

Work and Pensions Committee

Employment support for disabled people: Connect to Work

First Report of Session 2026–27

HC 77

Work and Pensions Committee

The Work and Pensions Committee is appointed by the House of Commons to examine the expenditure, administration, and policy of the Department for Work and Pensions and its associated public bodies.

Current membership

[Debbie Abrahams](#) (Labour; Oldham East and Saddleworth) (Chair)

[Rushanara Ali](#) (Labour; Bethnal Green and Stepney)

[David Baines](#) (Labour; St Helens North)

[Lee Barron](#) (Labour; Corby and East Northamptonshire)

[Johanna Baxter](#) (Labour; Paisley and Renfrewshire South)

[Mr Peter Bedford](#) (Conservative; Mid Leicestershire)

[Steve Darling](#) (Liberal Democrat; Torbay)

[Damien Egan](#) (Labour; Bristol North East)

[Amanda Hack](#) (Labour; North West Leicestershire)

[John Milne](#) (Liberal Democrat; Horsham)

[Joy Morrissey](#) (Conservative; Beaconsfield)

Powers

The Committee is one of the departmental select committees, the powers of which are set out in House of Commons Standing Orders, principally in SO No. 152. These are available on the internet via www.parliament.uk.

Contents

	Summary	1
1	Introduction	3
	Background	3
	Our inquiry	3
2	Programme design	5
	Design	5
	The supported employment model	6
	The role of values	8
	Evolution of employment support	9
3	Commissioning and implementation	12
	The commissioning model	12
	Evaluation	13
	Programme implementation	15
	Delivery plans	15
	DWP support	18
	Skilled workforce capacity	20
	Integration with local services	22
	WorkWell	24
4	Funding	26
	Programme funding	26
	Funding allocation progress	26
	Reduction in funding for employment programmes	27
	Long-term funding	29
	Transition from Work and Health Programme Pioneer	30

Conclusions and recommendations	32
Formal Minutes	37
Witnesses	38
Published written evidence	40
List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament	45

Summary

Connect to Work, launched in October 2024, forms an important part of the government's approach to reducing health-related economic inactivity. Centrally funded and delivered by local authorities, the programme is intended to support up to 300,000 people over the next five years into sustained employment, with a clear focus on disabled people and those with long-term health conditions who face complex barriers to work and have too often been overlooked by existing employment support.

We welcome Connect to Work. There is strong evidence that well-designed national employment support programmes are effective, and our commissioned research highlights the impact of supported employment approaches and the value of strengthening provision. Connect to Work represents a positive evolution, building on what has worked before and taking it further. Its voluntary nature and grounding in well-established supported employment models give it a solid foundation. Its national scale and flexibility to deliver services locally offers real potential to provide more tailored, accessible and effective support and stronger coordination across local services.

Early implementation has proven more challenging than anticipated. The government has acknowledged these initial difficulties and taken steps to improve delivery. However, issues related to administrative complexity, inconsistent guidance and variable operational support from DWP have continued. This has placed additional pressure on local authorities and providers and introduced early friction, creating uncertainty about consistency and quality. The success of Connect to Work will depend not only on its design, but on the effectiveness of central systems, digital infrastructure and assurance processes. We expect DWP to continue strengthening these areas to ensure local delivery is fully and reliably supported.

Local authorities have shown strong engagement and growing confidence in rolling out the programme. However, concerns remain about workforce capacity and access to specialist skills, underlining the need for a clearer and more coordinated approach to workforce planning and development.

More broadly, mixed public messages on funding and the long-term commitment to the programme risks undermining confidence across the system. Recent spending forecasts and potential gaps between programmes do not yet fully align with the stated ambition to increase disability employment and may slow momentum at a critical point.

A clearer and sustained commitment to Connect to Work, extending beyond the current Spending Review period, would provide greater certainty across the system and give participants clearer assurance about the stability of support, which is critical to building trust and sustaining engagement.

1 Introduction

Background

1. The government has set out measures to reduce health-related economic inactivity. As part of this, in October 2024, it announced the rollout of Connect to Work (CtW), an employment support programme aimed primarily at disabled people and those with long-term health conditions. Over five years, CtW aims to support up to 300,000 economically inactive people into sustained employment and to assist individuals at risk of falling out of work.¹
2. CtW is funded by the UK government, and is projected to cost £1.23 billion between 2023 and 2032. It is coordinated by the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP), and is being delivered by local authorities across 43 clusters in England and four clusters in Wales.² In Scotland and Northern Ireland, where powers and responsibilities for employment support have been devolved, local authorities deliver their own equivalent programmes.³

Our inquiry

3. We launched our inquiry, Employment support for disabled people, on 16 July 2025, the same day that we agreed our report *Get Britain Working: Pathways to Work*.⁴ That report questioned whether the government's ambitions to reform the incapacity benefit system could be achieved without removing barriers to people engaging with the available employment support and being supported into work and by improving trust in the system.⁵

1 Department for Work and Pensions, [29 January 2026: Connect to Work - Programme Business Case 1 Summary](#), 29 January 2026

2 [Connect to Work](#), PQ 17192, 2 December 2024; Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work](#), 27 February 2025

3 In Scotland, employment support is provided through No One Left Behind. Scottish Government, [No One Left Behind Employability Strategic Plan 2024–27](#), 2024; In Northern Ireland, employment support is offered through Labour Market Partnerships (LMPs) Department for Communities, [Hargey launches innovative employment scheme](#), 24 February 2022

4 Work and Pensions Committee, [MPs launch new inquiry to address disability employment gap Parliament](#), 16 July 2025 (accessed 20 May 2026)

5 Work and Pensions Committee, Third Report of Session 2024–25, [Get Britain Working: Pathways to work](#), HC 837, para 36

4. For this inquiry we published 113 pieces of written evidence. We also received submissions that we took into account, but chose not to publish because they contained personal information.
5. When the inquiry began, CtW was at an early stage of its national rollout, with service delivery still developing in many geographic areas. Much of the evidence received reflected initial expectations, often informed by experience of earlier programmes. Since then, the rollout has progressed significantly and is now approaching completion, with the programme operating across a wider range of local areas. In December 2025 we invited written evidence from local authorities with direct experience of delivery, which provided further insight into how the programme was operating.
6. We held three oral evidence sessions. In November 2025, we heard from disabled people and their representatives, as well as employer groups. In December 2025, we took evidence from academics and providers of employment support, focusing on CtW. Finally, in February 2026, we heard from local authorities delivering CtW and other employment support programmes, followed by the Minister for Employment, Rt Hon. Dame Diana Johnson MP and DWP officials. We also held two roundtables, one online and one in person in Durham, where we heard from disabled people about their experiences of employment support.⁶ We are grateful to all those who contributed to our inquiry.
7. The evidence we received highlighted many factors contributing to the persistent disability employment gap (DEG),⁷ and we have divided these into three separate reports: this report on Connect to Work, the government's new employment support programme; *Disability at Work*, which was published on 21 May 2026;⁸ and Access to Work, which we plan to scrutinise more deeply and report on in due course.⁹

6 Work and Pensions Committee, Seventh Report of Session 2024–26, [Employment support for disabled people: Disability at Work](#), HC 1227, Annex

7 DEG is the difference between the employment rate of disabled people and that of nondisabled people

8 Work and Pensions Committee, Seventh Report of Session 2024–26, [Employment support for disabled people: Disability at Work](#), HC 1227

9 Department for Work and Pensions, [Government Response to the Pathways to Work Consultation](#), October 2025

2 Programme design

Design

8. Connect to Work (CtW) aims to primarily support people currently outside the workforce who want to enter employment but face complex barriers to get into work and to stay in work. Angus Gray, Policy Director, DWP, explained that it is an entirely voluntary programme.¹⁰ CtW has a particular focus on disabled people and those with long-term health conditions, as well as certain other disadvantaged groups, such as ex-offenders, carers and people experiencing homelessness. Local authorities have the flexibility to shape provision around priority groups to address what is needed in that location.¹¹ The programme is not intended to replace all employment support provision or meet the needs of every disabled person. For example, it might not be suitable for individuals whose circumstances require sustained or continuous intervention.¹²
9. The design of CtW was welcomed by stakeholders. Written evidence strongly underlined the importance of the voluntary approach for the success of this programme and disability employment programmes more widely, with the Campaign for Disability Justice and Inclusion Barnet charity noting that voluntary participation “is the only way to build trust and positivity.”¹³ Industry witnesses from the employment and skills sector told us that the programme was designed to support those who were the easiest to exclude and ignore, who have not had provision up until now.¹⁴ Local authorities told us that it allowed services to be delivered in a way that

10 [Q135](#)

11 Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work. Grant guidance for England](#), 26 November 2024

12 Education Development Trust ([ESD0013](#)), The British Association for Supported Employment ([ESD0075](#)), CIPD ([ESD0039](#)), The Growth Company ([ESD0053](#)), Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#)), Mental Health UK ([ESD0057](#))

13 Campaign for Disability Justice and Inclusion Barnet ([ESD0062](#)), Inspired Community Enterprise Trust Ltd ([ESD0078](#)), Mind ([ESD0052](#)), ENABLE ([ESD0025](#))

14 [Q110](#) (Laura Davies), The Growth Company ([ESD0053](#)), Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#))

reflected local needs, to maintain strong local oversight, and to provide tailored support through inclusive referral routes, helping ensure eligible people could access a high-quality service and meaningful opportunities.¹⁵

10. CONCLUSION

We welcome the focus of Connect to Work on ensuring support is targeted at people who are currently out of paid employment and face the greatest barriers to employment, particularly disabled people and those with long-term health conditions. The evidence we have received suggests that its voluntary nature and eligibility framework will enable local authorities to shape provision around local priorities, while appropriate oversight is maintained by DWP at national level.

