

INNER LONDON PROBATION AND AFTER-CARE SERVICE

ILFAS/Vera Supported Work Project:

BULLDOG MANPOWER SERVICES LTD.

Report on the First Year.

13th October, 1975 - 31st October, 1976.

William Pearce, C.B.E.  
Chief Probation Officer.

Michael Smith  
London Director, Vera Institute  
of Justice.

### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Supported Work Project is the second in a series of action-research pilot projects developed in a programme of collaboration between the Inner London Probation and After-Care Service ("ILPAS") and the Vera Institute of Justice of New York ("Vera"). The joint work is supported by the Home Office, the U.S. Department of Justice (National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice, Office of Technology Transfer), the Ford Foundation and the German Marshall Fund of the United States.

The general programme has had the assistance of a Steering Group chaired by Mr. A. W. Clark, Metropolitan Stipendiary Magistrate and member of the ILPAS Committee. Its Home Office members include:

Mr. H. W. Stotesbury,\* Assistant Under Secretary of State,  
Probation and After-Care Department.  
Mr. A. W. Glanville,\* Assistant Under Secretary of State,  
Probation and After-Care Department.  
Mr. B. H. Hillary, Assistant Under Secretary of State,  
Criminal Justice Department.  
Mr. M. H. Hogan, Chief Probation Inspector.  
Mr. G. Emerson, Assistant Secretary, Probation & After-Care Department.  
Mr. M. E. Head, Assistant Secretary, Probation & After-Care Department.  
Mr. R. J. Jones, Assistant Secretary, Criminal Justice Department.  
Mr. G. J. Wasserman, Senior Economic Advisor, Urban Deprivation Unit.

The Supported Work Project takes the form of a limited company, registered as a charity. The following are the Directors of the Company:

Sir Carl Aarvold, O.B.E., T.D., D.L., recently Recorder of London and Chairman of the ILPAS Committee, Chairman.  
Dr. A. R. Baddeley, a Director of the Esso Petroleum Company Ltd.  
\*\*The Lord Feather, C.B.E. formerly General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress.  
Mr. W. H. Pearce, C.B.E. Chief Probation Officer of Inner London.  
Mr. E. G. Pratt, Deputy Chief Probation Officer.  
The Hon. Mrs. Lindy Price, formerly a Member of the Parole Board.  
Mr. R. T. Richardson, Vice-President and General Manager of the Chemical Bank.  
Mr. Peter Scott, Manager, Sir Robert McAlpine & Sons Ltd.  
Mr. Geoffrey Tucker, C.B.E., Public Affairs Consultant.  
Mrs. Barbara Warburton, O.B.E., J.P.

The day-to-day arrangement of the Company is in the hands of Mr. C. S. Crockford, Assistant Chief Probation Officer of Inner London, who has been seconded full-time as Bulldog's Manager.

The Vera Institute of Justice is represented, both on the Steering Group and at the meetings of the Bulldog Board of Directors, by Mr. M. E. Smith, Associate Director of the Vera Institute and Director of its London office.

---

\* Mr. H. W. Stotesbury retired and was replaced by Mr. A. W. Glanville on 4th November, 1975.

\*\* The Lord Feather died on 28th July, 1976, and was replaced by Sir Harry Nicholas, O.B.E., on 13th December, 1976.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Introduction .. .. .	(ii)
I.	The Supported Work Concept and the Creation of Bulldog Manpower Services, Ltd. ... ..	1
II.	Clients' Profile and Their Histories in Bulldog ..	7
III.	Evolution of a Supported Work Programme: Bulldog's Course of Development .. ..	12
	A. Experience of Choosing and Managing Different Types of Worksite: Lessons Learned ..	12
	1. Landscaping .. .. .	13
	2. Buildings Renovation .. .. .	16
	3. Cleaning down, Painting and Decorating ..	21
	B. Delivering the Supports: Lessons Learned ..	24
	1. Hiring .. .. .	24
	2. Helping Employees Get to Work Regularly ..	25
	3. Objective Performance Criteria and Graduated Stress on the Worksite .. ..	26
	4. Transition to Non-Supported Work, and Job Development .. .. .	28
	5. Liaison with the Referring Probation Officer ..	29
IV.	Research .. .. .	31
V.	Costs, and a Rudimentary Cost/Benefit Analysis of the Supported Work Programme .. .. .	33

(ii)

INTRODUCTION

Bulldog Manpower Services Limited was established in October 1975 by the Inner London Probation and After-Care Service in cooperation with the Vera Institute of Justice. It aims to turn some of the most troublesome clients of the Inner London Probation and After-Care Service towards a lawful, self-sufficient, wage-earning way of life, by employing them for a transitional period in a supported work situation.

The programme is about habits - breaking old habits and supporting the formation of new ones. The Company's employees have lost or had never developed a work habit. They are regarded as "unemployable" by the Employment Service Agency and by their probation officers. They can make their way down to the local Social Security office, as that is a habit; they can live off meagre incomes, as they have life-style habits permitting it; they can stay in bed all day, as that is a habit. The Company's aims have been to break these habits and to help them into the habits of attending regularly at a worksite, taking home regular wages, paying taxes, putting in a full week's work, and applying themselves to tasks demanded by work supervisors. The work habit could help them play a productive part in the economy over a long term. The continuing lack of it threatens, in a few years time, to leave them in a cycle of unemployment, offending and imprisonment - a permanent drain alternately on the resources of the penal system and of the supplementary benefits programme.

An initial 12-month "feasibility" study of the supported work method, applied to a sample of these probation clients, has been successfully concluded with the financial support of the Home Office Urban Deprivation Unit. Reports of research, one from the Home Office Research Unit and one from the Home Office Economic Planning Unit, are in preparation, as is the formal Company report to the Board of Directors.

This report, intended for a more general circulation, narrates the development of the project, details some of the obstacles to its success and solutions devised to meet them, and reports some hopeful work. Services have been provided to the larger community and to smaller specifically deprived groups and individuals within it who would otherwise have gone without. Imaginative use has been made of public monies in a programme of "treatment" that produces real benefits, in the short and the long term, both to the community and to the Exchequer. And, perhaps most important, some lessons have been learned about operating and researching

(iii)

a scheme of this sort. Thus, we hope that our report will interest not only probation officers — in Inner London and elsewhere — who are concerned to find ways of assisting unemployable clients to develop work habits, but, also the statutory and voluntary agencies which are becoming increasingly aware of a need to make similar provision for unemployable members of various other socially disadvantaged groups. Indeed, the Urban Deprivation Unit's first year grant and its recent grant to cover a second year have been predicated, in part, upon the potential for wider application of the supported work concept in the inner city.

