.

Please now go to the next sheet, Design Features
## Key Design Features

**Q1** How important do you think each of the following design features have been in meeting the main objectives of Action Teams for Jobs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know/ Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being able to deal with customers largely on a voluntary basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having some local discretion about the exact locations/areas to focus the Team's work on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having local discretion about particular customer groups on whom to concentrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having flexibility and local discretion in the choice of support to meet individual customer's needs and circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying a sufficient volume of advisers to allow time to work with each customer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deploying experienced advisers to assess and deal constructively with clients' needs and circumstances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having access to specialist providers to address particular client’s needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being perceived by customers/potential customers, to be separate from/additional to Jobcentre Plus's mainstream operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a customer-engagement strategy that reaches effectively into disadvantaged/disenfranchised communities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating as an additional resource in Districts(in financial, headcount, and performance terms)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q2** Do you think there have been other design features, which have also been important in meeting the central objectives of Action Teams for Jobs?

*In this case please identify them below, and rank them in the white cell opposite, again using the ranking scale below*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know/ Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you. Please now go to the next sheet, Efficiency.
## Efficiency in Operation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Rating Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q3</strong> How important do you think outcome related funding has been in</td>
<td>Very important: 5 4 3 2 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting the operational efficiency of PSL Action Teams for Jobs (</td>
<td>No at all important: 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question for PSL Action Teams only)</td>
<td>Don’t know/Not relevant: 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think have been the main advantages of outcome related</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>funding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q4</strong> What do you think have been the main disadvantages of outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>related funding?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Q5</strong> How important do you think the present funding system has been in</td>
<td>Very important: 5 4 3 2 1 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>promoting the operational efficiency of Jobcentre Plus Action Teams for</td>
<td>No at all important: 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>Don’t know/Not relevant: 5 4 3 2 1 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you think have been the main advantages of the present Action</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teams funding system?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q7 What do you think have been the main disadvantages of the present Action Teams funding system?

Q8 Funding for Action Teams is based on an average cost estimate of £2000 per job entry. In your view, how adequate is this level of funding on average?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very adequate</th>
<th>Not at all adequate</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q9 If at all which aspects of the programme could be reduced with the least effects on outcomes?

Thank you. Please now go to the next sheet, Job Outcomes
## Securing Job Outcomes

**Q10** How important do you think each of the following aspects of AT provision have proved in promoting and securing job entries? For these groups (A,B,C,D)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Team customers as a whole</th>
<th>Column A</th>
<th>Customers who are the most job-ready</th>
<th>Column B</th>
<th>Customers who are the least job-ready</th>
<th>Column C</th>
<th>Customers least able to retain their jobs</th>
<th>Column D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>customers who are the most job-ready</td>
<td>Column A</td>
<td>Customers who are the most job-ready</td>
<td>Column B</td>
<td>Customers who are the least job-ready</td>
<td>Column C</td>
<td>Customers least able to retain their jobs</td>
<td>Column D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>customers who are least job ready</td>
<td>Column C</td>
<td>Customers who are the least job-ready</td>
<td>Column D</td>
<td>Customers least able to retain their jobs</td>
<td>Column D</td>
<td>Customers least able to retain their jobs</td>
<td>Column D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Very important**
- **Not relevant**
- **Don’t know/Not relevant**
- **Not at all important**

5 4 3 2 1 0

Please rank each feature in the appropriate cell.

- Ongoing, One-One advice & support from 'their own' personal advisers
- Caseloding volumes that allow sufficient time for personal advisers to engage fully with customers
- Discretionary use of funding for employer subsidies, customer grants and purchase of "one-off" training provision
- Flexible financial support to enable job entry *eg interview and work clothes, tools, assistance with childcare cost, travel passes*
- Ready access to a sufficient volume, and variety of, vacancy notifications
| Ready access to basic employability training and support eg basic skills, generic ICT skills, job tasters, etc |
| Resources & personal support to improve jobsearch; eg CV prep, job broking, access to newspapers, internet, stationery, etc, interview coaching |
| Commitment from employers to support work of Action Team eg by notifying vacancies, offering interviews, work placements, etc |
| Ready access to specialist providers of support/advice eg disability, substance abuse, ex-offenders, debt counselling, etc |
Q11  Do you think there have been other activities or provision which have also been important in securing job outcomes, either for customers in general or for specific groups among them?  
In this case please identify them below, and rank them in the white cell opposite, again using the ranking scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Q12  Taking into account your own experiences, are there activities or kinds of provision (from the lists above, or additional ones) which you would like to have been able to implement, or do more of, or do differently, in order to secure improved rates of job entry?


