



LONDON
HEALTH COMMISSION

London Works *for Better Health*

Phase one scoping of employment activity across London

Report
March 2003

Contents

Background	1
Methodology	2
Mapping	2
A working definition of 'employment activity'	2
Mapping terms of reference	3
Mapping activity	4
Scoping interviews	6
First wave interviews (Nov–Dec 2003)	6
Second wave interviews (Jan– Feb 2004)	6
Interview guide	8
Strategic planning conference	9
Analytic themes	10
Theme 1: Health, regeneration and urban development	10
Validated activity areas for the future London Works programme of action 1: Developing an healthy and sustainable community	16
Theme 2: Healthy business and employment practice	19
Validated activity areas for the future London Works programme of action 2: The business of healthy employment	33
Theme 3: Health and basic skills	35
Validated activity areas for the future London Works programme of action 3: Key Skills	41
Proposed areas for the London Works action programme	44
Framework for proposed London Works action programme	45
The Business of Healthy Employment	45
Developing an Healthy and Sustainable Community	46
Key Skills	47
Additional recommendations and recommendations for other partners	48
Appendices	50

Background

In September 2003, OPM® (Office for Public Management) was commissioned to support the scoping phase of the *London Works for Better Health* programme.

The programme is supported by London Health Commission (LHC), via the King's Fund. The LHC acts an independent, high-level, strategic partnership that seeks to improve the well-being of all Londoners and reduce inequalities in health. By building partnerships involving the health sector, local and national government, the private sector and community and voluntary groups, influencing decision-makers and providing support for local action, the LHC promotes a co-ordinated approach to the factors that influence health in London.

The Commission is committed to developing employment activity as a way of promoting better health and reducing health inequalities (employment as a wider determinant of health). The aims of the *London Works for Better Health* programme are to:

- Add value to work by the Commission, its partners and stakeholders which will develop and implement strategies to improve health and reduce health inequalities through employment and enterprise
- Promote and support healthy and sustainable employment practices
- Promote and support partnership working in the planning and delivery of health- and employment-related initiatives
- Help raise the profile of the London Health Commission.

In order to achieve these aims, the objectives of the *London Works* programme are to:

- Conduct a London-wide scoping of
 - (i) health- and employment-related strategies and initiatives; and
 - (ii) employment strategies and initiatives targeted at Londoners experiencing poor health outcomes
- Develop and lead a programme of action in light of the above
- Conduct/commission evaluation and health impact assessment of the programme, in conjunction with the London Health Observatory and others, as appropriate
- Secure coverage of *London Works* in London media and specialist journals.

In the context of these objectives, this report outlines the scoping phase of the programme (corresponding to the first objective above), the output of which will inform the development of a tangible programme of action (the second objective).

Methodology

At an initial meeting involving members of the Steering Group, the Programme Manager and the OPM team, a timeline was established for the scoping phase of the programme, divided into three stages:

1. Mapping: pan-London and strategic contacts (October–December 2003)
2. Scoping interviews (November 2003 –January 2004)
3. Scoping event (January–February 2004)

A unique and distinctive aspect of the scoping work was the close collaboration maintained between the Programme Manager and OPM throughout the life of the project (and respective administrative support). It was the collaborative nature of this working relationship that supported scoping as very much a joint exercise and the process outlined in this report should be viewed against this context. Any substantive issues arising from the scoping were considered by a project steering group for the London Works programme, which included representatives of London Development Agency (LDA), the King's Fund, London First, LHC and the Regional Public Health Group (RPHG). This group met regularly through the life of the scoping. Progress on the scoping was also presented at LHC Commission and Executive Group meetings.

Mapping

A working definition of 'employment activity'

Many stakeholders are involved in employment activity across London. As well as those agencies that specifically focus on employment (e.g. JobCentre Plus), those working in other sectors, such as health, regeneration, education and transport, may be involved in or take an overview of the employment activity agenda. There is also great variation in the types of activity in which agencies engage. It was therefore important to have at the beginning of the project a clear and common understanding of what is meant by 'employment activity' and the wider terms of reference for initial mapping work.

The following categories of employment activities in London were identified:

- Increasing the capacity of people to move closer to getting work (e.g. skills)
- Activity of organisations to move people directly into work (e.g. recruitment)
- Activity seeking to foster health of people in work
- Activity that sustains people in work (training and development, LDA's FRESA programme, practical work with populations in work such as with BME groups, disabled groups)
- Activity relating to loss of work and movement out of the workforce (retirement).

Activity relating to those moving out of the workforce was considered outside of the remit of the criteria for the London Works project. The remaining activities were felt to coalesce around two major points of:

- | |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Activities, plans and initiatives attempting to move people into work (or get closer to getting into work)2. Activities, plans and initiatives seeking to increase the health of people in work – both cross-sector and those internal to particular sectors or employers (e.g. health and social care) |
|---|

This broad working definition of employment activity still covers a very wide range of projects, initiatives and interventions. Certain initiatives may seek to widen the participation in the labour market of social groups normally subject to exclusion (for example, minority ethnic communities and disabled Londoners). Such work may be focused within employment sectors, for instance if there are associated skill shortages (such as in the Health sector), and have a focus on training. Other work may focus on capacity building of particular sectors, such as voluntary and community organisations and social enterprises. Development of these sectors is understood to have positive social impact not just for immediate employees, but the wider community of which they are part. Activity around public sector procurement can help to support local suppliers by sourcing them for contracts where possible (*'Claiming the Health Dividend'*, Kings Fund, 2002). Other initiatives may seek to remove barriers that prevent particular groups from working, such as childcare expenses, or work directly with employers. Clearly, mapping this agenda in its entirety across London would represent a hugely resource-intensive task. In order to support a focused and targeted approach, robust terms of reference were identified to guide the mapping of types of activity considered most relevant to the research.

Mapping terms of reference

Using the broad working definition of employment activity described above, the following criteria were used to guide the mapping process.

a) Priority groups

A high priority for the programme is activity that focuses on particular groups that may be subject to exclusion and experience inequalities according to employment, health and wider social indices. Principally (and reflecting the wider priorities of the LHC) this included black and minority ethnic communities, children and young people and disabled Londoners. Through initial interviews, older people were also identified as an important group for the programme to consider, and this informed their addition as a fourth priority group for the programme.

b) Scale

Rather than focusing on either specific or generic projects, encompassing a broad range of different-sized plans and activities was identified as of most relevance to the research (e.g. in those instances where the micro-local or regional perspective of a project may be considered intrinsic to its success). In terms of geographic focus, this includes a pan-London, borough-

specific, and even ward-level focus (for initiatives such as New Deal for Communities, as identified in d) below).

c) Sector

London Works focuses on priority employment sectors, with particular interest in activity operating in growth areas predicted within the LDA 'London Plan'. This includes retail, hospitality and construction. Engaging in these areas is important, as it allows people to access those fields in which the greatest numbers of new jobs will be available in the future. However, many initiatives do not have a sector-specific focus (typically, sector-driven versus community-driven), so a mix of the two was identified as a positive aspect of any inclusion criteria (e.g. regeneration and community development projects).

d) Location

The GLA area of 33 boroughs was identified as the main geographical reference for the scoping work. Within this, the project focused on those areas experiencing high unemployment rates and where there was a concentration of priority groups such as BME communities and children and young people (e.g. Hackney, Brent). Of particular interest were those areas in which a number of central government initiatives aimed at addressing social exclusion had been established, such as Sure Start, New Deal for Communities and Neighbourhood Renewal.

e) Partnerships

Whilst this was not an explicit criterion, including examples of multi-sectoral and multi-agency partnership working was identified as being of import to the research.

In addition, it was felt to be important to include activities that both had and had not worked, in order to draw out learning from the range of activities.

Mapping activity

Once the terms of reference had been agreed, OPM conducted a mapping exercise to identify local, borough and regional employment activity. This was conducted in two waves.

First, mapping by the OPM team identified a range of employment activities operating on a pan-London basis (see Appendix A). The format of this document is a table including short descriptions of activity type, group focus, organisational involvement (including funders) and contact details. Following production of this pan-London mapping document in October 2003, and validation of this document with the steering group, a sample framework was established between OPM and the Programme Manager to identify potential interviewees, and interviewing took place between November and December 2003. This process was designed so that the first wave interviewing could draw on the strategic contacts' knowledge and expertise. This enabled the team to identify a greater range of local projects, some of which may not have been so readily identifiable using Internet searches, relevant document and literature reviews and other mapping tools. It also provided the basis for London Works to raise its own profile as an employment-related programme with high-level personnel within the field, who could support some of the areas of future action for the programme.

Second, the OPM team mapped more specific local and borough activities, focusing as agreed on the boroughs of Brent, Hackney, Islington, Newham, Tower Hamlets, Croydon and Southwark. Additional contacts were also made in Greenwich. These boroughs were of prime interest, but were not the sole focus of mapping, providing a 'guide' by which interesting examples of employment activity could be identified in order to give a snapshot of the range of activity across London. Where relevant activity was identified outside of these boroughs (such as by first wave interviewees) it was included within the mapping. The second mapping document was compiled in a similar way to the first (in tabular format with headings indicating activity type, group focus, organisations involved (including funders) and contact details – see Appendix B).

Scoping interviews

First wave interviews (Nov–Dec 2003)

Using contact details in the initial pan-London mapping document, together with suggestions generated by the Steering Group and Programme Manager, a number of potential contacts were identified for first wave interviews. These contacts were tabled into a matrix in order to ensure that there was broad coverage of high-level strategic expertise according to the axes of:

- Priority group focus (BME, disabled Londoners and younger people)
- Sector focus (health, education, childcare, cultural industries, private sector, cross-sector)

In collaboration with the Programme Manager, an interview schedule was designed to capture some of the main issues considered of relevance to the programme, in terms of specific employment activity (e.g. what has worked, what gaps there are and where the programme could add value). The interview guide (shown on page 8) was utilised with the understanding that respondents may offer insight into particular parts of the guide, rather than its entirety. Interviews were informal and semi-structured, with strategic contacts being interviewed on a face-to-face basis and notes taken during discussion and typed up for wider dissemination amongst the team. The work of conducting the interviews was shared equally between OPM and the London Works Programme Manager.

Second wave interviews (Jan– Feb 2004)

Second wave contacts were identified in discussions with first wave interviewees, together with the wealth of contacts identified in the OPM local and borough-level mapping document and any additional contacts identified from discussions with the Programme Manager and Steering Group members.

Again, in meetings with the Programme Manager, a matrix was constructed that allowed broad coverage of the range of activity focus (and thus interviewee expertise) against the two axes of priority grouping and sector focus. While the axes of first wave interviewees had been left deliberately broad (as contacts were expected to have strategic overview of employment activity), it became clear that additional axes would be needed to categorise the different types of activity that had emerged through the second wave mapping. Through first wave interviews it had also become clear that an additional priority group needed adding to the programme: older people. We also identified activity focusing on parents and women as of particular interest, although this was not an explicit priority.

An analytic distinction was made, as follows:

- Priority grouping (BME, disabled Londoners, younger people, older people and, informally, women and parents; and general focus)
- Sector grouping (small and medium enterprises (SME), social enterprise, public sector/procurement, voluntary sector, recruitment agencies, general focus)

Within the sector grouping, there was a further division according to the specific location of activity. Interviews were conducted equally by OPM and the Programme Manager, using a mix of face-to-face and telephone interviews; the interviews used the interview guide, shown on page 8. Interviews were also informal and semi-structured: written notes taken during discussion were subsequently typed up so as to be available for dissemination to other project team members.

In total, around 90 key contacts were spoken to during the course of both interview waves (see appendix C), generating a great wealth of data. Through analysis of this data, three major themes emerged in relation to employment activity: regeneration and urban development; healthy business and employment practice; health and Basic Skills (described p.10ff) These themes were presented at a final strategic planning conference, at which delegates were invited to critique and refine the research findings as well as put forward proposals for the programme of action for the London Works programme. Delegates at this conference were drawn from the interviewees from the two interview waves.

Interview guide

Background

Position? (role, wider responsibilities, other roles, length in post)

Previous experience?

Activity narrative: overview

What does it seek to achieve? (objectives)

How does the activity seek to achieve its objectives (is it early intervention, is it skills uplift, is it focused on people in work)

Who, where and on what sector does it focus?

Timescale?

What work has been done so far? (Overview of current and planned activities intended (short-term, long term), and progress to date)

Understanding behind employment activity

What do you feel are the major motivating reasons behind X?

Activity narrative: SWOT analysis

How do you understand success?

Process measures?

Currently or future planned evaluation frameworks?

What has worked? (explore facilitators, mainstream/specific)

What has not worked? (explore barriers, mainstream/specific)

Has there been learning through the work?

Will there be sustainability of the project beyond the life of the activity itself? Mainstreaming

What mechanisms exist to demonstrate sustainability of outcome (e.g of whether people continue to remain in work, to access skills etc)

What opportunities do you feel the activity has highlighted? (grow, rationalise, gaps)

Exit strategy/ies envisaged?

Outputs or products produced?

What do these look like, whom are intended audience, are they marketable tools?

Do you have a vision of your own corporate strategy and the future activity that could be a part of this? (future planning)

Funding, partnership working and wider networks

Who are your current funding sources? Whom do you see as future funders?

