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Executive Summary

Introduction

In the context of a range of policy initiatives introduced by the Government to address worklessness and improve the functioning of the labour market, revisions were introduced to the JSA/Restart process in April 2000 for long term unemployed JSA clients aged 25 and above, who are not on any of the New Deals. The revised mandatory process involved a stronger emphasis on job search at the six and 12 month Restart interviews and the introduction of a six week period of ‘intensive jobmatching’ following the interview, involving weekly contact by telephone or attendance at a Jobcentre.

The evaluation of these changes aimed to assess both the way in which the changes have been implemented and their impact in terms of moving people off JSA into work and other destinations. The evaluation comprised three main elements: first, qualitative research in a sample of 12 case study Jobcentres; second, a telephone survey of claimants who had been through the new process; and third, an analysis of off-flows from JSA over the period April 1999 to March 2001 using data from the ES Evaluation Database. This report assimilates the findings from all stages of the evaluation.

Approach to the implementation of the process

Advance notice and preparations for the enhanced JSA/Restart processes appear to have gone relatively smoothly although there were some cases of difficulty due to resource constraints and perceived lack of adequate consultation. There was some variation in the way in which the changes were implemented at District and local office level and a significant degree of departure from the ‘policy intention’ for delivery of intensive jobmatching through telephony, and mainly through ES Direct.

Two basic delivery models were found, one (‘Telephony Model’) conforming closely with the official guidance but the other (‘Attendance Model’) involving a significant move towards face-to-face delivery of the intensive matching process and with an increased involvement of advisory resource. Resource issues were paramount in influencing the approach adopted but the relatively strong emphasis on face-to-face provision developed from local perceptions of the needs of the target client group and the best approach to addressing barriers to work. Moreover, problems in dealing effectively with some clients through telephony resulted in a shift towards face-to-face provision over time and the load on advisory resource emerged as an issue in several offices.

The Restart advisory interview

The six and twelve month Restart interviews were being delivered largely in accordance with guidance, with most offices extending the six month interview by ten minutes and focussing on client needs, job goals and job search behaviour in preparation for intensive jobmatching.
Clients were generally positive about the Restart interview. Some two thirds felt that it had been helpful, with females, younger clients, members of black and minority ethnic (BME) groups and those with lower qualifications being most positive. These groups were also more likely to have vacancies identified for them, although those with lower qualifications were less likely to apply for jobs.

It was widely agreed amongst Jobcentre staff that the new process has resulted in more effective information collection in Jobseekers' Agreements (JSAs). Some problems had occurred, especially where jobmatching was undertaken through ESD telephony, but these had largely been addressed. The mandatory elements of the Client Progress Kit were being used in most offices but the CPK was widely seen as time consuming, too subjective, 'bureaucratic' and as duplicating work. In many cases it had not been adequately explained and little training had been given.

Issues of information management and communication were emphasised, including the importance of standardising information collection within the LMS system and detailed monitoring of client progress, with good communication between advisors and matching teams. Some problems of communication had occurred, especially between advisers and ESD matching teams.

The intensive jobmatching process

In the two jobmatching models, differential emphasis was placed on key referral criteria: availability of a phone; extent of problems and barriers that undermine job-readiness; specificity of job goals; and whether there were any suspicions about fraud. In particular, in the attendance model, priority was given to issues around problems and barriers affecting job-readiness and clients appeared to be given rather less choice. Some Jobcentres had introduced an 'exit' advisory interview into the process at the end of intensive jobmatching but resource constraints were preventing full implementation.

The dominance of the attendance model was confirmed by the client survey; 83 per cent had attended a Jobcentre with less than a fifth having telephone matching and only a quarter of these through ESD. Males, members of BME groups and those with lower qualifications were more likely to have face-to-face matching, supporting the case study finding that the telephony model was generally being used for clients who are more job ready. Some problems had been experienced in achieving telephone contact with clients, especially through ESD, and these had been addressed by ‘tightening up’ appointment systems, recruiting more staff and applying more rigorous criteria on clients’ access to a phone.

In the client survey just over half of respondents reported weekly jobmatching, with 29 per cent indicating more frequent contact (especially males and younger clients) and 17 per cent less frequent contact. Where matching was undertaken locally, ‘in-house’, there appeared to be more scope to adapt to clients’ needs and circumstances, especially where matching was undertaken on a caseload basis. However, there were resource implications which created dilemmas for local
offices in seeking to adapt the process to meet the needs of the client group effectively.

Nearly two thirds of clients reported that they had found jobmatching very or quite helpful and that they were satisfied. Females and those with lower qualifications were most positive about the process and these groups were most likely to have vacancies identified for them. Conversely, those with higher qualifications were least positive and (together with older clients) were least likely to have vacancies identified for them. Clients on face-to-face matching were rather more likely to be satisfied than those on telephony, who tended to have fewer vacancies identified and were less likely than face-to-face clients to apply for any.

**Effectiveness and impact of the process**

Many staff saw the ‘official’ jobmatching model as not very effective in addressing the significant barriers to employment faced by the target group, which require more intensive help. Some saw the process as inherently limited because the focus on job search does not address underlying problems around personal circumstances, skills and motivation. In several offices it was felt that there could be significant benefits from providing more intensive advisory and jobmatching help at the 13 week stage.

Some increase in job search behaviour and submissions was reported in the case study Jobcentres but in many cases a cautious approach was being taken on submissions in order to maintain good relations with employers. Most Jobcentres reported increased ‘signing off’ but there was a feeling that many were transferring to other benefits or were re-signing when eligible. There was some anecdotal evidence that the face-to-face matching regime applies a more rigorous framework and produces greater effect.

At the time of the survey, 36 per cent of clients reported that they were in work and 46 per cent on JSA. Females, younger clients and those with NVQ levels two and three were more likely to have obtained work during the process and to be still in work, while those with low qualifications were least likely to obtain work. Perceived helpfulness of the process correlates broadly with work status at the time of the client survey. However, although those with low or no qualifications tended to find the process helpful, they were least likely to obtain work, indicating a problem of lack of skills. Conversely, those with NVQ level three were less positive about the process but a relatively high proportion found work, indicating a problem of unsuitable vacancies in the ES system.

Jobs obtained by clients were predominantly in semi/unskilled and personal services/sales occupations. Females were more likely to obtain part-time work and jobs in administrative/secretarial and personal service/sales, while males and those with low qualifications were more likely to obtain semi/unskilled work. These work patterns and the perceptions of different client groups suggest that the effectiveness of the process is conditioned by the nature of vacancies notified to the ES, which presents some constraints on the effectiveness with which the ES can help those with higher qualifications.
Time-series analysis of off-flows from JSA based upon the ES Evaluation Database provided some measures of the effects of the new process although a robust counterfactual was not available. The analysis used the group of claimants aged 25+ and unemployed for less than six months as a ‘proxy comparator’ but emphasising the need for caution in interpretation. The analysis points to a small effect in terms of increased off-flows from JSA for both target groups (six and 12 month claimants), especially over the first three months after the Restart interview.

The effect in terms of transfers to other benefits and leaving to unknown and other destinations appears to be larger than the effect on movement into work. Analysis of the sustainability of off-flows indicates the significance of the ‘revolving door’ whereby some clients who leave the register within three months of their Restart interview re-sign before the three month point. This is particularly evident in the case of clients failing to sign and leaving to unknown and other destinations. On the other hand, off-flows into work appear to be more sustainable; thus, of clients leaving the register into work, over 80 per cent were still off the register three months after their Restart interview. Overall, the analysis suggests a reduction in the JSA count for the target client groups in the order of 1-2 per cent.
1. Introduction

Background and policy context

1.1 Since coming to power in May 1997, the Labour Government has introduced a range of policy initiatives to address worklessness and improve the functioning of the labour market (H.M Treasury, 2001). Based upon a foundation of measures designed to achieve macroeconomic stability, the main elements of the Government’s strategy have been (DFEE, 2001):

- helping to make work pay, by reforming the tax and benefit system
- helping to make work possible, by providing new support and new opportunities for people to move from welfare into work
- promoting diversity so there are genuine opportunities for all
- modernising the delivery of welfare
- improving skills through education and training.

1.2 A major element in the strategy is the New Deal, introduced for young people (NDYP) aged 18 to 24 in 1997 and subsequently extended to include long-term unemployed people aged 25+ (NDLTU), lone parents (NDLP), disabled people, those aged over 50 and the partners of unemployed people. The principle of all the New Deals are similar: more help tailored to individuals’ needs in preparing for and searching for work; more options for training and work experience, follow-through for those not securing work, and the support of a Personal Adviser. In addition, individuals are expected to take greater responsibility for helping themselves; those on New Deals claiming Jobseekers’ Allowance (JSA) have an obligation actively to seek work throughout the New Deal process (DFEE, 2001: Hasluck, 2000).

1.3 Evaluation of the New Deals is continuing but it has been shown that the New Deal for Young People (NDYP) has had a significant positive effect on youth unemployment (NIESR, 2000). An important element in NDYP and NDLTU in particular, is an enhanced emphasis on job search; indeed, this was strengthened by modifications introduced in late 1998 (Hasluck, 2000). Government commitment to strengthening individuals’ responsibility to look for work continues the principles introduced with JSA in October 1996 which, in addition to reducing the period of entitlement to contributions-based benefit and increasing checks on eligibility, introduced a range of measure to encourage more successful job search and enhanced advisory intervention (Sweeney and McMahon, 1998).

1.4 Subsequent evaluation of the effect of introducing JSA found that it had a significant effect in reducing the claimant count, especially for those who had been claiming for more than six months and especially due to increases in off-flows from the register into other benefits or ‘other destinations’ (ibid.). It is not clear what the effect of enhanced job search was, but there is evidence from elsewhere that indicate positive effects of job search on job prospects.
1.5 Thus, Robinson (2000, p. 21) concludes from a review of evidence from various countries that “…job-search-oriented programmes do seem to achieve their stated objective, which is to help people move more quickly into employment.” In an analysis of the labour market impact of the NDYP, Blundell et al. (2001) find an average increase in the probability of finding work of some five per cent, of which they attribute one per cent to the Gateway services, such as job search assistance. More generally, an analysis by Boheim and Taylor (2001) of job search behaviour in Britain found that job search intensity, measured by the number of search methods used, has a positive impact on the probability of employment.

The Enhanced JSA/Restart (EJSA) process

1.6 In April 2000 ES introduced nationally a strengthened JSA and Restart process for long term unemployed JSA clients aged 25 and above, who are not on any of the New Deals. This was one element of a broader package of enhancements to the services provided to long-term unemployed people to help them move into work, announced in the Chancellor’s Pre-Budget Report in November 1999. A particular concern behind these enhancements was to strengthen the matching of unemployed people over 25 to the substantial number of vacancies in the economy.

1.7 The ES was given £20 million over three operational years (2000/01 to 2002/03) to develop and implement the initiative. The revised JSA/Restart process (referred to as EJSA in this report) involved:

- a much stronger emphasis on jobmatching at both the six and twelve month advisory interviews, with the 6 month interview being lengthened by ten minutes for jobmatching;
- a six week period of intensive jobmatching immediately following both the six and twelve month advisory interview; and
- the six week intensive jobmatching period would usually be delivered by telephone, through either Employment Service Direct, or dedicated teams within Districts, although in some cases the Jobseeker might be asked to attend the Jobcentre.

1.8 The new process was mandatory for the target client group and sanctions were applicable to those who fail to attend interviews with the Employment Service or employers. Local Offices were given discretion over how to implement the changes in their areas and early reviews found that a number of different implementation models developed around the country. These changes to the Restart/JSA process were introduced initially for a three year period and evaluation was required to inform future policy decisions.

1.9 The main aims of the evaluation were:

- to investigate the ways in which offices have implemented and are operating the strengthened regime; and
- to assess the impact of the strengthened JSA regime on moving people off JSA and into jobs, and other destinations.
1.10 The specific objectives of the evaluation were to examine whether the new JSA regime:

- has been implemented as intended;
- has impacted on unemployment off-flows, both into jobs, and into other destinations;
- could be improved to increase effectiveness, in particular to compare the relative effectiveness of telephone and personal approaches, and to attempt to identify the most effective and efficient mix of these two basic approaches; and
- should be widened to other client groups.

1.11 The evaluation comprised three main elements. The first stage involved qualitative research in a sample of 12 case study Jobcentres in England and Scotland, undertaken in Spring 2001. The aim of this research was to investigate how the initiative had been implemented, how it was working, and obtain views of Jobcentre staff on its impact in terms of effects on claimants and on Jobcentre services. The second element was a telephone survey of claimants who had been through the new process, undertaken in Autumn 2001. Third, an analysis of off-flows from JSA over the period April 1999 to March 2001 was undertaken using data from the Employment Service Evaluation Database (ESED). The methodology pursued in the evaluation is outlined in more detail in the Annex to this report, which also contains the research instruments and a discussion of some methodological problems and issues that arose during the course of the evaluation.

1.12 This report assimilates and summarises the findings from the research for both stages one and two of the evaluation. The following section presents findings on approaches to the implementation of the initiative and this is followed by a discussion of findings relating to the advisory interview (in section three) and to the intensive jobmatching process (in section four). Section five draws together findings as to the effectiveness and impact of the process. Finally, section six summarises key findings and lessons and some examples of good practice drawn from the case study Jobcentres.
2. Approach to the Implementation of the Process

Introduction

2.1 This section reports findings from the research in case study Jobcentres on the approaches that had been adopted in implementing the enhanced JSA/Restart process. First, we consider the process of preparing for the changes and this is followed by a discussion of the delivery models adopted by the Jobcentres.

Preparation for the changes

2.2 Most Jobcentres considered that the degree of advance notice had been adequate and that the information provided was adequate for management purposes. However, in three cases there was dissatisfaction with the time allowed; in one case regional seminars were held only two weeks before the ‘going live’ date; in another the comment was that ‘the changes were thrust upon us’. In another small office, problems arose in coping with Enhanced Restart along with a number of other initiatives.

2.3 Some problems arose in preparing for the changes due to resourcing constraints. One Jobcentre reported problems obtaining equipment and ‘getting staff to express an interest’. In another, it took some time to communicate the changes to staff because many worked part time.

2.4 In two Jobcentres, issues were raised about the information provided. In one case, it was argued that there was inadequate information about the purpose of the initiative and the lack of targets was criticised. Another Jobcentre found the information ‘too verbose’ and argued that there is ‘too much paperwork’. In another case, the initial forms for statistical returns were felt to be inadequate so they were redesigned.

2.5 There was some variation in the approach to training but generally this was minimal. In some cases it was considered that the processes were relatively straightforward and where staff were re-allocated internally it was felt that they were already sufficiently experienced. Where training was provided it was mainly in the form of internal briefings. The major training need arose when new staff had to be recruited and some Jobcentres reported difficulties in providing adequate training due to resource constraints and the lack of any formal training materials.

Delivery models

2.6 There was some variation in the specific detail of the way in which the process had been implemented at local office level to accommodate local circumstances and resource constraints. In all cases the process was built into
the Restart interviews at six and 12 months. In most cases the six month interview was extended by 10 minutes; however, one district operated a policy of 35 minutes for all advisory interviews due to resource constraints. In two local offices the 12 month interview was also extended by 10 minutes.

2.7 In relation to the process of intensive matching, amongst the 12 Jobcentres visited two broad delivery models were found. These are outlined in Figure 2.1 below.