The supported employment model

11. All support delivered through CtW must align with one of two internationally recognised quality standards:

- Individual Placement and Support (IPS) – an evidence-based model of supported employment that integrates employment support with health services, enabling people whose health affects their ability to work to move quickly into paid employment with tailored, ongoing support. It is clinically integrated within secondary mental health services and primarily supports people with severe and enduring mental illness as part of their treatment and recovery;¹⁶ and
- Supported Employment Quality Framework (SEQF) – a non-clinical approach typically involving more intensive, regular contact with a dedicated practitioner who provides day-to-day employment support to participants. It is commonly used with autistic adults and those with learning disabilities, and others with complex needs, and is widely used within local supported employment services to support consistent, person-centred practice.¹⁷

¹⁵ Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England, 27 February 2025](#), Annex B; South Midlands Authorities ([ESD0126](#)), Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#)), Suffolk County Council ([ESD0121](#))

¹⁶ NHS England, [Individual placement and support for severe mental illness](#), 23 May 2023, (accessed 20 April 2026); Royal College of Psychiatrists, [Individual Placement and Support: Competence Framework and Curriculum](#) (accessed 14 May 2026)

¹⁷ The British Association for Supported Employment, [Home - BASE](#), (Accessed 3 June 2026)

Local areas are expected to offer both approaches, with national planning based on an indicative split of around 75% IPS and 25% SEQF, though this may vary locally.¹⁸

12. Stakeholders told us the supported employment models were underpinned by strong evidence.¹⁹ Enable Works, the largest employment support provider in Scotland, reported sustainment rates of 76% at 12 months for supported employment programmes and 88% at 12 months for IPS, almost twice the national average.²⁰ While there is no single internationally agreed model of supported employment, a substantial body of evaluation, policy and research evidence points to clear patterns in what works. Among other things, it shows that supported employment is most effective when it is delivered consistently across all the five stages of the process,²¹ rather than through partial, fragmented, or non-staged approaches.²²
13. Beyond the evidence on labour market outcomes, a body of research has examined the broader effects of supported employment for disabled people. A 2024 review of 13 qualitative studies found that supported employment approaches helped disabled people not only into jobs but also to build confidence, skills, wellbeing and independence, with outcomes dependent on the programme design, the support provided by advisers and workplace conditions. It argued that future research should measure these wider benefits, as most existing studies focus too narrowly on job outcomes and miss the full impact and longterm value of supported employment.²³

18 Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), updated 27 February 2025

19 Department for Work and Pensions, [29 January 2026: Connect to Work - Programme Business Case 1 Summary](#), 29 January 2026; CIPD ([ESD0039](#)), The British Association for Supported Employment ([ESD0075](#)), Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#)), ENABLE ([ESD0025](#))

20 Department for Work and Pensions, [29 January 2026: Connect to Work - Programme Business Case 1 Summary](#), 29 January 2026; CIPD ([ESD0039](#)), The British Association for Supported Employment ([ESD0075](#)), The British Association for Supported Employment ([ESD0075](#)), ENABLE ([ESD0025](#)), The Growth Company ([ESD0053](#))

21 The programme follows five stages of the supported employment model: engagement, vocational profiling, employer engagement, job matching and in-work support.

22 Sundermann, L.M., Haunberger, S., Gisler, F. and others. [How do supported employment programs work? Answers from a systematic literature review](#). Int J Educ Vocat Guidance 23, 2023, pp 659–679; CIPD ([ESD0039](#)), The British Association for Supported Employment ([ESD0075](#)), Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#)), ENABLE ([ESD0025](#)), [Q76](#) (Professor Adam Whitworth)

23 Susan Baxter, Jane Cullingworth, Adam Whitworth, Katherine Runswick-Cole, Mark Clowes, [Understanding interventions and outcomes in supported employment and individual placement support: A qualitative evidence synthesis](#), Disability and Health Journal, Volume 17, Issue 2, 2024

14. This perspective was reinforced by Professor Adam Whitworth, an academic with expertise in employment support, who told us about the findings from his recent trial on supported employment for people with a wide range of mental health conditions and barriers to work. He said IPS had “a very solid, international evidence base beyond severe mental illness”, with about 18 randomised control trials showing “very consistent and positive” outcomes for a range groups, although he said it was “not for everybody”:

That is why, rightly, Connect to Work has an SEQF fidelity model. For example, learning disabilities and autism has been tested occasionally with IPS, but it does not work or fit terribly well. SEQF is tailor-made there.

He concluded by saying that given the scale of CtW, careful matching of individuals to the most suitable model would be important to ensure the programme was effective.²⁴

The role of values

15. The values underpinning supported employment originate in the disability rights movement and early supported employment practice, which challenged long-held assumptions about who was considered employable and under what conditions. The British Association of Supported Employment (BASE)²⁵ said these values affirmed the principle that disabled people and people facing other barriers could and should have access to meaningful, paid employment on equal terms, supported by a “zero rejection” philosophy and personalised, long-term support.²⁶ Laura Davies, Chief Executive Officer, BASE, told us:

I am a strong believer that anybody can work with the right job and support. I fundamentally disagree with this idea that we have some people who are employable and some who are not.²⁷

She also stressed the importance of those delivering support having the right values:

For me, knowing disabled people is one thing, but having the right set of values that underpins a different way of working with people is more important. I can teach somebody disability awareness but I cannot teach them to have the right values.²⁸

24 [Q76](#)

25 The British Association for Supported Employment (BASE) is a national membership charity that promotes and supports the delivery of highquality supported employment

26 The British Association for Supported Employment, [Home - BASE](#), (Accessed 3 June 2026)

27 [Q88](#)

28 [Q88](#)

16. These values are grounded in the social model of disability, which understands disability as a result of social and structural barriers rather than individual impairment. This perspective reinforces the ethos behind supported employment: that exclusion from work stems not from individual capacity, but from systems and practices that do not adapt to people's diverse needs.²⁹ Accordingly, effective supported employment prioritises the removal of obstacles, the promotion of inclusion, and sustained, personalised support that enables people to develop and progress in their careers and participate fully in working life and wider society.

Evolution of employment support

17. Since the late 1990s, employment support for disabled people has gradually changed. The New Deal for Disabled People (NDDP) was an early move towards voluntary, tailored help to move into work and remain in employment.³⁰ Delivered through specialist providers and funded on a payment-by-result basis, it set the principles for the programmes that followed, including the Work and Health Programme (WHP) Pioneer, launched in September 2023 as a voluntary extension of the WHP.³¹ Aimed at economically inactive disabled people and others facing significant barriers to work, WHP Pioneer emphasised a 'place and train' approach, moving people quickly into appropriate jobs with ongoing in-work support.³² It drew on supported employment practices without mandating a single model and was delivered through centrally commissioned contracts using a mixed funding model of service fees and outcomebased payments for sustained employment.³³ Evaluations of these programmes consistently showed positive impacts, though the scale and durability of outcomes varied.³⁴

-
- 29 Parliamentary and Health Service Ombudsman, [Introduction to the Social and Medical Models of Disability](#), FDN-218144 (accessed 29 April 2029)
- 30 Bruce Stafford, [Supporting moves into work: New Deal for Disabled People findings](#), Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research, Vol 14 No 2, 2012, pp 165–176
- 31 Catherine Haddon, [Making Policy in Opposition: the Development of Universal Credit, 2005–10](#), Institute for Government, 2012; Department for Work and Pensions, [Work and Health Programme statistics](#), 17 December 2025
- 32 Department for Work and Pensions, [Work and Health Programme and Pioneer-Guidance_V29.0](#), 9 June 2025; Department for Work and Pensions [Work and Health Programme evaluation: synthesis report](#), 18 January 2024.
- 33 Department for Work and Pensions, [Work and Health Programme provider guidance chapter 13: Funding Model](#), updated 1 April 2026
- 34 Bruce Stafford with others, New Deal for Disabled People: Third synthesis report – key findings from the evaluation, DWP Research report No. 430, 2007, pp1–2; [Work Choice impact evaluation](#), (accessed 26 November 2025); Department for Work and Pensions, [Work and Health Programme statistics: background information and methodology](#), updated 29 February 2024

18. Building on earlier developments, CtW represents a further phase in the evolution of employment support, operating as a voluntary programme addressing economic inactivity among eligible individuals. It maintains an emphasis on personalised, voluntary support into and within work, while being based on defined supported employment models that apply a “place, train and maintain” approach, informed by experience from DWP-funded supported employment programmes.³⁵ In contrast to earlier provision, CtW moves away from payment-by-results, which was criticised for incentivising support for those closest to the labour market (‘creaming’), with funding provided through grants to local and combined authorities.³⁶
19. When we spoke to the panel of academics and policy professionals, Professor Benjamin Barr, an applied public health academic and expert in health inequalities, highlighted that employment support programmes are most effective when they are delivered by skilled, well-trained staff, build trusting relationships with participants, and are closely integrated with health and other support services.³⁷ He further emphasised that independent, evidence-based studies demonstrate that such well-designed employment support, delivered at scale, is effective and offers strong value for money.³⁸
20. The prominence given to CtW reflects its basis in validated, evidence-based supported employment models.³⁹ This is reinforced by a study we commissioned from a coalition of academic experts, which underlines the importance of the government’s focus on strengthening employment support. Their analysis used conservative assumptions based on previous government-evaluated programmes. The findings showed that enabling even 5% of over-25s who are economically inactive due to sickness or disability to return to work could generate significant fiscal benefits over the course of this Parliament.⁴⁰

35 These include Local Supported Employment (LSE) and Individual Placement and Support in Primary Care (IPSPC) and are based on the five stages of the supported employment model mentioned earlier

36 Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), updated 15 May 2026; [Q62](#) (Professor Adam Whitworth), [Q84](#) (Laura Davies), Bruce Stafford, [Supporting moves into work: New Deal for Disabled People findings](#), *Scandinavian Journal of Disability Research*, Vol 14 No 2, 2012, pp 165–176

37 [Q60](#)

38 [Q81](#)

39 Department for Work and Pensions, [29 January 2026: Connect to Work - Programme Business Case 1 Summary](#), 29 January 2026; CIPD ([ESD0039](#)), The British Association for Supported Employment ([ESD0075](#)), Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#)), ENABLE ([ESD0025](#))

40 Written evidence received for the Committee inquiry into Get Britain Working: Pathways to Work, Health Equity North ([PTW0030](#)), October 2025

21.