The affirmative tone of our present report is not a denial of the considerable difficulties that inhere in any effort to deal directly, in a structured setting and in full public view, with a substantial number of troubled and troublesome young adults; rather, it is an acknowledgment of the realism, skill and patience with which Charles Crockford and his team have met those problems.

William Pearce  
Michael Smith

1st January, 1977.

I. THE SUPPORTED WORK CONCEPT AND THE CREATION OF BULLDOG MANPOWER SERVICES, LTD.

"Michael" was 19 when his probation officer referred him to Bulldog Manpower Services Ltd. for possible employment. He had committed a series of minor theft offences after leaving school; he had worked only sporadically, never for longer than a week or two at any one job, and he tended to get into rows with work supervisors. He had had no employment during the eight months before Bulldog offered him work. Part of his difficulty could be characterized as a "problem relating to authority." More specifically, he was married and living with his middle-class in-laws who had contempt for him, his illiteracy and his origins. He did not possess a key to the front door of the house, he was confined to the use of one room, and was not allowed to use the TV or cooker.

Disputes with his father-in-law were frequent and often ended in blows. "Michael" focused his efforts to prove himself on making his wife pregnant; when he failed to do so, his troubles with the law became more serious.

After a few weeks at Bulldog, he was working hard and well. He was helped through his problems of taking direction, and was the first Bulldog employee to be promoted to "charge-hand". Newly hired employees were put directly under his supervision so that he could show them the ropes and by his example encourage them to apply themselves. Gradually, "Michael" began to take practical steps to extract himself from his debilitating home life. His probation officer helped him make contact with the local housing department and he pushed until he was offered a flat. The rows at home reached a new pitch and "Michael" was thrown out. He settled in a squat to wait for the flat. He felt he could not have stood the strain of squatting, unable to see his wife, without the strength he had won from successes in Bulldog. At the beginning of this unsettling period, his attendance and time-keeping at work slipped, but with the help of his probation officer and the support of the Bulldog site supervisor, he began again to come regularly to work and worked well, giving support and encouragement to the men working under him. He told a visiting news reporter: "If it weren't for working for Bulldog, I'd have been out 'doing jobs'. I mean, there weren't anything else, were there? Either that or I'd have done me father-in-law in."

"Michael" got his flat, established himself there with his wife, and came to terms with his father-in-law. Having achieved targets of stability at work and at home, he was rated "job-ready" and interviews were arranged for him with potential employers. At this point, however, his standard of work deteriorated and he did not attend the interviews: he had "made it" with Bulldog and did not want to leave. To break this dependence, Bulldog took a calculated risk; after an ultimatum, another interview was arranged which he did not attend and he was fired with the customary two weeks' notice. One day later he obtained a job for himself with a local authority's Parks Department at £55 per week (a substantial increase in pay). Firing him provided the motivation he had needed to set himself fresh targets. He left Bulldog in May 1976, is still employed and doing very well in his job, and has completed his probation order without further offences.

By no means all of Bulldog's employees have been such clear successes as "Michael", or made progress so quickly; but Bulldog is happy to see them go. The aim of this company is not to build up a workforce of highly productive men, as it would be in a conventional commercial firm; nor is it to trap "unemployable" probation clients in permanently sheltered employment. It is to equip them with the work habits, skills, motivation and self-confidence to find, keep and succeed in non-supported jobs. The "supported work" method adopted by the project involves:

- group working, to allow peer support;
- graduation of work demands and stress, gradually increasing from initial tolerance to the standards prevailing in conventional employment;
- close and supportive supervision, with regular review and discussion of progress and productivity;
- support around the difficult time of transition to a non-supported job.

The caseload of an urban probation service is not the only sub-population with a substantial number of "unemployable" individuals in it, but the problem of unemployability among offenders rises steadily on the agenda of the various agencies having overlapping responsibilities for carrying the burden it represents: the various Home Office Departments, particularly the Probation Department and Urban Deprivation Unit; the Manpower Services Commission, particularly the Employment Service Agency; and the Department of Health and Social Security, particularly the Supplementary Benefits Commission. Thus, the design, the operation, and the lessons learned in this ILPAS/Vera Supported Work Scheme may have wider implications; but this report has the general perspective of a Probation Service.

For a large number of probationers and ex-prisoners who are the responsibility of ILPAS, the prospects of rehabilitation and a lawful and productive life are diminished by their chronic unemployment. Repeated failure, delinquency, arrest, conviction and institutionalization have rendered them unable to hold a job, even if one can be found. Unskilled and inexperienced, lacking self-esteem and the experience of success, and unable to manage the routine and stress of regular employment, they anticipate job failure and often provoke it. The difficulty of having a criminal record, when looking for a job, is compounded by having no work record. Some are permanently out of work and completely dependent upon supplementary benefits or even less acceptable means of support, others work occasionally and unofficially whilst continuing to draw their benefits, and the rest work sporadically in low-paying and dead-end jobs but are

unable to cope with the demands of work or to avoid intolerable conflicts with co-workers and superiors. They are "unemployable", lacking the habits of work and the internal supports necessary to make a successful transition to steady and gainful employment.

The concept of providing a supported, transitional period of employment with a specialized and subsidized employer for a population such as this --supported work-- was introduced by the Vera Institute of Justice in New York in 1972. The Institute's Wildcat Service Corporation employs roughly 1,500 ex-offenders and ex-addicts in intensely supervised transitional jobs at a wage kept slightly below the level they could expect for similar work in the unsupported jobs to which they are encouraged to transit. The Wildcat supported work programme is funded jointly by the institutional equivalents of the Supplementary Benefits Commission, the Employment Service Agency, the Home Office, and the local authorities in whose area the Company provides needed services. When the costs of subsidizing the supported work programme in New York were analyzed alongside the reductions in cost and expenditure for those agencies, there appeared to be a net saving.