Table 2.1: Alternative delivery models adopted by Jobcentres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Telephony Model'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first model (applying to six Jobcentres) broadly followed the guidance and provided telephone matching for a majority of clients through a centralised team attached to ESD. In this model there was a presumption that clients would be referred for weekly telephone matching unless their circumstances dictated otherwise, in which case they would be referred to weekly face-to-face matching. Such circumstances included lack of a phone, problems or barriers which undermined job-readiness and suspicions about fraud. Clients on face-to-face matching were therefore in a minority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, there were some variation within this model. In particular, there was a distinction between, on the one hand, four offices which provided face-to-face matching on a caseload basis (through PB8 resource) and, on the other hand, the remaining two offices where matching was not caseloaded. In these cases, matching was undertaken by staff responsible for Response to Displayed Vacancies (RDV) or Fortnightly Jobseeker Reviews (FJR).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There had also been some changes over time. One office had to make a shift towards face-to-face matching in order to ease pressure on ESD. However, in another office the shift was in the other direction; at the outset ESD declined to take on the additional work but had subsequently agreed to do so.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Attendance Model'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The other six Jobcentres fell broadly into the second model although again there were variations. In this model there was a presumption that most clients would be referred to weekly face-to-face matching, primarily because it was seen as more effective for this client group. However, some clients were referred for weekly telephone matching if their circumstances allowed (i.e. more job ready, relatively specific job goals and had a telephone). All matching was undertaken within the resource limitations of the office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In a majority of cases in this model, face-to-face matching was undertaken on a caseload basis by advisers since this was seen as providing a necessary continuity of service for clients in order to build confidence and trust and deal effectively with their needs. In some cases changes had been made over time towards this approach, as it became evident locally that it was the most effective approach. However, it was dependent upon the availability of advisory resource, which tended to constrain the extent of face-to-face provision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In one Jobcentre, face-to-face matching was provided only fortnightly due to constraints on advisory resource. In another office weekly face-to-face matching was provided for the first six weeks after the six and 12 month advisory interview but an additional six week period of jobmatching by telephone was provided (also on a caseload basis but by a PB8 RDV specialist in ‘downtime’).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.8 In most cases it was reported that resource constraints had been the main factor influencing the approach adopted to delivering the process. In some cases, problems have arisen due to the inability of ESD to accommodate the extra work and Jobcentres have had to increase resources available locally to take on more jobmatching. Moreover, many offices have reported a shift towards face-to-face matching due to problems experienced with contacting clients by telephone and the perception that face-to-face matching is more effective for many in this client group. Many see the ideal as provision by advisers on a caseload basis but resource constraints hinder attainment of this ideal.

2.9 Problems experienced with communication depend upon the approach adopted. Such problems have been most significant in the telephony model where clients are not dealt with on a caseload basis and there is a need for communication between advisers, telephone matching teams and face-to-face matching teams. The most serious difficulties were reported between ESD teams and advisers in local offices, for example resulting in poor JSAg information and problems due to the time taken to resolve the issue. Also, one office reported that there had been problems of communication between the ESD team and PB8 staff responsible for face-to-face matching in some cases where clients had been referred to them due to lack of telephone contact. These had resulted in delays in the ‘calling in’ of clients.

2.10 Such difficulties were exacerbated by perceived excessive demands on the time of advisers and other matching staff. One office reported that the problems were exacerbated by the difference in grades of staff involved; thus, there were some examples where advisers had not been happy about referrals of JSAgs back to them by PB8 staff. However, such problems appear not to have been extensive and to have been addressed where they have arisen. For example, in one case a meeting was set up between ESD and advisory staff at district level to discuss their respective needs and, in particular, to make advisers aware of the specific information requirements for effective matching.

2.11 Most Jobcentres stressed the importance of ensuring that all relevant information about clients is entered into the LMS system, and kept up to date, so that it is readily available to all staff involved in the process. One of the district level policy documents produced for the implementation of the process contained a section with explicit guidelines for advisers and telephony teams on recording and transferring client information.

2.12 In one Jobcentre, it was reported that problems had arisen due to the inability of advisers to follow up promptly all cases referred to them from matching teams where refusal/availability issues had arisen. This had a demotivating effect on the matching staff, which might result in reduced inclination to refer such cases to advisers.
3. The Advisory Interview

Introduction

3.1 This section reports on findings from both the case study research and the survey of clients relating to the Restart advisory interview. First, we discuss the views of Jobcentre staff on the use of the additional time provided for the interview and, more specifically, on effects on the Jobseeker’s Agreement (JSAg) and on the use of the Client Progress Kit (CPK). This is followed by discussion of clients’ views on the interview and on jobsearch activity during the interview.

Views of Jobcentre staff

3.2 All Jobcentres reported that the enhanced process was being built into the six and 12 month interviews for all clients in the target group. Most offices are delivering the extended interview at the six month stage; one exception is due to a district level policy of 35 minutes for all advisory interviews due to resource constraints and some offices indicated that advisers prefer a flexible approach to the length of the interview depending upon the client’s circumstances and needs.

3.3 In most cases the additional 10 minutes for the six month Restart interview was being used for the following purposes:

- reviewing client’s job goals and specifying them in the JSAg in a form suitable for intensive jobmatching, for example ensuring specific SOC codes
- undertaking a more rigorous review of clients’ job search activities
- informing the clients about the intensive jobmatching process and agreeing the most suitable approach
- getting to know the client’s circumstances and needs better, especially problems and barriers to work and how they might be addressed.

3.4 In some cases it was reported there is also the opportunity for undertaking job search and jobmatching and discussing in-work benefits and training options. However, these appear to be limited specifically in relation to the use of the extended time, which tends to be focussed on reviewing clients’ circumstances in preparation for intensive jobmatching.

3.5 Advisers were generally positive about the extra time, reporting that it provided more scope for assessing clients’ circumstances, ‘getting to know them’ and answering their questions. One Jobcentre reported that an important aspect of the process is the opportunity to discuss clients’ job goals and identify potential additional jobs that they would be prepared to take up, particularly jobs that are more plentiful in the local labour market. The extra time was generally seen as being of greater value for clients facing problems and barriers than for the more motivated and job ready because it provided the opportunity to identify and discuss such barriers and potential approaches to addressing them. However, in two cases advisers argued that not much could be achieved in 10 minutes and that the extra resources would be better targeted on earlier intervention to prevent clients becoming long-term unemployed. There has been little discernible impact
on the provision of information to clients about in-work benefits; generally, it was reported that this is done as a matter of normal procedure.

3.6 The 12 month interview was generally being used for a more rigorous assessment of the ‘realism’ of clients’ job goals in relation to local labour market conditions and review of the effectiveness of their job search activities and of the barriers they face to achieving work. In some cases it was reported that there was a stronger focus on training options and actions to address barriers. However, in two offices it was argued that this stage may be somewhat confusing for clients because of the requirement to refer them to the Programme Centre for appropriate interventions. In one case, it was argued that this should be completed before they start intensive matching.

The Jobseeker’s Agreement – JSAg

3.7 It was widely agreed that the new process has resulted in a more rigorous review and specification of JSagos. In most cases during the extended time of the six month interview, advisers reported that they were reviewing clients’ job goals and identifying more precisely the factors relevant to the intensive matching process including type of job (with specific SOC), wage levels, search area and availability.

3.8 One of the district level policy documents produced for the implementation of the process included a specification of the content of the JSAg:

- realistic, specific job goals (that are available in the required travel to work areas)
- dates of intensive jobmatching period
- contact day and times in AM or PM slots
- contact telephone number
- weekly attendance dates (if applicable)
- any factors relevant to jobmatching e.g. health problem, specific travel to work areas, accepted restriction on days/hours of work

3.9 In most cases it was argued that the process has been beneficial both in focusing clients more on their job goals and in helping the effectiveness of the jobmatching process. It was widely agreed that good quality information in JSagos is of crucial importance, especially where clients are not caseloaded for intensive matching and therefore can be dealt with by any member of the matching team. One Jobcentre had introduced a ‘quality checking’ procedure whereby the Adviser Manager checked a sample of JSagos completed during the six and twelve month interviews.

3.10 The most significant problems had occurred where the information in JSagos had not been sufficiently precise to enable effective telephone matching through ESD. A common problem was lack of sufficient precision about the type of job to match on; an example given was ‘driving’ – what is needed is an indication of category of vehicle e.g. LGV or HGV. Some problems were also reported due to lack of sufficient precision in clients’ contact details. As indicated above, there were some examples of problems of communication between ESD teams and advisers that had hindered the effectiveness of the process,
particularly where delays occur in the revision of JSAGs. However, such problems appear to be rare.

**The Client Progress Kit – CPK**

3.11 The CPK was used in advisory interviews in most offices; in two Jobcentres it was reported that it was not used. In all cases, usage was restricted mainly to the mandatory elements.

3.12 Views on the usefulness of the CPK varied but the balance of opinion was negative:
- Many advisers argued that it was time consuming to complete (‘too long winded and bureaucratic’ according to one adviser) and that it added little value. Indeed, it was seen as duplicating work because most of the relevant information should be available on LMS.
- Many also saw the assessment criteria and questions as ‘an insult to the intelligence’ of many clients so they had to be adapted carefully to particular clients’ circumstances. They were seen as of greater relevance to the circumstances of the ‘more problematical’ clients.
- The Progress Grid was seen by some advisers as ‘potentially useful’ but undermined by the problem of the subjectivity of assessments such that if it is completed by different advisers at different stages the results have little meaning.

3.13 Generally, advisers had received little training in the use of the CPK and it was clear that this had not helped in terms of the extent of use and perceptions of its usefulness. In some cases it was reported that the CPK had ‘never been properly explained’. Clearly, an important issue for advisers is ensuring productive use of limited time and this meant that there was concern about duplication of information collection and the extent to which the CPK really added value to the process. Some advisers argued that the emphasis should be on ensuring that all relevant and useful information should be available on LMS.

**Clients’ views on the advisory interview**

3.14 Jobcentre staff were asked about their perceptions of clients’ reactions to the extension of the interview. It was widely felt that clients’ reactions vary according to their general attitude and motivation to achieve work. The more motivated the client, the more positive is likely to be the response. Conversely, clients with a longer history of unemployment, lower motivation and perhaps a range of problems tended to be less enthusiastic and responsive. Thus, according to a Team Leader in one Jobcentre: ‘Those who are most keen to find a job view it in the most positive light. Those who are not keen tolerate it’ – or, in the words of another Business Manager, ‘…go through the motions.’ However, the general picture was positive – it was reported that most clients appreciate the extra service and time with an adviser. For example, in one Jobcentre an adviser stated: ‘Clients appreciate the continuity of an adviser and feel that they aren’t being treated generically’. It is notable that generally advisers felt that the client group for which the extension is more valuable is less likely to be appreciative.
3.15 These views are generally corroborated by the results of the survey of clients. As Tables 3.1 and 3.2 show, overall 67 per cent of clients felt that the interview had been very or quite helpful in developing clearer and more appropriate job goals, and 61 per cent felt that it had been helpful in identifying and addressing problems faced in the search for work. However, it can be seen that the predominant view was that the interview had been ‘quite helpful’ in these respects.

Table 3.1: Clients’ perceived helpfulness of Restart interview in developing clearer and more appropriate job goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Not very helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Sample size requires grouping of non-white clients, and this term is used interchangeably with ‘black and minority ethnic (BME) groups’.

Table 3.2: Clients’ perceived helpfulness of Restart interview in identifying and addressing problems faced in search for work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Not very helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white*</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents N = 771

3.16 There is some variation in these views according to clients’ characteristics. Thus, females, those aged 25 to 49, and members of BME groups tend to be more positive about the helpfulness of the interview. Moreover, there is a notable variation according to level of qualifications, those with no qualifications and NVQ level one being more positive than those with higher qualifications, especially NVQ levels three to five.
3.17 Clients were asked about job search during the interview. In virtually all cases (94 per cent) clients indicated that the adviser had looked for vacancies. Overall, 70 per cent of clients had more than one vacancy identified; members of BME groups (79 per cent) and those with no qualifications (75 per cent) were more likely to have more than one vacancy identified for them. However, older clients and those with NVQ level four or five were more likely to have no vacancies identified for them. This correlates with their lower perceived helpfulness of the interview as discussed above.

3.18 Of those that had at least one vacancy identified, 87 per cent applied for at least one and 70 per cent more than one. Again, younger clients and members of BME groups were more likely to apply for more than one identified vacancy as were those with NVQ levels two and three. It is notable that those with lower or no qualifications appear less likely to apply for vacancies even though they tend to have more identified for them. Amongst the reasons given by clients for not applying, lack of appropriate experience and qualifications figured prominently, for example:

“I do part time gardening and want to expand to full time but all vacancies require a driving licence which I don’t have.”

3.19 On the other hand, some with higher qualifications felt that vacancies did not match their requirements:

“I have a degree but they were looking at jobs in supermarkets etc.”

“I am a musician not a hamburger salesman and I refused to apply.”

3.20 Other reasons given reflect a well-known picture:

“The jobs did not have enough hours. Also the buses are only every two hours and the jobs were too far away.”

They were too far away and didn’t pay enough money.”

“I did not have enough confidence and I am slightly disabled so they were not suitable.”

3.21 Although 87 per cent of clients reported applying for at least one vacancy, only eight per cent said that they achieved a job from these applications. The effectiveness of the enhanced JSA process in achieving job entries is discussed in section six below but it can be noted here that females and those with no qualifications were rather more likely to report getting a job at this stage.
4. The Intensive Jobmatching Process

Introduction

4.1 This section discusses the intensive jobmatching process drawing on both the Jobcentre case studies and the client survey. First, we discuss the processes whereby clients were referred to jobmatching from the advisory interview. We then consider in turn the two methods for jobmatching – telephony and attendance at a Jobcentre – in terms of the views of both Jobcentre staff and clients on the process and in terms of the pattern of jobsearch during jobmatching. This is followed by a brief look at the process for dealing with clients at the end of the jobmatching process. Finally, we consider in some detail the perceptions of clients on the helpfulness of, and their satisfaction with, the process.

The process of referral to jobmatching

4.2 As discussed in section two above, there were two broad models in operation in the sample of Jobcentres visited and the way in which criteria were applied in the process of referring clients to jobmatching differed between the two models. Jobcentre staff indicated that the main criteria applied in decisions on referral were availability of a phone, the extent of problems or barriers that undermine job-readiness, the specificity of job goals and whether there are any suspicions about fraud.

4.3 The relative emphasis on these criteria differed between the two models. In the telephony model there is a presumption that clients would be referred for telephone matching unless their circumstances dictate otherwise so relatively greater emphasis is placed on availability of a phone. In the attendance model there is a presumption that clients will receive face-to-face matching and priority is given to issues around problems and barriers affecting job-readiness.

4.4 Although in all cases Jobcentre staff indicated that the decision on referral to jobmatching was made on the basis with discussion with the client, it would appear that the degree of client choice is greater in the telephony model than in the attendance model. Thus, it would seem that clients in telephony model Jobcentres can opt for face-to-face matching rather than telephone matching rather more readily than clients in attendance model Jobcentres can opt out of face-to-face matching.

4.5 The client survey confirmed the picture of pretty much universal discussion and agreement with clients about the most appropriate approach to jobmatching. However, a quarter of clients reported that they had not actually commenced their six week period of jobmatching (although a small number said that they were waiting to start). The main reason, reported by nearly a half of ‘non starting’ clients, was obtaining work while some 12 per cent were referred to a training course or further education. A similar proportion said that they were not given the opportunity or were exempted by their advisers mainly, it was reported, due to the
lack of appropriate job opportunities. Other reasons were transfer to other benefits (mainly income support and sickness/disability benefits) and loss of JSA (due to refusal or partners’ circumstances).