CONCLUSION

We welcome Connect to Work's solid foundations in internationally recognised supported employment models grounded in person-centred, values-based approaches, that are widely regarded as an effective framework for supporting disabled people into sustainable employment. The programme's scale, national coordination, and delivery at a local level puts it in a good position to provide more targeted support to those most in need.

3 Commissioning and implementation

The commissioning model

- 22.** CtW is commissioned and delivered locally across 47 delivery areas. In each area, delivery is led by an Accountable Body (AB).⁴¹ ABs receive DWP funding through grants and must have an approved delivery plan in place before commissioning and implementing the programme. Delivery plans set out how CtW will be delivered locally, including service design, commissioning arrangements and costings, and must align with regional services and priorities. Plans are subject to an iterative review process with DWP prior to approval and the issuing of a Grant Funding Agreement (GFA). This process is intended to ensure that both DWP and local areas are confident in the quality and readiness of CtW delivery.⁴²
- 23.** In the early stages of the programme's rollout, witnesses told us that while the flexibility built into CtW enabled delivery to better reflect local needs, it also carried risks if the process was not carefully managed.⁴³ Shaw Trust, a national charity and supported employment provider, warned that although CtW operated within a single national framework, the discretion given to ABs could result in significant variation between areas. It said that while DWP approval of delivery plans provided assurance at the proposal stage, it did not standardise commissioning or delivery models. This could lead to differing funding arrangements and service designs, creating uneven experiences for providers and participants and resulting in "a single brand but not a single, consistent programme."⁴⁴

⁴¹ The Connect to Work Grant Guidance defines the Accountable Body as the lead authority within a defined Delivery Area, responsible for acting as the grant recipient and for leading the implementation of Connect to Work across that area. A Delivery Area refers to the geographical area within which the Accountable Body is responsible for delivering the programme. There are 47 Delivery Areas in total, comprising 43 in England and 4 in Wales.

⁴² Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), 27 February 2025

⁴³ Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#))

⁴⁴ [Q85](#) (Richard Clifton)

24. BASE told us locally designed commissioning arrangements could favour larger, more generalist providers able to navigate complex frameworks and deliver at scale, over smaller, grassroots specialist organisations with expertise in supporting people furthest from the labour market. It said the latter, which had strong track records and established local relationships, were less likely to be commissioned in areas where ABs prioritised efficiency, simplicity, or fewer contracts.⁴⁵
25. Maximus UK, a national provider of employment support, said giving local areas greater freedom over commissioning and timelines risked slowing mobilisation and making it more difficult to deliver visible results. Gareth Parry, Managing Director, stressed that early delays were particularly problematic where funding was structured in short, time-limited cycles, as this reduced the period available to demonstrate impact. As a result, a slow start could lead to the programme being judged unsuccessful, not because it lacked merit, but because there was insufficient time to show its value.⁴⁶
26. When we put these concerns to the government, the Minister said the programme “fits with the direction of the Government in terms of devolution and devolving down to local areas to make decisions,” noting that there is currently “quite a patchwork of devolution, particularly in England”. The Minister argued that this approach would also respond to a long-standing criticism that the department has historically been overly centralised in its decisionmaking.⁴⁷

Evaluation

27. When we held our evidence session with the Minister, the lead official for the programme in DWP, Angus Gray, reflected on the risks associated with the commissioning model. He emphasised that the planned programme evaluation would be critical in assessing how different approaches operate in practice:

This is one of the things I am keen for the evaluation to draw out—whether there are any observable differences between the different [commissioning] models—because it is a feature, not a bug. We allowed local areas to decide how [they deliver the service].

45 BASE ([ESD0075](#)); Research highlights that large-scale commissioning and prime provider models can unintentionally exclude smaller, specialist organisations, despite their proven effectiveness in delivering personalised, community-based support. Learning and Work Institute, Evidence Review: [Employment support for people with disabilities and health conditions](#), July 2019; Local Government Association, [Mapping national employment and skills provision](#), University of Oxford

46 [Q85](#) (Gareth Parry)

47 [Q143](#) (Dame Diana Johnson)

He went on:

We might conclude that doing it on a micro-level or in some places where there are very few people was a mistake and you would have got better economies of scale, for example, had you done it at the whole accountable body level. I did not want to prejudge that because actually the opposite accusation is the one I have heard most often in my career. “DWP, you are a monolith. Why do you do it at such large scale? Why are you not more responsive to local?” So here we are being more responsive to local, but it is not a risk-free enterprise.⁴⁸

28. In follow-up correspondence in March 2026, the government explained that CtW would be overseen using detailed routine data collected by DWP to monitor performance, with key figures published regularly as official statistics. Each delivery area will also be independently reviewed to assess how closely local services follow the agreed delivery model and standards. Alongside this, a large national evaluation will examine how the programme operates, the outcomes it achieves, its longer-term impact and its value for money, using delivery plans, surveys, interviews and linked government employment and earnings data to understand what works best, for whom and in which circumstances. From the CtW evaluation, DWP expects to publish an early insights report in 2026, an interim report in 2026/27 and a final report in 2030/31.⁴⁹

29. **CONCLUSION**

We welcome the programme’s devolved design and recognise the government’s view that it appropriately balances national oversight with local flexibility. We are reassured that extensive performance monitoring is part of CtW, and that there is also a comprehensive evaluation programme built into CtW from the outset, providing a mechanism not just to monitor performance and inform learning, but to consider the wider outcomes of the programme. However, the evidence highlights clear risks, with variation in local commissioning and delivery likely to create inconsistent experiences for participants and providers and potentially weaken the programme’s overall impact. The programme’s success will therefore depend less on its design and more on how effectively accountable bodies implement it in practice. We intend to revisit this issue in one year to assess whether the department has achieved an appropriate balance between flexibility, consistency, and timely delivery.

48 [Q143](#)

49 Letter from the Minister of State for Work and Pensions to the Chair, regarding Connect to Work programme, [24 March 2026](#)

Programme implementation

30. The implementation of CtW is a multi-staged process that requires lead authorities to work closely with DWP throughout. This collaboration is necessary not only to develop and agree delivery plans ahead of rollout, but also following the signing of the GFA. For example, once areas are delivering the programme, they are expected to provide ongoing updates throughout implementation, including submitting the details of any appointed delivery partners.⁵⁰

Delivery plans

31. Stakeholders told us implementation had involved a period of learning and adaptation, as funding arrangements and delivery processes were developed and brought into operation. Suffolk County Council described the process for the allocation of funding as “thorough and robust”, but said “initially the DWP process was not as clear as hoped”, which it attributed to it being an early participant when “some mechanisms had not been finalised.”⁵¹ Shropshire Council said the comprehensive bidding process had at times been lengthy and demanding, but that DWP staff had been “consistently supportive, approachable, and willing to provide clarification whenever needed”.⁵²
32. We also received feedback from councils operating outside lead authority roles. A joint response from Richmond and Wandsworth Councils, which report to separate ABs but share an Integrated Care Board (ICB) geography,⁵³ said the main challenge had been “managing differing mobilisation periods and programme start dates in each borough,” but that DWP and Accountable Body colleagues had taken a pragmatic approach to supporting them, including by accepting a joint delivery timetable format for each sub-region.⁵⁴
33. Some local authorities experienced more substantial difficulties during the rollout process. Several reported that the delivery plan and approval processes were extended, complex and inconsistently managed by DWP,

50 Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work, Appendix A – Delivery Plan Guidance England](#), 26 November 2024

51 Suffolk County Council ([ESD0121](#))

52 Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#))

53 An Integrated Care Board (ICB) is a statutory NHS body responsible for planning, commissioning and managing NHS services for a defined geographical area. ICBs sit within Integrated Care Systems (ICSs) and work with local authorities, the voluntary sector and other partners to deliver more joined-up care.

