

Work Programme Statistics

LEARNING AND WORK INSTITUTE ANALYSIS

17 MARCH 2016

Paul Bivand and Duncan Melville

*In January 2016, NIACE and the Centre for Economic and Social Inclusion
merged to form the Learning and Work Institute*

Learning and Work Institute

Patron: HRH The Princess Royal | Chief Executive: David Hughes
A company limited by guarantee, registered in England and Wales
Registration No. 2603322 Registered Charity No. 1002775
Registered office: 21 De Montfort Street, Leicester, LE1 7GE



SUMMARY

DWP has published statistics from the beginning of the Work Programme in June 2011 to the end of December 2015. In this data release, we are able to report on the **two-year job outcome performance**, i.e. whether or not an individual has secured a job outcome during the entire length of time on the programme.

The headline results are:

- The two-year Job Outcome performance is **26.0%, 2.9 percentage points above DWP's expectations**. This figure is for the whole Work Programme from June 2011 to December 2015.
- Two-year performance over the whole programme has **increased slightly**, from 25.7% in the December 2015 release to 26% now.
- For those completing the programme in the latest two months, two-year performance has risen from around 22% in 2013 to around 31% now.
- 1.81 million people have been referred to the Work Programme since June 2011.
- 503,200 people have had a 'sustained' job outcome through the Work Programme.
- ERSA - the Providers Trade Association, report that 772,000 participants have started work - and may eventually get a 'Job Outcome'.
- 12.5% of ESA new claimants get a job outcome within two years, below DWP's expectation of 12.7%. The equivalent figure for ex-IB ESA participants is 4.7%.
- People with a disability and those aged 50 and over are the least successful in getting a job through the Work Programme.

LEARNING AND WORK INSTITUTE COMMENT

Duncan Melville, Chief Economist at the Learning and Work Institute commented:

“The latest Work Programme performance figures show that just over one in four programme participants (26.0%) have secured a sustained job outcome. Evaluation evidence has indicated that the programme has performed similarly to those previous programmes it replaced but at a lower cost. Last year’s Spending Review announced that a new Work and Health Programme would replace the Work Programme and Work Choice.

Subsequently, it became clear that funding for this new programme would only be one fifth of the level of funding previously provided for the Work Programme and Work Choice. Yesterday’s Labour Market statistics release and OBR projections have again made clear that this is a mistake that the Government needs to revisit.

The labour market already appears to be cooling, and the OBR's projections are for a rising unemployment rate from around the middle of next year.


Even with the current unemployment rate of around 5%, we have 2.2 million people who have been on out of work benefits for 2 years or more and 1.6 million who have been on them for 5 years. This is a waste of human potential that needs to be addressed. This requires greater spending on active welfare to work measures to help those suffering long term worklessness to return to work, not 80% cuts in funding.”

WORK PROGRAMME OVERALL PERFORMANCE

In general, performance is *above* DWP's benchmark indicators and well above our economy adjusted indicators.

On the two-year measure performance has increased by 0.3 percentage points to 26%. This is in line with what we would expect from previous performance on the one-year measure. On our one-year measure there has been a slight increase of 0.1 percentage points with performance at 12.2%. Looking at the overall job outcome measure, covering the first 25 months of programme referrals, performance is at 28.5%. This is 0.3 percentage points higher than last quarter's figure.

Figure 1: Learning and Work Job Outcome Measures for all participants equivalent minimum benchmark compared to actual (Jun 2011-Dec 2014 referrals)



CONCLUSION

The two-year measure is a robust indicator of performance. This shows that more than 1 in 4 of participants (26%) of participants secure a sustained job outcome within two years.

In this report, the performance exceeds, overall, DWP's expectations of performance at the two-year point. Recent performance is higher. The overall performance is pulled down by poorer results in the early part of the programme, when the economy was performing much lower than expected when the Work Programme targets were set.

When we adjust for the fact that economic performance since 2011 has been below that expected at the time, performance looks better and is well above our economy adjusted expectation.

Performance for ESA (and disabled people in general) remains low.

Increasing performance for all groups remains a priority. All must share in any improvement in job outcomes and job sustainment.

INTRODUCTION

WHAT STATISTICS HAVE BEEN RELEASED?

DWP has published statistics from the beginning of the Work Programme in June 2011 to the end of December 2015. The data covers the first four years of the programme.

The statistics give:

- The number of customer referrals to Work Programme providers, and the number that started on the programme.
- The number of job outcome payments that have been made to providers. These are paid after a customer has been in work for either three or six months.
- The number of sustainment payments to providers, and the number of individuals for whom at least one sustainment payment has been made. Sustainment payments are made for each four-week period a customer spends in work following a job outcome.
- The number of leavers from the Work Programme who are not in employment, but may have had a spell of employment during their two years on the programme.