4.6 In the Jobcentres visited, no cases of client refusals to take up intensive matching were reported although some had failed to attend interviews and several advisers indicated that some clients were ‘very reluctant’ and merely ‘going through the motions’. In all cases normal adjudication and sanctions procedures would be applied in the event of any such refusals. Some cases had arisen in jobmatching where there were issues around refusal and availability for work and these were referred to advisers where matching was undertaken separately. As indicated earlier, there were cases where it was reported that there had been delays in dealing with such referrals.

**Approaches to jobmatching**

4.7 From the client survey, the results summarised in Table 4.1 highlight the predominance of face-to-face jobmatching through attendance at the Jobcentre, with 83 per cent of clients reporting taking this route. This does appear to be a surprisingly high proportion but nevertheless supports the findings from the Jobcentre interviews indicating that the use of face-to-face matching has exceeded planning assumptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach to jobmatching</th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Attendance at Jobcentre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All respondents who started jobmatching N = 571*

4.8 The picture varies somewhat according to clients’ circumstances, with males, members of BME groups and, to some extent, those with lower qualifications less likely to be referred to telephone matching and more likely to attend the Jobcentre. It can be seen that females and those with NVQ level two are most likely to have telephone jobmatching, providing some support for the argument that this route is used more for those most likely to obtain work.
The Intensive Jobmatching Process

Telephone matching

4.9 Telephone matching is provided either through ESD or locally within the Jobcentre. Although planning assumptions indicated a presumption in favour of using ESD, only a quarter of telephony clients in the survey reported that their contact was with ESD staff, while 63 per cent reported contact with Jobcentre staff. Therefore, of the total sample of clients surveyed, only three per cent reported having jobmatching through ESD telephony.

4.10 Of the 10 Jobcentres visited that provided some telephone jobmatching, six used ESD (with one other having used it but discontinued) while the remainder made local arrangements. In some cases additional staff had been taken on to enable ESD to handle the additional work either directly or through teams attached to the ESD site. However, there had been some capacity issues for ESD. In two cases, the ESD site had initially taken all Enhanced Restart clients for the districts concerned but could not cope with the extra workload so had to restrict intake.

4.11 Generally, Jobcentre staff indicated that the clients referred to telephone matching are more job ready, with reasonably specific job goals or those who find it difficult to attend the Jobcentre. As indicated above, the client survey results provide some corroboration for this. In all the Jobcentres, appointment times were agreed in advance with the client, usually morning or afternoon on a specific day. The degree of discretion in setting these times varied according to the model of delivery. There tends to be less discretion in ESD delivery; in one case a district level plan allocated each Jobcentre a half-day slot and all appointments had to be made during this period. There can be considerably more discretion when telephone matching is delivered within Jobcentre resources, especially when caseloaded to advisers.

4.12 The latter model also offers more flexibility in terms of frequency of contact. In most Jobcentres the policy of weekly contact was being followed (except in the cases where fortnightly contact was implemented) and where delivery is through ESD there tends to be little flexibility. However, in offices where telephone matching was undertaken on a caseload basis there were examples of more frequent contact being made. In one Jobcentre where all matching was undertaken by advisers on a caseload basis, it was argued that this approach allowed advisers to get to know clients well and if suitable vacancies arose during the period between normal appointment times then advisers would phone clients as appropriate. It was argued that this approach can have significant benefits because many vacancies are filled quickly and waiting for the normal weekly appointment time would place these clients at a disadvantage.

4.13 In the client survey, just over half (53 per cent) of those who had been through telephone matching reported weekly contact, while 29 per cent indicated more frequent contact and 17 per cent less frequent contact. Although sample sizes here are relatively small, it appears that males and younger clients are more likely to have more frequent contact, while females and older clients are more likely to have weekly contact.
4.14 Some problems were reported by Jobcentre staff in achieving good contact rates with clients on telephone matching, especially where it was delivered through ESD. This was due primarily to clients’ failure to keep appointment times although there had been cases where the problems of overload on ESD meant that it was not possible to make all calls at the appointed times. However, in all cases where problems had occurred it was argued that the situation had improved over time as the process had been ‘tightened up’. Thus, the service has been improved by employing more staff, developing appointment systems to provide a better chance of contact, and applying more rigorous criteria on clients’ access to a phone in decisions on allocation to telephone matching (including allowing use of mobile phone numbers).

4.15 Problems of contact were reported to be greater with clients who were regarded as ‘more problematical’ cases, for whom telephone matching was in fact seen as less suitable. For example, a member of matching staff in one ESD centre stated: “Some clients tend not to be in, or are not interested and are just going through the motions.” On the other hand, in several cases telephone matching staff felt that the process worked well with clients who were more motivated and job ready – as stated in one case, “…white collar workers and those who prefer to keep out of a Jobcentre.” In two Jobcentres it was reported that problems of contacting clients had had an adverse effect on staff morale. For example, in one Jobcentre telephone matching staff considered that some 80% of clients faced problems that hindered the effectiveness of telephone matching and they reported high levels of stress trying to meet targets in the face of problems of contact and unresponsiveness.

4.16 In all Jobcentre case studies, procedures were in place to deal with problems of non-contact. If clients had not been contactable after a specified number of attempts, they were referred to advisers for appointments for face-to-face matching. In most cases procedures allowed for three attempts during the specified appointment period but some Jobcentres allowed two weeks. In some cases a vacancy card was sent by post to clients who could not be contacted by phone. We discussed above (in section three) some problems in communication and relationships between telephony and advisory staff that had hindered effectiveness in dealing with referrals from telephony teams.

**Face-to-face matching**

4.17 We have outlined the two basic delivery models in place in the case study Jobcentres in which there are fundamentally different approaches to intensive matching. In the telephony model, face-to-face matching is seen as a ‘residual’ service for those clients assessed as not suitable for telephony; in the attendance model, face-to-face matching is seen as the preferred approach for this client group. As regards the approach to face-to-face matching, there is a further distinction in terms of whether it is provided on a caseload basis. The caseload approach was provided in eight of the twelve Jobcentres; in four of these it was undertaken by advisory staff, in the other four by PB8 staff. Where the caseload approach was not followed, clients were seen by designated PB8 staff according to availability.
4.18 In telephony model Jobcentres, face-to-face matching was used for clients assessed as unsuitable for telephone matching. This may be because they do not have a telephone, because they face problems and barriers to achieving work or have ‘motivational’ problems and, in some cases, because the client expresses a strong preference for the face-to-face approach. Attendance model Jobcentres generally took the view that clients having reached the six month stage face problems or difficulties such that a face-to-face approach is to be preferred.

4.19 Views on the greater suitability of the face-to-face approach would appear to have been borne out to some degree by the reported shift over time in certain Jobcentres away from telephony towards the face-to-face approach. Part of this shift occurred due to problems of telephone contact, with clients then being referred to face-to-face matching, but there was also some evidence of a change in the application of criteria in decision making at advisory interviews.

4.20 In addition to these ‘policy criteria’ relating to the suitability of matching approaches to clients’ needs, the main factor influencing the approach taken has been availability of resources. Thus, the scale of face-to-face matching, the extent to which it was delivered on a caseload basis, and the extent to which it was caseloaded with advisers depended very much on the local resource position. The availability of advisory resource appeared to be a major factor in many Jobcentres. Nevertheless, the degree of adviser involvement in jobmatching appears to exceed planning assumptions to a significant degree; thus, over half (54 per cent) of face-to-face clients reported meeting with an adviser for jobmatching.

4.21 Where face-to-face matching was caseloaded with RDV and FJR staff, obviously the availability of these resources was crucial. For example, in one Jobcentre the delivery of face-to-face matching by RDV staff depended upon them having ‘downtime’ due to variability in workload. In another Jobcentre, face-to-face matching was initially undertaken by RDV staff but had to be moved to FJR because it was detracting from the effectiveness of the RDV service.

4.22 In most case studies, face-to-face matching was provided on a weekly basis, although one Jobcentre (in which this approach applied to most clients) had adopted a fortnightly model and another was initially restricted to fortnightly interviews due to resource constraints. In some cases where clients were caseloaded to advisers, it was reported that some clients called into the Jobcentre several times a week and advisers would try to see them if time was available. However, resource constraints generally restricted capacity for this kind of service.

4.23 This picture is corroborated by the client survey in that nearly half (47 per cent) of face-to-face clients said that they attended the Jobcentre more than once a week for jobmatching (compared with 29 per cent of telephony clients reporting contact more than once a week). Again, that frequency reflects need is suggested by the fact that it is males, younger clients, members of BME groups and clients with NVQ level one who are most likely to attend more than once a week.
Jobsearch during jobmatching

4.24 The pattern of jobsearch during jobmatching has strong similarities to that undertaken during the advisory interview (see section three). Overall, more vacancies were likely to be identified; only ten per cent of clients reported that no vacancies had been identified. Some key results here are:
- again, older clients and those with NVQ level 4/5 are more likely to have no vacancies identified for them
- older clients and those with no qualifications are more likely to consider identified vacancies to be unsuitable and are less likely to apply for any
- those with NVQ level two or three are most likely to have more than four vacancies identified, more likely to consider all or most of them to be suitable, and more likely to apply for more than four.

This pattern indicates quite a strong effect due to level of qualifications, which (as discussed more extensively in section five) is also reflected in success in obtaining work.

4.25 The differences between telephone and face-to-face jobmatching in terms of jobsearch behaviour were not very great but there was a tendency for clients in face-to-face matching:
- to have more vacancies identified for them: thus, 23 per cent of face-to-face clients had 10 or more vacancies identified compared with 15 per cent of telephony clients
- to be more likely than telephony clients to consider at least some of these vacancies as suitable for them (85 per cent compared with 79 per cent)
- to be slightly more likely than telephony clients to apply for at least one vacancy (90 per cent compared with 86 per cent).

Termination and succession

4.26 Of all clients who undertook jobmatching, some three quarters (77 per cent) reported that they completed the six week period. Of those who had not completed (and who were not still within the six week period), the main reason (especially for females and younger clients) was that they had obtained work. A small number transferred to training or stopped claiming JSA.

4.27 The case study Jobcentres varied in the way in which clients were dealt with at the end of the six weeks intensive matching if they had not found work. In attendance model offices where intensive matching was undertaken by advisers (four cases), a review of progress at the end of the six weeks occurred ‘automatically’ as part of the process. In other cases, clients either reverted back to the mainstream caseload with no formal review (although some form of review could take place as part of the first FJR) or an advisory interview had been included in the process at the end of the six week period to review the experience of intensive matching and the progress made, and to agree future actions. Such a formal review had been introduced in three telephony model offices but in all cases these interviews were not being systematically undertaken due to constraints on advisers’ time. This was seen as problematical because such ‘exit’ interviews were seen as potentially valuable in these Jobcentres.
4.28 In one Jobcentre, the process had been implemented so as to provide clients with intensive jobmatching beyond the first six weeks in which all clients received face-to-face matching. After this, clients received telephone matching through the RDV team for a further six weeks (although advisers could decide to keep clients on face-to-face caseload if they felt that it would be particularly beneficial).

Client perceptions of helpfulness and satisfaction with jobmatching

4.29 In the Jobcentre case studies, staff were asked about their perceptions of clients’ reactions to the process. Generally, it was considered that these varied according to clients’ circumstances, motivation and attitude. Thus, it was felt that the more motivated and job ready clients tend to be more positive, welcoming the more frequent contact and the additional help. On the other hand, it was widely considered that those clients who are not motivated to find work tend to regard the process as a ‘hassle’ and react more negatively.

4.30 From the client survey, clients’ views on the helpfulness of jobmatching in providing encouragement and incentive to search for work and on overall satisfaction are broadly consistent with their views on the helpfulness of the advisory interview (see section three). Table 4.2 shows that 65 per cent of clients found the process very or quite helpful but, again, the predominant response is ‘quite helpful’. Females and those with no qualifications or NVQ level one are most likely to have found the process helpful; those with higher qualifications (NVQ level three and above) are most likely not to have found the process helpful.

Table 4.2: Clients’ perceived helpfulness of jobmatching in providing encouragement and incentive to look for work: by client characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Not very helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who started jobmatching N = 571

4.31 Table 4.3 shows the pattern of perceived helpfulness related to the type of jobmatching received by clients. It can be seen that broadly similar proportions of clients in the two groups found the process very or quite helpful (68 per cent for telephone and 65 per cent for face-to-face) but a relatively high proportion (18 per cent) of clients who received telephone matching found the process ‘not helpful at all’.
### Table 4.3: Clients’ perceived helpfulness of jobmatching in providing encouragement and incentive to look for work: by type of jobmatching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Attendance at Jobcentre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very helpful</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite helpful</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very helpful</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not helpful at all</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: All respondents who started jobmatching N = 571

4.32 When asked about the reason for their response, most clients who found the process very or quite helpful indicated that ES staff had been helpful and encouraging, had identified suitable vacancies and had provided an incentive and boosted their confidence in relation to job search:

“The staff were encouraging and supportive.”

*The staff were always ready to talk and helped me identify jobs and opportunities. They knew that I was genuinely seeking employment and helped me all they could.*

“It got me out of a rut of not looking properly for work.”

“He helped to restore my incentive. He made it sound exciting. I walked out ‘chuffed’ and it gave me my confidence back.”

*The staff were very good and helped me with my language difficulties. I am now awaiting the results of an interview I had that was found for me in the six week intensive jobmatching process.*

“It helped me realise that my usual employment of salesperson was fast becoming increasingly difficult due to many applicants and not enough positions available, so I am now looking to work in IT.”

*It was very encouraging and offered guidance and new ideas of jobs I’d never thought about applying for.*

“They did find me jobs and I went to interviews and this was encouraging. They found more jobs than I normally could on my own.”
4.33 An additional aspect of the process highlighted by a number of clients was the feeling that they were receiving more personalised attention:

“The staff were very friendly and sorted out a lot of jobs for me to apply for. I felt that they were actually trying to do something for me for a change.”

“It was good to have someone telephone me rather than the other way round.”

“It was on a one-to-one basis. It forces people to look for work and it helped me into doing this. I feel confident for the future since doing the six weeks.”

4.34 However, a number of clients had reservations, notwithstanding their view that the process had been encouraging and helpful, due to the perception that there were very few suitable vacancies for them to apply to:

“They were very helpful but there was only so much they could do as I live seven miles away from any possible vacancy; location and transport are a big problem.”

“They did the best they could but there is not that much work available in this area.”

4.35 As regards clients who found jobmatching not very or not at all helpful (31 per cent of the total), the main reason (stated by just under half of respondents) was the lack of suitable vacancies and the perception that the intensive jobmatching process did not add anything to the usual process:

“The jobs weren’t available for me to apply to.”

“They didn’t find anything suitable.”

“They barely found me any vacancies and the ones they did find were not suitable. I was doing better on my own. I thought it was a complete waste of time.”

“It wasn’t that the process wasn’t helpful and encouraging. It was just that I felt that I was already very willing to look for work.”

4.36 In four cases of telephone matching, clients had not been contacted on a weekly basis:

“At the initial interview, there were no suitable jobs to apply for and during the six week period the Jobcentre said that they would phone me as soon as jobs came in but they didn’t.”