54 Richmond and Wandsworth Councils ([ESD0123](#)); Richmond is a member of the South London Partnership, with the Croydon Council appointed as Accountable Body; Wandsworth is a member of the Central London Forward, with the City of London Corporation appointed to lead the programme.

with Hampshire County Council noting that the level of bureaucracy resembled that seen in earlier national funding programmes.⁵⁵ Other stakeholders noted that multiple approval stages involving different reviewers within the department often resulted in protracted timelines and repeated revisions. In one instance, the delivery plan had to be submitted to DWP seven times before receiving final approval.⁵⁶

34. Some stakeholders raised concerns about changes made to financial profiles, which set out how the total grant allocation would be phased over time, after submission of the Grant Cost Register.⁵⁷ They reported that departmental revisions required documents to be revisited and resubmitted, adding to delivery timelines and workload.⁵⁸ Others reported that DWP did not, from the outset, demonstrate a consistent understanding of its own processes for approving plans or the information required.⁵⁹ Additional requests for information, along with the introduction of new approaches by DWP, further extended the process beyond what local authorities had anticipated.⁶⁰ The South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority said:

The delivery plan submission process was protracted and administratively burdensome. Following submissions, there were extended periods of delay with key information and feedback provided to us at a late stage.⁶¹

Shropshire Council said the extensive DWP review process unintentionally gave the impression of limited confidence in local authorities, which “sometimes created the sense that there was limited trust in local authorities, despite our long track record of delivering complex programmes”.⁶²

35. When we raised these concerns, the government admitted that the early process had been “clunky and unsatisfactory”, but explained that it had introduced extensive oversight and assurance processes during commissioning to ensure that the programme was delivered as intended.⁶³ These requirements meant that local authorities had to produce detailed

55 Hampshire County Council ([ESD0128](#)), South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority ([ESD0125](#)), Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#)), Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#))

56 Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#))

57 The Grant Cost Register is a mandatory financial model that must be completed and submitted with the delivery plan.

58 Richmond and Wandsworth Councils ([ESD0123](#)), Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#))

59 Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#))

60 Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#)), Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#)), [ESD0124](#) (Portsmouth City Council), [ESD0125](#) (South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority), [ESD0127](#) (Essex County Council), [ESD0128](#) (Hampshire County Council)

61 South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority ([ESD0125](#))

62 Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#))

63 [Q140](#)

delivery plans and undergo expert assessments.⁶⁴ Angus Gray, Policy Director, DWP, said the programme had been funded on the basis of delivering a specific supported employment model with clearly defined features. To ensure consistency, DWP expected local authorities to follow this model, while recognising that some areas might wish to pursue alternative approaches. He said this constrained local flexibility and, for some early adopter areas, contributed to a more bureaucratic experience.⁶⁵

36. The government said it had taken steps to streamline the process, and noted that plans were now being approved far more quickly. Angus Gray also emphasised the intention to adopt a more collaborative approach with local authorities and “not treat them just like a provider, because they are on the same team.”⁶⁶ The Minister for Employment, reflecting on how the process had developed, told us:

It is fair to say that this is the first time the DWP has done it this way and it has been a learning process.⁶⁷

37. **CONCLUSION**

The early implementation of Connect to Work presented notable challenges as delivery arrangements were established. Some local authorities reported that extensive administrative requirements at the outset slowed progress and complicated early delivery. While the programme’s model appropriately requires robust assurance mechanisms, these could have been applied more efficiently. We welcome DWP’s acknowledgement of these early shortcomings and expect that its commitment to a more collaborative and streamlined approach will support more timely and effective implementation as the programme continues to be rolled out.

38. **RECOMMENDATION**

In response to our report, we ask that DWP provide an update on programme mobilisation, including the agreement of delivery plans and what steps it took to reduce delays, and set out what lessons it has learned that could be applied to the rollout of similar employment support programmes in the future.

64 Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#)), Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#)), Portsmouth City Council ([ESD0124](#)), South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority ([ESD0125](#)), Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#)), Hampshire County Council ([ESD0128](#))

65 [Q140](#)

66 [Q138](#)

67 [Q141](#) (Dame Diana Johnson)

DWP support

39. To support ABs with programme implementation, including help with the delivery plans preparation and approval,⁶⁸ DWP also provides assistance through designated Regional Engagement Leads (REL),⁶⁹ webinars and iterative feedback.
40. The evidence we received indicated that this support at times was inconsistent. Essex County Council told us the bidding process was underpinned by clear guidance, including a comprehensive, albeit extensive, suite of technical notes and webinars.⁷⁰ In contrast, Hampshire County Council reported that:

The webinars were poorly presented and presenters were unable to answer too many questions.⁷¹

41. Stakeholders echoed similar observations about the support provided by RELs. For example, a county council noted that at times their REL was unable to answer basic questions about documents on the online information platform and, in some cases, was unfamiliar with them. However, another reported a more positive experience, stating that:

the DWP response [to queries about guidance] has always been very efficient and we found our REL to be supportive and effective.

42. The evidence we received suggested that these inconsistencies in support were largely attributable to the evolving nature of the guidance.⁷² Stakeholders indicated that changes and updates to guidance created disruption across several stages of implementation, which in turn affected the consistency and quality of support provided.⁷³ For example, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority observed:

Guidance was changing through the process as DWP developed and learned from processes which caused delays needing to address different things all the time. [This] did have local delivery and financial implications.⁷⁴

68 Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), 27 February 2025

69 Regional Engagement Lead is defined as a DWP member of staff responsible for dedicated support to each Accountable Body throughout both implementation and delivery phases of Connect to Work. Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), 27 February 2025, Glossary

70 Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#))

71 Hampshire County Council ([ESD0128](#))

72 Richmond and Wandsworth Councils ([ESD0123](#)), Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#))

73 Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#)), Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#)), South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority ([ESD0125](#)), Hampshire County Council ([ESD0128](#))

74 South Midlands Authorities ([ESD0126](#))

43. Witnesses also highlighted some areas where DWP support could have been strengthened, particularly in relation to digital systems and the operational demands placed on local teams during early delivery. They told us that the need to rely on interim processes and navigate differing reporting requirements increased administrative demands during implementation, and in some cases there were practical limitations with national systems and templates, which constrained local delivery. Collectively, these factors contributed to workload pressures in the early stages of the programme and, at times, reduced capacity for frontline delivery.⁷⁵

44. **CONCLUSION**

Support from DWP during the launch of Connect to Work was not consistent across areas. Differences in the quality and clarity of guidance, levels of engagement from Regional Engagement Leads, and the readiness of digital systems created challenges in the early stages of implementation. While some accountable bodies reported positive experiences, others faced uncertainty and administrative burden. DWP was aware of these challenges prior to implementation and provided specialist support. However, it should have implemented a more proactive approach. Greater alignment of guidance, systems and support would have contributed to a smoother initial rollout and a more positive implementation experience.

45. **RECOMMENDATION**

DWP should outline how it intends to strengthen its operational processes to support a smoother operation of Connect to Work, including ensuring continuity in case management, updating the tools used for reviewing documentation, and reducing delays caused by slow or inconsistent checks. It should also explain how it will make better use of digital solutions to enable faster communication and clearer information flows with local authorities. Finally, it should set out how it will ensure consistent standards, with national oversight to address regional variation, particularly in areas with large disability employment gaps.

75 Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#)), Portsmouth City Council ([ESD0124](#)), South Midlands Authorities ([ESD0126](#)), South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority ([ESD0125](#))

Skilled workforce capacity

46. The CtW grant guidance makes it clear that attracting enough highly skilled staff “will be critical to the success of this programme” and places responsibility on ABs to build and maintain a shared understanding of the supported employment models among managers and frontline staff.⁷⁶ In October 2025, the government set out plans to place employment specialists within GP surgeries and mental health services as part of CtW. These frontline staff are intended to deliver employment support to small caseloads, working to supported employment standards and, where possible, maintaining continuity by supporting participants throughout their time on the programme.⁷⁷
47. When we took oral evidence in December 2025, witnesses emphasised that recruitment and retention of trained staff were significant risks for CtW and the wider sector. Commissioning delays were said to have driven experienced professionals out of employment support and forced smaller specialist providers to shut down, leading to the loss of valuable expertise.⁷⁸ Laura Davies specifically emphasised the importance of workforce skills and capacity to effective delivery.⁷⁹ She pointed to a wider skills gap in understanding the distinction between supported employment and employment support, warning that insufficient specialist capability risks excluding people with more complex needs.⁸⁰
48. Evidence from local authorities and regional stakeholders presented a mixed picture. Some expressed confidence in current provider capacity, with Suffolk County Council reporting “good capacity among external providers with IPS and SEQF experience”, Essex County Council stating that providers “have not reported recruitment problems for CtW to date”, and Shropshire Council indicating that “there are enough people with the necessary skills”.⁸¹ Others were more cautious, highlighting difficulties in securing sufficient IPS and SEQF expertise at scale. Central London Forward warned that “there are not enough experts in the field” and that securing enough staff with supported employment experience “may not be possible”, while the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority noted that although “the core skills

76 Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), updated 27 February 2025, para 113–114

77 Department for Work and Pensions, [Job advisers to be embedded in GP surgeries as tens of thousands more sick and disabled people offered help into work](#), 9 October 2025

78 [Q84](#) (Nicola Whiteman), [Q85](#) (Gareth Parry)

79 [Q85](#) (Laura Davies)

80 [Q110](#)

81 Suffolk County Council ([ESD0121](#)), Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#)), Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#))

and expertise are in place”, additional capacity and specialist capability would need to be developed, particularly to support disadvantaged groups.⁸²

49. In 2025, the government set out plans to expand a number of employment support programmes, including WorkWell,⁸³ alongside the ongoing development of CtW and other specialist employment initiatives. All of these rely on the recruitment and retention of a larger, skilled frontline workforce. The government acknowledged the growing demand for these services across the sector. Angus Gray, Policy Director, DWP, concluded that:

Whether it is in WorkWell, the work and health coach or employment advisers and talking therapies, whether it is the employment advisers who sit as part of the supported employment programme or whether it is work coaches in jobcentres, there is some difference in skill but there is also a core. It seems to me that we need to continue to invest, train and support them as a community and not poach between them.⁸⁴

50. **CONCLUSION**

Early feedback from local authorities demonstrated confidence in their ability to source, retrain and redeploy staff, demonstrating strong local engagement. However, there is some misalignment between the readiness reported by local authorities at a commissioning level and the experience of commissioned delivery providers, particularly regarding access to suitably experienced practitioners. While staffing capacity may appear sufficient overall, providers have reported challenges in recruiting and retaining staff with the specialist skills required to deliver the programme effectively.

51. **CONCLUSION**

The effectiveness of employment support depends on the quality and expertise of those delivering it. Despite a shared skill base across programmes, providers continue to face challenges in recruiting and retaining staff with specialist expertise, reflecting wider labour market pressures. While the government has recognised the need for continued investment and training, greater clarity on how workforce development will be coordinated and sustained would strengthen system-wide capacity and capability.