Thank you. Please now go to the next sheet, Sustainability.
### Sustaining Job Outcomes

**Q13** How important do you think each of the following features of AT provision have proved in promoting sustainability of job outcomes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Please rank each feature in the appropriate white cell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>Not at all important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality job-matching skills by advisers</td>
<td><strong>ie right person/job match</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accurate and comprehensive ‘better-off’ calculations prior to job entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help/advice/support in identifying and applying for appropriate in-work benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuing customer access to personal adviser for ongoing in-work support, advice, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers maintaining liaison with employer to offer support mediation, advice, etc</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for travel-to-work costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice/support for, childcare(or other caring) costs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisers able to guide customers towards better quality jobs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and away from temporary/casual vacancies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q14** Do you think there have been other activities or provision which have also been important in encouraging sustainability of employment among AT customers?

In this case please identify them below, and rank them in the white cell opposite, again using the ranking scale below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please rank each activity or provision in the appropriate white cell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

...
Q15 | Taking into account your own experiences, are their activities or kinds of provision (from the lists above, or additional ones) which you would like to have been able to implement, or do more of, or do differently, in order to secure improved sustainability of employment?

---

Thank you. Please now go to the next sheet, Partnership Working.
# Partnership Working

## Q16

How important do you think it has been for Action Teams to develop good working relationships with the following partners/stakeholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) training course providers

b) drug/substance councillors

c) New Deal providers

d) Local Strategic Partnerships

e) New Deal for Communities

f) job brokers

g) Others (please state)

## Q17

How successful would you say your Action Team has been in developing them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very successful</th>
<th>Not at all successful</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) training course providers

b) drug/substance councillors

c) New Deal providers

d) Local Strategic Partnerships

e) New Deal for Communities

f) job brokers

g) Others (please state)
### Q18
What do you think have been the main advantages of such relationships to your Action Team?

### Q19
What do you think have been the main advantages of such relationships for your external partners/stakeholders?

### Q20
Has your Action Team sought funding through either the Employment Projects Fund or the Transport Projects Fund?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPF</th>
<th>TPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pl insert, Yes, No or DK in box as approp</td>
<td>pl insert, Yes, No or DK in box as approp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If so, were you successful with any such bids?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EPF</th>
<th>TPF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pl insert, Yes, No or DK in box as approp</td>
<td>pl insert, Yes, No or DK in box as approp</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Q21
How important do you think EPF and/or TPF have been in helping Action Teams to develop good partnership/stakeholder relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know/Not relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Q22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In your experience, have there been any significant barriers or constraints which have inhibited co-operation with Partners and/or Stakeholders?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you. Please now go to the final sheet, Summary.
## Summary of Key Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q23</th>
<th>Taking everything into account, what would you say have been the main successes of Action Teams for Jobs, and where have they given most added-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24</td>
<td>Similarly, what would you say have been the main barriers, obstacles or difficulties with which they have been faced?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25</td>
<td>What are the three or four most important features of Action teams which you would like to see continuing when the Action Team programme comes to an end?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q26</td>
<td>Finally, if you were repeating the Action Team initiative, are there things that you would do, or like to see done, differently? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you very much for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.
Appendix B
Discussion guide for key policy stakeholders

Organisational background and delivery

- How are they set up?
- Location within Action Team areas eg outreach/office based?
- Size of the area they cover?
- Number of staff?
- How are staff chosen?
- What are staff backgrounds (Jobcentre Plus/provider, or community background)?
- How much funding do they get?
- How are they paid? Outcomes? (job or quals, 13 weeks?) Different for Jobcentre Plus/Private Sector Led (PSL)?
- How are they designed? (locally designed or nationally?)
- What does an average Action Team look like?
- Are they different in practice from the design intentions?