“The staff only called me twice with jobs that were not suitable.”
4.37 A number of clients (N=21) said that they felt pressurised by the process to apply for unsuitable jobs so that they would leave the register:

“I found it very depressing. I felt pressurised into applying for jobs that I wasn’t suitable for.”

“I felt that the staff were pushing any job vacancies at me to get the number of unemployed down. I feel that I have done better myself since finishing the six week period.”

“I felt very pushed into a corner and forced to apply for unsuitable jobs.”

4.38 A final significant response (N=29) was the perception that staff were unhelpful and in some cases clients commented on staff attitudes:

“There was no encouragement at all, just a list of jobs to look at.”

“The staff were unenthusiastic and found unsuitable jobs.”

“They were not very encouraging, just going through the motions.”

“No help or assistance was provided at the Jobcentre. No-one cares or tries to offer advice on how to write a CV even though I asked. And whenever I apply for a job, I found out it has already gone.”

Table 4.4: Clients’ overall satisfaction with the jobmatching process: by client characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Quite satisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Quite dissatisfied</th>
<th>Very dissatisfied</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who started jobmatching N = 571

4.39 The pattern of client satisfaction with jobmatching is broadly similar to perceived helpfulness, with 62 per cent overall very or quite satisfied, with a predominance of responses in the ‘quite satisfied’ category (Table 4.4). Here, the strongest variations again relate to level of qualifications; those with no qualifications or NVQ level one are more likely to be satisfied while those with NVQ level three or above are least likely to be satisfied. Table 4.5 shows the pattern of satisfaction related to the type of jobmatching received by clients. It can be seen that those who received face-to-face matching are more likely to be very
or quite satisfied than those who received telephone matching (63 per cent compared with 58 per cent)

Table 4.5: Clients’ overall satisfaction with the jobmatching process: by type of jobmatching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Telephone</th>
<th>Attendance at Jobcentre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quite dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents who started jobmatching N = 571

4.40 Clients were asked in the survey for reasons for their dissatisfaction with the jobmatching process. By far the most common reason (stated by about 60 per cent of respondents) was that the process failed to deliver suitable vacancies to apply for and did not provide additional useful help:

“It was a waste of time; no suitable jobs were offered.”

“No vacancies were found for me and I received little or no help or advice.”

“All the jobs were advertised in the newspapers anyway, so I would have seen them. They didn’t come up with anything new.”

4.41 The reasons given tend to reflect the fact that those with higher level qualifications are strongly represented amongst those who express dissatisfaction. For many of these clients, the process was perceived as pressurising them to take jobs that they did not consider suitable:

“I felt that there were no jobs to match what I was looking for. I found the whole process a waste of time as the jobs given were not what I was qualified in.”

“It might be fine if you’re a shopfitter or something but my last job paid 50k and they were trying to get me to apply for jobs that pay the minimum wage.”

“I have a degree and I felt that the Jobcentre was trying to push me into rubbish jobs.”

“The staff were more interested in getting me off their books than looking for jobs that I was fit enough to do.”

4.42 A number of clients (about 12% of comments) found the process confrontational, patronising and demotivating and made adverse comments about the Jobcentre of staff:

“They made me feel like I wasn’t welcome.”
“They weren’t very professional and I didn’t get a job so I was quite dissatisfied.”

“They never listened to my needs and threw any kind of jobs at me. I found the staff very unhelpful.”

4.43 Finally, there were a few comments related to the type of jobmatching received. Thus, two telephony clients indicated that they had received only one telephone call in the six week period. Two face-to-face clients complained about the cost and inconvenience of weekly attendance at the Jobcentre.
5. **Effectiveness and Impact of the Process**

**Introduction**

5.1 In this section we draw together the findings from all the elements of the research in relation to the effectiveness and impact of the enhanced JSA/Restart process. First, we consider findings from the case study research and client survey on job search behaviour and job outcomes attained by clients, and then report the views of Jobcentre staff on perceived effectiveness and impact, and effects on other Jobcentre services. Finally, we discuss the results of the time series analysis of off-flows from the register into work and other destinations.

**Job search**

5.2 Most Jobcentres reported increases in job search behaviour but it was generally considered that this was primarily amongst 'more motivated' clients. For example, a telephone matcher in one Jobcentre reported that “…some clients find many obstacles to job search, such as unwillingness to travel.” There is some evidence that face-to-face matching is more effective in encouraging increased job search; in several attendance model Jobcentres it was considered that it applies greater ‘pressures’ on jobseekers to show that they are actually seeking work. Little evidence was available about any effects on clients' use of ESD but two Jobcentres considered that this effect had been positive.

5.3 The picture on submissions is rather more mixed. In a majority of Jobcentres it was reported that there has been an increase in submissions but that most of these were not being translated into placings. This was seen as primarily due to the nature and characteristics of the client group which comprises a high proportion of ‘hard to place’ clients facing significant problems and barriers. In three Jobcentres it was reported that there had been no significant increase in submissions because a careful policy was followed to ensure that only suitable job ready clients were submitted to vacancies. A heavy emphasis was placed in these Jobcentres on the importance of maintaining the confidence of, and good relations with, local employers.

5.4 Results from the client survey reported in the previous section indicated quite a strong association between level of qualifications and the identification, perceived suitability and likelihood of applying for vacancies. In particular, those with NVQ level two or three were most likely to have more than four vacancies identified, more likely to consider all or most of them to be suitable, and more likely to apply for more than four. Moreover, results from the client survey indicate that clients undergoing telephone matching were more likely to have no vacancies identified for them and more likely not to apply for any.
Clients’ job outcomes

5.5 As Table 5.1 indicates, 41 per cent of all clients reported that they had obtained a job at some stage during the enhanced JSA (EJSA) process and 36 per cent were in work at the time of the survey. These figures do appear to be quite high. Thus, by comparison it is estimated from the ES Evaluation Database (ESED) that, over the three quarterly periods after the introduction of EJSA, some 22 per cent of 25+ clients in the six and 12 month duration groups left the register for work within six months of their Restart interview. This proportion increases to 35 per cent if all 25+ clients are included. This would suggest that the achieved sample for the client survey may over-represent those who secured work.

5.6 On the other hand, the proportion of clients who reported that they were claiming JSA at the time of the survey (46 per cent) accords closely with the ESED estimate of clients in the six and 12 months duration groups who were claiming JSA six months after their Restart interview (45 per cent). These figures are not strictly comparable because for clients in the survey, variable periods of time had passed since their Restart interviews (although six months may be a reasonable aggregate approximation). Nevertheless, this may provide grounds for arguing that the ESED data underestimates the degree to which clients obtain work, especially if it is of short duration.

Table 5.1: Clients’ reported job outcomes and status at time of survey (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Obtained work</th>
<th>Still in work</th>
<th>Currently on JSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-white</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: All respondents N = 771

5.7 Looking in more detail at the pattern of job outcomes by client characteristics, it can be seen that females, younger clients and those with NVQ levels two and three were most likely to have obtained work and also most likely to be still in work. Males and those with no qualifications were most likely to have lost a job if they obtained one, while those with no qualifications or NVQ level one were least likely to obtain work. Indeed, looking at the proportion of clients claiming JSA at the time of the survey, again males and those with no qualifications are amongst those groups most likely to be on JSA. It is notable that these groups also include younger people, members of BME groups and those with NVQ levels four and five.
5.8 Table 5.2 shows the characteristics of jobs obtained during the EJSA process as reported by clients. Overall, 20 per cent of jobs were part time but females and older people were more likely to obtain such jobs; thus, 37 per cent of jobs obtained by females and 29 per cent of jobs obtained by those aged 50 to 64 were part time. However, it can be seen that jobs obtained by females were more likely to be permanent than jobs obtained by males. In relation to qualification level, it can be seen that those with no qualifications (and, to a lesser extent, those with NVQ level two) were significantly more likely to obtain part-time work, while those with NVQ levels one and four/five were most likely to obtain temporary jobs. On the other hand, those with NVQ level three were most likely to obtain permanent work.

Table 5.2: Characteristics of jobs obtained by client group (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
<th>Permanent</th>
<th>Temporary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Base: Respondents who obtained a job during the EJSA process N = 317; excludes ‘Don’t know’ responses

5.9 As regards the occupational breakdown (Table 5.3), it can be seen that there is a preponderance of jobs in the semi/unskilled and personal service/sales categories; this is broadly consistent with the overall profile of vacancies notified to the ES. The proportion of jobs obtained in the management, professional and technical category does appear to be relatively high (about double the proportion notified to the ES in April 2001: see NOMIS). It can be seen that there are significant variations by gender, age and qualification level that conform to a well-known occupational pattern:

- females were more likely to obtain administrative/secretarial, and personal service/sales jobs and less likely than males to obtain managerial/professional/technical, skilled manual and semi/unskilled jobs
- older people were more likely to obtain administrative/secretarial and managerial/professional/technical jobs and less likely to obtain skilled manual and semi/unskilled jobs
- those with no qualifications or NVQ level one were significantly more likely to obtain semi-skilled and unskilled manual work; those with NVQ level two were most likely to obtain administrative and secretarial work; and those with NVQ level four/five (and, to a lesser extent, three) were most likely to obtain managerial, professional and technical jobs.
Table 5.3: Occupational breakdown of jobs obtained by client group (percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Man/prof/technical</th>
<th>Admin/secretarial</th>
<th>Skilled manual</th>
<th>Pers.serv/sales</th>
<th>Semi/unskilled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-49yrs</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64yrs</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ4/5</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Base: Respondents who obtained a job during the EJSA process N = 317*

Views of Jobcentre staff on effectiveness

5.10 In the Jobcentre case studies, relatively strong views were reported by staff on the perceived effectiveness of the Enhanced JSA/Restart process although in most cases it was emphasised that these were based upon personal experience and anecdotal evidence. In few cases had there been any systematic analysis of the MI. Some criticisms were made of the process of manual collection of MI and doubts expressed about its reliability (although these were general and unspecific).

5.11 In most Jobcentres it was considered that the new process does not constitute an effective use of resources. It was widely argued that it is not helping to improve performance in terms of ES target A3, relating to job entries for welfare recipients and other disadvantaged people. Where the process is having discernible results, it is mainly with the more motivated and job ready clients who would be more likely to secure work anyway through the ‘normal’ process.

5.12 In several Jobcentres it was argued that given the relatively ‘buoyant’ conditions in the local labour market, most clients reaching the six month stage have significant problems and barriers that need to be addressed, in terms of either motivation to secure work or personal characteristics and circumstances. The new process was seen as helping those who are motivated and job ready more than those facing such problems. This suggests that there may be a significant degree of deadweight in any observed effects on measures of performance.

5.13 Therefore, most Jobcentres reported that the process was not being very effective in improving the work chances of those facing significant problems and barriers. It was widely argued that telephone matching in particular was of limited value for such clients. As indicated earlier, there had been a shift towards face-to-face matching in many Jobcentres over time largely due to such clients being referred back due to problems experienced through telephone contact. Quite strong views were expressed in several Jobcentres that the face-to-face approach, undertaken on a caseload basis (ideally by advisory staff) was necessary for more disadvantaged or ‘problematical’ clients. It enables staff to get
to know clients and their circumstances and problems better; it helps to build rapport and a relationship of trust; and it helps in finding out relevant things about the client which may not normally be revealed.

5.14 However, although these attributes of a caseloaded face-to-face process were widely seen as valuable and helpful to disadvantaged clients, most interviewees argued that it is limited in the potential to get such clients into jobs. As one adviser argued, notwithstanding all the effort on jobmatching, ‘the barriers are still there’. Therefore, the argument was frequently made that more attention needs to be given to addressing these barriers earlier in the process and more resources devoted to the required interventions.

5.15 There was some variation in the views of staff on the process although the general picture is essentially negative because it is not seen as delivering good results for the client group and is not seen as an effective use of scarce resources. The telephone matching element of the process was viewed most negatively and in some Jobcentres it was an unpopular task (although some staff reported enjoying it). Some instances were reported where it had been difficult to attract staff to the work and in many cases additional staff had been taken on. In one Jobcentre it was argued that: ‘nobody likes it; nobody wants to do it; it’s not a nice job’. Views were more positive about the face-to-face element of the process because it enhances the service for clients but, as argued above, it was not perceived as very effective in delivering job placements. The most positive views were expressed in the Jobcentre that reported significant results in terms of job placements due to its caseloaded face-to-face approach.

5.16 In several Jobcentres it was argued that it would be more effective to target resources on clients earlier, notably at the 13 week stage, in order to provide more targeted help to address their problems and barriers and thus prevent them from becoming long term claimants. It was argued that if clients have no significant motivational problems or barriers, they should have achieved work before the six month stage. Therefore, for many clients in the Enhanced Restart target group, more intensive jobmatching after this stage is unlikely to be effective.

5.17 What is needed, it was argued, is more intensive help earlier in the process to address the barriers and improve the motivation to secure work. However, there is currently limited provision for clients at the 13 week stage and they are seen by clerical staff. In one Jobcentre it was argued that an advisory interview should be introduced at this stage and that intensive jobmatching might be more effective if provided earlier. Indeed, a pilot has been introduced in a Jobcentre in the Northern Region to introduce intensive matching at the 13 week stage. The potential benefits of such an approach were outlined by one Business Manager who argued that the burden on advisory time for six and 12 month interviews would be reduced, enabling advisers to focus more time on clients that are ‘difficult to get into work’.
Effects on other services

5.18 Most Jobcentres reported that resources for implementation of the initiative had been adequate and that it had had little effect on resource deployment within the office.

5.19 However, there were exceptions to this. Thus, two Jobcentres indicated that resources had not been adequate to cover additional staffing needs and that other services had suffered somewhat when PB8 staffing resources had to be transferred to cover the Enhanced Restart process. In another case, a PB8 resource had been available for Enhanced Restart at the outset but had to be transferred to other duties and this placed an additional burden on advisory staff, thus diverting some of their time from other elements of their responsibilities.

5.20 Indeed, in several Jobcentres it was reported that the extra load on scarce advisory resources had resulted in less advisory time being available for elements such as the 13 week review. This was seen as an issue because of concerns about the lack of effectiveness of the Enhanced Restart process and quite a widespread view that more resources should be devoted to clients at the 13 week stage in order to prevent them becoming long-term unemployed.

Perceptions of Jobcentre staff on the impact of the process

5.21 In all but one Jobcentre, it was reported that the revised process has had little impact on job placings and that where placings had been achieved, it was primarily for more motivated and job ready clients. This raises issues about the ‘additionality’ achieved since the more job ready clients would be more likely to secure work through the normal ‘non-enhanced’ process. Generally, Business Managers tended to be more negative about the process, focusing mainly on outcomes and the lack of evidence of additional impact on job entries, especially for more disadvantaged clients. However, advisers and front-line staff tended to be somewhat less negative, focusing more on the process and the benefits in terms of greater contact, the opportunity to enhance the service provided and build better ‘rapport’ and relationships with clients. Nevertheless, even these staff by and large felt that the process was not significantly enhancing job entry rates.

5.22 One Jobcentre provided an exception to this negative picture and reported 50 job placings due to the enhanced process. It is notable that this Jobcentre provides face-to-face matching on a caseload basis with advisory staff for all clients and extends the process beyond six weeks through caseloaded telephone matching. Staff also indicated that they were ‘fortunate’ with their target client group who were considered to be relatively highly motivated and job ready. Consequently, this Jobcentre is not typical but the approach adopted and the labour market circumstances to some degree corroborate the general findings from the case study research.