Who do you think should be responsible for funding the gaps in employment activity?

Partnership working now and in future and at what level?

Are you part of wider networks relating to employment activity (or any other interest areas)? (borough, sub-regional, pan London)

Detail these networks, who leads, how often meet, what type it is (e.g. if an action learning network, virtual network for dissemination etc).

How does your activity understand its profile?

LHC and London Works for Better Health Programme

Do you see there being a place for the involvement of different sectors (private sector, social enterprise, the public sector) in the area of employment activity in which you work?

Thoughts on the London Works programme? Do you see a place for this work? could it build on existing networks (where are these)?

What contribution do you see this making to your activities?

What place or contribution could you see your activity having in this network? (final event sign-up and/or continuing involvement).

Do you have literature on activities partnerships, networks.

What other relevant people do you think we could speak with?

Strategic planning conference

On 23 February 2004, a final strategic planning conference was held to mark the end of the formal scoping process and to establish proposals for consideration by the steering group for the forward action plan of the London Works programme. Around 70 people attended this final event, which was chaired and facilitated by OPM and held over a full day at the King's Fund, London (see Appendices D for list of attendees).

The purpose of the conference was two-fold. First, it was an opportunity to present and validate the analytic themes that emerged from the data with those strategic contacts who had been part of the interview process. The themes (health, regeneration and urban development, healthy business and employment practice and health and Basic Skills) are discussed in more detail in the following chapter. In the morning session, delegates were allocated to workshops, each with a focus on one of the three themed areas, and were invited to revisit, deepen and refine specific proposals for activity that London Works could include its programme of action. This generated many proposals, the write up of which forms part of the ongoing London Works database. During lunch, these ideas were synthesised into four main areas of activity.

The second opportunity that the conference presented was to secure delegates' own contribution to the delivery of the London Works programme. Using the four main areas of activity synthesised from the specific proposals for action generated in the morning session, delegates were asked to identify what their organisation could bring to the London Works programme, what their organisation currently needed in relation to engaging in employment activity and what they would like to see the London Works programme specifically do in relation to the employment activity agenda. As with the first session, a wealth of information was collated, and this data forms part of the London Works database. In a final plenary session, a small number of delegates were asked to identify where they would like to make contribution to the programme, with wider discussion involving all delegates following on from this.

The Programme Manager and OPM met after the planning event to analyse the main proposals for activity, identify contributions to the programme and establish a framework for the proposed areas of activity that London Works could focus upon in establishing its forward areas of action. Proposals for future programme content tended to confirm the three main analytic themes identified through interview data analysis; delegate proposals for action for the London Works programme are included after each of the following three chapters on the main analytic themes. These findings were presented to and refined by the project steering group, with the validated framework and proposals presented to the full LHC Executive on 1 March 2004 by the Programme Manager and OPM.

Analytic themes

Interviews produced rich and varied data, the full record of which forms part of the ongoing London Works database. To facilitate analysis, we produced summaries of all interviews, so that top-level findings could be identified. Of particular relevance in terms of potential analytic themes were: interviewees' perceptions of exemplar employment activity; perceived gaps in current areas of activity; and where – potentially – London Works could add value to these areas in terms of its overall programme of action. It became evident that the data coalesced around three major analytic themes. For sake of brevity, the major policy drivers and initiatives framing these themes have been included in Appendix E.

Theme 1: Health, regeneration and urban development

The theme of health, regeneration and urban development covers employment activity that in some way connects to the regeneration and/or physical redevelopment of areas of London. As identified in the LDA London Plan, physical regeneration is occurring or planned across many sites in London, including Wembley, Thames Gateway, Kings Cross and the various Olympic sites. Construction Skills (formerly CITB) estimates that some 40,000 new jobs will need to be created in the sector in the next five years to meet demand. Against this background, interviewees focused on employment activity in a range of different contexts. One stream of activity related to employment activity linked to the actual process of construction, its connections to local employment markets and training and learning opportunities. A second raft of comments concerned issues about the sustainable development of local communities surrounding new developments once they were complete (such as through Section 106 of the Town & Country Planning Act: see later). People also looked at the potential of new public building sector buildings being constructed under PFI, and the ways in which policy work could link, formally, the agendas of health and sustainability in terms of the impact of these schemes on their surrounding local communities. All of this discussion was underscored by a more foundational issue, concerning the extent to which 'sustainability' was integral to the thinking of those involved in employment activity and what could be done to address this potential gap.

Health and sustainable development

A fundamental issue for interviewees concerned the extent to which the sustainable development agenda was understood or engaged in cross-sectorally. Interviewees spoke of meaningful and sustainable employment as intrinsic to developing a strong and robust local economy. Routine work with low levels of pay, poor promotion prospects and high levels of staff turnover (such as at lower tiers of the hospitality industry) was felt to raise many challenges. However, interviewees felt that the link between this and the wider sustainable development agenda was not well developed at a local and regional level (for national context see *'Building a Better Quality of Life: A Strategy for Sustainable Development for the UK'*, Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions, 2000). Strategic voluntary sector contacts suggested that, in their sector, sustainability tended to be conceptualised in relation to funding cycles and the longevity of projects. Interviewees felt that there was a need for a more developed understanding of what sustainable local employment actually means. They felt that initiatives frequently bore the imprint

of an economic vision of London as either driven by corporate interests as the source of growth for the economy, or with local economies as the driver, with issues of sustainability sidelined. In bringing together the health and sustainable development agendas in a London context, there was felt to be potential for London Works to broker closer links between relevant bodies, such as the Sustainable Development Commission and LHC. In the specific context of the voluntary sector, collaborative working with organisations such as London Voluntary Service Council (LVSC) and the Third Sector Alliance (3SA) could identify ways to increase the engagement of health work with the sustainability agenda.

Defining a healthy economy

Interviewees identified the need to demonstrate what constitutes a healthy economy to all stakeholders involved in employment activity across the business, social enterprise and voluntary and community sectors. They felt that one potential area of interest was the partnerships being established by the GLA for the sub-regional development frameworks of the London Plan: they saw a potential role for London Works to input into this process. This was felt to link strongly to the kind of assessments that could be employed within the frameworks themselves.

Respondents thought that impact assessments were confusing for local agencies, with one developer bemoaning the need to conduct eleven different impact assessments for every development. A range of social enterprises and development trusts mentioned their difficulties in measuring health and sustainability, since the kind of effects they were trying to capture were not obvious or distinct. For example, Paddington Development Trust (PDT) said that it did not have to hand the kind of data it would need to demonstrate the links between health and other issues, complicated by a lack of confidence in knowing where to access such information in terms of the local health economy (in this case, at primary care trust (PCT) level). For some PCTs, involvement in employment activity that had more of a community development focus (e.g. work with older people) was difficult because 'health', as narrowly defined, was a relatively small impact of such work. Respondents felt that assessment should not focus solely on statistical analyses of health, but should include wider indices of health and wellbeing; they mooted the idea of London Works lobbying for this. If the programme were able to keep sight of ongoing work on impact assessment, it was felt that it could keep other agencies 'signposted' of developments occurring in the context of IIA.

Local authorities such as Greenwich identified how 'integrated regeneration' had been established as the fulcrum of its economic development function. In this context, development of a health-based Local Public Service Agreement (LPSA) was one approach that could demonstrate the mainstreaming of the health, sustainability and employment agendas at a local level (LPSAs commit local authorities to strong performance targets in strategic areas, such as employment, in exchange for council flexibilities). In terms of health, this is something that the Health Inequalities Unit at the Department of Health is currently engaged in, within its Shared Priority Project that helps local authorities working with PCTs and regional partners to promote healthier communities and narrow health inequalities. Building on the learning from the Shared Priority Project self-assessment tool was felt to be one way to encourage local councils in

London to develop approaches to planning and delivery that took a focused and integrated approach to action on health inequalities (inclusive of employment as a wider determinant of health).

From the perspective of organisations for disabled Londoners, one possible avenue for the London Works programme would be to promote health and sustainability agendas at a local authority level and there was interviewee support for the pilot auditing of Welfare to Work Joint Investment Plans for people with disabilities. The plans are intended to bring employment and disability together in a cross-cutting way at local authority level, in theory linking with community and regeneration strategies. While central government interest in the Investment Plans was felt to be waning, there was also felt to be a role for the programme to lobby for the plans to have a more prominent place on the London agenda.

PFI Contracts

The refurbishment and rebuilding of public service facilities, including for the NHS, has been facilitated in partnership with the private sector through PFI schemes, typically involving a long-term contract of up to 35 years. Respondents felt that PFI schemes could be better utilised to reduce health inequalities and increase employment for local people.

The Healthy Urban Development Unit (HUDU) is funded by RPHG, LDA and the NHS in London, in recognition of the importance of shaping the urban development of London so that health is promoted through urban design. Building for Health and joint work with the Carbon Trust, looking at how the PFI process can be used to procure, build and run NHS buildings so that they promote sustainability, are initiatives of the RPHG. The involvement of leading edge agencies such as Brook Lyndhurst and Fabermaunsell in these (and other) initiatives signals the importance of work that examines the mechanisms by which various aspects of sustainable development can best be incorporated into the PFI procurement process (e.g. for further details visit www.brooklyndhurst.co.uk/projects). There was felt to be a role for London Works to link into the dissemination of this work, developing the employment dimension further.

Interviewees looked to examples such as Whipps Cross University Hospital PFI, which won the Health Services Journal Sustainable Development Award in 2003. A key feature of the Whipps Cross approach was the way in which there was an explicit grounding of regeneration objectives within the hospital, as a way of reducing wider health inequalities in the area. In terms of employment, for example, a 'professional volunteer' scheme was established, which provided training in customer care for 200 people with mental health issues. Interviewees felt that this experience had given the clients real and transferable skills, enabling them to access New Deal and consequently gain sustainable employment and a sense of empowerment. The scheme has since been replicated in a number of other locations. Respondents felt that there was a potential role for London Works to disseminate such examples of good practice.

Section 106

Local authority interviewees identified how section 106 ('planning gain') had been used by a small number of authorities to establish local employment support. Section 106 is an amendment

to the Town and Country Planning Act (1990) that allows for community benefits to be derived by councils from optional levies imposed on developers who choose to pay instead of negotiating a conventional S106 agreement. For example, in Greenwich, development around the Millennium Dome was the initial driver that, together with strong council commitment, supported the establishment of the Greenwich Local Labour and Business agency (GLLaB), which is now an established organisation offering recruitment, training, job brokerage and skills matching to local people. The rationale for developer involvement is that the GLLaB work supports the development of a sustainable local employment base, working to mutual benefit in delivering skilled employees for developers and employment for local people. The level of funding from S106 money (to date 20 per cent of £25m raised has gone to GLLaB) has allowed the agency to focus on a number of hard-to-reach groups for whom employment activity packages tend to be more resource-intensive. For example, working with partners such as JobCentre Plus, GLLaB has established ESOL packages for refugees, offering translated materials and outreach work, and is now looking to expand the S106 approach further to focus on issues such as childcare and small businesses.

In areas such as Paddington Waterside (formerly Paddington Basin), lobbying of the local council had allowed PDT to spend S106 money on local initiatives. These activities had worked both to reinforce PDT as integral to the local community and also helped to promote the local area as a realistic place of employment for local people. Interviewees felt that there was a role for London Works in disseminating good practice from areas such as Greenwich and Paddington, particularly into other areas where large-scale development is planned (e.g. the redevelopment of Arsenal football stadium and Islington).

Construction industry

Interviewees from the construction industry concurred with the idea that PFI is a way to reach local communities and had an understanding of it as one way in which local employment initiatives could be established (and local businesses subcontracted). However, views about S106 were ambivalent, with some companies feeling that they might be better served if they were able to use the funds given to local authorities to establish their own recruitment and training, which they argued would be more flexible and in their own control. Some interviewees had doubts about the short-term nature of the majority of construction work, the degree of mobility required for people to remain within the industry and its lack of unionisation, and felt that further thinking was needed on how the construction industry contributed to a local sustainable employment. For example, one route would be for PFI projects to provide local employment both in the construction phase of a development and in its operation (e.g. workers moving onto non-clinical positions within a hospital).

A concern of construction companies was the issue of on-site language and the quality of ESOL provision (including language-specific health and safety instructions), given the high ethnic diversity of local communities in London. Construction Skills was identified as a key agency when looking to work at a sector level with the construction industry. There was felt to be role for London Works to have links with and promote awareness of the Construction Sector Framework

for Regional Employment and Skills Action (FRESA), which links local labour and training schemes across London with key regeneration/development schemes.

Local councils in areas of significant new build, such as Brent, identified the need to bring together a range of partners, such as local colleges, the local authority, JobCentre Plus, LDA and GLA, to ensure that employment is high up the agenda and that the shortage in qualified trade staff required by, for example, the Wembley regeneration can be met as far as possible by employing local people. Partnership working was felt to be vital. From the perspective of some interviewees, particularly those in skills agencies, there was an issue about training people in construction skills, when on-site experience was one of the common pre-requisites for a construction job. Organisations such as Women's Education in Building had overcome this by setting up links with a range of construction companies where they could then place clients, but these links had been built up over time, and other training providers found themselves facing a vicious circle of training people for employment when employers would only consider those applicants already possessing on-site experience. Again, there was felt to be a role for London Works to disseminate good practice and learning in this area, to overcome such barriers.