It is possible to analyse these statistics by each of the nine participant groups, localities, and participant characteristics.

HOW IS PERFORMANCE MEASURED?

DWP has two measures of performance:

1. The contractual measure is the Minimum Performance Level (MPL) for three key participant groups. The MPL is now measured on a revised basis based on either achieving or being on profile to achieve DWP's estimates of how many job outcomes should be achieved for each monthly group of referrals.
2. The DWP business plan measure is a monthly indicator and is a measure of how each monthly cohort of referrals is succeeding in getting a job within 12 months.

Learning and Work uses a third measure:

3. The Job Outcome Measure. This measures performance for every participant who could get a job outcome after 12 months and 24 months on the programme, and the overall measure for each cohort.

Our Job Outcome Measure is the average proportion of customers achieving a job outcome within a year, two years, or their maximum time on the programme. As the Work Programme is now into its' fifth year of operation, the overall measure represents the achievements with the first 25 months of referrals, and the two-year measure covers the first 31 months of referrals, to December 2014.

THE WORK PROGRAMME AS A WHOLE

HOW MANY JOB OUTCOMES HAVE THERE BEEN?

From the beginning of the programme to the end of December 2015, 503,200 thousand job outcome payments have been made to providers. 103,000 of these were achieved in the most recent 12 months of the programme.

HAS DWP'S MINIMUM PERFORMANCE LEVEL (MPL) BEEN MET?

DWP has now accepted that its' original Minimum Performance Level was flawed and has revised its' contractual measures.

Our measures are similar to the DWP's revised measures, but we only include actual achievements, rather than including being 'on-profile' to meet the revised Minimum Performance Levels. We also represent our measures as whole-programme measures, with some time series detail.

HAS LEARNING AND WORK'S JOB OUTCOME MEASURE BEEN MET?

We now have data for:

- 43 months of starts who have been on the programme for one year (the one-year Job Outcome Measure)
- 31 months of starts who have completed their two years on the programme (the two-year Job Outcome Measure)
- 25 months of starts who have completed overall and completed the job outcome period at the end (the overall Job Outcome Measure).

DWP's latest performance expectations are:

- 10.0% on the one-year Job Outcome Measure
- 23.1% on the two-year Job Outcome Measure
- 26.4% on the overall Job outcome measures.

These are the benchmark indicators that we use to assess overall performance.


We also make an adjustment for the economy because economic growth worsened after the Work Programme was commissioned and DWP's minimum expectations were set. However, economic growth subsequently picked up so we have re-estimated the economy effect (since the start of the programme) as a 12.1% reduction on the benchmark indicators. This has fallen from a 13.0% reduction we applied in the December analysis.

Therefore our economy adjusted benchmarks are:

- 8.8% on our one-year job outcome measure
- 20.3% on our two-year job outcome measure
- 23.2% on our overall job outcome measure.

Figure 1 shows performance against these benchmarks.

Figure 1: Learning and Work Job Outcome Measures for all participants equivalent minimum benchmark compared to actual (Jun 2011-Dec 2014 referrals)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations. Average weighted by monthly referral numbers.

IS PERFORMANCE IMPROVING?


On our one-year measure there has been a 0.1 percentage point increase in performance in the latest data.

On the two-year measure performance has increased by 0.3 percentage points since the last data release.

The overall job outcome measure now has 25 months' worth of data showing a 0.3 percentage point improvement on the December release, and is well above our expectations of where minimum performance should be.

We can judge performance improvements using our Job Outcome Measure. Figure 2, below shows job outcome performance over time.

Figure 2: Learning and Work Job Outcome Measures for all participants



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

ARE JOBS BEING SUSTAINED?

Yes, job sustainment remains strong.


One of the objectives of the Work Programme was to support participants to sustain employment for longer beyond their three or six month job outcome.

Up to the end of December 2015, DWP had made 5,350,000 sustainment payments for participants sustaining work beyond a job outcome. This equates to 10.6 payments (or 43 weeks in work) following every job outcome that has been achieved so far. This is higher than the last results.

Figure 3 shows average weeks in work by payment group. This is composed of the weeks in work paid for sustainment together with the weeks in work leading up to the Job Outcome (26 weeks in work for the first two JSA groups, 13 weeks for the remaining groups). It shows that, on average, people who achieve a Job Outcome

are in paid work for over a year, although this is slightly lower for JSA Prison leavers..

Figure 3: Average weeks in work per Job Outcome (June 2011 to December 2015)




Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

WORK PROGRAMME LEAVERS

There has been a total of 676,000 Work Programme participants who have finished their two years on the programme.