5.23 Most Jobcentres reported that there had been some effect in terms of increased ‘signing off’ due to the new process. It was again widely felt that face-to-face matching in particular resulted in closer scrutiny of clients’ circumstances and a ‘tighter’ framework of weekly contact, which allowed availability issues to be
identified more readily. In many cases there had been an increase in transfers to Incapacity Benefit but it was also reported that many clients were re-signing – a ‘revolving door’ phenomenon. As one Business Manager put it: ‘Some clients leave the register and then come back later, perhaps hoping they will escape the more rigorous regime.’ There was also some evidence of increased detection of fraudulent claims; for example, in one Jobcentre it was reported that the process had resulted in the detection of at least seven suspected fraudulent claims.

**Analysis of impact on off-flows from JSA**

5.24 Internal analysis by ES R&D of trends in JSA claimant stocks and flows indicates that over the period since the introduction of Jobseekers Allowance (JSA) in October 1996 the labour market has progressively tightened as indicated by a declining ratio between unemployment and notified vacancies (U/V ratio). Analysis of the relationship between the claimant count for the Enhanced JSA/Restart (EJSA) target group (i.e. those aged 25+ and unemployed six months or more) and notified vacancies over time suggests that there has been a structural improvement in the matching of claimants to vacancies although it is not possible to isolate the contribution of EJSA to this improvement.

5.25 Analysis of the trend in the 25+ claimant count stock indicates an effect due to the introduction of JSA, especially amongst longer-term claimants. However, although unemployment in the EJSA target group has continued to fall, there has been no observable break in the trend that would indicate an effect due to the introduction of EJSA in April 2000.

5.26 Analysis of unemployment flows indicate a slight decline in threshold flows into six month and twelve month unemployment between April 2000 and April 2001 (from 26 to 25 per cent and from 11 to 10 per cent respectively). However, this decline may simply be due to the overall performance of the economy. Total off-flows from the 25+ claimant count have been relatively stable although a slight downward trend is evident in the 12-24 month duration band. However, there is no discernible change in off-flows into work for the EJSA target groups since April 2000.

5.27 On the other hand, analysis of off-flows into unknown destinations indicates a significant increase after January-April 2000 for the EJSA target groups. For the 6-9 month duration band, there was a 41 per cent increase in the average quarterly off-flow after the introduction of EJSA; for the 12-15 month duration band the increase was 48 per cent. These figures suggest the possibility of an effect due to EJSA although other factors may be at work.

5.28 This analysis does not provide a convincing measure of the effect of EJSA due to the absence of a counterfactual. Indeed, no robust counterfactual exists but a proxy might be provided by changes observed for the 0-6 month duration group of 25+ claimants. However, caution must be exercised with this group because it is possible that short-term unemployment fluctuates around a level that is unlikely to change very much with the economic cycle. Nevertheless, since it is the best comparator available, we have undertaken a more detailed analysis of
comparative off-flows over the period April 1999 to March 2001 using the ES Evaluation Database.

5.29 The ES Evaluation Database (ESED) was set up in Spring 2000 as a combination of the various New Deal evaluation databases. It draws on two main sources of data. First, the Labour Market System (LMS) is the computerised system used in Jobcentres to record details of all clients and their dealings with the ES, and provides data on client characteristics, forms of intervention, job submissions and placings etc. Second, the Joint Unemployment and Vacancies Operating System (JUVOS) is a system maintained by the Office of National Statistics (ONS) which comprises details of all computerised claims for JSA, including claimant characteristics, claim start and end dates, and reasons for termination of claim.

5.30 This database permits an analysis, for individual claimants who had gone through the EJSA process, of their status at any time after having their six month or 12 month Restart interview. For this analysis, three groups of claimants in the 25+ age group were defined: two EJSA ‘target groups’ comprising those reaching the six month and twelve month Restart interviews respectively, and the ‘comparator’ group comprising those unemployed for less than six months. Off-flows were divided into four categories: into work; onto another benefit; failing to sign; and unknown/other. Off-flows were also analysed in terms of two time periods: those occurring up to three months after the Restart interview and those occurring up to six months after the interview.

5.31 Off-flows were calculated on a quarterly basis over the two year analysis period. It was difficult to discern any significant differences between the comparator and the two target groups from visual inspection of the trends over time. The data were then summarised by calculating the mean annual off-flow rates for the year before the introduction of EJSA and the year after and these are shown in Figures 5.1 to 5.5. Each pair of charts shows the mean proportions of clients leaving the register in various destination categories during the first three months and six months after their Restart interview. Figure 5.5 aggregates the data across all destinations except transfers to other benefits. All charts compare changes for the two target client groups (‘6 month’ and ‘12 month’) with the comparator group (‘New claims’). The percentage change between the two years in these mean proportions for each group is summarised in Table 5.4.

| Table 5.4: Change in mean proportion of clients leaving JSA (a) within three months and (b) within six months by destination (percentage change) |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | (a) Within three months | (b) Within six months |
|   | New claims | 6 month claims | 12 month claims | New claims | 6 month claims | 12 month claims |
| 1. Into work | +2.5 | +13.1 | +13.9 | +2.8 | +5.1 | +10.7 |
| 2. Other benefits | +5.6 | +20.0 | +14.4 | +6.1 | +9.9 | +5.9 |
| 3. Fail to sign | +2.4 | +7.3 | +10.1 | +2.4 | -0.1 | +2.9 |
| 4. Unknown/other | +11.3 | +20.0 | +19.5 | +10.3 | +17.3 | +19.7 |
| All except other benefits (1+3+4) | +3.7 | +14.1 | +15.0 | +3.8 | +7.7 | +12.0 |
5.32 Inspection of the charts and table suggests a modest EJSA effect in that increases in off-flow rates for the two target groups between 1999/2000 and 2000/01 are consistently larger than the increases for the comparator group. In particular:

- the effect over the first three months after the Restart interview appears to be larger than the effect over six months, except in the case of clients leaving into unknown and other destinations (Figure 5.4) where the effect is sustained over six months
- the effect in terms of leaving into unknown and other destinations (Figure 5.4) and transfers to other benefits (Figure 5.2) appears to be larger than the effect on movement into work (Figure 5.1).

5.33 The analysis indicates, therefore, that the most substantial changes are due to movements off the register into destinations other than work, although a modest effect in terms of off-flows into work is also suggested. An important question concerns the sustainability of off-flows from the register. It may be that clients leaving the register, especially for non-work destinations during the first three months, will re-sign later – the ‘revolving door’ syndrome referred to in some of our interview with Jobcentre staff. This can be addressed to some degree by looking at the extent to which clients in the two target groups who left the register during the first three months were back on the register at a point in time three months after their Restart interview.
Figure 5.1(a): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: Into work: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.1(b): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within six months: Into work: 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Figure 5.2(a) Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: Claiming other benefits: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

- 1999/2000: 2.67% new claims, 4.6% 6 months, 5.52% 12 months
- 2000/01: 2.82% new claims, 5.82% 6 months, 6.66% 12 months

Figure 5.2(b) Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within six months: Claiming other benefits: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

- 1999/2000: 4.28% new claims, 6.87% 6 months, 8.7% 12 months
- 2000/01: 4.54% new claims, 7.55% 6 months, 9.21% 12 months
Figure 5.3(a): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: Failing to sign: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.3(b): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within six months: Failing to sign: 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Figure 5.4(a): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: Unknown/other destination 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.4(b): Mean Proportion of Clients Leaving JSA Within 6 Months to Unknown/Other Destination 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Figure 5.5(a): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: All destinations except other benefits: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.5(b): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within six months: All destinations except other benefits: 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Therefore, the data on off-flows by destination were disaggregated into two sub-groups: (a) those claiming at the three month stage; and (b) those not claiming at the three month stage. Figure 5.6 shows the results for mean annual off-flow rates into work and Figure 5.7 the results for all destinations except transfer to other benefits. Again, all charts compare changes for the two target client groups (‘6 month’ and ‘12 month’) with the comparator group (‘New claims’). The percentage change between the two years in these mean off-flow rates for each group is summarised in Table 5.5.

Table 5.5: Change in mean annual off-flow rates from JSA within three months (a) claiming again at three months and (b) not claiming at three months (percentage change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(a) Claiming at three months</th>
<th>(b) Not claiming at three months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Into work</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All except other benefits</td>
<td>+2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.35 The charts and table show consistently that:

- the increases in off-flow rates for the target clients groups relative to the ‘comparator group’ are greater for those who are claiming again at three months (Figures 5.6a and 5.7a) than for those who stay off the register longer than three months (Figures 5.6b and 5.7b) indicating a ‘revolving door’ effect with clients leaving the register for a short period but re-signing within three months; this dilutes the sustainability of the JSA count reduction
- however, the changes in respect of off-flows into work (Figure 5.6) indicate that a significant proportion of those leaving the register into jobs move into ‘sustainable work’; this is 86 per cent in the case of the six month unemployed group and 84 per cent for the 12 month unemployed, and these proportions did not change between 1999/2000 and 2000/01.

5.36 This analysis supports the conclusions from the aggregate analysis discussed above although the reservations about the use of the 0-6 month duration group as a comparator should be re-emphasised. There appear to be grounds for concluding that the process has probably had a small effect in increasing off-flows out of JSA and reducing the register size. Figure 5.8 provides an aggregate view of the changes in the mean percentage of clients in the target groups claiming JSA at a point three months (Figure 5.8a) and six months (Figure 5.8b) after their Restart interview. Again, the changes in the target groups relative to the comparator group (summarised in Table 5.6) would indicate a small effect, which is greater over the first three months than over six months. Based upon these relative changes, we can estimate an effect on the claimant count for the target groups in the order of a 1-2 per cent reduction.
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Table 5.6: Change in mean proportion of clients claiming JSA (a) at three months and (b) at six months (percentage change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(a) Claiming at three months</th>
<th>(b) Claiming at six months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New claims</td>
<td>6 month claims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.6(a): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: Into work: Claiming again at three months: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.6(b): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: Into work: Not claiming again at three months: 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Figure 5.7(a): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within three months: All destinations except other benefits: Claiming again at three months: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.7(b): Mean percentage of clients leaving JSA within six months: All destinations except other benefits: Not claiming again at three months: 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Figure 5.8(a): Mean percentage of clients claiming JSA at three months: 1999/2000 and 2000/01

Figure 5.8(b): Mean percentage of clients claiming JSA at six months: 1999/2000 and 2000/01
Conclusions

Introduction

6.1 In this final section we summarise the main findings from the evaluation, identify key lessons arising from the case study research and summarise some good practice pointers from the Jobcentres visited.

Key findings

6.2 The case study research indicates that advance notice and preparations for the enhanced JSA/Restart processes appear to have gone relatively smoothly although there were some cases of difficulty due to resource constraints and perceived lack of adequate consultation. The changes did not have major implications for staff training although issues arose for some offices due to the need to recruit new staff and the lack of formal training materials.

6.3 There was some variation in the way in which the changes were implemented at District and local office level. In particular, across the sampled Jobcentres, there was a significant degree of departure from the ‘policy intention’ for delivery of intensive jobmatching through telephony, and mainly through ES Direct. Two basic delivery models were found, one (‘telephony model’) conforming closely with the official guidance but the other (‘attendance model’) involving a significant move towards face-to-face delivery of the intensive matching process and with an increased involvement of advisory resource.

6.4 Resource issues have been paramount in influencing the approach adopted but the relatively strong emphasis on face-to-face provision developed from local perceptions of the needs of the target client group. Thus, many face significant barriers and these were seen as best addressed through caseloaded face-to-face jobmatching; in some cases it was argued that this would ideally be provided by advisory staff. Moreover, problems in dealing effectively with such clients through telephony have resulted in a shift towards face-to-face provision over time.

6.5 Therefore, a degree of tension would appear to have emerged between, on the one hand, the policy intention (and associated resource assumptions) and, on the other hand, implementation on the ground conditioned by a strong concern to address the needs of the client group effectively. At the heart of this dilemma are advisory staff who are playing a more substantial role in the process than was intended. As a result, the load on advisory resource emerged as an issue in several offices.

6.6 The key role of advisers is in the six and twelve month Restart interviews and the case study research indicated that these were being delivered largely in accordance with guidance, with most offices extending the six month interview by ten minutes and focussing on client needs, job goals and job search behaviour in preparation for intensive jobmatching. Jobcentre staff considered that more motivated and ‘job-ready’ clients were reacting more positively to the new
process. On the other hand, it was felt that less motivated clients facing significant barriers appeared to be less enthusiastic, although advisers regarded the process as more valuable for such clients.

6.7 Clients themselves were generally positive about the Restart interview. Some two thirds felt that it had been helpful, with females, younger clients, members of BME groups and those with lower qualifications being most positive. These groups were also more likely to have vacancies identified for them, although those with lower qualifications were less likely to apply for jobs.

6.8 It was widely agreed amongst Jobcentre staff that the new process has resulted in a more rigorous approach to JSAgs, in particular to ensuring that the information required for effective jobmatching was specified at an appropriate level of detail. Some problems had occurred, especially where jobmatching was undertaken through ESD telephony, but these had largely been addressed and had underlined the importance of this issue. The Client Progress Kit was being used in most offices but primarily only the mandatory elements and most feedback about the CPK was negative. It was widely seen as time consuming, ‘bureaucratic’ and duplicating work and in many cases it had not been adequately explained and little training had been given. The subjectivity of assessments of progress was widely seen as undermining their potential value.

6.9 The above problems underlined the importance of the issues of information management and communication. Several advisers emphasised the importance of standardising information collection within the LMS system to provide consistent high quality information accessible to all staff when they needed it. The importance of detailed monitoring of client progress was emphasised, with good communication between advisors and matching teams. Some problems of communication had occurred, especially between advisers and ESD matching teams, which clearly had not helped the ESD telephony model. This underlines the importance of the role of advisory staff in the process and the potential implications when such staff are overloaded.

6.10 In the case study Jobcentres, decisions on referral of clients to different forms of jobmatching were made using four main criteria: availability of a phone; extent of problems and barriers that undermine job-readiness; specificity of job goals; and whether there were any suspicions about fraud. The relative emphasis on these differed between the two models. In particular, in the attendance model priority was given to issues around problems and barriers affecting job-readiness and clients appeared to be given rather less choice in this model. There were no instances of client refusals to undertake intensive jobmatching although some clients were seen by staff as simply ‘going through the motions’. Some Jobcentres had introduced an ‘exit’ advisory interview into the process at the end of the six weeks intensive jobmatching but resource constraints were preventing full implementation of this despite the fact that it was seen as very valuable.

6.11 A quarter of clients surveyed indicated that they did not start intensive jobmatching, mainly due to obtaining work or starting education or training, but some had been exempted by advisers. In some cases it was suggested that this was because there was little chance of finding work. Most clients (83 per cent)
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had attended a Jobcentre for jobmatching, with less than a fifth having telephone matching. This confirms the findings from the case study research to the effect that the use of telephony has been far less than assumed in planning the changes. Males, members of BME groups and those with lower qualifications were more likely to have face-to-face matching, suggesting that referral decisions take into account perceived likelihood of obtaining work.