Relationship to the mainstream

- How do they differ from mainstream provision (eg outreach)?
- Flow of customers – voluntary/those referred from compulsory programmes?
- What customer type – Jobsseeker’s Allowance (JSA), New Deal etc.?
- Points system? Do they have one? How does it work? Is there double-counting of points?
Types of Action Teams

• Is there a typology – do they fall into certain types? (eg PSL/Jobcentre Plus led, different regions, success/failure, others)?

• Any differences between PSL Action Teams and Jobcentre Plus Action Teams? What are the benefits/disadvantages of PSL?

• What strategic choices have they made?

• What developments have been made over the last two years?

• Which have been successful?

• Which have not been successful?

• Which Action Teams should we go and see?

• We are thinking of seeing the following roles within each Action Team – DMs, Action Team managers, team leaders, advisers, business managers. Is this right? Is there anyone else in the community we should see?

Views on Action Teams and this research

• What would you like to know/get out of the evaluation? Anything you didn’t get from previous evaluations and would like us to look at?

• What would you like to see happen to Action Teams? If mainstreamed, what would you like to see happen?

Further information

• What data do Action Teams collect themselves? Is there any local data they collect/have to collect? Can we get hold of it?

• Is there any data/further reports/grey literature on Action Teams?

• Are there any other ‘experts’ we could speak to about Action Teams?

• Are there any key policy people on the PSL side we should speak to?
Research objectives

The following are the research objectives and, therefore, will be some of the questions we are going to ask Action Teams. What do you think? Are there any other broad issue areas we should be asking them?

• Have Action Teams been effective in helping people to find jobs?
• What roles have Action Teams played in helping people to decide to move into work?
• How have Action Teams been innovative?
• Which groups were targeted and how were different approaches tailored to each group?
• What are the circumstances in which the Action Teams approach works best?
• What are the factors that hinder the success of the Action Teams approach?
• Is it possible to replicate innovative approaches and lessons learned in the future good practice of Jobcentre Plus and providers?
• Did issues arise in the operation of Action Teams that were unanticipated at the time of design? If so, how were they resolved?
• How can lessons learned in the Action Team experience inform Department for Work and Pensions’ (DWP’s) deprived areas strategy?
• Can the research provide practical advice for Jobcentre Plus field staff on steps to take, to ensure successful Action Team type activity?
Appendices – Discussion guides

Appendix C
Discussion guides

For Action Team Manager and other Action Team staff – Phase 1

Thank for agreeing to talk to us. Introduce IES and explain details of project:

The Institute for Employment Studies has been commissioned by DWP to undertake a Review of Action Teams for Jobs. The planned review will take place from mid 2005 until December 2005.

It is designed to:

- identify the key factors that have led to successful implementation of the Action Team approach;
- identify any constraints to effective operation;
- draw out and integrate key lessons to be learned from the Action Team experience for the delivery of other Jobcentre Plus services in the future, particularly for the delivery of future area-based services.

The research will be based mainly on qualitative case studies (of six Action Teams).

There will be two phases of fieldwork – this is Phase 1

- Phase 1 will be an introductory visit to the site (lasting no more than two days) and will comprise of mainly scoping and exploratory interviews with key respondents in and around the Action Team.
- Phase 2 will comprise of a later and more extended site visit, during which we will interview all individuals and organisations identified as appropriate during Phase 1.

Ask whether okay to record interview – if you want to.
Stress confidentiality of discussion, no one will be identified when reporting back to DWP.

Organisational background and delivery

Staff
1. Can you tell me something about your own background, and your experiences as an Action Team manager/Team leader/Adviser?

   • what are your main responsibilities (eg what is their role within the Action Team, what are their key responsibilities?)

   • how long have you been the Action Team manager/Team Leader/Adviser etc

2. How many members of staff work in the Action Team? Has this changed at all? Reasons why?

3. How are your/the staff chosen? (Explore different staff backgrounds - Jobcentre Plus/provider or community background)

4. How is the Action Team organised? (Explore roles of different staff)

Area

5. When was this particular Action Team set up? (phase 1 – June 2000-September 2001, Phase 2 – October 2001-March 2004 or Phase 3 – April 2004-March 2006)

6. What area does this Action Team cover (different areas/wards?)

   • what is the area the Action Team currently covers?