Figure 4: Work Programme completers by status upon completing attachment period (Jun 2011-Dec 2013 referrals)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

THE WORK PROGRAMME FOR PARTICIPANTS


HOW MANY PEOPLE ARE TAKING PART?

Up to the end of December 2015, 1.81 million people had been referred to the Work Programme, of which 1.78 million (98%) started on the programme.

Monthly referrals numbers have been steadily declining since the programme began. In the last three months, there were 8 thousand referrals a month across the country.

Figure 5 shows that the referrals have been concentrated in the three main JSA participant groups, but New ESA claimants have come to be a larger proportion of referrals.


Figure 5: Work Programme referrals and attachments by participant group (Jun 2011-Mar 2015)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

In the last three months, new ESA claimants have been 17% of referrals, compared to 44% in the JSA 25+ group. JSA 18-24 referrals were very slightly higher than new ESA claimants.

Figure 6 shows the percentages of referrals by Payment Group in the three months to December 2015.




HAS IT WORKED FOR ALL GROUPS?

Performance varies between the nine different participant groups on the Work Programme. DWP expected that job outcomes would vary between different participants, and has set benchmarks for each participant group. The benchmarks here have not been economy-adjusted.

Figure 7 shows performance for each group, on our two-year Job Outcome Measure, against DWP's minimum expectation.

Figure 7: Two-year job outcome measure benchmark compared to actual, by participant group (Jun-Dec 2014 referrals)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

Performance is currently above the DWP benchmark for four of the nine participant groups.


Performance for New ESA claimants is above DWP's expectation for each of the two sub-groups.

For the main group of adults claiming JSA (JSA 25 and over), performance is slightly above DWP's benchmark. For the JSA 18-24 group, performance is below the benchmark. However, if we adjusted DWP's benchmarks to reflect the economic performance over the entire Work Programme period, then the JSA 18-24 group would be above expectation as well.

Compared to last quarter's figures, performance has increased or remained static for all groups.

Figure 8 shows performance for each group on our one-year Job Outcome Measure against the equivalent of DWP's expectations.

Figure 8: One-year job outcome measure: Actual performance compared to DWP minimum benchmark, by participant group (Jun 2011 - Dec 2014 referrals)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations. Average weighted by monthly referral numbers.


Performance has been above DWP expectations at the 12-month point for most JSA groups. It has been below expectations for the ESA New Claimants (under 12 months prognosis) group, but this seems to have been reversed at the two-year point, indicating that this group may require more investment of time and support to achieve expectations. For the JSA Prison Leavers group, performance is below expectations at both the one and two-year points. This indicates that DWP's expectations may have been over-optimistic (as is evidently the case for the ESA Volunteers and the very small IB/IS volunteers groups).

HAS IT WORKED FOR THE MOST DISADVANTAGED?

Our estimates are based on 'Job Outcomes' and referrals over the entire Work programme, as two-year performance cannot be computed from the DWP release.

Overall performance on this basis (27.8%), is slightly higher than on the two-year performance measure (26%).

Figure 9: Job outcomes as a proportion of referrals by participant characteristics (June 2011 – Dec 2015)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

Women (at 28.2%) have higher Job Outcome rates than men (at 27.3%).

People with a disability (at 17.3%) have low Job Outcome rates. Many people with a disability are in the JSA payment groups as well as in the ESA payment groups.

By ethnicity, BAME participants have slightly higher Job Outcome rates than white participants.

By age, young participants have the highest performance, and the over-50s have the lowest performance (and this has declined since the last analysis).

HAS IT WORKED EVERYWHERE?

The Work Programme is delivered by providers working in contract package areas (CPAs). There are between one and three contractors in each area. The table below shows performance in each CPA.

Work Programme performance varies between CPAs by 6.3 percentage points on the two-year job outcome measure. Surrey, Sussex and Kent, The East of England, Manchester, Cheshire and Warrington and Surrey, Sussex and Kent have the highest performance. Scotland, North East Yorkshire and the Humber and Wales have the lowest performance.