6.12 Thus, in the case study research, staff indicated that telephone jobmatching was generally being used for clients who are more job ready, with relatively specific job goals and no problems of phone availability. Nearly two thirds of telephony clients reported in the survey that their jobmatching was undertaken through a Jobcentre. In all case studies, appointment systems were being used. Some problems had been experienced in achieving contact with clients, especially in the ESD model. These had been addressed by ‘tightening up’ appointment systems, employing more staff and applying more rigorous criteria on clients’ access to phone. However, they had also contributed to the shift towards face-to-face provision over time as non-contactable clients had been ‘called in’ by advisers. Some problems were reported of delays on the part of advisers in following up cases of clients refusing to accept vacancies; these again underline the importance of advisory resources and of good communication between advisory and matching staff.

6.13 Most Jobcentres reported that intensive jobmatching was provided on a weekly basis (although in one case this was not achieved at the outset due to resource constraints). However, in the client survey only just over half reported weekly jobmatching, with 29 per cent indicating more frequent contact (especially males and younger clients) and 17 per cent less frequent contact. Case study research indicated that where matching was undertaken locally, ‘in-house’, there was more scope for variation based upon a capacity to respond to clients’ needs and circumstances. This was most evident where matching was undertaken on a caseload basis and staff got to know clients quite well (especially through face-to-face provision). Thus, there were examples where staff would contact suitable clients as soon as vacancies were identified in order to improve their chances of success. In these cases it was argued that clients would miss out on many vacancies if the weekly cycle was adhered to. However, such an approach appeared to have significant potential resource implications and again illustrated the dilemma faced by local offices in seeking to adapt the process to meet the needs of the client group effectively.

6.14 Nearly two thirds of clients reported that they had found jobmatching very or quite helpful and that they were satisfied, although the predominant response was ‘quite helpful/satisfied’. Females and those with lower qualifications were most positive about the process and these groups were most likely to have vacancies identified for them. Conversely, those with higher qualifications were least positive and (together with older clients) were least likely to have vacancies identified for them.

6.15 Clients on telephone and face-to-face matching gave broadly similar responses on the perceived helpfulness of the matching process, although those on face-to-face matching were more likely to be satisfied. A slightly higher
proportion of telephony clients found the process ‘not helpful at all’. This can be related to the fact that clients on telephony tended to have fewer vacancies identified and were less likely than face-to-face clients to apply for any. Some clients indicated that the process resulted in no suitable vacancies and some indicated that they found staff unhelpful.

6.16 Views of local staff on the effectiveness and impact of the process were broadly consistent with the changes and adaptations to the process that have been implemented at the local level. Thus, the ‘official’ ESD model was not seen as very effective, especially in addressing the circumstances of clients who face significant barriers to employment. In several offices it was argued that clients who reach the six month stage face some problems that need to be addressed through more intensive help. In these offices there was a presumption in favour of face-to-face provision and a perception that it was more effective than the telephony option. However, it was widely felt that the process was inherently limited in effectiveness because the focus at the level of job search does not address underlying problems around personal circumstances, skills and motivation. In several offices it was felt that there could be significant benefits from providing more intensive advisory and jobmatching help at the 13 week stage.

6.17 Some increase in job search behaviour and submissions was reported in the case study Jobcentres but mainly affecting clients who were seen as more motivated and job ready. In many cases it was argued that it was counter-productive to submit clients for vacancies who were not directly suitable because of the risk of damaging good relations with employers that may have taken some time to build. Most Jobcentres did report that there had been some effect in terms of increased ‘signing off’ but there was considerable uncertainty about ‘destinations’; there was a feeling that many were transferring to other benefits or were re-signing when eligible. In relation to discernible effects on job search and ‘sign-offs’, the case study research provided some evidence that the face-to-face matching regime applies a more rigorous framework and produces greater effect.

6.18 At the time of the survey, 36 per cent of clients reported that they were in work and 46 per cent on JSA. The former figure appears to be high for this client group but cannot be taken to reflect the effects of the enhanced JSA/Restart process; it may also indicate under-reporting of temporary work in administrative data. Females, younger clients and those with NVQ levels two and three were more likely to have obtained work during the process and to be still in work while those with low qualifications were least likely to obtain work.

6.19 There is some correlation therefore between perceived helpfulness of the process and work status at the time of the client survey but with two notable exceptions. First, those with low or no qualifications tended to find the process helpful but were least likely to obtain work; conversely, those with NVQ level three were less positive about the process but a relatively high proportion found work. In view of additional comments made in the survey, it would appear that the latter group tended to feel that the process added little value for them and did not provide suitable job opportunities over and above their normal search activity. It is also notable that those with NVQ level four and five also tended not to find the
process helpful in identifying suitable job vacancies. On the other hand, it would appear that those with low qualifications felt that the extra help did add value for them in identifying vacancies even though they were less successful in obtaining work.

6.20 The characteristics of jobs obtained by clients conforms to a well-known pattern, with a preponderance of semi/unskilled work and jobs in personal services/sales. Females were more likely to obtain part-time work and jobs in administrative/secretarial and personal service/sales occupations, while males and those with low qualifications were more likely to obtain semi/unskilled work. These work patterns and the perceptions of different client groups suggest that the effectiveness of the process is conditioned by the nature of vacancies notified to the ES and accessible to clients. Thus, some two thirds of notified vacancies are in semi/unskilled manual and personal service/sales occupations which presents some constraints on the effectiveness with which the ES can help those with higher qualifications.

6.21 The time-series analysis of off-flows from JSA based upon the ES Evaluation Database provided some measures of the effects of the new process although a robust counterfactual is not available. The analysis used the group of claimants aged 25+ and unemployed for less than six months as a ‘proxy comparator’ but emphasising the need for caution in interpretation. The analysis points to a small effect in terms of increased off-flows from JSA for both target groups (six and 12 month claimants), especially over the first three months after the Restart interview. The effect in terms of transfers to other benefits and leaving to unknown and other destinations appears to be larger than the effect on movement into work.

6.22 Analysis of the sustainability of off-flows indicates the significance of the ‘revolving door’ syndrome whereby some clients who leave the register within three months of their Restart interview re-sign before the three month point. This is particularly evident in the case of clients failing to sign and leaving to unknown and other destinations. On the other hand, off-flows into work appear to be more sustainable; thus, of clients leaving the register into work, over 80 per cent are still off the register three months after their Restart interview.

6.23 Therefore, there are grounds for concluding that the process has probably had a small effect in increasing off-flows out of JSA for the target client groups. The analysis would suggest a small increase in off-flows into work but the evidence on additionality in this respect is partial. Clearly, the process is valued by many clients, especially those with lower qualifications and who are less ‘job ready’ who get more intensive assistance, particularly through face-to-face jobmatching. However, the process would appear to deliver limited net additional effect in terms of increased chance of job entry. Those with higher qualifications are more likely to secure work through their own efforts and efforts to help them appear to be limited by the shortage of suitable vacancies amongst those notified to the ES.

6.24 The most significant effects appear to be on movements to other benefits, failure to sign and off-flows to unknown and other destinations during the first
three months after the Restart interview, and on clients who are back on the register at the three month point. This is indicative of a 'revolving door' effect, which would dilute the effect of the new process in achieving sustained reduction in the JSA claimant count. Nevertheless, the analysis does provide grounds for concluding that the enhanced JSA/Restart process is likely to have had a small effect in reducing the claimant count for the target groups in the order of 1-2 per cent.

Key lessons

6.25 A number of key lessons can be highlighted, primarily based upon the research in case study Jobcentre:

- Advisers have a crucial role in the process and the availability of advisory resource is a key issue. It is important to ensure that the process works effectively in terms of assessment in the advisory interview, monitoring clients’ attendance and progress and liaison between advisers and matching staff. There is a need for consistent application of the process to all clients, in a way that addresses their specific problems and needs.

- There is a need for effective communication and good working relationships between advisers and matching staff. In particular, it is important that any problems or issues identified during matching are referred promptly to advisers and that advisers are able to follow these up promptly. This will ensure that clients’ needs are addressed, that availability/refusal issues are dealt with consistently, and that matching staff do not become demotivated.

- It was widely felt that there is a need for advisory interviews at the end of the six week matching period to review progress, identify any problems and issues, and discuss actions for the future. It would appear that such interviews are not being undertaken on a consistent basis, primarily due to constraints on advisory resources.

- Consistent and comprehensive recording and sharing of relevant information was seen as important. Manual recording systems duplicate effort and tend to be unreliable; indeed, monitoring data for the initiative proved to be unusable in the evaluation. Some aspects of the Client Progress Kit were seen as duplicating LMS. Many interviewees argued that efforts need to be focused on ensuring full and consistent use of LMS and ensuring reliable data capture.

- The need to ensure high quality and sufficiently detailed information in JSAGs was widely emphasised and the new process appears to have resulted in an improvement in JSAGs. Attention needs to be given to the role and usage of the Client Progress Kit. Perceptions of its value are varied and there may be a need for better information about its purpose and use and better training. Many staff emphasised the need to ensure that it ‘adds value’ and does not duplicate activity. The problem of subjectivity in assessing progress needs to be addressed if reliable measures are to be produced.
• In some Jobcentres it was argued that confusion may arise for clients at the 12 month stage due to referral to Programme Centre resulting in an overload of initiatives. It was argued that it may be simpler and more effective for clients to complete attendance at the Programme Centre before commencing intensive jobmatching.

• It was widely argued that the best approach to the jobmatching process, especially for more disadvantaged clients, is through the face-to-face approach, ideally caseloaded with advisers. If advisory resource is not available, then the staff undertaking face-to-face matching should have the appropriate skills and capabilities. However, such an approach may have significant resource implications.

• The effectiveness of jobmatching may be increased significantly by adopting a pro-active approach to vacancy identification and notification to clients. Many popular vacancies will be taken up quickly and if job searches are undertaken weekly clients may be ‘missing out’ on potential placings. However, the capacity to undertake job searches more frequently and contact clients with resulting vacancies again has resource implications. It also depends upon a caseload approach being in place.

• The corollary of the above points is the perception (in some Jobcentres) that there are limitations on the effectiveness of ESD for the jobmatching process. Thus, it was argued that ESD has been established as a primarily responsive service and was not suited to undertaking potentially long, discursive interviews. Also staff may lack local knowledge relating to some areas of the district and problems of communication with Jobcentre-based staff may arise. From this perspective, jobmatching is best undertaken within the Jobcentre allowing better co-ordination and communication and more potential for a caseloaded approach.

• It was widely argued that telephone matching should be restricted to clients who are considered to be highly motivated to achieve work, have clear and quite specific job goals, and have their own telephone. There is a need for an effective appointment system based upon a clear agreement with the client, and this should be tightly adhered to. In the event of contact problems, there should be clear rules for referral to advisers and, as indicated above, it is important that advisers have the capacity to follow up referrals promptly.

• The research pointed up limitations on the effectiveness of the process for clients with higher level qualifications due to the nature of vacancies notified to the ES. Efforts are needed to increase notification of vacancies from employers with managerial, professional and technical vacancies in order to provide more job opportunities for more highly qualified clients.

• There were some indications that the work in dedicated telephone matching teams is not considered to be very rewarding. Potential problems of staff demotivation and stress might be addressed through job rotation systems. It is also important, as indicated above, that such staff are not demotivated by problems of communication and relationships with advisers.
• In several Jobcentres it was argued that it would be more effective to target resources on clients earlier, notably at the 13 week stage, in order to provide more targeted help to address their problems and barriers, improve motivation and thus prevent them from becoming long term claimants. It was argued that if clients have no significant motivational problems or barriers, they should have achieved work before the six month stage. Therefore, for many clients in the Enhanced JSA/Restart target group, more intensive jobmatching after this stage is unlikely to be effective. However, there is currently limited provision for clients at the 13 week stage and they are seen by clerical staff. In one Jobcentre it was argued that an advisory interview should be introduced at this stage and that intensive jobmatching might be more effective if provided earlier.

• Some Business Managers argued that there is a need for better advance planning of initiatives in consultation with local offices in order to avoid overloading local managers and to allow more effective implementation and staff training.

Examples of good practice

6.26 The following are brief indications of ‘good practice’ from the case study Jobcentres, although it must be emphasised that these will not all be appropriate in all offices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Practice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District-level conference held between ESD matching staff and Jobcentre advisers to discuss mutual information needs and ensure universal understanding of the process from all perspectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caseloading of clients where possible, especially the more disadvantaged and less job ready. Where caseloading is not feasible, use of designated front-line staff for intensive matching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic and consistent use of LMS to communicate information about clients between all staff involved in the process and monitor client progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System of quality checking of JSAgs at both six and 12 months by Adviser Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diary system for telephone matching with time bands on set days allocated to clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up jobmatching beyond the ‘official’ six week period to ensure that any benefit from resource invested in the first six weeks is not dissipated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specified work procedures and guidelines to ensure consistent application of the process by all staff involved and facilitate effective communication and work flows</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Job rotation for ESD telephony staff in order to alleviate potential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>problems of low morale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Close monitoring and review of clients’ progress including sign-offs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and re-signing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Full training for PB8 staff to ensure effective delivery of intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Frequent vacancy searching and contacting clients as and when suitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vacancies arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Annex: Research Methodology

Introduction

The evaluation of the changes introduced in the enhanced JSA/Restart process comprised a number of elements, combining work undertaken internally by the Research and Development Department and research commissioned externally from the ES Research Partnership for Performance Analysis and Improvement. It should be noted that other work was undertaken internally by the Business Achievement Team (BAT) to produce an early review of the changes. Thus, BAT conducted a survey of Jobcentres (two in each region, including Wales and Scotland) during mid April to mid June 2000, to investigate whether the policy intent was being met, and to examine the implementation process for good practice lessons. An internal report was produced (‘Post Budget Implementation Review’)

The main aims of the evaluation were:
- to investigate the ways in which offices have implemented and are operating the strengthened regime; and
- to assess the impact of the strengthened JSA regime on moving people off JSA and into jobs, and other destinations.

The specific objectives of the evaluation were to examine whether the new JSA regime:
- has been implemented as intended;
- has impacted on unemployment off-flows, both into jobs, and into other destinations;
- could be improved to increase effectiveness, in particular to compare the relative effectiveness of telephone and personal approaches, and to attempt to identify the most effective and efficient mix of these two basic approaches; and
- should be widened to other client groups.

A number of specific issues to be addressed in the evaluation were specified:
- which method of delivery is being adopted in local offices?
- how (if at all) have the new processes affected resource deployment within local offices (e.g. is it robbing resource for other services like RDV)?
- what are staff views on the new processes?
- what impact has there been on exists from JSA after 6 and 12 months of unemployment?
- to what extent has the new regime helped people move into jobs?
- have there been any changes over time in exits into other destinations (e.g. onto other benefits, unknown destinations)?
- what impact has there been on the extent of LTC submissions activity and job entries?
- what factors have affected the impact of the interviews and intensive matching?
• if the strengthened JSA processes were extended to other groups, what changes would be needed?

The main stages and elements in the evaluation are outlined below.

Analysis of claimant unemployment

The work undertaken by ES R&D focused on the analysis of claimant unemployment data and included a descriptive overview of what has been happening to the client groups over time, both before and after introduction of the strengthened JSA processes, in comparison with other groups in the labour market. The analysis covered:

- unemployment stocks (under 25s, over 25s, by duration, at 3 month intervals);
- inflows (total, threshold flows e.g. 6-9 months, 9-12, 12-15 etc.);
- outflows (total, by duration at 3 month intervals, by destination);
- outflow rates (by duration).

The main data sources were NOMIS and JUVOS. NOMIS provides data on overall off-flows over time for the targeted client group (for example, 6-9 months and 12-15 months unemployed), and other groups. JUVOS data provides estimates of the probability of leaving unemployment for the client group.