82 South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority ([ESD0125](#)), Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#))

83 See [para 59](#)

84 [Q164](#)

52.

RECOMMENDATION

In response to this report, DWP should outline what assessment it has made of workforce capacity for Connect to Work. This should include whether workforce planning is in place, whether it thinks there are enough appropriately trained people to deliver CtW in line with the supported employment models, how emerging capacity gaps will be identified, and whether there are plans to support local authorities to mitigate risks to the effective and consistent delivery of the programme.

Integration with local services

53. We were told local government had extensive experience of supporting residents into employment through a range of discretionary and devolved employment and skills services.⁸⁵ Local government plays a central role in delivering CtW and integrating it into the wider package of support, as the programme's design places significant responsibility on it to shape the form and structure of local provision. Witnesses told us that integrating CtW properly with broader local systems will be key to its success.⁸⁶ Richard Clifton, Chief Commercial Officer, Shaw Trust, told us:

If you get integration right within a local community, particularly with health but also with other community organisations, and you become trusted by the people you are supporting, you can make this programme really successful.⁸⁷

54. Local authorities that have implemented CtW highlighted its strong alignment with local priorities to reduce economic inactivity and tackle health-related employment barriers.⁸⁸ Hampshire County Council reflected this view, emphasising the need for closer integration between education, skills, employability provision and health services, with CtW identified as the key delivery mechanism.⁸⁹

85 Local Government Association, [Connect to Work: Top tips](#), 8 July 2025

86 [Q60](#) (Professor Ben Barr), [Q73](#) (Becci Newton, Professor Adam Whitworth), [Q112](#), [Q123](#) (David Lillicap), Suffolk County Council ([ESD0121](#)), Shropshire Council ([ESD0120](#)), Maximus ([ESD0104](#)), Mental Health Matters ([ESD0081](#)),

87 [Q86](#)

88 Hampshire County Council ([ESD0128](#)), South Midlands Authorities ([ESD0126](#)), Suffolk County Council ([ESD0121](#))

89 Hampshire County Council ([ESD0128](#))

55. The government also highlighted this focus on integration, explaining how CtW builds on lessons from related initiatives, such as implementing Individual Placement and Support models in primary care (IPSPC).⁹⁰ Angus Gray told us:

Particularly in implementation terms, we have learned a lot from that. We have been stressing through the delivery planning process the importance of the integration with other services locally, for example, because that is one of the things we really see [works].⁹¹

56. Stakeholders said the triaging of participants at the point of entry into the programme would be key to achieving integration, as it enables individuals to be directed toward the most suitable support pathway from the outset, based on their needs.⁹² For example, the West London Alliance, a formal partnership of seven London boroughs, explained how it triaged people to the most appropriate support:

[W]hen somebody sends us an expression of interest in having employment support, the first thing that would happen in any programme is a support worker would pick up the phone and call them. [...] We get 2,000 expressions of interest a month, so we have extracted that into a triage process that looks at whether it is most suitable for somebody to go on to WorkWell, Connect to Work or the trailblazer. In addition, we also run an IPS service for people in treatment for drug and alcohol addiction. We have worked for a long time with our IPS teams in secondary mental health [...] so where we get people who have severe and enduring mental illness, we can move them to there. That means that the individual gets a seamless view of all the employment support.⁹³

90 Individual Placement and Support in Primary Care (IPSPC) is an evidence-based employment support model embedded in GP and primary care teams that helps people with health conditions find and keep paid work aligned with their preferences.

91 [Q139](#)

92 Triage is the initial assessment of how local authorities and delivery partners, such as employment support providers, health and wellbeing services, housing organisations, voluntary sector bodies and training providers, put the programme's integrated design into practice; [Q88](#) (Laura Davies), [Q121](#) (David Lillicrap), Essex County Council ([ESD0127](#))

93 [Q121](#)

57.

CONCLUSION

The success of Connect to Work will depend on how effectively it is integrated with wider local systems. We are encouraged to see that the government recognises the importance of this approach. One of the most effective ways of supporting this integration in practice is robust triaging at the point of entry, helping to ensure participants are guided towards the most appropriate support, and experience a more joined-up system of employment assistance. This will require close collaboration between government departments to ensure local authorities have the joined-up support they need to put in place a comprehensive offer of employment support.

58.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the government sets out its assessment of the adequacy of the cross-government support being provided to local authorities to enable them to provide a comprehensive offer of employment support to those who need it in their local area.

WorkWell

59.

One service which CtW must be integrated with is WorkWell. This programme was first announced in the Spring Budget 2023 as a proposal to integrate employment and health support for people with health conditions. The pilot was formally launched in November 2023, setting up programmes across 15 areas in England, with delivery beginning in October 2024 and continuing in stages into early 2025.⁹⁴

60.

WorkWell is a voluntary, early intervention service that is delivered jointly by DWP and the Department of Health and Social Care (DHSC). It aims to support people to stay in work, return to work after sickness absence, or move closer to employment by addressing health related barriers at an early stage. The programme provides light-touch, multi-disciplinary support, which varies by area and may include physiotherapy, mental health interventions such as counselling, advice on workplace adjustments, and guidance on managing ongoing health conditions.

61.

The WorkWell programme is delivered through NHS Integrated Care Boards (ICBs) in partnership with local authorities, Jobcentre Plus and community organisations, together forming local WorkWell partnerships that design and deliver the programme in response to area-specific needs. Unlike CtW, which provides intensive, sustained supported employment for individuals with significant barriers to entering and remaining in work,

94 Gov.uk, [Employment support launched for over a million people](#), 16 November 2023

WorkWell focuses on prevention, early intervention and work retention. It aims to address emerging health-related barriers before more structured supported employment is required. Referrals into WorkWell can be made by employers, local services, primary care providers such as GPs, Jobcentre Plus, or through self-referral.⁹⁵

62. In January 2026, the government announced plans to expand the WorkWell programme nationally, linking it to efforts to reduce NHS waiting lists and address economic inactivity related to long-term sickness. While the expansion is intended to be delivered over the next three years, no formal timetable has been published setting out the rollout or delivery timescales for individual ICBs.⁹⁶

63. **CONCLUSION**

We support the national rollout of WorkWell. By strengthening coordination between health and employment services, WorkWell has the potential to support clearer pathways between programmes, including Connect to Work, and to contribute to wider system change. Effective arrangements for information sharing will be an important part of enabling this coordination; however, a lack of clarity on rollout timescales risks undermining effective local planning.

64. **RECOMMENDATION**

In response to this report DWP should clearly outline indicative delivery and rollout arrangements for WorkWell. This should include referral readiness and the point at which full delivery is expected in each Integrated Care Board (ICB), as well as how information will be shared between relevant partners, including local authorities, Jobcentre Plus and health services. This would improve national visibility of where WorkWell is operating and help ICBs embed the programme within their local plans. It would also support local authorities, Jobcentre Plus and other partners to align activity across the wider health and employment system, including Connect to Work.

95 Department for Work and Pensions, Department of Health and Social Care, [WorkWell prospectus: guidance for Local System Partnerships](#), 12 March 2026

96 Department for Work and Pensions, [Expansion of support scheme to help thousands of people back into work](#), 12 March 2026

4 Funding

Programme funding

65. The government reaffirmed its commitment to expanding employment support in September 2025, when it announced the wider rollout of the CtW programme. The expansion forms part of a £3.8 billion package aimed at helping around 300,000 people across England and Wales over a five-year period, contributing to the ambition of achieving an 80% employment rate.⁹⁷ CtW aims to support 100,000 people each year, which is a significant increase in scale compared to the WHP Pioneer programme, which had 27,000 people referred to it between September 2023 and September 2024, with 20,000 starting on the programme by the end of October 2024.⁹⁸
66. As outlined earlier, the department grants funds to Accountable Bodies to deliver the programme. CtW is projected to cost £1.23 billion between 2023 and 2032. In January 2026, the government published a summary of the programme's business case, setting out assumptions and its anticipated impacts over the coming years. It estimated that CtW would deliver £693 million in wider societal benefits, including savings and improvements to participant experience, and that the overall economic return would be around £2 for every £1 invested.⁹⁹

Funding allocation progress

67. Initially introduced across 15 areas in England, the programme's national expansion began with West London, which secured the first grant. This was followed by a series of further funding allocations to additional areas over the subsequent months.¹⁰⁰ In November 2025, the department's Permanent Secretary, Sir Peter Schofield, updated us on progress:

97 Department for Work and Pensions, [Thousands of sick and disabled people to get life-changing support into work](#), 4 September 2025

98 Department for Work and Pensions, [Work and Health Programme statistics to November 2024](#), 15 April 2025

99 Department for Work and Pensions, [29 January 2026: Connect to Work - Programme Business Case 1 Summary](#), 29 January 2026; Q138 (Dr Simon Marlow)

100 Department for Work and Pensions, [Rollout begins on new Employment Support programme with £40 million boost to West London](#), 9 April 2025, Department for Work and Pensions, [£100 million cash boost to help thousands into work across the country](#), 11 July 2025

The latest information is that we have announced that 23 of the 49 areas in total are now live. We have agreed funding for a further 30, so that accounts for £650 million of the total of £1 billion for the period up until 2030, and we are making good progress with the others. They should all be up and running well in advance of the next financial year.¹⁰¹