Figure 10 Two-year job outcome measure (%) table of performance across Contract Package Areas (Jun 2011-Sep 2013 referrals)

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes
East of England	14.1%	29.2%	31.6%
Manchester, Cheshire and Warrington	13.9%	28.7%	31.1%
Surrey, Sussex & Kent	13.5%	28.7%	31.5%
Coventry, Warwickshire, Staffordshire and the Marches	13.4%	27.8%	30.3%
Thames Valley, Hampshire and Isle of Wight	12.7%	27.4%	30.5%
East Midlands	13.1%	26.9%	29.5%
North East	12.1%	26.4%	28.8%
East London	12.2%	26.2%	28.8%
South Yorkshire	11.8%	25.7%	28.4%
Birmingham and Solihull, the Black Country	11.7%	25.3%	27.5%
Merseyside, Halton, Cumbria and Lancashire	11.8%	25.2%	27.8%
West London	12.0%	25.0%	27.5%
Devon and Cornwall, Dorset and Somerset	11.2%	24.7%	27.8%
West Yorkshire	11.3%	24.4%	27.0%
Gloucestershire, Wiltshire and Swindon, West of England	10.6%	24.1%	26.9%
Scotland	11.7%	23.8%	26.1%
North East Yorkshire and the Humber	10.1%	23.1%	25.1%
Wales	10.2%	22.9%	25.4%

Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations. Average weighted by monthly referral numbers.

The table will mask wide variations in performance within CPAs at the local authority level. Annex One details performance in all local authorities. This shows that, on the two-year Job Outcome Measure, the top five best-performing local authorities are Brentwood (Essex), Bracknell Forest (Berkshire), Babergh (Suffolk), Tonbridge and Malling (Kent) and Rochford (Essex).

Figure 10 shows the relationship between Work Programme performance and local unemployment.

The Work Programme continues to produce fewer job outcomes in high unemployment areas. This is shown by the downward slope of the line.

There is a wide spread around the line, particularly for areas with stronger labour markets (the left-hand side of the graph). So, as with the CPA-level analysis, it does

not appear that the economy alone, while a factor, can explain much of the variation in performance. The variations in referrals by payment group is another source of variation.

Figure 10: Two-year job outcome measure compared to unemployment rates across local authorities (Jun 2011-Dec 2013 referrals)



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

HOW HAVE PRIME CONTRACTORS PERFORMED?

There are now 15 Prime Contractors delivering the Work Programme, down from 18 originally, following a range of corporate mergers, acquisitions and partnerships. The largest provider by number of contracts is PeoplePlus, a division of Staffline. PeoplePlus have 9 contracts, that were originally EOSWorks, Avanta and A4e contracts. The second largest provider by number of contracts is Ingeus, where there has been no change to the number of contracts. Interserve has also been active, taking over two original contracts awarded to others, and they continue in partnership with Rehab in operating the two Rehab Jobfit contracts.

Table 1 shows how Work Programme performance has varied among the 15 Prime contractors on all three of our benchmark indicators.

The data shows a performance gap of 6.3 percentage points for the two-year job outcome measure, between the highest and lowest performing primes, lower than we saw last quarter.

On the one-year performance measures, the gap is much smaller at 3.6 percentage points between the highest and lowest performing Primes.

On the overall measure, the gap is smaller at 5.2 percentage points.

Table 1: Prime contractor performance on Learning and Work's Job Outcome Measures (Jun 2011-Sep 2014 referrals)

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes
G4S	13.5%	28.2%	30.6%
ShawTrust CDG	13.1%	27.4%	29.8%
Seetec	12.9%	27.2%	29.5%
Maximus	13.0%	27.2%	30.2%
Serco	13.0%	27.0%	29.4%
Ingeus	13.3%	26.8%	29.2%
People Plus	12.0%	26.2%	29.0%
Interserve	11.3%	24.9%	27.7%
Learndirect	10.5%	24.1%	26.9%
Reed	10.9%	24.0%	26.7%
Prospects	10.0%	23.9%	27.0%
APM	10.7%	23.8%	26.5%
Working Links	11.1%	23.7%	26.3%
NCG	10.4%	23.6%	25.6%
Rehab	9.9%	22.9%	25.4%

Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

WORK PROGRAMME FINANCES


WHAT PAYMENTS HAVE BEEN MADE?

Up to December 2015, we estimate that DWP had paid providers a total of £2.2 billion. This is made up of:

- £510 million in attachment fees, which were paid when customers started on the programme up to March 2014 (23% of total so far).
- £546 million in job outcome payments (25% of total so far).
- £1,143 million in sustainment payments (52% of total so far).

Figure 11 shows how the payment profile has changed over time.


Figure 11: Payments to Work Programme providers by payment type



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Learning and Work calculations.

Over the last year, we estimate that DWP has paid providers £440 million. 77% of this total has been sustainment payments for those who had already secured a Job Outcome. The remaining 23% was for Job Outcome payments.

Figure 12: Work Programme: Breakdown of DWP payments over the year to December 2015



Source: DWP: Information, Governance and Security Directorate; Inclusion calculations.

These figures have been estimated using actual numbers of attachments, job outcome payments and sustainment payments. Job outcome payments incorporate an estimate of the average price discount that providers offered in their bids to DWP.