The work commissioned from the ES Research Partnership was undertaken in two stages. The first stage involved qualitative research in a sample of case study Jobcentres in England and Scotland and was reported in July 2001 (Evaluation of Enhanced Restart: Report on Stage One). The second stage involved quantitative research based upon a telephone survey of claimants and an analysis of data from the Employment Service Evaluation Database (ESED), designed to assess the effects and impact of the changes. These elements of the evaluation are described in more detail below.

Qualitative research in case study Jobcentres

The aim of this element of the research was to investigate how the initiative had been implemented, how it was working, and obtain views of Jobcentre staff on its impact in terms of effects on claimants and on Jobcentre services.

In-depth face-to-face interviews were undertaken with ES staff in a sample of 12 Jobcentres in Spring 2001. All English regions, Scotland and Wales were asked to provide nominations of Jobcentres for this research. The final sample comprised one Jobcentre from each of four English regions (EME, N, NW, WM) and Scotland, two each from YH and SW and three from LASER. It was not possible to include a Jobcentre from Wales. The selection of Jobcentres sought to achieve a mix of:

- local approaches to implementation (i.e. ESD telephony; non-ESD and/or face-to-face intensive matching)
- ‘good’ and ‘poor’ performing offices (in terms of the client group)
- local labour market conditions (and size of client group)
- local office size
It was also necessary to avoid offices that were involved in other evaluations or special initiatives, in order to prevent overloading staff. The selected Jobcentres are shown in Appendix 1.

In-depth interviews were held with the following staff in the sampled local offices:
- Business Manager
- Restart Advisers
- Team leaders for intensive matching
- Advisers working on intensive matching including those on telephony teams and ES Direct where appropriate.

In some small offices more than one of the above posts were undertaken by one person.

The aim of the staff interviews was to gather information in order to assess the extent to which the new processes are being delivered, and views about how they are working (what works and what doesn’t etc.) and what impact they are having on the client group and on Jobcentre services. Such qualitative information on the effectiveness and efficiency of the changes was intended to supplement quantitative work on effects and impact and provide the context for interpretation of the quantitative findings. A comprehensive schedule of questions for interviews was developed and this can be found in Appendix 2.

**Telephone Survey of Claimants**

The views of clients who had been through the enhanced JSA/Restart regime were obtained through a telephone survey, which was the only approach that was feasible within the funding and timescale for the evaluation. After a consideration of options, it was decided to obtain a sample of respondents from a cohort of clients who had been through the Restart interview (at either the six or 12 month stage) during the period January to May 2001. Interviews were conducted in September to October 2001 thus allowing between three and nine months after the interview for outcomes and effects to become evident.

The sampling frame for the survey was provided by the ES Evaluation Database (ESED). Originally, a random sample of 10,000 clients was selected (structured into 4,000 claimants at the 12 month stage and 6,000 at the six month stage). A letter was sent to all these contacts in advance informing them about the survey and providing the option of non-participation. The target response sample was 1,000 achieved interviews. A questionnaire was prepared covering the following:
- views on the Restart interview, jobsearch and outcomes
- approach to intensive jobmatching
- nature of, and views on, contact during jobmatching
- jobsearch during jobmatching and outcomes
- client characteristics.

A copy of the questionnaire is provided as Appendix 3.

In the event, the telephone survey proved to be highly problematical. The key problem arose from the ESED data which did not provide the degree of accuracy in relation to clients’ participation in the enhanced JSA/Restart process that had
been assumed at the outset. Thus, of the original 10,004 contacts, 54% could not be contacted at all due to the fact that there was no telephone number or the number was inaccurate, there was no response or the client was not at the address given. A further 34% could not be interviewed because they were not in the eligible age group or had not reached the six month point of a JSA claim (see Appendix 4 for full details). From this initial sample, only 667 valid completed interviews were obtained, so it was necessary to select a further 2,500 clients. Similar problems were experienced with this supplementary sample so the number of interviews finally secured was 771.

A further problem arose in conducting the interviews with clients to the extent that many were initially uncertain about whether or not they had been through the new process. Part of the problem was due to difficulties of recall amongst this client group but part appeared to derive from the way in which the enhanced process had been implemented at Jobcentre level. Our qualitative research in the case study Jobcentres indicated there was a significant degree of discretion at local level in how the process was delivered and it would seem that in many cases it had been ‘integrated’ into mainstream provision such that clients were not necessarily fully aware that they had experienced anything different. Therefore, interviewers had to spend some time with respondents at the outset to ensure that they understood fully what the survey was about, that they had in fact been through the process, and that they were capable of reliable recall about the processes and its effects. Where there was an element of doubt, interviews were not pursued and this contributed to the low response rate and the extended time needed for the survey.

Completed questionnaires were input for analysis using SPSS. It has been necessary to exercise caution in interpreting the results of the survey due to the limitations on sample size, especially in cross-tabulations against client characteristics, but the results reported are considered to be significant and valid. Given the sample size, it was not possible to undertake multivariate analysis using these data.

**Quantitative analysis of impact**

The final element of the evaluation comprised a quantitative assessment of the impact of the new processes based upon administrative data available from LMS and JUVOS and collated in the ES Evaluation database (ESED). This work was largely descriptive due to the unavailability of control or comparison groups or areas. Thus, time series data were collated for the target client group (those aged 25 and over, reaching six and 12 months unemployment) over a period of two years, April 1999 to March 2001, providing one year’s data both before and after the introduction of the new processes in April 2000. However, the trends for the target client group were compared with a ‘proxy comparison group’ – those aged 25 and over but unemployed for less than six months. To some degree (but imperfectly) this group provides a proxy for general conditions in the labour market and therefore an indicator of the ‘counterfactual’ situation.

The ESED data was collated on a quarterly basis to provide the numbers of clients in each of three client group categories (six and 12 month stage in JSA
claim and less than six month claim) who were in one of five ‘outcome status’ categories at three and six months after their Restart interview. The ‘outcome status’ categories were:

- still claiming JSA
- left JSA and found work
- left JSA but claiming other benefits
- left JSA, failed to sign
- left JSA for unknown/other destination.

From this data it was possible to calculate the trend over time in the proportions of the different client groups in the various ‘outcome status’ categories. Two bases for comparison were possible:

- comparison of the four quarters before the introduction of the new processes with the four quarters after April 2000
- comparison of the two target client groups (six and 12 month unemployed) with the ‘proxy comparison’ group (under six month unemployed).
## Appendix 1: Sample of Case Study Jobcentres

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobcentre</th>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Methods used*</th>
<th>Labour Market conditions</th>
<th>6m+ Client base</th>
<th>No. on local office register</th>
<th>% of total claimants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forest Hill</td>
<td>LASER</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>a,c</td>
<td>Inner city, high unemployment (District ESD site)</td>
<td></td>
<td>895</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waltham Cross</td>
<td>LASER</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>b,c</td>
<td>Suburbia; buoyant, low unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td>470</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alfreton</td>
<td>EME</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Declining industries; redundancies (District ESD site)</td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwick</td>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>a,c</td>
<td>Urban; high unemployment (District ESD site)</td>
<td></td>
<td>458</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burnley</td>
<td>NWest</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>a,c</td>
<td>Urban; tight labour market, low unemployment for area</td>
<td></td>
<td>198</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroud</td>
<td>SWest</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>a,c</td>
<td>Urban/rural mixed; tight labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td>199</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>WMids</td>
<td>Moderate?</td>
<td>b,c</td>
<td>&quot;Up market&quot; area; buoyant, recent redundancies</td>
<td></td>
<td>282</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wombwell</td>
<td>Y&amp;H</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>b,c</td>
<td>High unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td>239</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Active labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td>257</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleford</td>
<td>Y&amp;H</td>
<td>Average/good</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>High unemployment (District ESD site)</td>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ringwood</td>
<td>SWest</td>
<td>Very good</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Urban/rural mixed, tight labour market</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woolston</td>
<td>LASER</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>b, c</td>
<td>Rural/urban; high unemployment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Methods used: a - ESD telephony; b - non-ESD telephony; c - face to face*
Appendix 2: Combined Interview Schedule for Case Study Research

Note: This schedule of questions was adapted as appropriate for specific interviewees

Respondent Details: Jobcentre / name

Key Characteristics of Jobcentre

- Size of register
- Number of 6m+ clients
- Local labour market characteristics
- APA performance to date

Preparation for Changes

1. Were you given adequate advance notice / time to prepare for the changes?
   - If not, in what way?
   - What were the consequences? (Obtain evidence if possible)

2. Were you given adequate information about the changes?
   - What was good / poor about the information?
   - What were the consequences?

3. What training was given to staff in advance of changes?
   - Was this adequate? If not, how/why?
   - What were the consequences? (Any evidence?)

Implementation of Changes

4. What approach has been adopted to deliver the Enhanced JSA process?
   - Obtain full details of approach adopted - including approximate proportions of clients on ESD, Jobcentre telephony and face-to-face matching
   - Why was this approach adopted (what rationale)?
   - To what extent have staff resource limitations / capacity of premises been issues for you? (Obtain full details)
   - Have any significant changes been made over time? If yes, why?
   - Have the changes resulted in improvements? (If yes, details). (Obtain any evidence)

5. How effective is co-ordination and communication between teams within the Jobcentre in the delivery of the enhanced process?
   - Do you have any examples of good practice?
   - What problems are there? How have they arisen? What consequences? (Obtain any evidence)
   - What could be done to improve co-ordination and communication between teams?
6. Have any changes been made to the process prior to the Six Month Advisory Interviews?
   • What changes have been made? Why were they made?
   • Have the changes had their intended impact? If not, why?
   • What has worked well / not worked? (Obtain any evidence)
   • What are the key lessons?

7. Are there any other general implementation issues?
   • With hindsight, would anything have been done differently? If yes, what and how?

Advisory Interviews

8. Are all the target client group receiving extended interviews at the six month stage?
   • How is the extra time being used? To what extent is it being used for more rigorous review of job search and/or more jobmatching/submission to jobs?
   • How do clients react to the extra 10 minutes?
   • What do you think can realistically be achieved in the extra 10 minutes?
   • Overall, how effective is the extension of the interview? Is there evidence of concrete results?
   • Any key lessons?

9. Although the 12 month interviews are not extended in time, are they being used for more rigorous review of job search and/or more jobmatching/submission to jobs? If not, why?

10. Is the new process resulting in a more rigorous review of JSAs (at 6/12 months)?
    • How is this being done at the 6 and 12 month stages?
    • What aspects are being scrutinised?
    • What effect is this having? (Obtain any evidence)
    • Has the process resulted in more realism about job goals? Is there evidence that greater realism about job goals results in improved matching?
    • Is the six month review resulting in better quality JSAs? Has their suitability for job matching been improved?
    • Any key lessons / changes needed?

11. Are clients being provided with better information on WFTC and other incentives to take work (at 6/12 months)?
    • How is this being done?
    • Are clients given specific calculations?
    • What effect is this having? (Obtain any evidence)
    • Any key lessons / changes needed?

12. How is the Client Progress Kit (CPK) being used (at 6/12 months)?
    • How is it being used?
    • Has any training been given? If so, how effective has it been? Any key lessons?
• For each element:
  - Desktop aide memoir assessment criteria
  - Questions for basic skills assessment
  - Client Progress Grid / scoring
  - Tracking Grid
  - Detailed Summary Sheets
  - Is it being used / how?
  - How useful is it? Key benefits / problems? (Any evidence?)
  - Key lessons / changes needed?

13. Overall, how effectively are the needs of clients, and any obstacles they face to securing work, being identified and addressed in the 6 month and 12 month interviews?
• What is working well / not working?
• Are there any examples of good practice that can be passed on? (Obtain details)
• Key lessons / any changes needed?

**Intensive Jobmatching**

14. How is the process of referral to intensive jobmatching working at the 6 and 12 month stages?
• Are all clients in the target group being referred? If not, why?
• What criteria are used for referral to face-to-face or telephone jobmatching? Do clients have a choice?
• How closely do these criteria relate to the needs and circumstances of clients? (e.g. motivation / confidence / distance from Jobcentre)
• Is a distinction made between clients in terms of degree of job-readiness? How well does the process meet the needs of job ready and non-job ready clients? (Any evidence?)
• Are the needs of clients with basic skill needs being addressed effectively? In what way? (Any evidence?)
• Have there been any refusals to take up intensive jobmatching? Have normal adjudication/sanction processes been applied in such cases? Are there any cases where they were not applied? If so, why not? Has any other action been taken? If so, how effective? Any lessons?
• Have any jobseekers been referred back by the matching team? If yes, for what reasons? What action was taken? Lessons?
• Overall, how well has the process worked? What are the key lessons? Would you want to make any changes?

15. Is a ‘plan’ for jobmatching agreed with jobseekers?
• If no, why not?
• If yes, what form does this take?
• How is it developed? Have JSAGs contained enough information? If no, what consequences? (Evidence?)
• How is it monitored?
• How many clients are still on caseloads after the six weeks?
• What is the procedure for ‘hand-off’ at the end of the intensive jobmatching period? Is there a review of progress/achievement? If yes, any evidence of benefits?

• How useful? What benefits / drawbacks? (Evidence?)
• Key lessons / changes needed?

**Telephone Matching**

16. How is telephone matching being delivered?
• Is it delivered through ESD or other arrangements? (Obtain full details)
• Why was this approach adopted?
• Has additional training been provided for telephone matching? If yes, how useful? If no, what consequences? (Evidence?)
• How good is the information in JSAs for jobmatching? What action has been required if information has been inadequate? Have clients had to see an adviser again before matching can begin? If so, how extensive has this been? What consequences?
• Broadly, what type of clients receive telephone matching?
• How often are clients contacted? Have any clients been contacted more than once per week? If so, how extensive is this? Any evidence of benefits?
• Has it proved possible to achieve a good contact rate with clients by phone? How/why? What consequences? (Evidence?)
• Has there been any effect on staff morale where contact rates have been low? (Any evidence?)
• Is the Client Progress Kit used in matching?
  - How is it being used? Are all elements being used?
  - Has any training been given? If so, how effective has training been? Any key lessons?
  - How useful is the CPK? Key benefits / problems? (Any evidence?)
  - Key lessons / changes needed?
• To what extent are suitable job matches being found for clients through telephone matching?
• What procedures are in place to deal with refusals / availability issues? How well have these worked? Lessons?
• What is the procedure for ‘hand-off’ at the end of the intensive jobmatching period? How well has this worked? Lessons?
• Has it been possible to provide an effective service by phone? How/why? What consequences? (Evidence?)
• Key lessons / changes needed?

**Face-to-Face Matching**

17. How is face-to-face matching being delivered? (Obtain full details)
• Broadly, what type of clients receive face-to-face matching?
• How is it being delivered? Through dedicated resource or combined with other service? Why has this approach been adopted? What impact has the method of delivery had on Jobcentre resources?
• Has additional training been provided for face-to-face matching? If yes, how useful has it been? If no, what consequences? (Any evidence?)
• How good is the information in JSAgs for jobmatching? What action has been required if information has been inadequate? Have clients had to see an adviser again before matching can begin? If so, how extensive has this been? What consequences?
• How often are clients seen? Have any clients been seen more than once per week? If so, how extensive is this? Any evidence of benefits?
• Is the Client Progress Kit used in matching?
  - How is it being used? Are all elements being used?
  - Has any training been given? If so, how effective has the training been? Any key lessons?
  - How useful is the CPK? Key benefits / problems? (Any evidence?)
  - Key lessons / changes needed?
• To what extent are suitable job matches being found for clients through telephone matching?
• What procedures are in place to deal with refusals / availability issues? How well have these worked? Lessons?
• What is the procedure for ‘hand-off’ at the end of the intensive jobmatching period? How well has this worked? Lessons?
• Overall, how well is face-to-face matching working? What is working well / not working? (Any evidence?)
• Are clients needs being met? (Evidence?)
• Key lessons / changes?