Attracted by the supported work concept, after examining Wildcat in operation, ILPAS proposed an experiment in early 1975 for a relatively small-scale adaptation of the concept to its unemployable clients. The need to gain experience in managing such an enterprise, the need to design a proper research framework, and the need to test the feasibility of a larger exercise of this sort, led to the modest 12-month feasibility study examined in this report.

A grant from the Research and Development budget of the Home Office Urban Deprivation Unit permitted the formation of a limited company, its registration as a charity, payment of the salaries of its management personnel, and payment of the portion of participants' wages that could not be recovered from voluntary and statutory bodies for which the company intended to provide services. The Home Office Research Unit assigned a research officer to monitor the programme's development, and to help think through how its impact on participants might be properly researched. The Home Office Economic Planning Unit assigned a Senior Economic Assistant to join in the monitoring, and to explore the possibilities of a cost/benefit analysis of any larger, longer-term demonstration. The Employment Service Agency of the Manpower Services Commission seconded an employment officer part-time to assist in determining the "unemployability" of persons referred to the scheme, to assist in designing a system to assist successful participants in finding non-supported work, to assist in developing criteria of "job-readiness"



for persons working in the scheme, and to keep his agency informed about possibilities suggested by this exercise for its handling of other "unemployable" sub-populations. Through the assistance of the Action Resource Centre, the Esso Corporation seconded part-time to the scheme an executive with business expertise to help get the new firm underway. At the end of his period of secondment in March 1976, Sir Robert McAlpine & Sons Ltd. seconded full-time an executive with experience relevant to costing and planning contracts for new work.

A Board of Directors of the Company was formed consisting of: Sir Carl Aarvold, O.B.E., T.D., D.L. recently Recorder of London and Chairman of the Inner London Probation and After-Care Committee (Chairman); Dr. A. Baddeley, a Director of the Esso Petroleum Company Ltd.; the Lord Feather, C.B.E., formerly General Secretary of the Trades Union Congress; Mr. W. H. Pearce, C.B.E., Chief Probation Officer of Inner London; Mr. E. G. Pratt, Deputy Chief Probation Officer; The Hon. Mrs. Lindy Price, formerly a Member of the Parole Board; Mr. R. T. Richardson, Vice-President and General Manager of the Chemical Bank; Mr. P. Scott, Manager, Sir Robert McAlpine & Sons Ltd.; Mr. Geoffrey Tucker, C.B.E., Public Affairs Consultant; and Mrs. Barbara Warburton, O.B.E., J.P. The Board appointed Barber Swinnerton & Co., Chartered Accountants, as auditors to the Company. Management for the firm was provided by full-time secondment of an Assistant Chief Probation Officer and a Senior Probation Officer to act as Manager and as a Deputy Manager respectively. Also seconded to the firm were several probation ancillary workers to act initially as foremen of the crews which were to be hired, and then (when individuals from those crews demonstrated a capacity to shoulder more responsibility) to step back as work supervisors and permit promotion to "charge-hand" of suitable programme participants. Salaries of the staff seconded from ILPAS were, during the feasibility year, met by the firm from its Urban Deprivation Unit grant. The Company's management was given the consulting services of the Director of the London office of the Vera Institute of Justice, who had assisted in the design of the project.

It was decided to limit participation to probation clients who were 18-23 years of age. First, it was felt that the investment in a relatively young group -- if it paid off -- would yield a better return over a longer period of time. Second, it was thought desirable for research purposes to set age limits in order to reduce the number of variables in the profile of participants.

To establish a relatively uniform degree of "unemployability" among participants, eligibility for referral to the scheme was established by the following criteria:

- (a) a poor work record (e.g., a demonstrated inability to sustain steady employment over at least the past two years, and no continuous employment of more than three months in the past year);\*
- (b) a willingness to work and to come to a work site for interview;
- (c) be seeking work through the Employment Service Agency, probation officer or otherwise;
- (d) an ongoing statutory or voluntary (after care) relationship with a probation officer which has at least six months to run, and a probation officer who is willing to make use in his casework of the change that steady employment brings to his client's life and to support him in adjusting emotional and practical problems that are unrelated to work but are found to interfere with it; and
- (e) no outstanding court appearances that could result in employment being broken by a period of custody, except where there has been formal deferralment of sentence.
- (f) no incapacitating addiction, illness or homelessness.

It was decided that the firm would not "screen" its prospective employees. Probation offices would be invited to refer clients meeting the basic criteria and it would be left to the individual officers of those offices to determine which of their unemployable clients would be put forward next. Background information, which might be discussed between the referring probation officer and the Deputy Manager of Bulldog when taking referrals, would not be conveyed to the employee's immediate work supervisor except as it became necessary for coping with problems directly presented by the employee's performance at the work site.

It was decided that the firm should present itself to employees -- insofar as possible -- as an ordinary employer. Commercial firms were consulted to establish for Bulldog the kinds of hiring, firing, supervisory, and other procedures that would be found generally. Bulldog was intended to offer a "real" job and not a social casework service. The firm would rely on the referring probation officer to provide the necessary support for all problems except those presented directly in the context of work. (This required development of a system for liaising with the probation officer when work problems seemed to require help within a relationship

---

\* Offenders discharged from penal institutions, whose work record prior to imprisonment was sufficiently poor, would not be considered for employment with Bulldog until it had been demonstrated (after at least one month of adjustment and job seeking) that their unemployability had not been alleviated.

which would be inappropriate for a work supervisor.)

Wage rates\*, for hours worked, were established as follows:

Improver (new hires)	£ .90 per hour
Crew man	£1.10 per hour
Leading hand	£1.15 per hour
Charge hand	£1.25 per hour

A 36-hour week was set; there would be no overtime. It was felt, following discussions with the unions whose members do work roughly similar to that intended for Bulldog, that these rates were equivalent to the rate for the job discounted for part of the value of special supervision and training that would be provided; it was also felt that they were sufficient to provide an incentive to improve work attendance and time-keeping, but not so high as to discourage those ready for transition to non-supported work from leaving the firm.

Any employee promoted above charge-hand (e.g., to site foreman) or any foreman hired from outside the target client group to bring specific skills or work experience to the firm, would be paid a full competitive wage.