Reduction in funding for employment programmes

68. In February 2026, the government released the 2025/26 Supplementary Estimates, which showed a £79.8-million reduction in funding for employment programmes.¹⁰² When we sought further information on this reduction, the Permanent Secretary told us the delayed rollout of CtW was expected to lead to “lower overall spend over the life of the programme”, due to the department “not being able to carry forward budgets between financial years.”¹⁰³ This carrying forward of budgets is known as Budget Exchange.
69. The apparent decision not to pursue the option of a Budget Exchange has not been clearly justified.¹⁰⁴ Moreover, the position set out in the Permanent Secretary’s letter appears to differ slightly from the approach described in DWP’s programme grant guidance. While this guidance also confirms that underspends cannot be *automatically* transferred from one year to the next, it nonetheless invites Accountable Bodies with a clear plan for moving expenditure across financial years to raise this with DWP.¹⁰⁵
70. When we raised this with DWP, it informed us that in order to maintain the required robust and accurate forecasts, the projected expenditure for that year was reduced. At that point, two delivery areas for CtW had yet to submit draft delivery plans, and a further seven were still in the process of finalising theirs. The department further clarified the basis for this decision, stating

This reduction in the forecast spend reflected the funding delivery areas needed in 2025–26 based on the plans submitted by Delivery Areas and did not impact the ability of any Connect to Work delivery area to provide support to participants.¹⁰⁶

101 Oral evidence taken on 19 November 2025, [Q123](#) [Sir Peter Schofield]

102 HM Treasury, [Central Government Supply Estimates 2025–26 – Supplementary Estimates](#), HC 1676, February 2026

103 Letter from the Permanent Secretary to the Chair, regarding Supplementary Estimate 2025/26, [20 March 2026](#)

104 HM Treasury, [Consolidated Budgeting Guidance 2026–27](#), March 2026, pp. 20–22 (accessed 20 May 2026). The guidance states that these mechanisms are subject to HM Treasury approval and limits and sets out in detail the rules governing departments’ ability to carry forward budgets between financial years.

105 Ref 107, Department for Work and Pensions, [Connect to Work: Grant Guidance for England](#), 27 February 2025, para 145

106 Letter from the Permanent Secretary to the Chair, regarding Supplementary Estimate 2025/26, [20 March 2026](#)

71. DWP also informed us that, in mid-2025, it anticipated an underspend in the CtW budget and therefore invited delivery areas to request additional funding to expand the number of participants they could support in 2025–26. Sixteen accountable bodies submitted requests and were awarded further funding, which enabled support for around 2,300 more participants than had originally been planned for that financial year.
72. Despite this uplift, DWP still forecasts an overall underspend in respect of employment programmes at the end of 2025–26, reflecting the slower than expected rollout of CtW. Although it identified the likelihood of an underspend at an early stage, the extent to which subsequent decisions and actions were able to address this within the year is not clear.

73.

CONCLUSION

The funding profile for CtW exposes some rigidity in how departmental resources are being managed across financial years, particularly where delivery does not align with planned timelines. The indication that any unspent funding from delays to Connect to Work would not be carried forward into 2026–27 or kept within the programme raises concerns about how effectively the department is using its allocated budget. Moreover, this rigidity contrasts with the urgency expressed by ministers to move people into work and risks undermining those efforts. The Committee is concerned that the Department are not exploring all options to maximise and retain CtW funding reflecting this urgency and the need to scale up CtW support.

74.

RECOMMENDATION

In response to this report, the government should clearly set out how it has applied proportional and effective financial management to maximise the use of allocated resources across financial years. Additionally, this should include a detailed explanation of its consideration of Budget Exchange mechanisms, as well as the basis for its decisions where such options were not pursued.

Long-term funding

- 75.** The programme funding is allocated through the Spending Review process.¹⁰⁷ This includes £114 million already agreed for 2025–26 and £978 million allocated for 2026–29 through Spending Review 2025. The remaining £138 million for 2029–30 onwards will be considered in a future Spending Review, as it falls outside the current budgetary period.¹⁰⁸
- 76.** During our evidence session, the Minister for Employment reiterated that long-term funding commitments were constrained by the government’s budgeting framework, stating:
- Of course, we are bound by the fact that we have a spending review period. That is why the funding is as it is. The intention is [...] that the five years is what we are looking at but the funding is allocated on a three-year basis just because that is the way Government operates.¹⁰⁹
- 77.** Building on this explanation, Angus Gray, Policy Director, DWP, told us that the department had nevertheless:
- signed agreements for the full five years, even though DWP does not have a budget for the final year. I have had strong conversations with my finance director about the wisdom of that and obviously there are clauses that would enable that to be broken.¹¹⁰
- 78.** In written follow-up to that evidence session, the department reiterated that:
- [It] has agreed Grant Funding Agreements with Connect to Work delivery areas that cover funding to March 2030. These funding agreements have been agreed with areas on the basis of submitted delivery plans, which set out their planned monthly spend to the end of the programme in 2030.¹¹¹

107 This is the process through which HM Treasury sets multiyear budgets for government departments and allocates funding for public services

108 Department for Work and Pensions, [29 January 2026: Connect to Work - Programme Business Case 1 Summary](#), 29 January 2026

109 [Q142](#) (Dame Diana Johnson)

110 [Q142](#)

111 Letter from the Permanent Secretary to the Chair, regarding Supplementary Estimate 2025/26, [20 March 2026](#)

79.

CONCLUSION

We welcome DWP's intention to fund Connect to Work beyond the Spending Review period. It is encouraging that, as the programme was conceived from the outset as a multi-year intervention, early actions indicate a commitment to continuity. It is important that DWP maintains and strengthens this approach through firmer commitments, to give stakeholders greater confidence in the programme's future.

80.

RECOMMENDATION

The government should set out a clear commitment to the long-term future of the programme beyond the current Spending Review period. This should include a written statement of intent confirming that the programme is expected to continue, providing local authorities and delivery partners with the certainty they need to plan workforce, capacity and delivery structures with confidence.

Transition from Work and Health Programme Pioneer

81. CtW was launched on 4 September 2024, and the Work and Health Programme (WHP) Pioneer closed to new referrals on 30 September 2024.¹¹² We received a substantial body of evidence highlighting concerns about an emerging gap in support during 2025, when CtW was still in the early stages of implementation. Written submissions from October 2025 noted that, with the WHP Pioneer closed to new referrals and CtW operating in only a small number of local areas, there was not yet a consistent, nationwide system of specialist employment support for disabled people.¹¹³
82. In December 2025 service providers and sector specialists reinforced these concerns in oral evidence. While witnesses acknowledged that the WHP and CtW are intended to support different cohorts, they emphasised that there is a degree of overlap between the groups covered by each programme. They argued that the closure of the WHP Pioneer to new referrals meant that this overlap left some individuals without a clear route to support. Witnesses highlighted this as a weakness in government forward planning. Evidence from a partnership of seven London councils indicated that this gap could result in demand for Connect to Work exceeding its capacity.¹¹⁴

112 Department for Work and Pensions, [Work and Health Programme statistics: background information and methodology](#), 27 November 2025

113 Maximus ([ESD0104](#)), para 7; The Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) is the representative membership body for the employment support sector, Employment Related Services Association (ERSA) ([ESD0067](#)), para 38

114 [Q107](#) (Richard Clifton), [Q108](#) (Nicola Whiteman), Central London Forward ([ESD0122](#))

83. When we raised this concern in oral evidence, Angus Gray, DWP, said the government had known that ending the WHP would create gaps in support, but the decision had come down to “financial priorities and what we could afford to do.” He acknowledged the delay in rolling out CtW had contributed to a widening shortfall in provision. To address this issue, he said the government had extended local supported employment for people with learning disabilities and expanded some IPSPC provision. However, it had chosen not to extend the WHP Pioneer as its different operating model would have required a substantial and costly expansion rather than a short, incremental extension.¹¹⁵

84. CONCLUSION

We heard evidence that some areas experienced a gap in provision where referrals to the Work and Health Programme Pioneer ended before Connect to Work was fully mobilised. Although the two programmes serve different cohorts, the absence of both in some localities meant that residents in need of support were left with limited alternatives. While the government acknowledged that these gaps were anticipated and driven by financial constraints, we are not persuaded that a sufficient system wide assessment has been undertaken of the consequences for those affected.

85. RECOMMENDATION

In its response to this report, the government should set out clearly how individuals affected by gaps between the Work and Health Programme Pioneer and the rollout of Connect to Work will be supported going forward. This should include an explanation of how demand pressures on Connect to Work will be anticipated and managed as implementation continues, particularly in areas where alternative provision has been limited.

86. RECOMMENDATION

The DWP should improve its forward planning by using a systems-based approach to minimise the risk of gaps in provision and maintain continuity of support for people who need employment assistance. This includes planning programme transitions in a way that ensures individuals are not left with limited or no support options during periods of change, even where schemes serve different but overlapping cohorts. New programmes should be designed from the outset to enable smoother mobilisation, clearer sequencing and better-coordinated handover arrangements across services.