NHS spending: Claiming the health dividend

In '*Claiming the Health Dividend*' the potential impact of the NHS is understood in terms not only of employment, but also its wider purchasing power and impact on local communities. Local procurement, that is, contracting local suppliers, was felt to be a major way for NHS agencies to become involved in local communities, for example in the areas of childcare, food suppliers and waste management. Respondents saw this involvement as supporting the health and sustainable development agendas and working toward developing a 'virtuous' circle, involving local communities and NHS agencies. Agencies such as the Procurement Federation in South West London and London Remade (focusing on waste procurement) were felt to be helping to establish the NHS as an organisation integrated into the social, economic and environmental fabric of local community life. However, in order to achieve this, some interviewees felt that a regionalised approach should be taken to the strategic planning of issues such as procurement. The Health Creators/Wealth Creators strategy formulated by Regional Public Health Group (RPHG) works from the premise that the scale of issues such as procurement (spanning across NHS agencies in London and linking to other sectors outside of Health) means that a regional approach is the only effective means by which strategic planning can be conducted. While interviewees understood the context of the disbandment of NHS London region, one implication was felt to be the loss of such a 'London focus' in their work.

Guidelines produced by agencies such as Social Enterprise London (SEL) have focused on developing social enterprises working with and for older people to provide health and social care services, particularly the SRB6 funded Enterprise for Communities to create sustainable social communities in East London. However, interviewees saw these examples as the exception, and, despite a recent DTI toolkit providing guidelines for social enterprises wanting to get involved in procurement ('*Public Procurement: a Toolkit for Social Enterprises*', Department for Trade and Industry, 2003), the process was still felt to pose challenges. In the experience of social enterprises such as GreenWorks, their potential to sell their product (recycled furniture) to local

hospitals was high, but the perceived impenetrability of the health sector and bureaucracy of public sector procurement procedures could present an obstacle. Non-health agency respondents called for the LDA, LHC and GLA to work more closely together to aid understanding of the health sector among those outside of the sector. While not necessarily specific to London Works, this does have relevance to the sector more widely.

Conversely, scoping interviewees based at PCTs identified their interest in the procurement agenda, but felt it was something that they did not have time to follow up through their own work, given their immediate constraints and the need to balance cost benefit with community benefit. Interviewees welcomed the potential for further guidelines around procurement and felt that this, together with dissemination of learning and good practice, was something London Works could consider as an area of involvement, in relation to health and other sectors.

London Olympic 2012 bid

Given the Mayoral focus on health and sustainability as two of the cross-cutting themes in the London Plan (the third being Equalities), interviewees felt that there was synergy in joint policy work that could demonstrate the relationship between health, regeneration and sustainable development through the lens of employment. A concrete example given was the London 2012 Olympic bid and its legacy, particularly insofar as it pertained to the regeneration planned for the Lower Lea Valley. A small number of strategic contacts identified how demonstrations of the long-term local social impact and sustainability of the 2012 bid not only showed what an integrated approach to the two agendas could look like for actual projects and interventions on the ground, but that consideration of health and sustainability was itself a fundamental criterion of success for previous successful Olympic bids. For example, successful bidders for major sporting and 'expo' events, such as Barcelona and Shanghai, have reported that the ability to demonstrate positive, sustainable social outcomes for local people was integral to their success, where the Games had a reconstructive impact on the social and economic infrastructure of the city itself, the legacy of which continued to have positive impact for local people. Following an approach by the bid company 2012, this input has already resulted in London Works facilitating a collaboration between the London Health, Skills and Sustainable Development Commissions to support this activity.

Validated activity areas for the future London Works programme of action 1: Developing an healthy and sustainable community

The major areas for action identified through the strategic planning event for the future London Works programme are set out below. Each of these issues, in totum, was seen as enabling the London Works programme to model what a healthy community for sustainable growth might look like. The added value of London Works involvement in this modelling was felt to be the sheer breadth of people it could bring people together to achieve this.

- **The London Plan** sub-regional development framework (SRDF) was proposed as an area into which London Works could broker input. Within the planning workshop, delegate sign up from the GLA identified how, in addition to SRDFs, the GLA could bring potential access to the Thames Gateway development and the Olympics 2012 bid. Targeted work with strategic bodies such as GLA and LDA was also identified by delegates as one of the specific contributions that London Works could bring to employment activity in London. This builds on calls made through interviews for London Works to lobby for the inclusion of indices of wider health and wellbeing in SRDFs, in addition to health statistics (and to disseminate learning if integrated impact assessment becomes an integral part of the frameworks). It was felt that London Works could focus on one specific SRDF to demonstrate this approach; for example, a focus on East London (corresponding to the LSC London East region) would cover the Thames Gateway and proposed Olympic Lower Lea Valley area. This would allow oversight of the wider Olympics agenda (also reflected in interviews) – the 2012 bid and its legacy was identified as a potential exemplifier of the synergy of the health and sustainable development, as well as this being a key criterion of the success of the bid.
- **The sustainable impact of NHS Capital Development** on local communities within London was felt to be an area in which the programme could add value, through work with partners such as RPHG, Strategic Healthy Authorities (SHAs) and HUDU to draw out employment and wider economic implications. Policy work to build on current efforts to embed wider social clauses within hospital PFI projects was identified as a key area of activity. Delegates at the strategic planning conference from ELBA and Brook Lyndhurst identified their contribution to the London Works programme as bringing extensive knowledge of the PFI process held by them and their wider private sector links. Drawing together this expertise in an advisory group would allow the programme to exert influence on the PFI agenda (through RPHG, HUDU, SHAs). Work with the NHS PFI Unit was also identified as important, with all this work helping to support the wider NHS Workforce Development agenda. Delegates from Wandsworth PCT, Lend Lease and an SHA identified their willingness to contribute to the London Works programme and build on the PFI agenda through joint thinking around public health and employment activity linking in with Roehampton, Battersea and St George's Mental Health Trust. Local authorities such as Greenwich identified that their potential contribution lay in their expertise of job brokerage schemes and S106 funding. In addition to disseminating the good practice around S106, London Works could conduct policy work with authorities such as Greenwich to inform their piloting of an initiative to demonstrate the bringing together of health and sustainable development agendas at a local level under the aegis of the Health SRB that

Greenwich hold (a commitment outlined in the interview stage). All of this work links strongly to the government Sustainable Communities agenda.

- **Patient Choice:** agencies at the planning event identified that, while a skills deficit may operate in terms of current roles in sectors such as health, there also needs to be thinking of future employment trends and changes. Delegates felt that new technologies and Patient Choice as an increasing driver within the health sector would precipitate the formation of new roles and positions, potentially with different skills sets than needed by people in current positions. They felt that this was an area around which thinking had not been well developed to date, and that there was a role for London Works to broker research in this area and/or disseminate learning around the implications of Patient Choice and what this may hold in terms of the health sector and the kinds of jobs and aligned structures that will be needed in the future. This was felt to be of particular importance given that, even for councils with 'Removing Barriers to Work' beacon status such as Greenwich, health was not an area in which there had been any great degree of penetration or understanding. Positions within the health sector were not felt to correlate to grades of positions outside so complicating any attempts at future forecasting of change within the sector, which would be needed to work out how future employment 'supply' can be configured to meet demand.
- Regarding **public sector procurement**, agencies such as ELBA made a firm commitment to bringing their expertise in procurement to the London Works programme. In addition delegate offer was made for the London Works programme to be able to draw on the experience of a South West London procurement project (part of a London regeneration EU/Business Link network). Such contributions matched the 'needs' delegates identified of their organisations in looking for a London-wide procurement model that covered equalities and social inclusion. The GLA was itself identified by delegates as a positive example in promotion of good employment practices within all its procurement contracts. Within interviews, agencies such as King's Fund (food procurement) and Social Enterprise London (health and social care procurement) were identified as contributing to the procurement agenda. London Works was envisaged as brokering policy work around the procurement process that would bring in issues of social inclusion and wider social impact, learning from the experience of South West London (and others) to develop further the London procurement model. Such a role was felt to include lobbying for London criteria for quality procurement standards. This would link to proposed work at the level of sub-regional development frameworks and to wider government policy on public sector procurement and the various toolkits produced (such as the toolkit produced by Department of Trade and Industry).
- **Social enterprise:** While developing models of procurement was felt to represent one side of the procurement equation, participants felt that the 'added value' that London Works could bring to the issue of procurement could potentially influence the supply-side to meet procurement demand: local social enterprises and contractors able to engage in procurement. They felt that work with the social enterprise sector through key partners such as Social Enterprise London was important, in order to help potential contractors to gain sufficient knowledge to engage with processes of procurement – something considered a key 'need' by delegates at the planning event. Such intelligence was considered as an area around which London Works could broker learning, providing social enterprises with an understanding of the

skills needed to try to meet procurer needs. For example, Bridge House Estates have awarded £90, 000 to Social Enterprise London to support the establishment of 20 new health and social care social enterprises. There was felt to be potential for London Works to link with this programme.

- **Self-employment** is an area that cuts across social enterprise and the business sector. A specific project idea developed at the planning conference concerned the provision of support for self-employed people. The provision of resources and psychological support to tackle issues of capacity and social isolation was identified as a key preventive issue, reducing the number of self-employed people potentially becoming unemployed. Participants felt that such work should be conducted by London Works, in collaboration with the wider business support community. Partners such as Reed-in-Partnership identified their contribution to the London Works programme in terms of their expertise in specialist self-employment advice and guidance.
- **Volunteering** was regarded as an area of activity that had resonance with a number of different themes. Volunteering was seen as enabling access to basic skills, forming an important part of pre-employment training as well as being an important activity in its own right (in terms of developing civic identity, social capital and local community bonds, for instance). In relation to health and sustainability, volunteers have certainly been identified as an important aspect of a successful 2012 Olympic bid in London, and so work to develop the number of volunteers and the nature of their involvement in employment activity was supported. London Works' role was identified in terms of disseminating good practice from partners such as LVSC, who identified how their knowledge of the voluntary sector would also allow access to a range of voluntary groups who could identify volunteers. In addition, positive volunteer schemes were identified in terms of PFI in hospitals such as Whipps Cross, with such volunteering forming a bridge to involve local communities in terms of PFI social clauses. For agencies such as the New Economics Foundation, volunteering formed a parallel to the fiscal economy, with people 'trading' the activities conducted for each other (the 'TimeBank' concept).

Theme 2: Healthy business and employment practice

The second analytic theme that emerged through interviews related to projects and interventions regarding actual employment and recruitment practices of employers, activity supporting people with complex needs in the transition in to work (including agencies such as JobCentre Plus, and recruitment consultancies such as Reed-in-Partnership) and the complementary support needs of both employers and employees.

A major sub-theme identified through the interviews was the need to make the business case for being 'a healthy employer'. Complementary to this was the need to identify the level of support that business – and particularly the SME sector – needed in occupational health terms, for its workforce generally and for people with complex needs in particular. On the other hand, interviewees felt that there were a number of issues around the support that people with complex needs themselves needed in order to make their transition into work, which were felt to be particularly pronounced for disabled Londoners.

Supporting employers: making the case for the 'healthy employer'

In the context of current employer health obligations, 'occupational health' refers to those services that relate to workplace health and safety (risk assessment, training, health surveillance etc) and employee clinical health (health needs assessment, screening, immunisation etc). The Employment and Health Innovations Network (EHIN) was identified as having developed tools aimed at supporting the business community in terms of occupational health. NHS Plus was also identified as an occupational health support service (based at NHS hospitals) for NHS staff and, in addition, also offering services on a commercial basis to the private sector to improve the health of their employees. Currently, there are over 90 services nationally, 19 of which are located in the London region. In the context of disabled Londoner organisations, trade unions such as the Amicus MSF were identified as having disability champions who operated as occupational health specialists for people with disabilities.

However, a key concern throughout discussions was that focus on occupational health should be placed in the wider context of being a healthy employer, including issues such as work/life balance, recruitment practices, and provision of 'reasonable adjustment' to support the working lives of disabled employees. A call was made for basic support about what constitutes general healthy employment practice within London, to demonstrate the business case to the business community. National networks such as the EHIN have focused on health and employment as of key concern. The network's most recent meeting (Edinburgh, January 2004) focused on the needs of those furthest away from the job market, and previous meetings have looked at such issues as health at work and making the business case for a healthy employer. Respondents felt that London Works could build on such work and broker further research looking to demonstrate the case for being a healthy employer in London, or could establish an advisory group to reach out to the business sector, which could involve partners such as London First, BITC and CBI.

Major firms such as Deloitte identify themselves as having an exemplar approach to healthy employment, through giving employees flexible benefits packages that allowed for variation and changes in employees circumstances over time. In this way, employees were able to exercise

choice and control over the kinds of support that they wanted as a 'total reward' package (comprising elements of core salary, core benefits and benefits allowance). Tailoring these packages on-line, employees ensure their reward packages suit their own particular circumstances. By making such flexibilities available to all, the idea of 'reasonable adjustment' is not seen as relating only to those with particular needs but becomes applicable to all employees, sending out a clear message that all employees require adjustments to a certain degree. In addition, an informal policy of flexibility about working hours was felt to be supportive of a working environment in which staff felt part of a valued work community.