It was felt that the "supports" which Bulldog was to provide would be aimed at helping the client overcome specific work-related problems, culminating with support in moving away from the firm altogether when ready to withstand the stress of less sheltered work. Specifically, support would be required:

- first, to get to work each day;
- second, to get to work on time and work for the full 36-hour week;
- third, to develop work habits and a pace of work that would be acceptable to other employers;
- fourth, to develop specific skills (either on the job or in training programmes) necessary for obtaining work of the kind desired, or to scale expectations of future employment to a more realistic level;
- fifth, to accept responsibilities for getting the work done, for the welfare of other members of the crew, and for plant, equipment and tools;
- sixth, to develop acceptable patterns of behaviour for work and acceptable relationships to those in work supervisory roles; and
- seventh, to reach stable and marketable work habits, and to reach beyond by taking non-supported jobs or by entering skill centres or other specific job training programmes.

With its aims, structure, funding, management and methods established, Bulldog's corporate experience began in the third week of October, 1975.

\* Bulldog employees involved in mobile groups were also made eligible for reimbursement of the excess cost of public transport to worksites where it exceeds 20p per day.

## II. CLIENTS' PROFILE, AND THEIR HISTORIES IN BULLDOG.

In early September, 1976, Bulldog, was carrying 46 unemployable clients of the Inner London Probation and After-Care Service in transitional, supported jobs; a month later, at the end of the feasibility year, the workforce had been allowed to drop to 33 due to uncertainties about second year funding. (The programme is now embarked on expansion of the workforce to 80-85 participants.)

Over the first 12 months, one hundred individuals were offered places in the programme.\* They came from the case-loads of 70 probation officers

---

\* In addition, eight older clients of the probation service were hired during the course of the year to take on responsibilities as "charge hand" and "foreman" within the scheme. It had been anticipated that these posts would be filled by identifying appropriate candidates from among the more immediately responsive programme participants, but attempts to implement the plan were frustrated by most participants' inability to withstand the additional stress such responsibilities entail. (See Section III A2 below.) Only a handful of programme participants, later in the year, were able to shoulder the charge hand job successfully before graduating out of the programme to non-supported jobs. It appeared that an immediate work supervisor in the context of supported work for relatively young offenders, required more than just a background of failures and offending to share with those under him -- he also needed relative maturity of age and experience.

Thus, eight men were recruited for these jobs from the ILPAS Day Training Centre. The DTC delivers an intensive twelve week, 5-day per week programme of supervision and therapy at the commencement of a probation order to selected offenders between 21 and 45 years of age who have substantial histories of delinquency, prior failure following custodial and non-custodial sentences and poor work records.

The ages of these charge hands ranged from 26 to 30 years; the average age was 29. Four were single (although one of these was cohabiting), one was married and three were separated. Their criminal records were more substantial than the average of programme participants; the mean number of their convictions and custodial sentences were 16 and five respectively. Three had not worked at all in the 12 months prior to employment with Bulldog, two had work histories of a very unstable type, and three had substantial work experience and some skills (e.g., fitting, slating, plumbing). One worked - and was very successful in the role - for ten weeks and was then imprisoned (for an offence committed many months earlier), three resigned shortly after taking the jobs, and the four who are still with Bulldog have lasted from 13 to 32 weeks on the job.

in 22 local offices. Just over half of them were either 18 or 19 years of age when starting with Bulldog and only two were 25 years old, at the upper limit of eligibility. Eighty-seven were single and one of the eleven who were married was separated from his spouse. Two were cohabiting. Twenty-three of the single men lived in hostels; some were residents there as a condition of their probation orders and most who lived in hostels had been assisted by their probation officers to find that accommodation.

Forty-five were under supervision pursuant to probation orders, thirty-five pursuant to borstal licences, seven pursuant to licence or parole from other sentences, and one pursuant to a suspended sentence supervision order. (For three, the current type of supervision was unknown to the programme at the time this report was prepared.) Complete criminal histories have been verified for 88 of the 100. Their average number of convictions were 5.6. The records of eleven showed more than 10 convictions, and only five showed just one conviction. More than three-fourths of these 88 programme participants had served custodial sentences, and 17 (19%) had served three or more terms inside.

The range of their prior criminal activity is best illustrated by a few examples: "Tony" and "Frank" represent the less serious end of the scale; they were on probation as first offenders. "Tony" had been convicted of possessing an offensive weapon, after a search turned up a knife when he was arrested for assault in a pub; "Frank" had been convicted of a burglary committed in concert with his brothers. A more typical employee is "James" who had four separate convictions (theft, burglary, taking and driving away, and breach of probation). "Larry" had nine convictions (six were for taking and driving away).

At the more serious end of the scale were "Kevin" and "Robert". "Kevin" had a long record of theft, burglary and attempted robbery; he had been almost continuously in penal institutions since the age of 13. "Robert" had recently been released on parole following a medium-length prison term for a series of muggings.

Criminal history is, of course, pre-requisite to participation in Bulldog, but more important to the programme is the poor or non-existent work history of each participant. The decision was made to go directly to the heart of the problem and not to select "good bets" for the beginning of the scheme. Through contact with five probation offices in areas accessible to the first work site, eight unemployable clients were identified for the first job interviews. Seven showed up for the interview

(although several of these were unable to face it without the support of an accompanying mother, wife or probation officer). A practice was then established, and has continued to date, of calling eligible applicants' local employment offices to confirm whether their work records were bad enough for the scheme. Four of the first-hired applicants were immediately known to their local employment offices when the check was made: reactions to the enquiries about prior work history were as follows: (1) "Good God, you must be mad!"; (2) "Him? You don't want to touch him"; (3) "Which borstal is he off to now?"; and (4) "You must be conning us. Can we ring you back?"

Their work records were bad. This was to be expected, as referrals from probation officers were ineligible unless they had been unsuccessful for at least two years in finding steady employment and had held no job for more than three months in the last twelve. "Victor", for instance, had almost no work record at all and he insisted to his probation officer that "only mugs work". His probation officer believed this attitude was really a cover-up for abject failure in the area of work --as in other areas of his life. "Nick" was isolated and withdrawn; his unemployability fed the more deep-rooted difficulties. For others --particularly those with psychiatric problems-- unemployability seemed a minor part of the picture, but a successful employment seemed the best start on pulling these lives together.

It was not expected that employment trouble would be the only problem for men referred to Bulldog, but it was explained to probation officers that Bulldog jobs were intended for those whose prospects for rehabilitation would be significantly improved by learning to handle the stress, to appreciate the rewards, and to develop the self-supports that go with success at steady employment.