Effects on Other Services

18. Has the introduction of the new processes had any effects on resource deployment within the Jobcentre?
• Have resources been adequate to cover additional staffing needs? If not, how / consequences? (Evidence?)
• Has staff training been adequate? If not, how / consequences? (Evidence?)
• Have there been any adverse effects on other services? (Evidence?)
• Key lessons?

Impact on Clients

19. How effective are the new processes in helping clients to secure work?
• Is there any evidence of wider job search behaviour? (Obtain evidence)
• Is there any evidence of higher use of ESD following intensive jobmatching? (Obtain evidence)
• Has the new process improved the submissions to vacancy ratio? (Obtain evidence)
• Is there any evidence of improved job entry rates? (Obtain evidence)
• Is it improving the work chances of more disadvantaged clients? (Any evidence?)
• Is there any evidence of ‘register cleaning’? (increases in clients ‘failing to attend’ or leaving the register for reasons other than entering employment)
• Is there any evidence of clients leaving the register, and then returning to register within 13 weeks?
• Are resources being targeted effectively in accordance with clients’ circumstances? If not, why? What consequences?
• Is there any evidence of any effect – positive or negative – on APA performance?
• Overall, what is working well / not working?
• What are the key lessons?
• What changes would improve the process?
• What changes would be necessary if the process were to be extended to other target groups?

**Overall Staff Views**

20. Finally, overall what do staff think of the changes?
• Impact on work / approach to the job?
• Impact on staff satisfaction / morale?
• Impact on clients?
Appendix 3: Questionnaire for Client Telephone Survey

Evaluation of the Enhanced Restart / JSA Process

Client Survey Questionnaire

Introduction

Hello, my name is XXXX, and I'm calling from the Policy Research Institute at Leeds Metropolitan University. We are currently carrying out a short survey on behalf of the Employment Service to evaluate changes that have been made to procedures for JSA claimants. You should have received a letter about this survey.

The Employment Service have informed us that you have now been claiming JSA for approximately (either 6 or 12 months – see contact sheet) and so you should have taken part in a Restart Interview followed by a six week period of Intensive Jobmatching.

A) Could you please tell me: Have you had your Restart Interview? (If respondent does not recall the interview, inform them that it probably lasted between 40 – 50 minutes and took place at their Jobcentre, on a one-to-one basis with an adviser, away from the front line.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Go to Question D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Go to Question B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>See notes in bold above – if respondents still does not recall the restart interview thank them and terminate interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B) If No: Could you please tell me why you have not had your Restart Interview?

| Restart Interview will take place soon | Thank respondent and end interview |
| No longer claiming JSA: obtained work | Thank respondent and end interview |
| No longer claiming JSA: moved to other benefit | Thank respondent and end interview |
| No longer claiming JSA: for other reason | Ask Question C |
| Other reason | Ask Question C |

C) If other, write in reason:

........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................
........................................................................................................

.........................................................................................................

D) If Yes:

Would you be willing to take part in the survey? The interview will take approximately 7 – 9 minutes to complete and any information you give will be totally confidential.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Go to Question 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Thank respondent and end interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Restart Interview**

1. How helpful did you find the Restart Interview in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Developing clearer and more appropriate job goals for you?</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Not very helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Identifying and addressing problems you face in your search for work?</th>
<th>Very helpful</th>
<th>Quite helpful</th>
<th>Not very helpful</th>
<th>Not helpful at all</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. At the Restart interview did the adviser look for any job vacancies for you?

- Yes  □ 1  Go to Q3
- No    □ 2  Go to Q16
- Don't Know □ 3  Go to Q16

3. How many job vacancies were identified for you to apply for?

- None  □ 1  Go to Q16
- One   □ 2  Go to Q4
- More than one □ 3  Go to Q4
- Don't Know □ 4  Go to Q16

4. How many of these vacancies did you actually apply for?

- None  □ 1  Go to Q5
- One   □ 2  Go to Q6
- Some of them □ 3  Go to Q6
- All of them □ 4  Go to Q6
- Don't Know □ 5  Go to Q6

5. If None: Could you please state why you did not apply?

................................................................................................................................. Go to Q16

6. Did you actually get a job from any of these applications?

- Yes  □ 1  Go to Q7
- No    □ 2  Go to Q16

7. What was this job?

.................................................................................................................................

8. Was this job …?

- Full Time (More than 16 hours/week) □ 1
- Part Time (Less than 16 hours/week) □ 2
- Don't Know □ 3
9  Was this job …?

Permanent ❏ 1
Temporary ❏ 2
Don’t Know ❏ 3

10  Are you still in this job?

Yes ❏ 1  Ask Q11
No ❏ 2  Go to Q12

11  If Yes: How long have you now been in this job?

Less than 3 months ❏ 1
Between 3 and 6 months ❏ 2
More than 6 months ❏ 3

Go to Q16

12  If No: How long were you in this job?

Less than 3 months ❏ 1
Between 3 and 6 months ❏ 2
More than 6 months ❏ 3

13  Could you please say why you are no longer in this job?

........................................................................................................................................................................

14  Have you had another job since this job?

Yes ❏ 1  Ask Q15
No ❏ 2  Go to Q16

15  If Yes: How long were you / have you been in this job?

Less than 3 months ❏ 1
Between 3 and 6 months ❏ 2
More than 6 months ❏ 3

Intensive Jobmatching

16  At your Restart Interview, did you discuss and agree with your Adviser the most appropriate approach for you to undertake the six week period of intensive jobmatching?

Yes ❏ 1
No ❏ 2
17 Following your Restart Interview, did you actually start your six week period of intensive jobmatching?

Yes  ☐ 1  Go to Q29
No  ☐ 2

18 Could you please say why you did not start the intensive jobmatching?

- Obtained work  ☐ 1  Go to Q21
- Transferred to other benefit  ☐ 2  Ask Q19
- Stopped claiming JSA for other reason  ☐ 3  Ask Q20
- Wasn’t given the opportunity  ☐ 4  Go to Q20
- Other (please specify)  ☐ 5  Go to Q52

-----------------------------------------------------------------  Go to Q52

19 What benefit did you transfer to?

-----------------------------------------------------------------  Go to Q52

20 Could you please tell me why you stopped claiming JSA?

-----------------------------------------------------------------  Go to Q52

21 If obtained work in Q18 ask: Is this the same job I asked you about earlier?

Yes  ☐ 1  Go to Q52
No  ☐ 2  Go to Q22

22 If No ask: What was this job?……………………………………………………………

23 Was this job …? 

- Full Time (More than 16 hours/week)  ☐ 1
- Part Time (Less than 16 hours/week)  ☐ 2
- Don’t Know  ☐ 3

24 Was this job …?

- Permanent  ☐ 1
- Temporary  ☐ 2
- Don’t Know  ☐ 3

25 Are you still in this job?

Yes  ☐ 1  Ask Q26
No  ☐ 2  Go to Q27
26 **If Yes:** How long have you now been in this job?

- Less than 3 months [ ]
- Between 3 and 6 months [ ]
- More than 6 months [ ]

Go to Q52

27 **If No:** How long were you in this job?

- Less than 3 months [ ]
- Between 3 and 6 months [ ]
- More than 6 months [ ]

28 Could you please say why you are no longer in this job?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………
…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

Go to Q52

29 What was the main type of contact you had with the Jobcentre during the intensive jobmatching period?

- Telephone [ ]
- Attendance at Jobcentre [ ] Go to Q32

30 **If by Telephone ask:** Was your telephone contact with …? (Tick one only)

- Employment Service Direct staff [ ]
- Jobcentre staff [ ]
- Don’t Know [ ]

31 How often were you telephoned?

- More than once a week [ ]
- Once a week [ ]
- Once every two weeks [ ]
- Less than every two weeks [ ]

Go to Q34

32 Other than for your fortnightly signing, how often did you attend the Jobcentre specifically to see someone about Jobmatching?

- More than once a week [ ]
- Once a week [ ]
- Once every two weeks [ ]
- Less than every two weeks [ ]
33 Who did you meet with for your intensive jobmatching?

- Adviser [1]
- Other Jobcentre staff [2]
- Don't Know [3]

34 Did you complete the **full six week** intensive jobmatching period?

- Yes [1] **Go to Q45**
- No [2] **Go to Q35**

35 **If No:** Why did you not complete the intensive jobmatching period?

- Obtained work [1] **Go to Q38**
- Transferred to other benefit [2] **Ask Q36**
- Stopped claiming JSA for other reason [3] **Ask Q37**
- Still within six week intensive jobmatching period [4] **Go to Q45**

36 What benefit did you transfer to?

................................................................................................................................. **Go to Q45**

37 Could you please tell me why you stopped claiming JSA?

............................................................................................................................................ **Go to Q45**

**If obtained work in Q35 ask:**

38 What was this job?

........................................................................................................................................

39 Was this job?

- Full Time (More than 16 hours / week) [1]
- Part Time (less than 16 hours/week) [2]
- Don't Know [3]

40 Was this job?

- Permanent [1]
- Temporary [2]
- Don't Know [3]

41 Was the vacancy for this job identified during your intensive jobmatching?

- Yes [1]
- No [2]
42 Are you still in this job?

Yes  [☐]  Ask Q43  
No   [☐]  Ask Q44

43 If yes at Q42: How long have you now been in this job?

Less than 3 months  [☐]  
Between 3 and 6 months  [☐]  
More than 6 months  [☐]  

Go to Q45

44 If No at Q42: Could you please say why you are no longer in this job?

................................................................. Go to Q45

45 During your intensive jobmatching, around how many vacancies were identified for you to apply for?

None  [☐]  Go to Q48  
1-4  [☐]  
5-9  [☐]  
10 or more  [☐]  

46 How many of these vacancies did you think were suitable for you?

All  [☐]  
Most  [☐]  
Some  [☐]  
None  [☐]  

47 How many of these vacancies did you actually apply for?

None  [☐]  
1-4  [☐]  
5-9  [☐]  
10 or more  [☐]  

48 How helpful was the intensive jobmatching in terms of providing encouragement and incentive for you to look for work?

Very helpful  [☐]  
Quite helpful  [☐]  
Not very helpful  [☐]  
Not helpful at all  [☐]  
Don't know  [☐]  
49 Why do you say this?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

50 Overall, how satisfied were you with the intensive jobmatching process?

Very satisfied ❑ 1 Go to Q52
Quite satisfied ❑ 2 Go to Q52
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied ❑ 3 Go to Q52
Quite dissatisfied ❑ 4 Ask Q51
Very dissatisfied ❑ 5 Ask Q51
Don’t know ❑ 6 Go to Q52

51 If dissatisfied ask: Could you please say why you were dissatisfied?

........................................................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................................................

Current Status and Personal Details

I would now like to ask you a few details about yourself; this is for classification purposes only and all the information you give me is strictly confidential.

52 Record gender (DO NOT ASK!):

Male ❑ 1 Female ❑ 2

53 Would you mind telling me to which of these age groups you belong?

| ❑ 1 | 16 - 18 | ❑ 2 | 19 – 24 |
| ❑ 3 | 25 – 34 | ❑ 4 | 35 – 49 |
| ❑ 5 | 50 – 59 | ❑ 6 | 60 – 64 |
| ❑ 7 | 65+  | ❑ 8 | Does not wish to say |

54 To which of these groups do you consider you belong?
(Read out list and circle one only)

White ❑ 1
Black – Caribbean ❑ 2
Black – African ❑ 3
Black – Other black group ❑ 4
Indian ❑ 5
Pakistani ❑ 6
Bangladeshi ❑ 7
Chinese ❑ 8
Other (please specify) ❑ 9

I do not wish to say ❑ 10
55. Could I now just confirm your current position? Are you …?
(Please establish main income source - tick one option only)

- Claiming JSA \[1\] \text{Go to Q63}
- Claiming another benefit \[2\] \text{Ask Q56}
- Not in work and not claiming any benefit \[3\] \text{Ask Q65}
- In work \[4\] \text{Go to Q58}
- Other \[5\] \text{Ask Q57}

56. What benefit is this?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………… \text{Go to Q63}

57. Could you please tell me what this is?

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………… \text{Go to Q65}

58. Is this the same job you told me about earlier?

- Yes \[1\] \text{Go to Q64}
- No \[2\]

59. \textit{If No ask:} What is this job?

………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

60. Is this job …?

- Full Time (More than 16 hours/week) \[1\]
- Part Time (Less than 16 hours/week) \[2\]
- Don’t Know \[3\]

61. Is this job …?

- Permanent \[1\]
- Temporary \[2\]
- Don’t Know \[3\]

62. How long have you been in this job?

- Less than 3 months \[1\]
- Between 3 and 6 months \[2\]
- More than 6 months \[3\]

\textit{Go to Q64}
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63 **If currently on benefit**: How long is it since your last spell of work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 18 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had a job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Go to Q65

64 **If currently in work**: Before starting your current job, how long had you been out of work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 – 18 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 24 months</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never had a job</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

65 What is the highest qualification that you have achieved?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualification</th>
<th>Option</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSE Grade 2 or Below</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCSE’s/O Levels or 1 A Level / 2 AS Levels</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCE Highers/ A Levels (2 or more) / AS Levels (4 or more)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ or SVQ Level 1 / GNVQ Basic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ or SVQ Level 2 / GNVQ Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ or SVQ Level 3 / GNVQ Advanced</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ or SVQ Level 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NVQ or SVQ Level 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTEC First Certificate/Diploma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTEC National Certificate/Diploma or ONC/OND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City &amp; Guilds or other trade qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTEC HNC / HND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree level qualification</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate qualification (e.g. PG dip, MA, MSc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional qualification eg Chartered accountant, surveyor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Vocational Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-UK Qualifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know / Can’t remember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

80
66 Do you have any health problems or disabilities?

- Yes □ 1
- No □ 2 \textit{Go to Q68}

67 Does your health problem or disability:

- Prevent you from doing certain types of work or training □ 1
- Prevent you from working or training at all □ 2
- Have no effect on work or training □ 3

68 Is English your first language?

- Yes □ 1
- No □ 2

69 How many spells of unemployment have you experienced in last 5 years?

Write in:................

\textit{Thank respondent for participating in the interview and confirm again that all the information given is confidential.}
Appendix 4: Client Survey Contact Details

Three databases of client contacts were supplied:
- Database 1: 12 month claimants
- Database 2: 6 month claimants
- Database 3: supplementary contacts (6 and 12 month claimants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Database 1</th>
<th>Database 2</th>
<th>Database 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of contacts provided</td>
<td>4002</td>
<td>6002</td>
<td>2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No telephone contact number</td>
<td>1129</td>
<td>1552</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter returned/refused to participate</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unable to contact:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone not working/number withheld</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wrong number</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at given address/deceased</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacted but not interviewed:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language/disability problem</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineligible due to age</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>1350</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never claimed JSA</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not reach 6 month stage in JSA claim</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not go through EJSA process</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed interviews</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing/misallocated contact details</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>