In practice, Deloitte's rate of staff illness comes in below the corporate budgeted sick rate of 2 per cent, despite the level of stress associated with some aspects of the work. This example gives an indication of the benefits of being a healthy employer for businesses and employees alike, in terms of less sick days and increased productivity, together with higher levels of staff morale. This demonstrates a clear business case for firms wishing to engage in the healthy employer agenda. Interviewees felt that trade unions were also key players, with the TUC and MSF Amicus identified as having lengthy involvement in campaigns for the business sector to be a healthy employer on a number of levels (e.g. work/life balance and workplace flexibilities, reasonable adjustment) and with union membership itself bringing better social health dividends (the concept of 'community unionism'). Against this background, there was felt to be a role for London Works to broker partnership working with a range of stakeholders, including trade unions and business sector representatives, to produce a guidance pack that would disseminate learning and information on the strong business case that exists for being a healthy employer.

A pilot programme identified as including (but not focusing only on) occupational health was an HR locum pilot service, Personnel Plus, run by Businesslink4London. Funded by EQUAL via London South LSC, the scheme provides bespoke generic support regarding staff issues, covering six South London boroughs. Businesses of any legal status can apply for support (so it is inclusive of the voluntary sector). Each client company receives one hour's free HR consultancy conducted by a CIPD accredited consultant, with the option of having a further 20 hours of consultancy at a total cost of £100 to the client company. The consultancy provides advice on the existing systems and culture of client organisations (recruitment, retention, staff morale etc). There was felt to be potential for London Works to build on this or work in conjunction with a complementary project, for which funds are available but are as yet unallocated. This project is intended to focus on mental health and unemployment, with the aim of bridging the needs of employers and employees. Another pilot, 'Small Firm Learning Accounts' in South London, was also identified as providing a training plan to businesses, which can then draw down available training.

An initiative operational in Scotland is Safe and Healthy Working, a web-based resource that provides the Scottish business community with an online occupational health toolkit for small and medium sized enterprises. It offers SMEs a step-by-step process on what to do about healthy and safety issues, as well as providing an advice line and professional advisors where needed. Working in collaboration with organisations such as Health at Work and Safe and Healthy Working in Scotland, one possible focus of London Works activity would be to broker the

establishment of a similar resource for the London SME community. This would be a step-by-step guide to being a healthy employer, and would contain particular areas of support for sectors such as the SME community, which are discussed in more detail below. Scotland's Health at Work scheme has also established a national award scheme (via gold, silver and bronze level awards) to reward employers that demonstrate commitment to improving the health and ultimately the performance of their workforce. In the Health Creators/Wealth Creators plan, there is a similar focus on having gold, silver and bronze awards for those companies best exemplifying an 'healthy employers' approach in the context of London. London Works' role would be supportive of these ongoing plans and strategies.

Supporting employers of people with complex and/or challenging needs

Interviewees felt that there were particular issues when looking at specific population groups and the capacity of employers to meet the needs of these groups. Of particular concern was the capacity that SMEs had to comply with employment legislation. On a general level, capacity issues identified by the SME community included recent changes in the Employment Act (2002), which required them to demonstrate processes for minimum dispute resolution (that is a process of warning, hearing and appeal) or their dismissals be rendered unfair.

However, of greater concern to many interviewees was the SME community's capacity to provide 'reasonable adjustment' of working practices and premises to support disabled employees, and so comply with the Disability Discrimination Act (DDA) (1995) and the requirement from October 2004 to make 'reasonable adjustment' for disabled staff. To comply, employers have to remove major barriers to work that could be faced by disabled employees. Importantly, this involves not only straightforward physical adjustment, such as installing handrails and ramps, but also changes to working practice (e.g. flexible hours of working, recruitment practices).

For agencies such as the Employers Forum on Disability, supporting employers to enable them to employ disabled people and be inclusive of disabled people as a consumer market has been of prime focus. In working to support employers to the point where they can engage disabled people themselves, the Forum has produced products such as an interactive disability training solution for business (*'Disability Confident'*) and a publication focusing on the DDA and employing a best practice approach to 'reasonable adjustment' (*'Open for Business'*). The Disability Rights Commission (DRC) has been involved in helping business to understand what is meant by 'reasonable adjustment' and the benefits of compliance with the DDA. However, while interviewees felt that these products were positive for business, it was also recognised that the expense of such items would put them beyond the reach of the majority of SMEs (although Employers Forum is looking to develop the provision of information to SMEs further). There was felt to be a distinct role for London Works to inform the development of an online resource that would provide all business, but particularly SMEs, with a step-by-step guide on what they need to do to comply with DDA, which could form part of the toolkit outlined above. Collaboration with partner agencies such as DRC, Employers Forum and Unum Provident (which facilitates the New Beginnings programme to support retention of employees who become sick or disabled) was felt to be vital.

Employer-representative organisations such as South Bank Employers Group (SBEG – made up of 17 major corporate firms located around the Thames-South Bank site) identified how they had delivered DDA workshops to SME companies, but that this was very much the tip of iceberg in terms of further learning for the sector. Agencies such as Prevista outlined their work with colleges (such as the Oxford School of Mentoring and Coaching) to produce work placement programmes bringing together corporate firms and SMEs. Respondents felt there was a need to draw on and formalise this learning and share the experience of such good practice, in collaboration with agencies such as Businesslink4London and the London Business Support Network.

As identified in the following chapter on ‘Health and basic skills’ there are a series of social firms and enterprises established primarily as a vehicle to increase the skills and employability of people with mental health issues. A theme pertinent to both mental health-focused employment activity and the wider issue of supporting people with complex needs is the requirement for a ‘total package’, aimed at supporting both employers and employees. Agencies such as the Richmond Fellowship were identified as giving support for both employers and employees in the context of big companies such as Tesco, but again respondents felt that there needed to be support on a much more generic scale that would be inclusive of the SME community.

Black and minority ethnic small and medium enterprises (BME SME)

The proportionally greater concentration of BME businesses within the SME sector in London, and the health inequalities differentially experienced by BME communities, were felt to reinforce a need for specific work to focus on the BME SME sector (in terms of learning and training). However, according to interviewees within the skills sector, the BME SME community was one group that public services have not penetrated to a great degree, and there is a need to share the learning of identified exemplar schemes in order to increase understanding of how to support this sub-sector effectively. For one project (Unlocking Potential) that had engaged with male African-Caribbean mental health users aged 18-30 years, it was not that members of the BME/SME community were hard-to-reach, but that public sector agencies had attempted to access them in a culturally inappropriate manner. Respondents from the BME sector identified that there were many small black businesses that could be supported to take on placements (in the context of East London, for example), but accessing these firms required a close social and historical understanding of the black community in the area; this idea was echoed by respondents from the skills sector. Accessing the organic routes into local BME communities, such as through community leaders, was felt to be one avenue of reaching out effectively. Interviewees welcomed work that could focus on this area, whether in terms of original or brokered research by London Works, or in terms of producing guidance and disseminating learning for wider public sector agencies. Other projects perceived as positive included ‘Reflex’, an EU EQUAL programme run by Prevista. Following an eighteen-month intensive start-up period, the project funded community business advisors to work directly with the BME SME community in the area, and had worked extensively with BME enterprises in Islington.

Such work with the BME SME sub-sector was felt to be important in building the basic skills of BME people working in SMEs, who were frequently identified as older family members. In the

light of the generally poorer health expectancies of BME people, increasing the skills and employability of employees was felt to pay significant dividends in terms of employment as a wider determinant of health. Moreover, in the event of an SME closing down, it was felt that training would provide BME employees with transferable skills to take with them onto further employment, rather than them possessing a purely experiential skill base that would be lost with a company's closure (rendering low their chances of further employment).

Employment/CSR schemes

Private sector

On a general level, interviewees felt that the routes through which employees worked their way up through companies in previous decades in London were not now available for new entrants. The contracting out of entry-level, low-skilled work within large city companies has closed an obvious first entry route for people to enter into big firms. This was felt to be a particular problem in London, for the business and the public sector alike. Interviewees pointed to good practice, such as the SBEG, with firms such as Shell bringing their subcontractors together with explicit instructions to facilitate the employment of local people and setting up a local job shop to achieve this. In a neighbouring South London initiative, the Cross-River Partnership, dedicated workplace co-ordinators were appointed to increase local employment in specific sectors such as health, creative industries, construction etc.

One example that attempted to address the issues of workforce development, transport, geography and skills was a scheme focused on East London that was supported (in partnership with JobCentre Plus and other public sector agencies) by BAA. The programme was established with the aim of getting long-term unemployed people in Haringey into work, and had a focus on low-wage, entry-grade jobs. A major barrier to employment within Stansted was the expense of travel. BAA reached an agreement with the rail operator to provide a subsidised fare for workers going from Tottenham Hale, providing a subsidised travel card. In addition, Haringey Council persuaded employers to improve the bus connection to the station, and JobCentre Plus funded a mini-bus to provide transport for shift workers. The scheme campaigned to persuade employers of the benefits of being involved in the scheme, with recruitment drives carried out by JobCentre Plus and Reed in Partnership. The scheme was felt to be an example of good practice in terms of a multi-sectoral and multi-agency approach to local employment. A number of other schemes have followed this scheme, and there was felt to be a strong role for London Works to disseminate good practice, as well as having input into the proposed pan-London co-ordination group that will oversee work across Stansted and Heathrow for BAA.

ELBA is a privately funded social and economic agency that runs volunteering schemes for its member organisations in the City. In addition to mentoring work (employees support pupils in school), other schemes have sought to place the business expertise of volunteering City firms within local social enterprises. For example, Aesops Trust provides accommodation for elders, and ELBA has facilitated the placement of twenty volunteers who have imparted their professional expertise (e.g. accountancy). Business mentoring has also extended to local GP surgeries, with three pilot schemes bringing in business expertise to work with GP practice

managers. In addition, ELBA also sought to broker the placement of young people from East London into City companies.

Marks and Spencer was identified as having a strong ethos towards community outreach, for example in areas such as Paddington Basin where the Chief Executive and members of the board had come out to Westminster College to meet with students. This was felt to have given students an invaluable insight into the food and retail sector and the wider business sector, as well as enabling local young people to view their local area as providing real employment opportunities. Interviewees also outlined how Marks and Spencer were involved in schemes to take on homeless recruits and ex-offenders, with similar work supported by Asda. British Gas Transco identified an acute skill shortage in the area of fork-lift truck drivers. The company has worked with contractors to take young ex-offenders through a scheme that secures them employment within a three-person team, one of whom mentors the young person. The scheme was established in 1997 in Reading, and Transco is working with other prison services and companies to take this on spread the model further, including London.

Across all of these employment schemes, there was felt to be a clear role for London Works to share the learning, looking to the key principles and lessons.

Social enterprise

Organisations such as Social Enterprise London (SEL) identified their involvement in a spectrum of social enterprise initiatives, focusing on mental health, disability, older people and food, for example. In supporting the development of the social enterprise sector, SEL has also developed a Masters in Social Enterprise at the University of East London. The Prince's Trust was identified as holding a Social Enterprise Award for young people who wanted to establish businesses that, while not highly profitable in themselves, would nonetheless put something back into the local community. Although subject to great proliferation in London, the social enterprise sector was felt to be better developed in areas such as Glasgow and the North East, with the London context distinctive in the number and diversity of communities that social enterprises could potentially work with. There was support for London Works to establish networks of learning between London and other regions with a longer history of social enterprise.

Despite these calls, a range of good practice was identified during discussion of social enterprises and employment in London. In Paddington, a warden scheme was established that gave local people control of their own services, bringing caretaking, cleaning and building maintenance functions back into the local community. Developed as a social enterprise, this helped to provide local employment and give local people a sense of ownership of their area. The Paddington Development Trust (PDT) approach itself has led to the development of a bespoke comprehensive qualitative evaluation framework, in collaboration with Goldsmiths College. With the support of initial SRB money, PDT has grown into a key player in Paddington.

Greenworks was identified by many interviewees as a positive example of a social enterprise, with a focus on recycling corporate furniture for use by not-for-profit organisations. The project has recruited those who were previously long-term unemployed. The need to support people

through their transition into first employment has already been identified, and in the case of Greenworks, this support was sometimes offered at the personal risk of the Director himself. Social enterprise respondents identified how a range of informal support has to be given to people unused to the labour market, including benefits, rent arrears and family conflict. Clearly, the ability to address such issues may exceed the capacity of many social enterprises. While respondents from the sector outlined their belief that their respective projects would not have been successful without being able to offer high levels of informal support, it was also evident that this was very much dependent on the calibre and commitment of the staff involved (an issue of sustainability). There was felt to be a need for greater support of social enterprises to support people with complex needs and/or chaotic lives. One potential activity was for London Works to lobby for virtual 'one stop shops' that could provide support for the SME community, in addition to the previously identified guidelines and toolkits. People also felt London Works could broker the setting up of subsidised seminars or masterclasses, which would help employers to support people with challenging needs or complex lives in a non-patronising, non-stigmatising and empowering manner.