115 [Q146](#) (Angus Gray)

Conclusions and recommendations

Programme design

1. We welcome the focus of Connect to Work on ensuring support is targeted at people who are currently out of paid employment and face the greatest barriers to employment, particularly disabled people and those with long-term health conditions. The evidence we have received suggests that its voluntary nature and eligibility framework will enable local authorities to shape provision around local priorities, while appropriate oversight is maintained by DWP at national level. (Conclusion, Paragraph 10)
2. We welcome Connect to Work's solid foundations in internationally recognised supported employment models grounded in person-centred, values-based approaches, that are widely regarded as an effective framework for supporting disabled people into sustainable employment. The programme's scale, national coordination, and delivery at a local level puts it in a good position to provide more targeted support to those most in need. (Conclusion, Paragraph 21)

Commissioning and implementation

3. We welcome the programme's devolved design and recognise the government's view that it appropriately balances national oversight with local flexibility. We are reassured that extensive performance monitoring is part of CtW, and that there is also a comprehensive evaluation programme built into CtW from the outset, providing a mechanism not just to monitor performance and inform learning, but to consider the wider outcomes of the programme. However, the evidence highlights clear risks, with variation in local commissioning and delivery likely to create inconsistent experiences for participants and providers and potentially weaken the programme's overall impact. The programme's success will therefore depend less on its design and more on how effectively accountable bodies implement it in practice. We intend to revisit this issue in one year to assess whether the department has achieved an appropriate balance between flexibility, consistency, and timely delivery. (Conclusion, Paragraph 29)

4. The early implementation of Connect to Work presented notable challenges as delivery arrangements were established. Some local authorities reported that extensive administrative requirements at the outset slowed progress and complicated early delivery. While the programme's model appropriately requires robust assurance mechanisms, these could have been applied more efficiently. We welcome DWP's acknowledgement of these early shortcomings and expect that its commitment to a more collaborative and streamlined approach will support more timely and effective implementation as the programme continues to be rolled out. (Conclusion, Paragraph 37)
5. In response to our report, we ask that DWP provide an update on programme mobilisation, including the agreement of delivery plans and what steps it took to reduce delays, and set out what lessons it has learned that could be applied to the rollout of similar employment support programmes in the future. (Recommendation, Paragraph 38)
6. Support from DWP during the launch of Connect to Work was not consistent across areas. Differences in the quality and clarity of guidance, levels of engagement from Regional Engagement Leads, and the readiness of digital systems created challenges in the early stages of implementation. While some accountable bodies reported positive experiences, others faced uncertainty and administrative burden. DWP was aware of these challenges prior to implementation and provided specialist support. However, it should have implemented a more proactive approach. Greater alignment of guidance, systems and support would have contributed to a smoother initial rollout and a more positive implementation experience. (Conclusion, Paragraph 44)
7. DWP should outline how it intends to strengthen its operational processes to support a smoother operation of Connect to Work, including ensuring continuity in case management, updating the tools used for reviewing documentation, and reducing delays caused by slow or inconsistent checks. It should also explain how it will make better use of digital solutions to enable faster communication and clearer information flows with local authorities. Finally, it should set out how it will ensure consistent standards, with national oversight to address regional variation, particularly in areas with large disability employment gaps. (Recommendation, Paragraph 45)
8. Early feedback from local authorities demonstrated confidence in their ability to source, retrain and redeploy staff, demonstrating strong local engagement. However, there is some misalignment between the readiness reported by local authorities at a commissioning level and the experience of commissioned delivery providers, particularly regarding access to suitably experienced practitioners. While staffing capacity may appear sufficient

overall, providers have reported challenges in recruiting and retaining staff with the specialist skills required to deliver the programme effectively. (Conclusion, Paragraph 50)

9. The effectiveness of employment support depends on the quality and expertise of those delivering it. Despite a shared skill base across programmes, providers continue to face challenges in recruiting and retaining staff with specialist expertise, reflecting wider labour market pressures. While the government has recognised the need for continued investment and training, greater clarity on how workforce development will be coordinated and sustained would strengthen system-wide capacity and capability. (Conclusion, Paragraph 51)
10. In response to this report, DWP should outline what assessment it has made of workforce capacity for Connect to Work. This should include whether workforce planning is in place, whether it thinks there are enough appropriately trained people to deliver CtW in line with the supported employment models, how emerging capacity gaps will be identified, and whether there are plans to support local authorities to mitigate risks to the effective and consistent delivery of the programme. (Recommendation, Paragraph 52)
11. The success of Connect to Work will depend on how effectively it is integrated with wider local systems. We are encouraged to see that the government recognises the importance of this approach. One of the most effective ways of supporting this integration in practice is robust triaging at the point of entry, helping to ensure participants are guided towards the most appropriate support, and experience a more joined-up system of employment assistance. This will require close collaboration between government departments to ensure local authorities have the joined-up support they need to put in place a comprehensive offer of employment support. (Conclusion, Paragraph 57)
12. We recommend that the government sets out its assessment of the adequacy of the cross-government support being provided to local authorities to enable them to provide a comprehensive offer of employment support to those who need it in their local area. (Recommendation, Paragraph 58)
13. We support the national rollout of WorkWell. By strengthening coordination between health and employment services, WorkWell has the potential to support clearer pathways between programmes, including Connect to Work, and to contribute to wider system change. Effective arrangements for information sharing will be an important part of enabling this coordination; however, a lack of clarity on rollout timescales risks undermining effective local planning. (Conclusion, Paragraph 63)

- 14.** In response to this report DWP should clearly outline indicative delivery and rollout arrangements for WorkWell. This should include referral readiness and the point at which full delivery is expected in each Integrated Care Board (ICB), as well as how information will be shared between relevant partners, including local authorities, Jobcentre Plus and health services. This would improve national visibility of where WorkWell is operating and help ICBs embed the programme within their local plans. It would also support local authorities, Jobcentre Plus and other partners to align activity across the wider health and employment system, including Connect to Work. (Recommendation, Paragraph 64)

Funding

- 15.** The funding profile for CtW exposes some rigidity in how departmental resources are being managed across financial years, particularly where delivery does not align with planned timelines. The indication that any unspent funding from delays to Connect to Work would not be carried forward into 2026–27 or kept within the programme raises concerns about how effectively the department is using its allocated budget. Moreover, this rigidity contrasts with the urgency expressed by ministers to move people into work and risks undermining those efforts. The Committee is concerned that the Department are not exploring all options to maximise and retain CtW funding reflecting this urgency and the need to scale up CtW support. (Conclusion, Paragraph 73)
- 16.** In response to this report, the government should clearly set out how it has applied proportional and effective financial management to maximise the use of allocated resources across financial years. Additionally, this should include a detailed explanation of its consideration of Budget Exchange mechanisms, as well as the basis for its decisions where such options were not pursued. (Recommendation, Paragraph 74)
- 17.** We welcome DWP’s intention to fund Connect to Work beyond the Spending Review period. It is encouraging that, as the programme was conceived from the outset as a multi-year intervention, early actions indicate a commitment to continuity. It is important that DWP maintains and strengthens this approach through firmer commitments, to give stakeholders greater confidence in the programme’s future. (Conclusion, Paragraph 79)
- 18.** The government should set out a clear commitment to the long-term future of the programme beyond the current Spending Review period. This should include a written statement of intent confirming that the programme is

expected to continue, providing local authorities and delivery partners with the certainty they need to plan workforce, capacity and delivery structures with confidence. (Recommendation, Paragraph 80)

19. We heard evidence that some areas experienced a gap in provision where referrals to the Work and Health Programme Pioneer ended before Connect to Work was fully mobilised. Although the two programmes serve different cohorts, the absence of both in some localities meant that residents in need of support were left with limited alternatives. While the government acknowledged that these gaps were anticipated and driven by financial constraints, we are not persuaded that a sufficient system wide assessment has been undertaken of the consequences for those affected. (Conclusion, Paragraph 84)
20. In its response to this report, the government should set out clearly how individuals affected by gaps between the Work and Health Programme Pioneer and the rollout of Connect to Work will be supported going forward. This should include an explanation of how demand pressures on Connect to Work will be anticipated and managed as implementation continues, particularly in areas where alternative provision has been limited. (Recommendation, Paragraph 85)
21. The DWP should improve its forward planning by using a systems-based approach to minimise the risk of gaps in provision and maintain continuity of support for people who need employment assistance. This includes planning programme transitions in a way that ensures individuals are not left with limited or no support options during periods of change, even where schemes serve different but overlapping cohorts. New programmes should be designed from the outset to enable smoother mobilisation, clearer sequencing and better-coordinated handover arrangements across services. (Recommendation, Paragraph 86)

Formal Minutes

Wednesday 20 May 2026

Members present:

Debbie Abrahams, in the Chair

Rushanara Ali

Lee Barron

Johanna Baxter

Mr Peter Bedford

Steve Darling

Damien Egan

John Milne

Joy Morrissey

Employment Support for disabled people: Connect to Work

Draft Report (*Employment Support for disabled people: Connect to Work*), proposed by the Chair, brought up and read.

Ordered, That the draft Report be read a second time, paragraph by paragraph.

Paragraph 1 to 86 read and agreed to.

Summary agreed to.

Resolved, That the Report be the First Report of the Committee to the House.

Ordered, That the Chair make the Report to the House.

Ordered, That embargoed copies of the Report be made available (Standing Order No. 134)

Adjournment

Adjourned till Wednesday 3 June at 9.00 am

Witnesses

The following witnesses gave evidence. Transcripts can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Wednesday 12 November 2025

Michelle De Oude, Co-Chair, Greater Manchester Disabled People's Panel; **Conor D'Arcy**, Deputy Chief Executive, Money and Mental Health Policy Institute; **Evan John**, Policy and Public Affairs Advisor, Sense; **Geoff Fimister**, Head of Policy, and a spokesperson for the Campaign for Disability Justice, Inclusion Barnet [Q1–31](#)

Kate Nicholls OBE, Chair, UKHospitality; **Jamie Cater**, Senior Policy Manager, Make UK; **Patrick Milnes**, Head of Policy – People and Work, British Chambers of Commerce [Q32–49](#)

Wednesday 17 December 2025

Professor Benjamin Barr, Professor of Applied Public Health, University of Liverpool; **Becci Newton**, Director of Public Policy and Research, Institute for Employment Studies; **Professor Adam Whitworth**, Professor of Work, Employment and Organisation, University of Strathclyde, Glasgow; **Professor Bruce Stafford**, Emeritus Professor of Public Policy, University of Nottingham [Q50–81](#)

Laura Davis, CEO, British Association of Supported Employment; **Gareth Parry**, Managing Director, Maximus UK; **Nicola Whiteman**, Policy and Communications Manager, Papworth Trust; **Richard Clifton**, Managing Director – Employability and ERSA Board Member, Shaw Trust [Q82–110](#)

Wednesday 11 February 2026

David Lillicrap, Assistant Director Health and Employment Programmes, West London Alliance; **Ruth Cooper**, Economic Development Manager, Renfrewshire Council [Q111–132](#)

The Rt Hon. Dame Diana Johnson MP, Minister for Employment, Department for Work and Pensions; **Dr Simon Marlow**, Deputy Director, Joint Work and Health Directorate, Department for Work and Pensions;

Lorraine Jackson, Director, Joint Work and Health Directorate, Department of Health and Social Care; **Angus Gray**, Policy Director, Department for Work and Pensions [Q133-166](#)

Published written evidence

The following written evidence was received and can be viewed on the [inquiry publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

ESD numbers are generated by the evidence processing system and so may not be complete.