Thus, at one extreme, "Peter" had only been able to work for three days during his twenty years, and was terrified of venturing from home to the worksite for his intake interview with Bulldog. "Dan" had many problems, but it was his inability to control his temper that lost him job after job; he had been out of work for eight months before starting at Bulldog. Most had spent more time since leaving school out of work than employed; and most who had been able to hold onto a job were unable to keep it for more than two months, at the longest. "Bill", for example, once worked for three months as a warehouseman, but left because he was "bored" and worked only casually after that. "Greg" once held a labouring job for two months, but had been dismissed and never did as well again. "Steve" had joined the army upon leaving school but left when his mother was dying. His offending and his problems with work began with his mother's death and,

although the two seemed inextricably entwined, his probation officer had some hope that success with work might have repercussions elsewhere. "Al" began working when he left school, but the periods of unemployment got longer and his stays in work shorter over two and a half years until the time when he was sentenced to a detention centre; when released he was unable to get any of his old jobs or any job at all. Because he had spent more time in employment than out of it before his imprisonment, Bulldog turned him down when his probation officer first referred him; several months later, when his unemployment was clearly disrupting his adjustment and leading to other problems, Bulldog offered him a job.

Sixty-seven had left Bulldog's employ by the end of the feasibility year. Of these, 25% left in order to take up conventional, non-supported jobs and 55% either resigned before reaching a "job-ready" level or were terminated by the company for failure to meet the standards of attendance, time-keeping and performance which were set low for new hires but were gradually raised throughout each participant's employment. Another 20% left the programme because they were either taken into custody or fired for gross misconduct on the work site. The majority of the "unsuccessful" participants were employed for less than two months (and three of those who resigned worked less than one week or did not show up at all after being offered the job at the initial interview). The majority of those who left for non-supported jobs were in the programme for four months or longer. The thirty-three programme participants still with Bulldog at the end of the feasibility year had been employed for periods ranging from one week to nine months. These data on participants' histories with Bulldog may best be viewed when gathered in the Table below, prepared by the Home Office Research Unit's research officer:

Length of time in employment with Bulldog

	<u>Length of time (in weeks)</u>									Total
	Less than 1	1 4	5 8	9 12	13 16	17 20	21 28	29 36	37 or more	
Still working at end of feasibility phase		6	9	3	5	2	5	1	2	33
<u>Ex employees</u>										
Placed in jobs found by Bulldog				1	1	2	1			5
Found own job			4	1		1	4	2		12
Resigned, no job to go to	3	6	5	3	1	1				19
Terminated by Company (except for gross misconduct)		3	6	5	3	1				18
Fired for gross misconduct			2	5	1	1				9
Taken into custody		1	2	1						4
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100</b>

The "graduation" into the labour force of formerly unemployable programme participants is only one measure of positive programme impact. For example, it continues to be the case that the majority of participants who are dismissed from the scheme for misconduct or failure to progress satisfactorily subsequently apply for re-admission to the programme either directly or through their probation officers. Five of these have been rehired already and are doing well. But it is a particularly unambiguous one. And a 25% "success rate" seems honorable enough for a new venture of this sort, particularly when it is considered that the rate of unsuccessful terminations (resignations and dismissals) was high in early months (and on particular sites) and declined in the last six months as the scheme matured. For example, fourteen programme participants were terminated over a relatively short period of time at one of the early worksites in south-east London; their gross misconduct or other failures may be attributed in large measure to the early difficulties experienced by the company at that site. (These cases, and the lessons learned from them, are discussed below in Section III A.)

In addition, the Urban Deprivation Unit's preliminary analysis of costs and benefits accruing during the first six months, suggests that - even during this build-up period when high dismissal rates were matched by high per capita overhead costs - the projected future tax and national insurance payments from successful participants and their removal from supplementary benefit would, within two to three years, repay to the Exchequer the public investment required to cover Bulldog's entire operating losses during the period of their employ. The public expenditure implications of Bulldog's early months are more encouraging than most rehabilitative programmes, but the project appears even more unusually cost-efficient if the value of work performed for deprived communities (a by-product of the supported work "treatment") and the future savings of penal system resources (from any reduction of recidivism among programme participants) are taken into account. This cost/benefit dimension of Bulldog is considered more fully in Section V, below.

7.  
7.



III. EVOLUTION OF A SUPPORTED WORK PROGRAMME: BULLDOG'S COURSE OF DEVELOPMENT

A. Experience of Choosing and Managing Different Types of Worksite

The first object of the supported work programme is to attract into regular attendance at a job site individuals who have lost or never had a habit of work. To this end it is necessary to find work that has variety within it (and to find varied work for the transfer of employees from one site to another more suitable site). The work should be of a kind in which the employee can identify his part and take pride in it, and which is appreciated by the community; it should be located at sites reasonably accessible to him. And the work must be of a kind that the firm is capable of supervising and directing in a professional way.

The second object of the scheme is to prepare employees to face the stresses and demands of the non-supported job market. To this end, the work must offer opportunities to learn routines and basic skills that will be assets to the employee in seeking and holding the kind of work likely to be available to him outside Bulldog. It must be possible to apply performance standards to the work, to measure an employee's performance against those standards, and to determine when his performance is good enough to qualify him for placement in a non-supported job.

The third object is to provide practical and emotional help towards the first two ends. This requires worksites and a type of work where it is possible to provide intense supervision, group working situations, and immediate evidence of the product of an employee's effort in which he can take pride and his supervisors can find evidence of his progress (or lack of it) towards acceptable standards. The worksites must allow for initial failures (poor attendance and time-keeping, poor performance and disruptive behaviour) without undermining the work of other employees or the credibility of the firm.

Finally, the programme aims to return to the community (and, through the community, to the public purse) benefits that balance the subsidy required to keep its "unemployables" in work. To this end, it is necessary that the work have some immediate social utility and that some of the work meet pressing community needs that would otherwise not be met. In order to limit the net subsidy required for the programme, it is necessary to seek work for which the customer - usually a voluntary agency - can pay part of the labour costs and all material costs. As some voluntary bodies with otherwise suitable work will be unable to cover more than the cost of materials, it is necessary to find suitable work for statutory agencies responsible for providing services to the community, and whose more substantial reimbursement to the programme for labour costs can bring the total contract income up to roughly

half the total labour costs of the firm. It is important that in undertaking work which provides social benefits, non-supported workers should not, as a consequence, be displaced.