   • how big is the area? (population and geographically)

   • what are the main problems facing the area: Jobs, skills, education, crime, culture, etc.?

   • are there any particular problem groups in the area: gender, age, ethnicity, lone parents, etc.?

7. Has the area covered by the Action Team changed over time? (Phase 1 to Phase 2 to Phase 3?)

   • How were any new areas selected?

   • What impact has the change in areas had?

8. Where are they located within the area (multiple areas/attached to the Jobcentre or EZ/outreach offices/mobile outreach/leased premises, etc.)?
Funding and targets
1. How much funding do you receive? Has this changed at all? Why?
2. How do you feel about the funding process? Does it have a negative/positive effect on operational efficiency?
3. How is the funding spent? (proportions on staff/premises/customer needs)
4. What are your job entry targets?
   - Are you achieving them?
   - Have the job entry targets changed over time and if so, why?
   - Do you have any sense of the cost per job entry?
   - Do you know what proportion are retained in work after 13 weeks? (Higher/lower than expected and why)
5. Are you achieving the 70% inactive target? Any difficulties achieving that?
6. What impact does the 70% inactive target have on serving JSA customers who come to you when you already have sufficient JSA customers? Do you:
   - Serve JSA customers anyway and make it more difficult to achieve 70% target?
   - Serve JSA customers but not report them to national office?
   - Not serve JSA customers?

Activities/support provided by Action Teams
1. Which customer groups do you target from the list of 15 groups? Why?
2. What impact did the introduction in Phase 2 of this list of 15 customer groups have on your team?
3. How do you reach your customer groups?
   - how do you market your activities/projects?
   - how effective is your marketing? What has worked well/not worked well with different groups? Why?
   - PSLs only: Is the Action Team branded as Reed/Working Links, or as Action Team for Jobs?
4. What type of mainstream customer do you typically help (i.e. New Deal or JSA)? Are they mainly customers who come through outreach or are they referred from mainstream programmes?
   - Do you have any problems claiming outcomes if they have been referred from mainstream?
• Do you have any problems getting referrals from mainstream?

5. What processes do you/have you used when recognising that a customer engaged via your Action Team (outreach) would benefit from moving to mainstream provision?

6. What support/activities do you provide for customers? (Get a full description)
   • moving people towards work – improving soft skills, referring on to other services (what kind), etc
   • finding them jobs – job search/CV preparation
   • in-work support
   • other

7. Has your Action Team sought additional funding through either the Employment Projects Fund (EPT) or Transport Projects Fund (TPF)? If so, were you successful with any such bids? (Get a description of the bid/project, target group, timescale and amount received) . What was the impact of the project(s)?

8. How are the different approaches/projects tailored to each target customer group?

9. Do different types of support work better for different groups?

10. How do you differ from mainstream (Jobcentre Plus/EZ) provision?

11. In what ways have you been innovative? Gain examples and an understanding of whether these innovative approaches have been successful or not

12. Have there been any changes over time in the types of activities/support provided? Why?

13. Do you have any further developments/projects planned? What are these?

14. Are there any gaps in your provision? What would you like to do/provide? For particular customers? What stops you?

**Relationships and partnership working**

**General**

1. What are the key relationships/partnerships that have been developed (training course providers, drug/substance councillors, ND providers, Local Strategic Partnerships, job brokers)?

2. Why were these partnerships/relationships developed (problem solving or strategic)?

3. What type of partnerships/relationships are they (contractual relationship, steering, strategic (area) partnership)?

4. How does your role in partnerships link into the District Partnership role/agenda?
5. Have there been any issues/problems with partnership working - examples? Have these been resolved?
6. What have been the key factors that have helped/hindered partnership working?
7. What are the benefits from partnership working?
8. Have there been any lessons learned re effective working relationships?

**Jobcentre Plus mainstream**
1. What is your relationship with Jobcentre Plus mainstream services? Changes over time - has it improved/worsened? Why?
   • frequency of contact - regular meetings?
2. Have there been any lessons learned re effective working relationships with Jobcentre Plus mainstream?