1	Access to Work Collective; and CIMR Birkbeck, University of London	ESD0016
2	Adam Smith Institute	ESD0111
3	Alcohol Change UK	ESD0009
4	Ambitious about Autism	ESD0087
5	Anonymised	ESD0032
6	Association of Disabled Professionals	ESD0069
7	Aston, Jane (Researcher & Director, Jane Aston Associates)	ESD0119
8	Autism East Midlands	ESD0055
9	British Assistive Technology Association (BATA)	ESD0097
10	British Chambers of Commerce	ESD0050
11	British Psychological Society	ESD0043
12	Business Disability Forum	ESD0091
13	Buziuk, Mr Hleb (UK immigration adviser (IAA Level 3) and human-rights advocate, FairGo CIC)	ESD0072
14	CIPD	ESD0039
15	Calico	ESD0022
16	Campaign for Disability Justice; and Inclusion Barnet	ESD0062
17	Carrington, Miss Tina	ESD0015
18	Central London Forward	ESD0122
19	Centre for Ageing Better	ESD0106
20	Citizens Advice	ESD0042
21	Common Sense Policy Group	ESD0101
22	Communities that Work	ESD0034
23	Community Integrated Care	ESD0049

24	Cook, Mr Nigel D	ESD0026
25	Department for Work and Pensions; and Joint DWP and Department of Health and Social Care Work and Health Directorate	ESD0118
26	DFN Charitable Foundation	ESD0109
27	Diabetes UK	ESD0029
28	Down's Syndrome Association	ESD0027
29	ENABLE	ESD0025
30	Education Development Trust	ESD0013
31	Employment Related Services Association (ERSA)	ESD0067
32	Epilepsy Action	ESD0083
33	Equalise: ESRC Centre for Lifecourse Health Equity	ESD0033
34	Equity	ESD0040
35	Essex County Council	ESD0127
36	Fedcap UK	ESD0096
37	Goldsmiths, University of London	ESD0030
38	Goodwin, Mr Robin (Professor, University of Warwick); Ms Olena Orlova (Research assistant, University of Warwick); and Mr Tarandeep Kang (Ph.D. Student, University of Warwick)	ESD0018
39	Grant, Dr Christine (Associate Professor, Coventry University)	ESD0028
40	Greater Manchester Disabled People's Panel	ESD0011
41	Hampshire County Council	ESD0128
42	Headway – the brain injury association	ESD0060
43	Hoque, Professor Kim (Professor of Human Resource Management and Vice Dean (People and Culture), King's Business School, King's College London); and Professor Nick Bacon (Professor of Human Resource Management, Bayes Business School)	ESD0021
44	Huntington's Disease Association	ESD0014
45	Inspired Community Enterprise Trust Ltd	ESD0078
46	Institution of Occupational Safety and Health (IOSH)	ESD0114
47	Jones, Professor Melanie (Professor, Cardiff University); and Professor Vicki Wass (Professor, Cardiff University)	ESD0007
48	Lawson, Dr Gabriel (Research Associate, King's College London)	ESD0054

49	Leeds Beckett University	<u>ESD0105</u>
50	Lewis, Dr Jane (Associate Professor, London Metropolitan University)	<u>ESD0051</u>
51	LightAware	<u>ESD0041</u>
52	ME Association	<u>ESD0116</u>
53	MS Society	<u>ESD0115</u>
54	Make UK	<u>ESD0058</u>
55	Maximus	<u>ESD0104</u>
56	Mental Health Matters	<u>ESD0081</u>
57	Mental Health UK	<u>ESD0057</u>
58	Microsoft	<u>ESD0112</u>
59	Mind	<u>ESD0052</u>
60	Money and Mental Health Policy Institute	<u>ESD0044</u>
61	Motability Foundation	<u>ESD0103</u>
62	Muscular Dystrophy UK	<u>ESD0077</u>
63	NAHT – The school leaders’ union	<u>ESD0012</u>
64	NASUWT	<u>ESD0066</u>
65	National Association of Disabled Staff Networks	<u>ESD0046</u>
66	National Association of Welfare Rights Advisers	<u>ESD0064</u>
67	National Centre for Social Research	<u>ESD0048</u>
68	Nguyen, Ms Lan (Researcher, University of Bristol); Mrs Renitha Tutin (Academic, University of Bristol); Mr Ricky Tutin (Academic, University of Bristol); and Dr Chinyere Uche (Academic, University of Bristol)	<u>ESD0063</u>
69	Organise	<u>ESD0031</u>
70	Papworth Trust	<u>ESD0085</u>
71	Parkinson’s UK	<u>ESD0113</u>
72	Policy Connect	<u>ESD0107</u>
73	Portsmouth City Council	<u>ESD0124</u>
74	Public Health Wales	<u>ESD0065</u>
75	RNID	<u>ESD0094</u>
76	Recro Consulting	<u>ESD0117</u>
77	Reed in Partnership	<u>ESD0093</u>
78	Richmond and Wandsworth Councils	<u>ESD0123</u>

79	Scope	ESD0045
80	Sense	ESD0098
81	Shropshire Council	ESD0120
82	Society of Occupational Medicine	ESD0047
83	South Midlands Authorities	ESD0126
84	South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority	ESD0125
85	Spinal Injuries Association	ESD0108
86	Suffolk County Council	ESD0121
87	The British Association for Supported Employment	ESD0075
88	The Council for Work & Health	ESD0079
89	The Disability Policy Centre	ESD0102
90	The Dyscalculia Network CIC	ESD0076
91	The Growth Company	ESD0053
92	The Health Foundation	ESD0036
93	The Royal National Institute of Blind People (RNIB)	ESD0086
94	The Wise Group	ESD0068
95	ThinkForward UK	ESD0056
96	Thomas Pocklington Trust	ESD0095
97	Thompson, Mr G.K.	ESD0023
98	Trades Union Congress (TUC); and TUC affiliated Unions	ESD0035
99	Trussell	ESD0082
100	UK Women's Budget Group	ESD0100
101	UK Young Academy THRIVE project	ESD0092
102	UKHospitality	ESD0038
103	UNISON	ESD0084
104	University of Hertfordshire	ESD0089
105	Verstappen, Professor Suzanne (Professor of Epidemiology, The University of Manchester)	ESD0037
106	Versus Arthritis	ESD0024
107	Wei, Dr Hua (Research Associate, The University of Manchester); Dr Sarah Daniels (Research Associate, The University of Manchester); Dr Ruth Wiggans (Lecturer & Consultant Respiratory Physician, The University of Manchester & North Manchester General Hospital); Dr	

Anna Coleman (Senior Research Fellow, The University of Manchester); Dr Donna Bramwell (Honorary Research Associate, The University of Manchester); Professor Damien McElvenny (Honorary Senior Research Fellow & Principal Epidemiologist, The University of Manchester & the Institute of Occupational Medicine); Professor Martie Van Tongeren (Professor of Occupational and Environmental Health, The University of Manchester); and Davine Forde (Associate and Patient Involvement Representative, NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre)

[ESD0070](#)

108 William, Associate Professor (Associate Professor of Sustainable Careers and Human Resource Management at Southampton Business School, University of Southampton)

[ESD0008](#)

109 Work Foundation at Lancaster University

[ESD0059](#)

110 Yes2Ventures Ltd

[ESD0080](#)

111 Young Lives vs Cancer

[ESD0074](#)

112 Youth Futures Foundation

[ESD0110](#)

113 techUK

[ESD0061](#)

List of Reports from the Committee during the current Parliament

All publications from the Committee are available on the [publications page](#) of the Committee's website.

Session 2024–26

Number	Title	Reference
7th	Employment support for disabled people: Disability at Work	HC 1227
6th	The appointment of Emma Douglas as Chair of the Pensions Regulator	HC 1610
5th	Get Britain Working: Creating a new jobs and careers service	HC 1286
4th	Get Britain Working: Reforming Jobcentres	HC 653
3rd	Get Britain Working: Pathways to Work	HC 837
2nd	Pensioner Poverty: challenges and mitigations	HC 465
1st	Safeguarding Vulnerable Claimants	HC 402
7th Special	Get Britain Working: Creating a new jobs and careers service: Government response to the Committee's Fifth Report	HC 1494
6th Special	Get Britain Working: Reforming Jobcentres: Government response to the Committee's Fourth Report	HC 1493
5th Special	Pensioner Poverty: challenges and mitigations: Government Response	HC 1384
4th Special	Get Britain Working: Pathways to Work: Government Response	HC 1385
3rd Special	Safeguarding Vulnerable Claimants: Government response	HC 1248
2nd Special	Defined Benefit Pensions Schemes: Government Response	HC 870

Number	Title	Reference
1st Special	Statutory Sick Pay: Government Response	HC 787