During the feasibility year, Bulldog has had experience with work of three basic types at a score of different sites. The basic types are: (1) landscaping, (2) restoration of derelict buildings, and (3) washing down, painting and decorating. A great deal has been learned about the advantages and disadvantages of these different types of work and of the different worksites at which they have been attempted. These lessons can be drawn from the three chronicles below:

1. Landscaping:

(a) A North London Cemetery.

Forty men were employed before the War to landscape and maintain the 32-acre site of this local cemetery. Its paths were open and used for public enjoyment. Over time, the private company that owned and maintained the grounds went bankrupt and by 1975 the site was badly overgrown and the paths impenetrable. The grounds, graves and chapel were the targets of vandalism, sections of the public were fearful of entering, and questions were raised in Parliament about the cemetery's deteriorating condition.

Although it was not formally to become the responsibility of the local authority, by Act of Parliament, until April 1976, and there was therefore no money to reimburse Bulldog for any labour of the site, the firm was asked by the local Parks and Gardens Department and by the bankrupt company to attempt to clear and maintain some portion of it. Bulldog accepted the work, as it saw some possibility that the borough would pay a portion of the costs when it assumed statutory responsibility for the site and, as turnover in the Parks and Gardens Department is regularly high, there was some hope that Bulldog employees who proved their mettle at the site would be able to "roll-over" into non-supported jobs on the Council's payroll when the Council hired to fill its establishment.

A crew of five newly hired men, working under a supervisor who had been hired as an ancillary, moved into a newly erected hut on the cemetery grounds on 3rd November, 1975. They were closely watched by the Council's Parks and Gardens Department for several weeks, until it became apparent that the work was of good quality and the supervision adequate to protect the Council's interests. Employees of the Department provided technical advice where required. By the beginning of April, Bulldog's workforce was 13. The Council then agreed to reimburse the firm at an hourly rate, for hours worked, covering roughly half the hourly wage rate of employees; the agreement

runs for 12 months from 1st April, with reimbursement limited to no more than £9,000. Towards the end of the feasibility year, negotiations were commenced toward extending the agreement for another year on the same terms.

The interplay of support, demands, regular pay and "group" working that characterize Bulldog's programme were felt to have had a positive impact at this site on "John":

"John" had problems at home. His brother dresses as a woman, his mother feigns a "nervous condition" to trap her sons at home to care for her, and "John" himself is a homosexual, as well as an offender. He was unable to get into work, he said, because of his mother's constant demands. Indeed, she had a habit of calling him home from the few jobs he had held.

"John's" homosexuality caused some difficulties for him when he started at Bulldog; the ribbing he took from other members of his crew, together with his mother's dependency, made it hard to attend work regularly and develop good time-keeping habits. With the help of his probation officer and the support, but firm demands, of the Bulldog site supervisor, he came to terms with these problems and began to get into the work. With increased productivity at work came the respect of his fellow crew members; with regular attendance came regular pay, and "John" began to pay off his outstanding fines. His response to his mother's demands became more measured and he is beginning to look for a better job.

"Terry" presented a more difficult set of problems, but his success - though modest so far - is clear:

"Terry" had a history of theft, heavy drinking and drug abuse. He lived with his mother, who was also a heavy drinker, and his brother who shared all of "Terry's" problems. The council was due £600 back rent on their flat and gas and electricity had been cut off. "Terry" had attempted suicide while in hospital for treatment for blood poisoning - he had mainlined with a dirty needle. He had had no employment for two years and no prospect of any.

After a lot of support at the beginning, and regular visits to his home to bring him to work when he failed to turn up, "Terry" began working regularly. His pride in the work led him to become more productive until he was made a charge-hand. This was too much pressure, he began to falter and, at his own request, he was put back to crew member. In the first five months that he was in the programme, his drinking decreased steadily and he resorted to drugs only once. Although Bulldog felt he was not job-ready, and that in a further period of supported employment he could develop enough self-supports to have a good chance of making it on his own, he was given encouragement and support in his own efforts to find another job.

"Terry" did find his own job and gave up drink and drugs completely. He had, however, made no attempt to pay his outstanding fines and, shortly after graduating from Bulldog, he was arrested and imprisoned for 30 days for non-payment. When he was in prison, his family lost their flat and when he was

released, homeless, he was unable to find another job. He has been re-hired by Bulldog and has found himself a place to live. His standard of work and personal stability have continued to improve and now, as "job-ready", his graduation out to a non-supported job is imminent.

The cemetery site proved to be a good choice for a variety of reasons. The 32 acres provide a wide variety of working conditions and tasks. The work was therefore not boring and a day-to-day routine could be demanded without forfeiting the new employees' interest. It provided opportunities for them to learn marketable skills within a framework where low standards of performance could be tolerated initially and demands gradually increased. When the initial crew was expanded, it was possible to divide it into several crews - thus preserving the "group working" element of the programme whilst encouraging mild competition between crews on the same site with respect to attendance, time-keeping, and productivity. Both the employees and the supervisors could see, from day-to-day, how many graves had been cleared, how many trees felled, how many yards of grass verge put in, hedge trimmed or path cleared. These are a ready base upon which to build employees' confidence and pride. With proper site supervision, these site characteristics permit sound evaluation of the workers' progress towards job-readiness and immediate feedback to them on their performance and their progress.

Because the worksite is open to the public, there was some concern that Bulldog's employees would be subjected to unfriendly scrutiny or harassment. It happened, however, that public expressions of appreciation for the work being done has reinforced rather than undermined their pride, their sense of being accepted as "normal", their feeling that their work is appreciated, and their sense of accomplishment. From the start, individuals and families coming to pay respects to relatives, or coming to look after the graves of the famous, stopped to talk with the workers and expressed delight at the prospect of the cemetery's restoration. A local pressure group, concerned to maintain the cemetery, reserved judgement at first but soon came around with a vote of confidence based on the quality of the work.

(b) A School for the Blind in South-west London.

This school for blind children had received an acre of derelict land, but had insufficient resources to clear and fit it out as a playground suitable to its students' use. Bulldog agreed to provide one crew for several months for about one-quarter of the labour costs incurred. Work began with a crew of newly hired men on 29th March, but it was clear by early April that the motivation of these new employees -- as indicated by their early attendance and time-keeping records -- received a boost from

the sense that their efforts would mean an immediate improvement in the lives of the blind children playing in the enclosed ground adjacent to the site. For its duration, this remained one of the best Bulldog work sites - as measured by time-keeping, productivity and discipline.