**Employers**
1. What relationships have been developed with local employers? (obtain details such as sector, size, location, etc.)
2. What factors facilitate/hinder employer relationships?
3. Any evidence of benefits from employer relationships?

**Effectiveness of the Action Team**
1. What has been most successful about this Action Team? Why do you think this is?
2. What has been least successful about this Action Team? Why do you think this is?
3. Have there been any factors that have hindered your approach/outcomes?
   • staff – recruitment/training/retention/Jobcentre Plus headcount issues
   • premises – suitability/availability
   • management – internal/relationship with Jobcentre Plus/EZ
   • particular customer groups – difficulties of working with them
   • systems/procedures – eg financial procurement
   • evidence gathering – eg PSLs having to document interventions/prove customers have right to work/evidence job outcomes
   • funding – eg outcome payments for PSLs/Jobcentre Plus teams not ring-fenced
   • relationships with other stakeholders eg LSP/community and voluntary sector
   • others
4. Have these problems been addressed? How?

5. To what extent has your Action Team been able to learn from good practice in other Action Teams? (Buddying/networking, etc.)

**Overall views on Action Teams**

1. In your opinion, how well has the Action Team worked overall?

2. Which features of Action Teams (such as flexibility, outreach, and voluntary engagement) are most important in being able to help customers?

3. Is there any evidence of impact on overall conditions in the Action Team area?
   - employment rates
   - any other impacts/benefits (e.g., crime; schools; health)

4. What lessons have been learned from the Action Team experience?

5. What practical advice would you give someone setting up an Action Team from your experience?

**Further information**

1. Do you collect any local level data (i.e., information on retention, local employers) in addition to MI sent to DWP in Sheffield? Can we get hold of it?

2. Is there any other info/local publications/publicity materials/info about the area we can have copies of?

3. Who do you think we should talk to when we come back for phase two (We want to talk to Team Leaders, Front line advisory staff and other staff, Business managers, other community stakeholders)? What are their contact details? Would it be possible to visit an EPF or TPF project on our next visit?

**Thanks and close**
For Jobcentre Plus District Managers – Phase 1

Thank for agreeing to talk to us. Introduce IES and explain details of project:

The Institute for Employment Studies has been commissioned by DWP to undertake a Review of Action Teams for Jobs. The planned review will take place from mid 2005 until December 2005.

It is designed to:

- identify the key factors that have led to successful implementation of the Action Team approach
- identify any constraints to effective operation
- draw out and integrate key lessons to be learned from the Action Team experience for the delivery of other Jobcentre Plus services in the future, particularly for the delivery of future area-based services.

The research will be based mainly on qualitative case studies (of six Action Teams).

There will be two phases of fieldwork – this is Phase 1

- Phase 1 will be an introductory visit to the site (lasting no more than two days) and will comprise of mainly scoping and exploratory interviews with key respondents in and around the Action Team.
- Phase 2 will comprise of a later and more extended site visit, during which we will interview all individuals and organisations identified as appropriate during Phase 1.

Ask whether okay to record interview – if you want to.

Stress confidentiality of discussion, no one will be identified when reporting back to DWP.

The aim of the whole exercise is to advise on future strategy for DWP and community outreach provision – so DWP are very interested in the strategic district manager point of view on this – ie are Action Teams vfm/worthwhile/useful – should they be funded in the future.

Background

1. Can you tell me something about your own background, and your experiences as a Jobcentre Plus district manager?
- what are your main (key) responsibilities?
- how long have you been the Jobcentre Plus district manager?
- size of the area covered?
2. What is your role with regards to the local Action Team?
   - individual role – steering group?
   - organisational role – contract managers, supply staff etc.?

**Action Team Area**
2. What area does the Action Team cover (different areas/wards?)
   - what is the area the Action Team currently covers?
   - how big is the area? (population and geographically)
   - what are the main problems facing the area: Jobs, skills, education, crime, culture, etc.?
   - are there any particular problem groups in the area: gender, age, ethnicity, lone parents, etc.?
3. Has the area covered by the local Action Team changed over time? (Phase 1 to Phase 2 to Phase 3?)
   - How were any new areas selected?
   - What impact has the change in areas had?
4. Where is the Action Team located within the area (multiple areas/attached to the Jobcentre or EZ/outreach offices/mobile outreach/leased premises etc.)?