This shows that the attachment fee income has now finished, after an earlier decline. This is partly due to referrals falling, and the attachment fee being reduced year on year. The fee was reduced to 75% of the original amount in April 2012, and to 50% in April 2013. From April 2014 onwards providers receive no up-front funding via attachment fees at all. Fees for Job Outcomes are now declining as they are reduced by 10% (magnified by discounts offered by providers) each year from April 2014.

HOW MUCH HAS DWP SPENT ON EACH PERSON?

We estimate that DWP has paid providers an average of £1,214 for each participant referred.

The average spend so far is not the same as what the total average spend per participant will be once they have all finished the programme (as some participants are only part-way through their time with providers).

The average DWP spend per participant has risen over the last quarter by £35.09 This is due to continuing sustainment payments for those who have already had a job outcome.

ANNEX 1: PERFORMANCE IN LOCAL AUTHORITIES

Table 3: Job Outcome measures (Jun 2011-Dec 2014 referrals) and unemployment rates (Jan 2011-Sep 2015) by local authority

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Brentwood	12%	41%	42%	4%
Bracknell Forest	17%	38%	40%	5%
Babergh	16%	38%	39%	5%
Tonbridge and Malling	16%	37%	38%	5%
Rochford	17%	37%	38%	5%
Mid Suffolk	14%	37%	37%	4%
Chichester	16%	36%	37%	4%
Vale of White Horse	12%	35%	39%	4%
Chiltern	5%	35%	42%	4%
Rushcliffe	13%	35%	36%	5%
Horsham	17%	35%	38%	4%
St Edmundsbury	13%	35%	36%	5%
Broadland	11%	35%	38%	4%
Mid Sussex	11%	35%	36%	3%
Dartford	17%	34%	37%	6%
South Holland	17%	34%	36%	6%
Forest Heath	9%	34%	38%	5%
Wychavon	14%	34%	34%	4%
East Hertfordshire	17%	34%	35%	4%
Dover	15%	34%	34%	8%
South Kesteven	17%	34%	35%	5%
Canterbury	16%	34%	35%	7%
Wokingham	8%	34%	36%	4%
Lichfield	14%	34%	34%	5%
Broxtowe	17%	33%	35%	7%
Castle Point	14%	33%	33%	6%
South Oxfordshire	10%	33%	35%	3%
Suffolk Coastal	13%	33%	36%	4%
West Oxfordshire	4%	33%	37%	4%
Huntingdonshire	17%	33%	36%	5%
Sevenoaks	15%	33%	35%	4%
Braintree	15%	33%	35%	6%
Lewes	13%	33%	35%	5%
Tunbridge Wells	11%	33%	33%	4%
East Lothian	17%	33%	35%	6%
Stafford	15%	32%	32%	4%
Epping Forest	18%	32%	34%	6%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Chelmsford	17%	32%	33%	5%
Fenland	14%	32%	34%	7%
Reigate and Banstead	15%	32%	35%	4%
North Kesteven	15%	32%	33%	5%
Eastleigh	14%	32%	35%	4%
North Hertfordshire	14%	32%	37%	6%
South Norfolk	15%	32%	35%	5%
Woking	15%	32%	35%	4%
Welwyn Hatfield	13%	32%	33%	6%
Chorley	16%	32%	35%	5%
King's Lynn and West Norfolk	17%	32%	33%	7%
Hinckley and Bosworth	14%	32%	34%	6%
Stevenage	17%	32%	34%	7%
North Tyneside	15%	32%	34%	8%
Test Valley	12%	32%	32%	4%
Broxbourne	13%	32%	37%	6%
Moray	13%	32%	32%	5%
Havering	14%	32%	34%	8%
Stroud	10%	32%	36%	4%
Tendring	17%	32%	32%	9%
Trafford	15%	32%	34%	6%
Adur	5%	31%	35%	6%
Solihull	16%	31%	33%	6%
South Cambridgeshire	11%	31%	34%	4%
Stockport	17%	31%	33%	6%
Worthing	12%	31%	33%	6%
Warrington	15%	31%	33%	6%
Thurrock	15%	31%	34%	8%
Bury	16%	31%	33%	7%
Maidstone	14%	31%	34%	6%
Cheshire West and Chester	15%	31%	34%	6%
Tandridge	10%	31%	37%	4%
Tameside	16%	31%	33%	8%
North Norfolk	14%	31%	37%	5%
Cannock Chase	15%	31%	35%	7%
Amber Valley	15%	31%	35%	6%
New Forest	15%	30%	33%	4%
Redbridge	16%	30%	33%	9%
Midlothian	14%	30%	32%	6%
Aylesbury Vale	15%	30%	36%	5%
East Hampshire	6%	30%	34%	4%
Milton Keynes	13%	30%	34%	7%
West Lancashire	16%	30%	34%	7%
South Staffordshire	15%	30%	34%	6%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Winchester	8%	30%	38%	4%
Colchester	13%	30%	34%	6%