Borough councils

From a local authority perspective, a number of developers had become involved in local employment initiatives via S106 (described above), while other businesses were proactive in approaching local authorities to develop a local employment strategy (e.g. Phillips and Croydon Borough Council). However, the point was raised that public sector agencies did not always have the requisite language with which to communicate with business, and that aims and objectives could be quite divergent. A theme recurrent through interviews was the potential of corporate social responsibility (CSR) to function as an increasingly useful mechanism to attract the involvement of business in (amongst other things) creating local employment. For example, the Health Creators/Wealth Creators strategy views the business sector as currently ready to drive through CSR in order to find common regional solutions to London-wide problems of health (thus allowing PCTs to function as a business, for instance). However, given that such strategies remain to be actualised, and the uncertainty that PCT respondents felt about engaging in cross-sector partnerships, there was felt to be a role for London Works in helping public sector agencies to engage more effectively with the private sector. There was also an identified role for lobbying and campaigning for standards that would bring together health and sustainability in terms of CSR reporting. Interviewees pointed to the potential of mandatory CSR requirements (such as mooted by the Mayor) and the potential for these to function as an effective management driver, given the experience of ISO 4000 in the context of environmental standards. Respondents also suggested that there could be lobbying and campaigning to make 'healthy employment' part of the Customer First quality mark for business.

Supporting the transition into employment: people with complex needs

Interviewees identified two major issues for those with complex needs – financial issues (e.g. the benefit trap, complexity of benefit support) and cultural issues (e.g. being born into generations of worklessness and motivational issues when no other household members may be in work), and the different ways that London Works could help with these issues.

Financial issues: the benefit trap

Interviewees identified the benefit trap as a major issue for people who are benefit-dependent and have complex needs. They highlighted research such as *'Making Work Pay in London'* (Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion, 2003) which identifies that there has been less incentive to take up benefits in London. Expenses such as transport and childcare are markedly higher in London than elsewhere in the UK, and once these are taken into account against allowances such as incapacity benefit or disability living and jobseekers allowance, employees can have little to show after tax and national insurance deductions, in comparison to the total level of benefit received when not in work. The argument here is not that the level of benefit is high but that, as entry-level positions in the job market pay relatively low wages, people would not be significantly better off in paid employment. This is particularly the case once further issues such as clothes and subsistence expenses are taken into account.

Interviewees felt that the benefit trap was not always appreciated by public sector agencies whose aim was to get people into work, rather than focusing on the qualitative issues concerning the added value and impact that employment makes on people's lives. It was felt that London Works could disseminate information on this or broker original research, perhaps as an adjunct to the work on building a business case for being a healthy employer. The benefit trap was emphasised by disabled Londoner contacts, who raised concern that people may be exhorted to work in inappropriate contexts – for example where people had been forced to leave work through ill-health. Common to all interviews was the belief that paid employment should be available for those who wanted it, rather than a more value-laden judgment of employment as a social good in itself.

One suggestion was to establish a high-level London Employment Task Force, maybe with advisory input from London Works, and that there was also a potential role for London Works in encouraging LHC to lobby on the issue. An example considered of good practice by interviewees was a financial diary entitled *Passport to Work*, developed as part of the Government's Pathway to Work pilot schemes (none of which are located in London). The passport acts as a financial record for an individual, providing a week-by-week account of when certain benefit sources cease and others begin during the transition period into work and the immediate period after starting work. Lack of certainty around total income stream, together with the complexity of the benefit system, was identified as a major reason why clients preferred to remain on established benefit levels to which they were accustomed rather than adopt a more 'risky' strategy of moving into paid employment. The passport was felt to address this in providing clients with a level of certainty and security over their income streams. As with other generic lessons from the Pathway to Work pilots, there was felt to be a role for London Works in lobbying for the passport and its principles to be disseminated more widely in the context of London (particularly given the case that scoping interviewees such as Disability Alliance inputted into the development of the passport).

Cultural issues

An issue that respondents considered important in terms of the transition into employment from unemployment was the 'culture of work' with which people were familiar. An observation made in

relation to refugee communities was that they tended to be the most self-selecting for education and skills, motivated by their desire to make a new life for themselves in a different country and so to access education to become proficient in English and convert or restudy qualifications already held. Those groups considered hardest to reach by employment activity were those people born in the UK and disenfranchised from formal education contexts. 'Worklessness' describes the scenario in which unemployment has become normative for successive generations within a household, perhaps also extending to family and friends within a local neighbourhood. Here, household members rely on temporary unskilled labour as a means 'to get by'.

Interviewees from agencies such as the Prince's Trust outlined how young people growing up in a context of worklessness had great difficulties in breaking the cycle, if they were the only person in their household who was in weekly paid employment and thus motivation to go to work in the morning was low. Prince's Trust training courses were identified as supporting young people to access the job market. Interviewees identified the highly resource-intensive nature of such work. Helping a habitual late attender to regulate his or her timekeeping was felt to be an important achievement, but one that evaluation frameworks did not easily pick up.

Employers felt that they needed strong support when employing people from backgrounds of worklessness. They suggested that this was sometimes an important factor in why work placements did not work out, as JobCentre Plus sometimes placed people who were not 'job ready', with little familiarity with the world of work, for example in terms of personal conduct, levels of responsibility, hygiene, conventions of dress and language. Sharing the learning from exemplars that had been successful in working with such groups was felt to be an important area for the London Works programme. This fits well with the call for provision of guidelines and masterclasses on how to support people with challenging needs in a manner that is non-patronising, non-stigmatising and supportive to the business community.

Specific group issues

In addition to the support needed for the transition into employment for people with complex needs, interviewees also identified a series of more specific issues relating to particular groups.

Substance abuse

In the context of people with substance abuse issues, respondents felt that a social rather than a medical model needed to be adopted, as with disabled Londoners. JobCentre Plus South London was identified as funding a positive initiative named Progress to Work, which takes as its starting point that housing and employment increases the chances of rehabilitation and works to greater effect than medical treatment in isolation. Progress to Work Link Up brings together drug agencies and drug advice teams (DATs) to share effective ways of working with addicts, and a lead agency (EcoActive) acts as a broker for clients in terms of counselling and employment. This facilitates the introduction of clients to named JobCentre Plus officers – where otherwise clients would experience difficulty in keeping to appointments and thus accessing services. Respondents identified few other schemes that could demonstrate this wider social understanding of the employment and health agendas in this context (and this also applied to

other groups, such as ex-offenders); the Progress to Work initiative did not receive funding from the Department of Health but rather the Department for Work and Pensions. From the perspective of employers (and reinforcing observations made above), it is clear that people with substance abuse issues would need additional forms of support that most companies, particularly SMEs, would not have the capacity to support. Reflecting earlier calls for London Works to broker a toolkit on being an healthy employer and supporting people with complex needs, it was felt that the programme could offer guidelines to the SME and wider business community on how it could support employees with substance abuse issues.

Older people

Interviewees felt that initiatives aimed at older people were one of the more underdeveloped areas of employment activity, especially given the wider context of an aging demographic profile in London and the UK. The assumption of older people as 'economically inactive' was felt to be a value-laden concept, with organisations such as Age Concern London identifying that anything up to 250 000 people in the 50-65 year age group could be looking for work in London at any one time (see 'Making Age Work for London'). They felt that confidence building for older people was required, particularly in relation to re-training people in later life to facilitate re-entry into the labour market.

Agencies such as the Health Development Agency (HDA) have been involved in pre-retirement pilots that aim to develop a strategic context in which a range of existing local projects can operate. Here, the shift has been to move away from thinking of 'older people' to thinking of 'mid-life and beyond'. The HDA pilots highlighted how 50-65 year-olds constituted a distinct generation that did not think of itself as 'old' (thus reaching out to people on the basis of their age would not necessarily be successful). The 'mid-life' stage was identified as one in which there was a genuine desire for change in health and lifestyle, and so the need for support and information was very strong. Interviewees saw this as critical, since health is one of the major barriers to work by older people. They felt that interventions made at an early stage of people's experience of acute ill-health would prevent loss of employment (and, due to their age, then becoming unlikely to find further paid employ). Though not specific to 50-65 year olds alone, such intervention would have a greater focus on this age group, due to greater likelihood of episodes of acute ill-health.

One major question was how to locate and target mid-life and older people in order to support them in appropriate ways (e.g. whether through a combination of existing services or establishing new ones). This was felt to be an issue that a wider forum on older people and employment, perhaps involving London Works, could begin to address. There is an intention for those HDA pilots still in operation to form a learning network, and there was felt to be potential for these to inform the London Works programme, if falling within an appropriate timescale.

BME communities

In terms of BME communities, interviewees identified numerous networks on specific issues such as workplace racism (for example, the police recruitment team headed by Bill Morris), business advice (e.g. East London Business Association) and leadership support (e.g. NHS Leadership

Centre Breakthrough Programme to help BME middle managers move into senior management). The King's Fund Health Advocacy for BME Londoners Programme, launched in 2000, aims to empower communities and improve their health through a network to give a coherent voice for advocates to respond to government policy. Of most relevance here has been the focus on career pathways: a consortium of training organisations has written an HE-level qualification with links to other careers, such as social work and feeder courses into the University of East London. The availability of bursaries (of around £1000) has been integral to take-up of the course – funding often being a major barrier. The advocacy network has also identified a conceptual framework for evaluation, and there could be potential to share this information with London Works.

The Mellow Campaign (part of the Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health (SCMH) Breaking the Circles of Fear work) aims to empower young African-Caribbean men who have had mental health issues. Using a community development approach, the focus of the scheme is on clients gaining experience of the wider job market, rather than entry into a specific employment destination. Interviewees felt that a key aspect of the success of the Mellow project was the sustained and continued funding it had received over a number of years. A number of interviewees perceived that there was a history of under-funding of the BME voluntary sector, resulting in a lack of expertise to support successful funding applications. They called for a lobbying and campaigning role for London Works, in terms of building capacity in the BME sector, to facilitate further employment activity focused on BME communities. Work with organisations such as LVSC were felt to be key in this regard (e.g. LVSC's recent briefing on how PCTs and BME voluntary organisations can work more closely together).

Disabled Londoners

A number of issues raised were specific to disabled Londoners wanting employment. In addition to the benefit trap, there was particular concern among respondents representing disabled Londoner organisations about the support their clients received to move into work from unemployment or education. Agencies such as the Employers Forum felt that intermediate agencies (e.g. JobCentre Plus, recruitment agencies) did not understand how the current system fails to support non-standard applicants. Other agencies felt that there was a need for employers to change their attitudes.

Disability Employment Advisors (DEAs)

DEAs at JobCentre Plus were identified as the main source of benefit advice for disabled Londoners. Interviewees felt that that JobCentre Plus was increasingly receptive to the agenda for disabled Londoners. However, they felt that recent restructuring had left London with fewer DEAs, and this was exacerbated by the fact that District Managers had jurisdiction over where DEAs were located in any one area. One respondent identified how, when he had first started work, his DEA visited him in his office but that the DEA was now located in central London, which presented particular access challenges.

DEAs were felt to face a difficult task, given the wide spectrum of conditions that 'disability' encompasses. It was felt to be unrealistic to expect DEAs to have expert and in-depth knowledge

of the range of physical and mental health issues that would enable them to identify appropriate employment for disabled clients. For example, Prospects, an employment agency for people falling within the autistic spectrum, identified their clients as most challenged by communication and interpersonal issues. Potential employees with autism who may appear impressive on paper frequently lack the communication skills to put themselves across in an interview situation. Part of Prospects work is to negotiate with employers to alter their application procedures and recruitment practice to facilitate recruitment of clients (so making a reasonable readjustment). Autistic spectrum clients also fare better when work has a certain routine and examples were given where JobCentre Plus had sent autistic clients to situations, such as serving in a restaurant, where peaks of activity were stressful. Interviewees felt that, had DEAs had been aware of such employment needs, inappropriate placements would not have been made.

Another issue identified by interviewees was that negotiation of the constantly changing benefits system is complex, and DEAs do not have access to extensive training opportunities. Their awareness of government schemes, such as Access to Work, was not felt to be high. Access to Work allows clients to access benefit while in work, with tapering of benefit income to support the initial costs of working. A sister scheme, Fares to Work, provides help for those who cannot use public transport or drive. Both schemes were felt to have particular importance, given the benefit trap that some disabled people find themselves in. There was also an issue about people having to drop down to lower levels of benefit than previously if their employment was not successful and they had to return to benefits. The DWP scheme, Linking Rules, allows disabled Londoners to return to the benefit rate they were last on if leaving their job within the first year of employment. Knowledge of these and other schemes and initiatives were felt to be vital to help disabled Londoners to gain employment, and DEAs will require high levels of current knowledge to facilitate this. This is echoed in a DRC submission to the Employment for All Select Committee Enquiry (Department for Work and Pensions).

Overall, interviewees felt that DEAs have a focus on processing client benefit claims, rather than working with clients to identify the best arrangement of benefits to enable them to obtain employment, although the development of the Passport to Work scheme was considered a positive pilot in this regard. Another innovative way of helping disabled Londoners to find employment was identified at Sabre, a job-finding agency based in Wandsworth. The agency exploited a loop-hole in social services payment that allows direct payment to disabled Londoners to purchase care. Traditionally, funds have been assumed to be purchasing personal care, but Sabre identified that the money could also be used to hire a personal job coach. A resting actor was employed to act in the capacity of a personal job-coach (motivating the client, helping with practical issues) enabling one client to access employment before going on to provide the same service for the next client. Calls were also made for disabled Londoners to be enabled to set up their own agencies, in a similar manner to mental health users' staffing of some disability training enterprises. Interviewees identified that countries such as Canada were ahead of the UK in this regard, and disability-staffed job agencies would work to overcome some of the barriers to work experienced by disabled Londoners.