**Funding and targets**
1. How much funding do you receive for the Action Team? Has this changed at all? Why?
2. How is the funding spent? (proportions on staff/premises/customer needs)
3. What are the Action Team job entry targets?
   - Are they achieving them?
   - Have the job entry targets changed over time and if so, why?
   - Do you have any sense of the cost per job entry?
   - Do you know what proportion are retained in work after 13 weeks? (Higher/lower than expected and why)
4. Is the Action Team achieving the 70% inactive target? Have they had any difficulties achieving that?

**Relationships and partnership working**

**General**
1. What key Action Team relationships/partnerships have been developed (training course providers, drug/substance councillors, ND providers, Local Strategic Partnerships, job brokers)?
2. Why were these partnerships/relationships developed (problem solving or strategic)?
3. What type of partnerships/relationships are they (contractual relationship, steering, strategic (area) partnership)?
4. Have there been any issues/problems with partnership working - examples? Have these been resolved?
5. What have been the key factors that have helped/hindered partnership working?
6. What are the benefits from partnership working?
7. Have there been any lessons learned re effective working relationships?

**Jobcentre Plus mainstream and Action Team**
1. How effective is your (Jobcentre Plus) relationship with the Action Team? Changes over time– has it improved/worsened? Why?
   - frequency of contact – regular meetings?
   - hands off/on approach?
2. Have there been any lessons learned re effective working relationships with Action Teams?

**Employers**
1. What relationships have been developed with local employers? (obtain details such as sector, size, location etc.)
2. What factors facilitate/hinder employer relationships?
3. Any evidence of benefits from employer relationships?

**Effectiveness of the Action Team**
1. What has been most successful about this Action Team? Why do you think this is?
2. What has been least successful about this Action Team? Why do you think this is?
3. Have there been any factors that have hindered the Action Team approach/outcomes? *Please ask each point in turn:*
• staff – recruitment/training/retention/Jobcentre Plus headcount issues
• premises – suitability/availability
• management – internal/relationship with Jobcentre Plus/EZ
• particular customer groups – difficulties of working with them
• systems/procedures – eg financial procurement
• evidence gathering – eg PSLs having to document interventions/prove customers have right to work/evidence job outcomes
• funding – eg competing priorities for (Action Team) funding?
• relationships with other stakeholders eg LSP/community and voluntary sector
• others

4. Have these problems been addressed? How?

5. To what extent has this Action Team been able to learn from good practice in other Action Teams? (Buddying/networking etc.)

**Overall views on Action Teams**

*Your local Action Team*

1. In your opinion, how well has the Action Team worked overall?

2. Which features of Action Teams (such as flexibility, outreach, and voluntary engagement) are most important in being able to help customers?

3. Is there any evidence of impact on overall conditions in the Action Team area?
   • employment rates
   • any other impacts/benefits (eg crime; schools; health)

4. What lessons have been learned from the Action Team experience?

5. What practical advice would you give someone setting up an Action Team from your experience?

*Action Teams in the broader agenda*

1. What other provision is there in the district (WNP, EZ, Lone Parent EZ, Progress to Work, IB Reform Pilots etc.)?

2. How do Action Teams fit with this other provision?

3. What do Action Teams add to the mainstream provision in your district? *(What do they do that mainstream provision cannot do?)*
4. How important are Action Teams in your overall (Jobcentre Plus) district agenda?
   • how well do Action Teams fit with your broader agenda?
   • do they usefully contribute to it?
   • have the partnerships developed by Action Teams helped with the District Partnership role/agenda?
   • how much of a priority is the Action Team for you?
   • how do they fit with your districts other priorities?
5. How do Action Teams fit with the broader local area agenda (the Local Strategic Partnership Agenda)?
   • how important are Action Teams in the broader local area agenda?

Future of Action Teams
1. If you were given complete flexibility over the programmes and services that you offer would you choose to run an Action Team? Why? Why not?
2. Should elements of Action Team activity be mainstreamed? Which elements? How?
3. Are Action Teams the best way of delivering community outreach (are they vfm/worthwhile/useful)? Why? Why not? If not, what is the best approach?