Fareham	11%	30%	34%	4%
Kettering	13%	30%	30%	6%
Arun	16%	30%	33%	5%
Corby	12%	30%	32%	8%
Maldon	6%	30%	31%	5%
Waveney	16%	30%	34%	8%
Darlington	13%	30%	32%	9%
Daventry	12%	30%	31%	5%
Cherwell	9%	30%	36%	4%
Gravesham	14%	30%	32%	8%
Hart	7%	30%	36%	3%
South Northamptonshire	4%	30%	38%	3%
North Warwickshire	6%	30%	31%	5%
Shropshire	15%	30%	33%	5%
Cheshire East	15%	30%	33%	5%
Erewash	14%	30%	31%	7%
Brighton and Hove	15%	30%	33%	7%
Croydon	15%	30%	32%	9%
Southend-on-Sea	14%	30%	33%	7%
Hillingdon	15%	30%	32%	7%
Shepway	13%	29%	31%	7%
Basildon	14%	29%	30%	7%
Wigan	15%	29%	33%	8%
Malvern Hills	5%	29%	34%	5%
Harlow	16%	29%	32%	8%
South Gloucestershire	12%	29%	33%	5%
East Dunbartonshire	15%	29%	31%	5%
Staffordshire Moorlands	10%	29%	33%	5%
Waverley	7%	29%	31%	4%
East Northamptonshire	12%	29%	29%	5%
Ashford	15%	29%	34%	6%
Oadby and Wigston	8%	29%	34%	6%
Wealden	10%	29%	28%	4%
Tamworth	12%	29%	33%	7%
Breckland	15%	29%	33%	6%
Newcastle-under-Lyme	12%	29%	32%	6%
Oxford	15%	29%	32%	5%
Flintshire	14%	29%	31%	6%
St Albans	8%	29%	30%	4%
Dacorum	13%	29%	32%	5%
Sutton	13%	29%	31%	6%
Windsor and Maidenhead	14%	29%	32%	4%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Bolton	14%	29%	31%	9%
East Devon	9%	29%	32%	4%
Wycombe	15%	29%	33%	6%
Oldham	13%	29%	32%	9%
Gedling	14%	29%	31%	7%
North Lincolnshire	14%	29%	31%	7%
Aberdeen City	15%	29%	31%	5%
Crawley	11%	29%	31%	6%
Gateshead	14%	29%	31%	9%
Rossendale	13%	29%	30%	7%
Basingstoke and Deane	14%	29%	35%	5%
Fylde	6%	29%	29%	5%
Sefton	14%	29%	31%	8%
Barking and Dagenham	13%	29%	31%	12%
Cambridge	11%	28%	30%	5%
Rochdale	12%	28%	31%	10%
Newark and Sherwood	15%	28%	31%	6%
Surrey Heath	13%	28%	34%	4%
Watford	10%	28%	32%	5%
Coventry	14%	28%	31%	9%
South Ribble	15%	28%	33%	5%
Rugby	9%	28%	30%	5%
Medway	13%	28%	31%	9%
West Lothian	15%	28%	30%	7%
Redcar and Cleveland	14%	28%	30%	11%
Scottish Borders	15%	28%	32%	5%
South Somerset	11%	28%	30%	5%
Stratford-on-Avon	7%	28%	31%	3%
Reading	12%	28%	33%	6%
Bassetlaw	13%	28%	31%	7%
Boston	11%	28%	31%	6%
Waltham Forest	13%	28%	30%	10%
East Cambridgeshire	8%	28%	35%	5%
Herefordshire, County of	11%	28%	31%	5%
West Lindsey	15%	28%	29%	7%
Bolsover	12%	28%	32%	7%
Plymouth	13%	28%	30%	8%
Conwy	14%	28%	31%	6%
Worcester	13%	27%	31%	6%
Central Bedfordshire	13%	27%	31%	5%
Rushmoor	10%	27%	30%	6%
Rother	10%	27%	29%	6%
East Renfrewshire	10%	27%	29%	5%
Uttlesford	9%	27%	35%	3%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
North East Derbyshire	15%	27%	32%	6%
Three Rivers	4%	27%	30%	5%
Wiltshire	13%	27%	30%	5%
Bexley	12%	27%	28%	7%
Dudley	12%	27%	29%	9%
Norwich	13%	27%	29%	9%
Charnwood	14%	27%	31%	6%
Hambleton	5%	27%	29%	4%
Carlisle	13%	27%	31%	5%
North West Leicestershire	8%	27%	28%	6%
Bromsgrove	10%	27%	29%	5%
Newcastle upon Tyne	13%	27%	29%	10%
Wyre Forest	12%	27%	29%	6%
Kirklees	13%	27%	30%	8%
Telford and Wrekin	13%	27%	30%	8%
East Staffordshire	9%	27%	27%	5%
Bath and North East Somerset				
Somerset	11%	27%	30%	5%
Mid Devon	4%	27%	30%	4%
Doncaster	12%	27%	29%	10%
West Berkshire	10%	27%	29%	4%
Mansfield	12%	27%	28%	9%
Lancaster	13%	27%	30%	7%
Swindon	12%	27%	28%	6%
Slough	12%	27%	31%	8%
Mendip	6%	26%	33%	5%
Teignbridge	8%	26%	32%	5%
Blaby	12%	26%	32%	5%
St. Helens	13%	26%	29%	9%
Stoke-on-Trent	12%	26%	30%	9%
Knowsley	12%	26%	29%	11%
Northumberland	12%	26%	29%	7%
Derby	13%	26%	29%	8%
Bromley	13%	26%	29%	6%
Southwark	13%	26%	29%	10%
Barnsley	12%	26%	29%	9%
West Dorset	2%	26%	28%	3%
Ashfield	13%	26%	28%	8%
Copeland	11%	26%	29%	7%
Warwick	10%	26%	26%	4%
Harborough	6%	26%	31%	4%
Sunderland	12%	26%	28%	10%
Torridge	7%	26%	27%	6%
Haringey	14%	26%	29%	10%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Ealing	13%	26%	30%	9%