## 2. Buildings renovation:

A buildings preservation trust had launched a plan in 1975 to convert the historic buildings that occupy a local wharf and that had been unused and decaying at the heart of a derelict dock area for some years into low-cost accommodation for about 40 commercial craftsmen and women, designers and related craft businesses. The scheme aimed to keep craft and design skills in the Inner City area, to create manual jobs and apprenticeships in conjunction with the craft businesses in an area of high unemployment, to inject new life and activity where a vacuum was contributing to the decline, depression and deprivation of the area, and to restore two distinctive 19th century warehouse structures for that purpose.

The proposed rehabilitation and conversion of the warehouses called for a great deal of work ranging from general cleaning through painting and decorating to basic brickwork, carpentry, plumbing and electrical installation. There was no shortage of time, but not enough money to get the work done. An architectural, a surveying and a construction firm were each giving professional advice, and Bulldog was asked to provide some of the labour.

An agreement was reached in late September for Bulldog to provide a supervised workforce that would assist the Trust's site foremen in the recovery of the warehouses and their conversion to craft workshops. As this was to be Bulldog's first contract, it was agreed that the first month would be a proving period, and no reimbursement would be made. On 5th November, after three weeks on the site, an agreement was reached for Bulldog to be reimbursed at 30p per hour for each hour worked by an employee from 30th November.

Bulldog began working to these agreements on 13th October, with its first crew of six "unemployable" workers referred by probation officers, and a young probation ancillary worker (with previous experience as a building site labourer) providing site supervision. The size of the workforce at this site reached 10 near the turn of the year, but dropped to 5 at the beginning of April. Over the six months, this site provided more - and more painful - lessons than the other sites taken together. The scope, and some of the detail, of this learning is indicated in the paragraphs below.

First there was an immediate challenge to the concept that, by working in groups, the workers could support each other and diffuse the stress and anxiety of steady demands being placed on them in an unfamiliar (work) situation. One of the first crew seemed utterly unable to get to the site

regularly or on time; when he was there he did not work. Suspending him from work (and therefore from pay) seemed to matter little to him so long as he had or could borrow cash for drinking. He showed no signs of improving in response either to threats or support. His pay was therefore low and he pestered the others for loans. As the others began to turn up for work more regularly and to work harder for the full day, they grew resentful of him and of the patience with which he was handled by the site supervisor. They discovered he was homosexual and ribbed him mercilessly; eventually they refused to work with him, if only because he reduced his team's productivity. It might have been possible to salvage this young man in a supported work programme, but it was not possible to do so within this crew - he was jeopardizing their development and, in time, the tolerance with which he was treated could be expected to undermine the authority by which increasing demands were to be placed upon those making progress in the programme. There was, however, no other site at that time to which he could be transferred.

It was decided to set him a series of individual tasks, allowing plenty of time for him to complete them, under the threat of termination from the programme if he did not meet the demands. The choice was too stark; he handed in his notice. Although he said he had been offered another job, it appeared at subsequent case conferences that his situation had been entirely too complex and too unstable for the embryonic supported work programme to make very much difference to him. He had a drinking problem in addition to the homosexuality, his offences were for indecent exposure and soliciting in public toilets, and he was incontinent as well as homeless. He had been residing in a probation hostel, for assessment only, during the period of his employment at Bulldog; the assessment was that he needed a more structured setting than even the probation hostel. As he was on remand at the time of his employment, he was really in passage between two probation officers. From this recapitulation of the experience, Bulldog was led to establish new policies; that the identity of the supervising probation officer must be settled before Bulldog would employ a client referred to it; that, therefore, no employment could be offered to clients referred during a period of remand or during the preparation of a social enquiry report; that, although the selection of the individual clients (from among those meeting the broad eligibility criteria of the programme) would be left to the probation offices contacted for referral, the individual's supervising probation officer would be engaged in a discussion about the range and depth of the difficulties additional to the client's unemployability before Bulldog's

management could approve arrangements for an intake interview on a worksite; that Bulldog would employ only those whose lives were - however troubled - sufficiently stable for the referring probation officer, in his judgement, to be able to handle the emotional, medical and practical difficulties that were likely to interfere with work; and that, to this end, it would be additionally required as a criterion of eligibility for the programme that the probation officer's supervision not terminate for at least six months after the Bulldog employment begins. This early experience, painful although it was to all concerned, focused the attention of Bulldog's management and the attention of the Probation Service on the need to define and limit with some clarity the service being provided by Bulldog.

Following the departure of this young man, the rest of the crew settled down to work reasonably well. There were a number of visits to the site by persons whose importance was obvious to the crew; although the workers tried to use these occasions to wrest authority from the ancillary placed in the foreman's role, they did feel they were working well and their work was appreciated. But when the novelty of the job wore off, they began to protest that the work - which at that time was mainly digging, trenching and clearing rubble from the building and grounds - was unsatisfying and never really "finished". Indeed, from the management perspective, it was difficult to see how their performance could be measured or, given the vastness of the Trust's enterprise, how the employees' contribution could be made immediately visible and rewarding to them. It was decided therefore to set realistic but increasingly tight time limits on each task required by the Trust. Although the crew responded well to this device, the value of the exercise was too often undermined by the Trust's lack of an accurate and thought-through work plan. For instance, shortly after this procedure had been introduced, the crew (which had turned up in its entirety at 8.00 a.m.) was sent home after half the day, because there was no more work for them to do. This occurred because the building in which they were engaged on a task was sealed off in the afternoon for fumigation. As there was no formal forward plan, the Trust was unable to assign further work that day. This was frustrating to Bulldog's management, although perhaps less so to the employees who were paid anyway. But the difficulties of working without an adequate forward work plan could be much more destructive of the supported work aims than this. The crew was set the task of digging a rather deep and long trench through the main entrance of one of the warehouses, as preparation for the laying of drains. They worked hard and well and completed the task well within the time limit that had been set; they were justifiably proud of their effort. But within a few minutes after they had finished the task and were being congratulated by the Bulldog site

supervisor, the Trust's foreman came across with his surveyor and decided that the trench was in the wrong place; the crew's next task was to fill the trench in and start again.