Thanks and close

For Partners and EPF/TPF Projects – Phase 2

Thank for agreeing to talk to us. Introduce IES and explain details of project:

The Institute for Employment Studies has been commissioned by DWP to undertake a Review of Action Teams for Jobs. The planned review will take place from mid 2005 until December 2005.

It is designed to:
• identify the key factors that have led to successful implementation of the Action Team approach
• identify any constraints to effective operation
• draw out and integrate key lessons to be learned from the Action Team experience for the delivery of other Jobcentre Plus services in the future, particularly for the delivery of future area-based services.

The research will be based mainly on qualitative case studies (of six Action Teams).

There are two phases of fieldwork - and this is Phase 2
- Phase 1 was an introductory visit to the site and comprised of mainly scoping and exploratory interviews with key respondents in and around the Action Team.

- Phase 2 is more extended site visit, during which we will interview all individuals and organisations identified as appropriate during Phase 1.

**Ask whether okay to record interview – if you want to.**

**Stress confidentiality of discussion, no one will be identified when reporting back to DWP.**

*The aim of the whole exercise is to advise on future strategy for DWP and community outreach provision – ie are Action Teams vfm/worthwhile/useful – should they be funded in the future.*

**Background**

1. Can you briefly describe the work of your organisation?
2. What is your role with regards to the local Action Team?
   - individual role - steering group?
   - organisational role – contract managers, supply staff etc.?
   - cross refer customers to provision/courses/training
   - provide training etc.
   - share outreach premises

**Working with the Action Team**

1. How did you become involved with the Action Team?
   - problem solving/strategic reasons/both?
2. What service do you provide for customers in the Action Team area?
   - what are the objectives of the service?
   - what specific forms of help do you provide? How? Where?
   - who are the target customers?
   - what are the target outcomes?
3. How did the Action Team commission your service/provision?
4. What is the nature of your working relationship with the Action Team?
   - how do you liaise/work with the pilot?
5. How effective is the service provided in meeting the needs of customers?
   - is it reaching the intended target groups?
   - how effective is the service in helping customers?
6. What evidence do you have of outcomes/impact?
7. How effective is your relationship with the Action Team?
8. Have there been any issues/problems with partnership working – examples?
   • premises – suitability/availability
   • funding – timing etc.
   • management – relationship with Action Team staff
   • particular customer groups – difficulties of working with them
   • relationships with other stakeholders eg LSP/community and voluntary sector
   • others
9. Have these problems been addressed? How?
10. What have been the key factors that have helped/hindered partnership working?
11. What are the benefits from partnership working?
12. Have there been any key lessons learned re effective working relationships?

**Effectiveness of the Action Team**
1. In your opinion, how well has the Action Team worked overall?
2. What do you think has been most successful about this Action Team? Why do you think this is?
3. What do you think has been least successful about this Action Team? Why do you think this is?
4. Which features of Action Teams (such as flexibility, outreach, and voluntary engagement) are most important in being able to help customers?
5. What lessons have been learned from the Action Team experience?

**Thanks and close**
Appendix D
Management Information tables

The data in this appendix is presented for year one of Phase 3 of Action Teams (April 2004 to March 2005). See the following pages for tables.
Table D.1  Contacts by age (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 574 1,001 976 3,680 23,557 65,350 88,907


Table D.2  Contacts by gender (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,686 23,566 65,468 89,034

## Table D.3 Contacts by benefit type (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit type</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,687 23,566 65,469 89,035

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-forces regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offenders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol problems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People lacking basic skills</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/no fixed abode</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers/ refugees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left LA care home in last 3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal 25+/ EZ finishers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years old or over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority group</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 months unemployed</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 742 694 773 1,458 1,193 6,117 39,054 130,030 169,084

### Table D.5 Contacts by ethnicity (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,687 23,306 65,467 88,773*

### Table D.6  Contacts by duration of joblessness (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of joblessness</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – 12 months</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 18 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18m – 3 yrs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 yrs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,684 23,565 65,451 89,016


### Table D.7  Contacts by number of characteristics (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 15 target characteristics</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base 486 662 572 1,000 976 3,681 23,549 65,039 88,588