Recruitment consultancies

Recruitment agencies such as Reed in Partnership were identified as important employment brokers in some London areas. On a general level, interviewees were ambivalent about private sector companies holding public sector employment contracts. While some felt that they could bring a fresh approach, others questioned the level of expertise that recruitment agencies had in relation to the diverse needs of groups such as disabled Londoners. Many agencies were unclear about the role of consultancies such as Reed in Partnership, and there were calls for London Works to be involved in disseminating information about the sort of work they do.

At the other end of the recruitment agency spectrum, interviewees recognised that major companies, such as UBS Warburg, tend to recruit through a small number of agencies. While there may be issues of access to these agencies by disabled Londoners, there were also felt to be problems of social context; in general there are low expectations of what disabled Londoners can achieve in their lives, and these are not always conceptualised in terms of work.

Access and transport

An additional issue for disabled Londoners is transport and access. For the Disability Champions Group (a breakfast club supported by London First), access was one of the major barriers that affected disabled people in gaining employment. They said that the lack of a distinct rush hour within London meant that public transport was always busy. While schemes such as Fares to Work may help with those unable to use a car or public transport, for those who can use a car, the expense involved in driving and parking in London is high, in addition to the stresses of driving in the capital on an everyday basis.

Plurality of disability and employment contacts

Interviewees felt that the employment agenda for disabled Londoners was characterised by the sheer number of initiatives and organisations. There are many small organisations that focus on disability and employment, such as Prospects (National Autistic Society) and Mencap, as well as mainstream providers of the New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP). Employers find this confusing, as no one organisation covers all forms of disability or caters for a comprehensive range of jobs (e.g. Reed caters for a particular level of entry/early career stage employment). Employers would benefit from signposting to help them become aware of the different agencies. Moreover, this was also felt to be beneficial for clients, who may also find the number of agencies and social interventions confusing. London Works could have a role in brokering collaboration with agencies such as Employers Forum.

In summary, in all the disabled Londoner discussions there was a call for greater support and advice for disabled people, and for London Works to be involved in campaigning and lobbying on issues of transition support and transport and access at a strategic, regional level in an attempt to join up the practice of public sector agencies (such as a JobCentre Plus).

JobCentre Plus

Perceptions of JobCentre Plus among interviewees varied. Some JobCentre Plus schemes have already been rolled out in full, while others are in the process of becoming a JobCentre Plus

service. Learning and Skills Council London East and a range of other strategic leads stated that they collaborate with JobCentre Plus on a range of activities and recruitment drives. JobCentre Plus South was felt to be a positive example, due to Progress to Work and their dealings with clients with substance abuse issues, while the presence of the JobCentre Plus office in Stansted airport and its close collaboration with BAA as part of the Runway to Work project was felt to be integral to the project's success. In Brent, the manager of JobCentre Plus had put a significant amount of resources into the activity around the Wembley regeneration, because of its strong commitment to working in partnership. Other interviewees noted how, in some areas, the council was effectively in competition with JobCentre Plus (in terms of developing a local employment base), and this had negative implications for the kinds of employment activity that could then occur.

In the experience of BME schemes, JobCentre Plus was not always felt to be geared to the potential of its young African-Caribbean clients, with a tendency towards pigeon-holing clients into particular job pathways; this is exacerbated by poor quality training resources for people in their local community. Some respondents were concerned about whether a similar kind of skewing of clients' employment preferences was also occurring within recruitment agencies that had won government contracts for Employment Zone and Action Team for Jobs (e.g. Reed in Partnership), but this was raised only on an anecdotal rather than an evidential level.

As previously identified, a series of issues were raised in the specific context of disability and DEAs. A number of interviewees felt that there needed to be upskilling of staff, so that they understood the health issues related to employment. In some areas (e.g. Paddington), JobCentre Plus was felt to be quite distant from the communities with which it was working. JobCentre Plus interviewees themselves perceived that it was business sector that needed their support to understand the reality of local employment initiatives, the benefit trap and the difficulties inherent in supported return to work initiatives and understanding illness. However, in the experience of both disabled Londoner and BME agencies, JobCentre Plus did not always send 'job-ready' candidates to employers. Again, the issue of occupational health support was felt to be important in helping businesses to employ people with little or no experience of the job market. This was echoed by representatives of employer organisations, who recounted experiences where they had had to supply intensive support to employees, such as giving advice on appropriate clothes to wear for an interview. Developers identified how they had installed on-site showers for hygiene purposes, with work co-ordinators calling employees in the morning to ensure they came to work on time. Guidelines on such basic issues were felt to be important, particularly for the SME community, in enabling business to support employees in a non-paternalistic and effective manner.

In overview, there was felt to be a raft of issues constellating around JobCentre Plus. While some of the listed issues may fall outside the remit of the London Works programme, such concerns were felt to have significant knock-on effects on other aspects of employment activity in which the London Works programme could get involved, and so to be an important message to JobCentre Plus from the scoping interviews.

Validated activity areas for the future London Works programme of action 2: The business of healthy employment

An important area of activity identified for the programme at the planning event was to support and challenge employers. Delegates felt that there was a need to articulate the business case for being an healthy employer to the business and wider employer community, and to link into the business community CSR agenda. Work to change the attitude of some employers was also felt to be important, particularly in relation to issues such as mental health. Also considered of key importance was the retention of the workforce through early intervention work to address the issues of long-term sick leave leading to fall-out of employees.

- **Supporting employers:** Agencies such as ELBA identified that they could bring business personnel's time and energy to the London Works programme, with the DRC identifying its own expertise in best practice in the employment of disabled people. Reflecting observations made in interviews, one specific delegate proposal during the planning event called for support of employers, and in particular the SME community, to comply with the forthcoming DDA amendments. A strong recommendation from the event was for London Works to be involved in making the business case for compliance with the DDA specifically, and to demonstrate the wider positive outcomes of being a healthy employer generally. In keeping with the GLA disabled Londoner priority, it was also felt that London Works should act as a broker for the production of a toolkit with Greater London Action on Disability (GLAD), the Confederation of British Industry (CBI), the Small Business Service and Businesslink4London. This work would develop and widely disseminate guidelines to enable the SME community to make reasonable adjustment for its employees.
- In addition to taking a supportive role, delegates also felt that the programme should **challenge employers' attitudes** towards employing people with complex needs and/or at a distance from the job market. Under the wider agenda of removing the barriers to employment, delegates identified that awareness-raising campaigns were needed to dispel the myths and stereotypes around employing groups of excluded people (e.g. capacity, absence, reliability issues). The specific contribution that delegates felt they could contribute to this included bringing training skills, being able to negotiate with employers and having specialist knowledge of sector and employer needs (ELBA). Delegates identified that they could provide evidence of successful work placements. This was felt to match the gaps that delegates felt were apparent in work trying to change the attitudes of employers, particularly around the experience of mental health users, and that London Works was best placed to demonstrate why employees from priority groups may be the best people for the job. Collaborating with partners such as CBI, London First, GLAD, London Development Centre for Mental Health and ELBA, London Works could lobby, disseminate good practice and broker the production of toolkits in developing the business case for being a healthy employer. One specific proposal from the conference concerned a 'one stop shop' that would map the skills shortage for employers (as well as supporting employees). This links to wider issues, such as Business in the Community (BITC) having a major theme on health for 2004.
- There was felt to be a specific role for London Works in changing employer opinions of **mental ill-health**, which was still felt to be subject to stigma in the workplace: Partners such

as the London Development Centre for Mental Health felt they could contribute evidence to the programme by identifying how users can bring high levels of skill to meet the skills deficit experienced across employment sectors in London. The Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health's forthcoming systematic review of common mental health problems in the workplace was also identified as a contribution to this agenda, as was the Mayor's work on mental health in the workplace. Potential pilot work in the area of mental health identified by JobCentre Plus (South London) is intended to build on an employer HR locum service to look at mental health from the perspective of employees. This was felt to be a potential area of action research, in which London Works could collaborate. Overall, such strategic links with a range of employer organisations was seen as key aspect of the added value that London Works could bring to employment activity in London.

- Another potential means of engaging with employers identified in the planning event was through the **corporate social responsibility (CSR)** agenda. Interview analysis highlighted that CSR was felt to be an effective means through which employment activity could be supported, with a range of London firms identified as having active CSR programmes. Building on this, delegates felt that London Works could collaborate with agencies such as BITC and ELBA to produce a toolkit or guidelines on CSR strategies that would be compliant with health and sustainability targets. The Regional Public Health Group's Health Creator/Wealth Creator plan suggests the concept of an award scheme. Delegates suggested that London Works could broker the establishment of a scheme that would recognise good practice, backed with a campaign for business to recognise their CSR contribution in terms of health and sustainability. One possibility would be to collaborate with the Health Creators/Wealth Creators plan and support work to develop a gold award scheme to recognise good practice in conjunction with employer organisations, such as CBI (following the model developed in Scotland).
- **Retention of employees** was felt to be a key issue. A Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health delegate cited the Government's Pathway to Work Green Paper which identifies that for those on extended sick leave the likelihood of their working again is significantly reduced as time progresses. Thus, of the 40% still on incapacity benefit after a year, there is only a 20% chance of them working again within five years. Clearly, this involves the loss of valuable skills and expertise from the employment market and decreases the health expectancies of exiting employees. In collaboration with agencies such as Age Concern London and Unum Provident, there was support early intervention at around the 4-6 week period after people have first gone on sick leave. A pilot scheme brokered by London Works could focus on GPs and employers in one case study area to better employees' situation at work and prevent them falling into long-term sickness. For those already claiming Incapacity Benefit, lobbying work with DWP could help to establish the extension of the Pathways to Work scheme in London areas. Such work would link into the HDA pre-retirement pilots and BME Elder work through the BME Health Advocacy Network at the King's Fund.

Theme 3: Health and basic skills

The last theme that emerged through analysis of interview data encompasses activities focused on supporting people to attain literacy and numeracy skills to facilitate their first entry into the labour market. This theme also covers people needing paper qualifications to enable them to progress in their careers (for example in social care) and migrants and refugees looking for English as a Second Language (ESOL) courses to enable them to utilise fully their skills and experience in the UK and/or convert qualifications that they may already hold from their country of origin.

A number of sub-themes were apparent within the area of health and Basic Skills. Those respondents within the basic skills sector felt that it was more difficult to engage certain sectors, such as SME and the social enterprise community, within the Basic Skills agenda, due to perceptions about their lack of capacity to support training and learning. A range of respondents who held a focus on community development identified how a bottom-up approach had allowed them to identify local intelligence on needs assessment that would otherwise have been difficult to find, and that this facilitated greater accessing of basic skills in localised communities than would have otherwise have been the case. Furthermore, in order to go beyond a focus on particular priority groups, interviewees identified pilot projects such as the Household Employment Initiative (Brent) in which workers went from door to door within a given area. By offering clients a single interface for a range of services, workers are able to link people into a range of support services such as housing, community group support etc, configured to individual need. Libraries were identified as offering a localised source of learning and training opportunities that escaped the formality of educational institutions. There was felt to be potential in building on this agenda. Agencies with a refugee interface felt that the quality of ESOL training in general was variable, and that there was a need to disseminate widely the good practice of organisations that have tabled their own courses together (such as Reed in Partnership, and Refugees into Work in Brent).

Basic Skills Strategy

An issue identified by respondents within the skills sector itself was the need to have a clear definition of the Basic Skills agenda, used by all those who operate within it – whether aware of this focus within their work or not. A quality concord of stakeholders working in the adult Basic Skills arena was identified as a way of building up a two-way process of learning between different sectors and integrating the employment and skills agenda. For example, Basic Skills organisations reported less engagement with social enterprise than with other sectors. The voluntary sector reported finding it difficult to access the multiple funding streams for short-term projects, making engagement with areas such as the Basic Skills agenda more difficult. There was felt to be a potential role for London Works in brokering collaborative working between agencies such as the Adult Basic Skills Strategy Unit, voluntary sector representative organisations and initiatives such as the LDA Project Synergy Programme (commissioned through LVSC) that takes a strategic role in building the capacity of London's voluntary and community sector to provide information, advice and support.

Interviewees felt that the Treasury-funded Employment Training Pilot “Profit from Learning” was a good example of an initiative providing Basic Skills training for people in work in East London. This scheme gives up to 150 per cent in wage subsidies to employers (with fewer than 150 employees) and fully funds up to 70 hours training for employees aged 19 years and above. The subsidy element is designed to decrease with the size of participating companies, so that organisations with more than 250 employees receive 75 per cent of the wage subsidy for an employee when s/he is being trained. With Business Link as the main delivery agency for SMEs in the London East region, the scheme is concerned with first time qualifications, rather than job-specific training. Given the scheme’s retention rates of 98 per cent and positive formal evaluations, interviewees called for London Works to lobby for further London pilots.