South Derbyshire	12%	26%	25%	5%
Enfield	13%	26%	29%	10%
Salford	12%	26%	29%	10%
Northampton	13%	26%	28%	7%
Allerdale	14%	26%	29%	7%
Stirling	11%	26%	30%	7%
Harrow	14%	26%	28%	7%
County Durham	12%	26%	28%	9%
Bedford	13%	26%	28%	7%
East Riding of Yorkshire	11%	26%	27%	6%
South Tyneside	11%	26%	27%	11%
Lincoln	12%	26%	27%	9%
Havant	12%	26%	29%	7%
Brent	12%	26%	27%	9%
Merton	12%	26%	29%	7%
Wyre	11%	26%	26%	5%
Nuneaton and Bedworth	15%	26%	27%	7%
Taunton Deane	9%	26%	29%	5%
Nottingham	13%	26%	27%	12%
Gwynedd	13%	25%	27%	6%
Manchester	12%	25%	28%	11%
South Lanarkshire	12%	25%	27%	7%
Greenwich	11%	25%	28%	10%
East Lindsey	13%	25%	27%	7%
Sandwell	12%	25%	28%	11%
Derbyshire Dales	7%	25%	32%	4%
Sedgemoor	13%	25%	30%	6%
Hounslow	13%	25%	28%	7%
Hammersmith and Fulham	11%	25%	27%	8%
Hartlepool	12%	25%	28%	13%
Wrexham	13%	25%	28%	7%
Rotherham	12%	25%	28%	10%
Swale	14%	25%	28%	8%
Wellingborough	10%	25%	27%	7%
Wirral	12%	25%	28%	8%
Sheffield	11%	25%	28%	9%
Birmingham	12%	25%	27%	13%
Exeter	10%	25%	29%	6%
Guildford	5%	25%	28%	5%
Hertsmere	9%	25%	29%	5%
Pembrokeshire	12%	25%	29%	7%
Poole	12%	25%	29%	5%
Cornwall	12%	25%	28%	6%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Liverpool	12%	25%	27%	11%
Stockton-on-Tees	11%	25%	27%	9%
High Peak	9%	25%	30%	6%
Edinburgh, City of	13%	25%	27%	6%
Tower Hamlets	11%	25%	27%	11%
Peterborough	11%	25%	27%	8%
South Hams	4%	25%	33%	4%
Bradford	12%	25%	27%	10%
Ipswich	11%	25%	28%	8%
Luton	11%	25%	27%	9%
Torbay	10%	25%	27%	8%
Southampton	11%	25%	26%	7%
Walsall	11%	24%	26%	10%
Leicester	11%	24%	28%	12%
Selby	9%	24%	27%	5%
Lambeth	11%	24%	27%	9%
Denbighshire	9%	24%	28%	7%
Eastbourne	10%	24%	26%	7%
South Lakeland	2%	24%	28%	3%
North Lanarkshire	12%	24%	27%	10%
Thanet	12%	24%	26%	11%
Islington	12%	24%	27%	9%
Gloucester	8%	24%	26%	7%
Great Yarmouth	11%	24%	27%	9%
Perth and Kinross	12%	24%	29%	5%
Hyndburn	13%	24%	23%	7%
Hackney	11%	24%	26%	10%
Gosport	10%	24%	27%	6%
Chesterfield	12%	24%	31%	8%
Mole Valley	7%	24%	26%	4%
Leeds	11%	24%	27%	9%
Camden	12%	24%	26%	8%
Angus	11%	24%	27%	6%
Halton	12%	24%	28%	9%
South Bucks	4%	24%	31%	4%
North Ayrshire	12%	24%	26%	11%
Bridgend	11%	24%	26%	7%
Barnet	11%	24%	27%	7%
Newham	11%	24%	26%	11%
North Dorset	1%	24%	31%	3%
Barrow-in-Furness	10%	24%	26%	8%
Redditch	8%	24%	27%	6%
Weymouth and Portland	7%	24%	25%	6%
Wandsworth	12%	24%	27%	6%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Ceredigion	3%	24%	27%	5%
West Devon	4%	24%	33%	4%
Glasgow City	12%	24%	25%	11%
Kensington and Chelsea	11%	23%	27%	7%
Middlesbrough	10%	23%	26%	14%
Lewisham	11%	23%	27%	9%
Hastings	11%	23%	27%	9%
Powys	9%	23%	25%	5%
Monmouthshire	7%	23%	24%	5%
Burnley	10%	23%	25%	9%
Calderdale	10%	23%	25%	8%
South Ayrshire	12%	23%	26%	8%
Wakefield	10%	23%	26%	9%
Pendle	9%	23%	25%	8%
York	10%	23%	24%	5%
Preston	10%	23%	26%	7%
Fife	11%	23%	25%	8%
Caerphilly	9%	23%	25%	9%
The Vale of Glamorgan	11%	23%	27%	7%
Wolverhampton	11%	23%	25%	12%
Newport	10%	23%	24%	9%
Melton	0%	23%	27%	4%
Elmbridge	6%	23%	24%	4%
North Somerset	10%	23%	27%	6%
North East Lincolnshire	10%	22%	23%	11%
East Ayrshire	11%	22%	24%	10%
Swansea	10%	22%	26%	8%
Renfrewshire	11%	22%	25%	8%
Dumfries and Galloway	12%	22%	26%	7%
Isle of Anglesey	9%	22%	25%	7%
Cardiff	9%	22%	24%	9%
Aberdeenshire	9%	22%	27%	3%
Bristol, City of	9%	22%	24%	7%
Rhondda, Cynon, Taff	9%	22%	25%	10%
Falkirk	11%	22%	24%	8%
Scarborough	8%	22%	25%	8%
Merthyr Tydfil	10%	22%	26%	10%
Torfaen	10%	22%	23%	10%
Isle of Wight	10%	21%	23%	8%
Highland	10%	21%	23%	5%
Harrogate	5%	21%	22%	4%
Cotswold	2%	21%	24%	4%
West Dunbartonshire	9%	21%	25%	10%
Forest of Dean	5%	21%	26%	6%