### Table D.8  Job entries by age (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 152 324 229 354 458 850 8,814 18,385 27,199


### Table D.9  Job entries by gender (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: 152 324 229 356 459 851 8,818 18,418 27,236

### Table D.10  Job entries by benefit type (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit type</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JSA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70:30 split</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D.11  Job entries by group (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-forces regular</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offenders</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol problems</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People lacking basic skills</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/no fixed abode</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers/ refugees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left LA care home in last 3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal 25+/ EZ finishers</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years old or over</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 months unemployed</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D.12  |  Job entries by ethnicity (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Base** 152 | 324 | 229 | 356 | 459 | 851 | 8,717 | 18,418 | 27,135

Table D.13  Job entries by duration of joblessness (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of joblessness</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18m - 3yrs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 yrs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 152 324 229 356 459 851 8,818 18,418 27,236


Table D.14  Job entries by number of characteristics (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 15 target characteristics</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 152 324 229 354 457 849 8,818 18,342 27,160

Table D.15  Job entries as a percentage of contacts by age (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 574 1,001 976 3,680 23,557 65,350 88,907


Table D.16  Job entries as a percentage of contacts by gender (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,686 23,566 65,468 89,034

### Table D.17  Job entries as a percentage of contacts by benefit type (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit type</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ISA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IB</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \text{Base} )</td>
<td>[486 ]</td>
<td>[662 ]</td>
<td>[575 ]</td>
<td>[1,005 ]</td>
<td>[978 ]</td>
<td>[3,687 ]</td>
<td>[23,566 ]</td>
<td>[65,469 ]</td>
<td>[89,035 ]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table D.18 Job entries as a percentage of contacts by group (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ex-forces regular</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health problems</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offenders</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol problems</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People lacking basic skills</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone parent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless/no fixed abode</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English as a second language</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seekers/refugees</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left LA care home in last 3 years</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Deal 25+/EZ finishers</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 years old or over</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic minority group</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 12 months unemployed</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 742 694 773 1,458 1,193 6,117 39,054 130,030 169,084

Table D.19  Job entries as a percentage of contacts by ethnicity (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnic origin</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White British</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Irish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other White</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black Caribbean</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Black African</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White &amp; Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Mixed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistani</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladeshi</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Asian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black African</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to say</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,687 23,306 65,467 88,773

Table D.20  Job entries as a percentage of contacts by duration of joblessness (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration of joblessness</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-12 months</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12-18 months</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18m-3yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 575 1,005 978 3,684 23,565 65,451 89,016


Table D.21  Job entries as a percentage of contacts by number of characteristics (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of 15 target characteristics</th>
<th>Team A PSL</th>
<th>Team B PSL</th>
<th>Team C JCP</th>
<th>Team D JCP</th>
<th>Team E JCP</th>
<th>Team F JCP</th>
<th>All PSL Total</th>
<th>All JCP Total</th>
<th>All AT Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four or more</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base 486 662 572 1,000 976 3,681 23,549 65,039 88,588

Appendix E
List of current Action Team areas

Barnsley & Rotherham
Birmingham North
Birmingham South
Blackburn with Darwen
Blaenau Gwent
Brent
Brighton & Hove
Caerphilly
Chester-le-street
Cornwall
Doncaster
Dundee, City of
Easington
East Ayrshire
Greenwich
Glasgow Central
Glasgow North
Glasgow South
Glasgow West
Hackney
Halton
Hartlepool
Haringey
Highlands & Islands
Islington
Kingston upon Hull
Knowsley
Lambeth
Lewisham
Liverpool Central
Liverpool North
Liverpool South
Manchester Central
Manchester North
Manchester South
Merthyr Tydfil
Middlesborough
Neath Port Talbot
Newcastle upon Tyne
Newham
North Lanarkshire
North West Wales
Nottingham, City of
Pembrokeshire
Plymouth
Redcar & Cleveland
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff
Salford
Sefton
Sheffield
South Tyneside
Southwark
St Helens
Stockton-on-Tees
Sunderland
Thanet
Tower Hamlets
Waltham Forest
Wansbeck
West Dunbartonshire
Wales Objective One
Wirral
Wolverhampton
Barrow in Furness (April 04)
Weir Valley (April 04)