A major structural issue identified by interviewees drawn from the business sector concerned skill shortages and geography. For example, the LDA London Plan identifies sectoral growth in areas outside of South London that have a declining manufacturing base. This presents particular issues for employers already located in the South and the local employment base available. The issue of transport also maps onto sectoral location, given that parts of South and East London are not so accessible by public transport. Looking to examples such as Runway to Work, there are clear implications for the kind of work that people can realistically attain within their own boroughs, if travel expense and physical access proves to be a limiting factor. As with disabled Londoners, there was felt to be a role for London Works to lobby GLA, LDA and other regional bodies in regard to transport and access issues.

Community groups

Initiatives such as Sure Start have facilitated a number of childcare start-ups and outreach programmes with an explicit focus on the basic skills agenda. For example, with the Step into Learning scheme, Sure Start managers and neighbourhood nurseries have identified the Basic Skills needs of parents and looked at integrating this as a component of childcare qualifications. Childcare partnership managers based at JobCentre Plus were highlighted by respondents as recently established positions intended to support the movement of people into childcare, linking into early years partnerships (EYDCPs). The degree to which this had been facilitated was felt not yet to be apparent. In Paddington Development Trust (PDT), programmes working with refugee communities have included a focus on working with local primary schools to identify what skills and qualifications their parents required.

For the Waterloo Employment Training Network (WETN), basic skills training has been used as a vehicle to employ local people (delivered by agency Prevista). Such schemes were felt to take time to establish in order to gain the trust of local people, and it was felt that London Works had a role in disseminating some of the key principles involved in setting up such schemes.

In areas of major regeneration, organisations such as PDT were felt to exemplify an approach that sought to put local communities at the centre of local change, enabling them to take advantage of local employment opportunities. For PDT, employment is a means to tackle the social deprivation and fragmentation in the local area. Using the concept of neighbourhood management, the Trust sought to facilitate mainstream engagement with local communities. This

incorporated a range of initiatives, such as an Arabic Speakers Advice and Advocacy project, using language as a way to bring culturally distinct but linguistically similar cultures together. A key feature of the PDT approach has been to develop multi-agency programmes with a focus on working from the bottom up. PDT respondents identified how they had run 'parties' for a number of different groups, such as new refugees. They felt that such events had led to the growth of local networks and enabled local people (such as refugees) to meet local services and service providers. A similar approach was taken by the community development work of agencies such as Peabody, who threw local 'parties' for particular areas as a method of outreach that enabled the programme to reach people who would not be picked up using a more formal method. This then allowed for Basic Skills needs assessment within the local community.

In Brent, the Household Employment Initiative identified all the people who were eligible for work in one area, and supported three keyworkers to knock on people's doors, mapping the people they met and identifying the places where they would congregate. In this sense, the project spanned neighbourhood renewal, health and employment agendas. Each individual contacted was assigned a personal job advisor, who was then able to link the person to other service areas (health, education) so that the services appeared 'seamless' from the perspective of the client. Such a micro-level scheme was felt to be of positive benefit when working with some of the social groups furthest from the job market. In the Peckham area, agencies such as Pecan have adopted a similar approach with outreach workers knocking on people's doors as a way of conducting needs assessment in the local area.

In summary, there was felt to be a role for London Works in dissemination and sharing this good practice more widely for those working in employment activity in similar fields.

Libraries

One area of potential collaboration for the London Works programme was with the London Libraries Development Agency. The LLDA has a number of Basic Skills pilots planned to run between April 2003 and April 2005, which are attempting to test the thesis that libraries are better placed to provide access to excluded groups than more formal learning scenarios. For example, in Kensington and Chelsea a Refugee Doctor Group has been formed, working to develop English language skills amongst its clients, who want to be able to use their skills and practise medicine in the UK.

The number of libraries in London – some 395 – means that local communities are never that far away from a library, which can provide a base for localised education and training provision.

The London Health Library Network, which recently joined LLDA, also has an interest in Basic Skills, with a wider push for libraries to link with the health agenda. In this manner, the libraries sector was felt to be developing itself as a 'learning community' model that local communities could access. There was felt to be potential for London Works to act as a broker to find opportunities to place learning and information on the health agenda, and to work in partnership with LLDA and LHLN, in addition to disseminating the good practice that current library schemes may have evolved, as awareness of this outside of the library sphere was not felt to be high.

Refugees into jobs (ESOL)

Other projects, such as Refugees into Work in Brent, identified that they were attempting to increase proficiency in non-technical and colloquial English in an informal social club setting amongst refugees who were formerly medical staff in their countries of origin. The project was felt to be one of the lead schemes of its kind in London with a focus on highly skilled refugees looking to acquire English language skills and/or convert their home qualifications.

A key focus within such training is literacy and, as echoed by other agencies such as Reed in Partnership, there was some degree of dissatisfaction with the quality of the ESOL courses available in the local area. Another refugee project in the Brent area, Working Links, has identified vocational work-based language skills as far more relevant for refugee communities than more classroom-based courses. Respondents identified how the initiative had devised a TEFL (Teaching English as a Foreign Language) approach to teaching, with short, focused programmes teaching situation-based work, with a personal advisor placed in the classroom. While cost-intensive, such an approach was felt to equip refugees with more transferable language skills than comparative grammar-based courses. Other agencies such as Reed in Partnership have developed their own courses and coursebooks, due to the perception that local ESOL courses were not serving well the needs of the refugee people that were coming into their agencies looking for employment. Reed in Partnership said that they had spent considerable time working up their coursebooks, and were interested in sharing some of their experience with other agencies across London, which London Works could facilitate.

Mental health

On a general level, interviewees discussed the integration of basic skills into a range of other areas. For instance, respondents identified how Basic Skills courses can be integrated into health on a pragmatic basis, such as in material aimed at specific disease sets (e.g diabetes) that can also integrate Basic Skills development. In another initiative Central London LSC, with the support of the five SHAs, has trained healthworkers to become tutors and mentors.

The rehabilitation of mental health users was felt to be of particular relevance to the Basic Skills and employment agenda, with respondents identifying positive dividends from engaging users in employment activity, in terms of both their rehabilitation and their future employability. Discussants identified St George's Hospital and its programme of work with mental health users as a positive example in this regard. Other examples included café and restaurant schemes, where users were trained to take basic skills and food hygiene courses and staff the kitchen of cafes and restaurants run as social enterprises. Respondents from initiatives such as the Richmond Fellowship Mental Health Programme identified an explicit objective of identifying a coherent psycho-social route to rehabilitation in the broadest sense. In the treatment of mental health users, a single programme and care pathway was aspired to, made up of different modules (including, but not only, employment) and funded by a single source. An advisor would be able to identify a mental health user's individual needs in order to support and sustain them in work. This model was also one that a number of protagonists are trying to support in local

contexts. In Haringey, a Mental Health Employment Working Group had been established as a consortium, attempting to facilitate a seamless and holistic service for clients following their discharge. Respondents identified this process was extremely time-intensive, and developing a single assessment tool that mental health users could take with them from service to service was problematic. The benefits of doing this were felt to be an improved service and the better level of intelligence that employment brokers would have about the needs of clients (e.g. if going to a recruitment agency, clients could make people aware of the pressing issues relevant to their condition and the kind of employment they could do by reference to a single assessment tool that they hold themselves). There was felt to be a role for London Works to disseminate good practice around the development of a single assessment tool, or in being able to signpost such learning.

Also in Haringey, a Mental Health Support Placement Team was established, linked to Mencap Pathway. Made up of users, the team intends to deliver disability awareness training to Haringey Council and will facilitate entry for disabled people to come into the council. Another project in a Haringey psychiatric hospital sourced New Deal for Communities (NDC) funds to develop an information and media-training course. In order to access funding, all those within the psychiatric department have been considered as residents of the local area, and the media training course is open to all local residents within the NDC area whether resident in the hospital or not. The project is intended to produce posters and information about mental health for service users and non-users alike, in an effort to enable the hospital to be used more as a community resource.

The Rethink Social Firms Initiative plans to develop a number of social firms composed of people with personal experience of mental illness, one of which will focus on providing organisations which disability awareness training on a commercial basis. Another social firm, Seagull Print Ltd, was established in 1991 and is a registered charity and limited company by guarantee. Through its print business it provides a range of training opportunities linked to work and employment for people recovering from mental health problems. The business exists solely as a vehicle to deliver training services and enhance trainees' employment opportunities by offering work-based training.

There was felt to be an important role for London Works to bring together learning around these different social firms and enterprises, and share the learning in order to disseminate it to other employment activity that may want to focus on people with mental health issues.

NHS Workforce

At a national level within the Health Inequalities Programme for Action (Department of Health), public service employment – incorporating all forms of public services rather than the NHS alone – is one of the long term hurdles (set for 2030). This is important in terms of both acknowledging the public health and employment agendas and working towards the kinds of services that agencies such as the NHS need to provide (a more diverse workforce reflecting the demography of local communities, facilitating the provision of more culturally appropriate services, for instance).

With over one million people employed in the NHS, and a predicted skills shortage of 40 000 people in London alone over the next five years, interviewees felt there was a recognised need for flexible thinking about NHS recruitment. As identified in *'Claiming the Health Dividend'*, this requires a focus on non-traditional candidates drawn from local communities, with investment in pre-employment training and helping people to move up the skills escalator. It is against that interviewees were positive about the Framework for Regional Employment and Skills Action (FRESA), in its approach to increasing employment in the NHS and addressing the skills deficit in the sector. In addition, schemes such as 'Creating Capacity' have sought to create a new tier of non-clinical roles (funded by North West London Workforce Development Confederation - NWLWDC) although this focuses on qualifications beyond that of the Basic Skills agenda alone. While LDA and North East London Strategic Health Authority (NELSHA) have been mapping practice for North East and North West London, the Centre for Economic and Social Exclusion (CESI) has been commissioned by the LDA to research all health skills escalator activity, to be published in March 2004. In London, the FRESA uses some shared competency frameworks but no overarching one, with different HR departments developing action plans.

From the perspective of HR management interviewees within the Health sector, there were some reservations about the extent to which a strategic approach to NHS employment at workforce development confederation/strategic health authority level could cascade down, due to the very immediate and pressing issues experienced by HR departments at a local level (immediate staffing shortages understandably taking precedence over long-term work). While networks such as Strategic Human Resources Intelligence Networks (SHRINE) for SHA HR managers were valued, interviewees at PCT level felt that SHAs largely focused on their own projects (in response to central strategic workforce development issues) and that this would not be something individual PCTs would necessarily get involved in.

PCTs highlighted as providing positive examples of engaging with the Basic Skills agenda included St Mary's Hospital in West London, which was identified as working with Westminster College to co-ordinate Basic Skills and ESOL courses provided on the hospital premises. As previously identified, St George's Hospital was also identified as engaging with a range of employment activities. In both cases, their positive approach was understood as facilitated by longstanding and committed HR Directors who supported long-established employment programmes, some of which were mainstream to PCT work. Elsewhere, the picture was felt to be much more variable. From a wider perspective, while there was felt to be high-level buy-in to the mutuality of the employment and health agendas, barriers were felt to exist at the level of middle management within the Health sector. Thus, in a number of separate initiatives where a PCT and local authority had worked together to take non-conventional recruits for non-clinical support roles, interviewees identified resistance from levels of middle management. This was also identified as applying to some examples of skills escalator work and the success of initiatives such as New Deal in PCT contexts, which was also felt to be variable, depending on how well line managers had received the scheme and how willing they were to take on New Deal entrants.

Validated activity areas for the future London Works programme of action 3: Key Skills

The final area of activity identified for the London Works programme coalesced around the theme of 'key skills'. Initial commentary by delegates in the planning event identified that the analytic theme title 'Basic Skills' could appear inappropriate, particularly given that many refugees had skill sets far exceeding 'basic'. Additionally, needs for skills of literacy, numeracy and ESOL are often combined with other 'basic' job skills. In this sense, the skills being accessed were more 'skills for life' (as per the government's strategy in this area) and so could be better described as key skills.

An area of activity identified for the London Works programme was the support that employees themselves needed to be 'job ready' in order to overcome barrier of moving into work (e.g. the benefit trap). Delegates also identified that London Works could broker the formation of an intermediary one-stop-shop that could bring together the support needed by both employers and employees, covering the key skills that employees may need to progress into work. A virtual one-stop-shop presence was also identified as linking in a complementary manner to the proposal for London Works' involvement in producing a toolkit to support the business community (as identified in the previous activity area). In terms of access to basic skills training and learning opportunities, representatives from the library sector identified how local libraries remained an under-utilised resource by local people. The building in of basic skills to other forms of service provision was also felt to be an area for London Works involvement, together with dissemination of learning around volunteering as a vehicle for basic skills learning. In terms of the variable quality of ESOL training for refugee communities, delegates identified how agencies had developed their own more vocationally inflected courses, around which London Works could share learning.