	12-month outcomes	2-year outcomes	Overall outcomes	Unemployment rate
Clackmannanshire	9%	21%	21%	9%
Kingston upon Thames	10%	21%	27%	6%
Inverclyde	11%	21%	23%	9%
Portsmouth	9%	21%	23%	7%
Richmond upon Thames	10%	21%	24%	5%
Cheltenham	9%	21%	24%	6%
Argyll and Bute	7%	21%	22%	6%
Carmarthenshire	10%	21%	24%	7%
Blackpool	9%	21%	23%	9%
Spelthorne	6%	21%	25%	4%
Ryedale	2%	20%	21%	4%
Kingston upon Hull, City of	9%	20%	23%	14%
Tewkesbury	4%	20%	27%	5%
Blackburn with Darwen	9%	20%	24%	9%
East Dorset	2%	20%	29%	3%
West Somerset	4%	20%	23%	5%
Bournemouth	9%	20%	23%	6%
Blaenau Gwent	8%	20%	23%	13%
Neath Port Talbot	9%	20%	22%	8%
North Devon	3%	20%	24%	5%
Richmondshire	0%	20%	27%	4%
Westminster	9%	19%	22%	7%
Runnymede	3%	19%	26%	4%
Eden	0%	19%	26%	3%
Epsom and Ewell	3%	18%	26%	4%
Dundee City	7%	17%	21%	10%
Craven	0%	16%	38%	5%
Christchurch	2%	13%	18%	5%
Ribble Valley	0%	11%	23%	4%
Shetland Islands	0%	10%	10%	3%
Eilean Siar	2%	10%	13%	6%
Purbeck	2%	10%	17%	4%