- A number of the specific projects developed by delegates in the planning conference concerned differing kinds of support to help people to become "**job ready**". One specific proposal identified the different ways in which employees could be supported to move into work and away from the relative security provided by benefit. In order to support such people, there was felt to be a need to challenge and substantiate what services such as JobCentre Plus offer people, and to use community groups and advocates as paid trainees to support people into work. A number of delegates identified this as requiring local job brokerage and felt that their knowledge and expertise could bring a valuable contribution that the London Works programme could draw on (JobCentre Plus, Sainsbury Centre for Mental Health, North East London Strategic Health Authority, Greenwich Development Agency). Working with these partners, London Works could broker a pilot to support local people in this way. Such a pilot was also felt to match wider delegate concerns about helping potential employees to address the benefit trap, given its disproportionate impact on Londoners.
- Another specific proposal identified by delegates in the planning event concerned the formation of a **one stop shop** for employers and employees, which would provide advice and enable employees to think differently about themselves, seeing themselves as assets to their communities rather than as 'victims'. This was seen as increasing the willingness of employees to take their first steps towards moving into and remaining in work. In terms of

employment support, another specific proposal was having a job mentor or job coach who would provide ongoing support to potential employees, but also provide coaching and support for employers once people had moved into work (also identified as a current gap in employment activity by other delegates). This was felt to be an effective way of gauging both employer needs and the training needs of employees (with mutual feedback conducted throughout the employee induction period within a company). Employees could also be retained on the project itself as external project consultants, either on a part-time basis or as volunteers to contribute to the scheme and continue their own upskilling. As identified in interviews, support for both employers and employees was evident in a few positive schemes focusing on mental health (e.g. Richmond Fellowship) and was identified as a more common model in the area of learning disabilities. Such work links strongly to national government policy and the 'Skills for Life' agenda.

- **Libraries:** A library sector delegate identified how some 395 libraries were located throughout the London area, and that they were often more accessible and local for proximate communities than more formal centres of learning. In this sense, the potential of a library is to constitute a neutral community space that can be used to provide access to basic skills at a more localised level. A contribution that the LLDA identified it could make to the programme concerned the provision of information to local employers and to employees. London Works' involvement in brokering further local pilots around libraries strongly links to government policy on libraries as outlined in 'Framework for the Future', which emphasises libraries as a community resource. This is similarly reflected in a Round 3 Beacon Council theme.
- Delegates identified that an issue related to localised provision was how to identify the requisite **local intelligence**. Delegates looked to the example of the Household Employment Initiative in Brent, which knocked on people's doors in a given area to conduct needs assessment on a range of issues, including employment and basic skills. Delegates such as those from Greenwich Council identified that they could bring such good practice and learning to the programme through their links as Beacon Councils in removing barriers to employment (also including Brent). London Works' role could be to disseminate learning and good practice in this regard. This would firmly link into the Objective 2 FRESA on social inclusion.
- **Pre-employment training and volunteering** was identified as a way of local people gaining experience and basic skills and increasing their confidence and self-esteem in the world of work, particularly if they had been at some distance from the job market for a period of time. Partners who were willing to bring such experience to the London Works programme included Whipps Cross University Hospital and its pre-employment training programme (with formal evaluation by South Bank University). This corresponds with the need for dissemination of good pre-employment training practice identified by delegates in the planning event. Moreover, agencies such as the New Economics Foundation identified how volunteering, while important as a way of gaining skills and moving closer to employment, was also a valuable activity within itself, identifying the 'timebank' scheme of reciprocal support between people based on the units of time they have spent doing work for each other. For specific sites such as the Olympics, it was also noted that there would be a need to generate a large number of volunteers. Work to demonstrate why volunteering is important and its contribution to people's skills and employment pathways was felt to be an important potential role for the

programme, resonating with the wider government skills agenda. Delegates identified how London Works could draw on the experience of projects such as the King's Fund Health Advocacy for BME Londoners Programme, where the aim of advocates has been to empower communities and improve their health through providing a coherent voice for advocates to respond to government policy. This matches the need expressed by delegates for the dissemination and sharing of good practice around supporting BME access to employment opportunities.

- Within the planning event, there was support for **building key skills into other kinds of provision**. In interviews, examples were given of building basic skills courses into training and learning around particular health conditions (e.g. diabetes) from the perspective of health agencies. Within the planning event, one specific proposal concerned accessing unemployed primary care patients. For those people whom employment may help with health issues, primary care facilities could be an access point for unemployed GP patients to be offered a range of services. This could involve brokering a pilot with PCTs, the King's Fund, the Adult Basic Skills Strategy Unit (ABSSU) and LDA Skills Commission, for instance. An important and necessary pre-requisite here is the level of awareness that health professionals have of the skills agenda and their openness to different ways of working. Another specific proposal developed at the planning conference concerned work to change the attitudes of health professionals themselves, in making them confident of being able to work with a range of partners, even including those outside the public sector. This would also involve professionals being aware of the links between the skills and health agendas. Within interviews, there was felt to be a need to raise awareness of these agendas, both for health professionals and for other sectors, such as the voluntary and community sector. London Works could input into the brokering of a pilot to demonstrate such complementary linkage between the skills and health agendas.
- A concern expressed in interviews regarded the provision of **ESOL** courses, which were identified as often overly formal and classroom-based (an area that the LLDA identified libraries as providing a more local and less formal learning opportunity). Agencies such as Refugees into Work and Reed in Partnership identified their development of course materials along more vocational and practical lines (in Brent, understood as more TEFL-inflected). In the example of Reed in Partnership, this has included the development of a series of workbooks that Reed is looking to disseminate more widely as a product. There was felt to be a role for London Works in bringing together this good practice for ESOL providers and health professionals, and disseminating it more widely. This could also represent a further opportunity for better sharing between health and basic skills providers, with the support of agencies such as HDA. Clearly, this would also link into the FRESA refugee flagship projects, as well as the Skills For Life agendas.

Proposed areas for the London Works action programme

In overview, the scoping process has generated a huge amount of ideas and plans regarding employment activity across London, both in discussions held with interviewees and also within from delegates within the planning event. While OPM reports on the overall process, it must be emphasised that the scoping work itself has been conducted in complete collaboration with the Programme Manager. It is only because of this strong collaboration that it has been possible to generate the wealth of ideas and plans that have emerged over the scoping.

Against the backdrop of the many suggested ideas and plans for the programme, together with the context of London Works resources' (namely, the Programme Manager and a budget of £50,000), there has been a need to be selective of the specific areas of activity in which London Works could be involved. Interviewees and delegates bring differing levels of awareness of the those agencies engaged in the London employment activity agenda. For example, particular areas of activity suggested for London Works may in fact already be supported by particular streams of work and/or developing strategies and plans (e.g SELs already sharing work with other regions and information sharing already conducted by GLA and LDA). Clearly, the role of the programme would be to endorse the profile of such work already taking place rather than undertake any such work itself.

The full range of suggestions and ideas are invaluable for the scoping work as they can be shared and taken up by other partners and interested bodies where not selected for the programme itself. However, it is within the context of considerations around the suitability of activity for the programme, together with the scoping themes and context of resources that the Programme Manager and the project steering group worked to identify a broad framework for the future programme of activity for London Works.

The framework has three main domains, broadly corresponding to the three themes identified through interview analysis. These are:

- 1) The business of healthy employment
- 2) Developing an Health and Sustainable Community
- 3) Key Skills

Within each domain, the framework outlines the main activity theme (e.g. for 'the business of healthy employment', supporting employers), the partners who can be involved in the activity (e.g. CBI, Small Business Service, ELBA, Businesslink4London etc) and the wider policy context alluded to by the area of activity (e.g. libraries information for business).

This framework is intended to allow flexibility within the identified themes and activity areas, whilst also representing a commitment by the programme to specific areas of work and associated partners. The framework was presented to and agreed by the project steering group on February 27th 2004 and is shown overleaf.

Framework for proposed London Works action programme

The Business of Healthy Employment

THEMES	PARTNERS	LINKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supporting employee } making the business care • Challenging employers • CSR • Retention of staff (mental health, long term sickness) • Early intervention (prevention not cure) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CBI – London 1st – GLA • ELBA • SEL • Small business service • Business link 4 London • RPHG • LSC (London South) HR Locum – mental health project • DRC • DWP (Pathways to Work extension) • Age Concern London (LDA) • Greenwich Health SRB • GLAD • Disability Champions Group (Unum Provident) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DDA (October 2004) • Libraries and information for business • CSR sustainability reporting • GLA disabled Londoners priority • HDA pre-retirement BME elders and healthy advocacy • Health creators / wealth creators (RPHG)

Developing an Healthy and Sustainable Community

THEMES	PARTNERS	LINKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • London Plan (SRDF) • NHS Capital Development (PFI) – S106 (Greenwich, Paddington) • Patient Choice (remodelling service provision) • Public Sector procurement • Developing Social Enterprise • Building local capacity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - volunteering - self employment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GLA • RPHG <li style="padding-left: 40px;">} HUDU • SHA's • King's Fund (food procurement) • HDA • SEL • Wider business support community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wider Government policy on public sector procurement • Sustainable Community agenda • Bridge House funded programme (SEL) • NHS workforce development) • Olympics & its legacy (regeneration NEL)
<p>Activity: modelling an healthy community for sustainable growth</p> <p>London Works – to focus on one area such as bringing people together, broker input in one SRDF area such as East London</p>		

Key Skills

THEMES	PARTNERS	LINKS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Job readiness” • Localising provision • Volunteering <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - health advocacy - NEF / Time Bank • Building key skills into other kinds of provision (e.g. social care) • Mentoring • ESOL 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LLDA • Reed in Partnership • PCTs • King’s Fund – BME Health advocacy network • ELBA & BITC (health a theme for BITC 2004) • ABSSU (DFES at GOL) • LVSC and community groups • Refugees into Work (RETAS) • LDA skills Commission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skills for Life (Government policy) • FRESA: objective 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - flagship – social inclusion - flagship - refugee
<p>Activity: piloting and mainstreaming & good practice sharing London Works – to focus more on brokering/supporting a pilot programme or project</p>		

Additional recommendations and recommendations for other partners

The scoping process for the London Works for Better Health programme has sought to identify a range of employment activity across London, interview key personnel connected to these various forms of activity and draw together these people as an ongoing community of interest involved in and having oversight of employment-related activity across London. While the previous sections have identified the analytic issues pertinent to each of the themes emerging from the data and, building on this, the validated areas of activity that the London Works programme of action should focus on, there also emerged a number of issues that, while not necessarily of prime focus for London Works, remain germane to agencies with which London Works has engagement.

- **Recognising exemplar healthy employers:** There was interviewee and delegate support for establishing an award scheme that would recognise those members of the business community who are exemplary of the 'healthy employer' agenda. Those businesses achieving the awards would themselves act as demonstrators to the wider business community of the benefits of being an healthy employer in London. This suggests that there is support for the RPHG Health Creators/Wealth Creators plan in its focus on gold, silver and bronze awards and is an area of activity that warrants continued development by RPHG.
- **'External' understanding of the health sector:** A key issue raised by many agencies, both in interviews and at the final planning event, was the lack of understanding that many people outside the health sector had of the sector itself. In the context of '*Claiming the Health Dividend*' and issues of sustained and integrated social impact of the NHS in London on local communities, this must remain an issue of concern for SHAs, PCTs and regional representative bodies such as RPHG. Social enterprises (e.g. GreenWorks) identified little engagement with local PCTs in terms of procurement, because of their belief in the impenetrability of procurement procedures and the perceived difficulty of establishing contact with the sector as a whole. As identified in analysis, even among councils awarded beacon status for removing barriers to work for excluded groups, there has been little engagement with health as a sector within itself. While positive examples of local employment initiatives were identified at hospitals such as St George's and St Mary's, these institutions remained an exception proving the rule of wider non-engagement. While London Works may have a role in disseminating more widely the learning forged by such sectors, it remains clear that there is work for health agencies in terms of promotion and raising awareness of the structure of the sector, entry points into the sector and procurement processes pertaining to the sector itself, as '*Claiming the Health Dividend*' for the NHS in London becomes ever more important.
- **Information need:** A theme highlighted throughout the needs identified by delegates within the planning event concerned a lack of information and local intelligence. This manifested

itself in the need for information of local populations (e.g. the physical number of refugees in an area), information share between agencies and institutions (e.g. health and local authorities) and the kinds of information about what constitutes success in terms of employment-related activity. Here, a clear message emerges for wider regional bodies such as GLA and LDA concerning the perceived accessibility of different levels of information. In particular, there was felt to be a lack of awareness around the kind of information that agencies may require to access different funding streams and lack of clarity around accessing of regional bodies such as LDA in terms of addressing gaps in information need. This makes a clear call for improved information-share processes.

- **JobCentre Plus:** As identified within analytic themes and highlighted within the strategic planning event, JobCentre Plus generated a great deal of discussion and thought amongst interviewees and delegates. While people could identify elements of good practice in terms of specific projects and ways of working of certain regional London offices, it was clear that the picture was more variable when viewed across against the wider London context. In relation to disabled Londoner's and New Deal programmes there was ambivalence about the level of support that advisors give to clients. While outside the remit of the London Works programme per se, there is a clear message that JobCentre Plus can look to from strategic respondents in terms of building on its own good practice and addressing perceptions that may exist around aspects of its service from particular population groups.
- **Cross-sectoral representation:** A final recommendation specific to London Works concerns the very cross-sectoral, multi-agency partnership way of working that is required by virtually all the areas of activity identified by delegates. While the project steering group represents the interests of some major bodies such as LDA, GLA, London First, the King's Fund and RPHG, it is clear that there will need to be a widening of the steering group to represent the multiplicity of sectoral interests that could be involved in the London Works programme. This would involve the social enterprise and business sector representatives, for example, in order to guide the various streams of work that the Programme Manager will take forward from the validated areas of activity in the next phase of the *London Works for Better Health* programme.

Appendices