Although Bulldog was given every cooperation from the Trust in trying to remedy these problems by joint weekly planning sessions, the Trust itself was faced with difficulties because of its own inexperience in work of this kind and the fragmentation of its seconded technical expertise. The resulting confusion and enforced idleness on the site led, not unnaturally, to misbehaviour by the crew. In addition, the crew was open in its expression of hostility and contempt for the Trust's foreman. Thus, although a large number of people having no association with Bulldog passed through the site offices, any damage or loss of property was laid at Bulldog's door. It became increasingly difficult for the probation ancillary to supervise the crew. Although well-educated and dedicated to his job, his ambition was to be a social worker and his experience of labouring was not much greater than the experience of the men he was supervising. He was only a few years older than they and, because he shared little of their background and difficulties, he found it difficult to make and enforce demands upon them. He seemed faced with a dilemma; either to collude with the crew in their open resentment of the site and Bulldog management, or to lose his authority by "going over" to the other side. One of the crew, however, had demonstrated considerable ability and proved himself a leader of the others. It was decided to try running the site with this crew member appointed as "leading hand"; the ancillary site supervisor might then step back and, at a distance, negotiate work plans with the Trust on behalf of the Company and support the leading hand in his direction of the rest of the crew. The leading hand, however, was unable to cope with the responsibilities; he quickly committed various offences and, enmeshed in the criminal process, handed in his notice. It had nevertheless appeared that, by placing successful crew members in the role of crew leader, our ancillary workers could better balance the tasks of providing support to the crew and making demands upon it. Thus, although the workforce at this site was reduced, it was led thereafter -- as were some of the crews at other sites -- by charge hands recruited from the ILPAS Day Training Centre; these probation clients were more mature than the crews, by age and experience, and had general knowledge of the various snagging and handyman's routines used on such sites.

The reduction in workforce became necessary, not only because of the difficulties detailed above but also, ironically, because the Trust for a time had additional funds to assist it in the renovation work. These funds



brought onto the site various mechanical aids, digging machines, trenching machines, and other crews hired to do small contract jobs. From the Trust's point of view, at this point, it was more important to use the more expensive resources to the hilt than to keep the Bulldog crews fully occupied at tasks suitable to the supported work method. Again, they were often left with no work to do at all. It became even more difficult to set and maintain standards of work and productivity or to focus on the prerequisites of the supported work programme (e.g., regular attendance and good time-keeping). The series of crises provoked by these working conditions led to intolerable misbehaviour that ended in a rash of suspensions and, finally, sackings. These actions, although necessary to preserve the worksite for the remaining Bulldog employees, and although providing incidents by which management could give substance and criteria to its general power of suspension and termination, were painful lessons. The pain is alleviated only somewhat by the fact that each employee dismissed from this particular site has made contact, either directly or through his probation officer, requesting another job with Bulldog.

Bulldog's last few months on this site went much more smoothly, when a new foreman appointed by the Trust assisted regularly in planning varied schedules of suitable work-specifically for the Bulldog crew.

The experience might be summarized as follows:

- Where possible, work should be sufficiently varied on a site to provide different tasks for the crew over time; it should be measurable and progress should be visible - both to the contractor and to the Bulldog employees - within a reasonable period of time. Bulldog employees should not be made available as "jobbing hands" to be allocated on a day-to-day basis to tasks for which other sub-contractors or persons have responsibility.
- It is difficult if not impossible to operate a supported work project as sub-contractors on a site that lacks advance planning and definition of responsibilities.
- The immediate supervision of crews should be placed in the hands of persons promoted from the programme's workforce or who share the background experiences of the employees.
- Responsibility for negotiation and planning of complex worksite contracts should rest at some distance from the crew and should not be subjected to the ad hoc decisions of someone subjected to the pressures of working on the site.
- Personnel responsible for the direction of crews need, and crew members expect, realistic demands to be made, and made with some firmness, in addition to support and practical encouragement toward meeting them.

It should be said, before passing on to consider the third area of work, that renovation of derelict properties for the benefit of the surrounding community is still seen by Bulldog management as a desirable - and perhaps necessary - field in which supported work will operate. Thus, even before the dockside project was concluded, Bulldog provided a workforce in Brixton to take on part of the general clearance and refurbishing of portions of a local church intended for use as a community centre. If the lessons learned at these sites can be properly incorporated, future such projects can be expected to go more smoothly and provide, over a long term, work that is suitable to the supported work method and appreciated by participants in the programme whilst directly benefitting the surrounding deprived areas.

### 3. Cleaning down, Painting and Decorating.

In December it was decided to establish a painting and decorating unit within Bulldog. It had become clear that a supported work scheme needs a range of motivating devices for its "unemployable" employees. Financial rewards can provide motivation, as can threats of suspension from a satisfying or financially rewarding job. It had also become clear that personal satisfaction associated with the object of the task and the worksite were important. What had not been tried to the full, however, was the provision of opportunities for employees to realize the potential of their own skills resources. It is obvious that the institutional treatment of delinquency breaks down young men's opportunity for apprenticeship for professional training, but this is to some extent countered by training schemes offered in Borstal institutions. These schemes are focused primarily on building trades, motor mechanics, farming and painting and decorating. Many probation officers and most graduates of Borstal painting and decorating courses realize that, although the institutional training can provide marketable skills, it almost always proceeds at such a leisurely pace that the skills cannot be applied in the competitive labour market. At the same time, in a deprived urban environment, there are a great many voluntary and quasi-voluntary organizations requiring the refurbishing of older or short-life property to meet the needs of homeless people, whether they be ex-offenders, single parents, elderly or just socially inadequate. A large number of these organizations are inadequately financed to do the job. The statutory organizations -- including the Probation Service itself -- that make provision for similar needy populations, are more likely to be financed to do the work (the Probation Service, for instance, through the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District), but persons on probation with relevant basic training from Borstal institutions have little opportunity to compete for these jobs. Bulldog's intention was

to provide transitional supported jobs in painting and decorating services across the whole range of socially useful projects, with the aim of averaging income from such contracts to cover half the labour costs of the unit.

On 31st December a skilled painter and decorator was hired as foreman for this unit. He started on 5th January with two newly hired men (two more joined the crew on 12th January), to strip down, paint and decorate one large flat among several that had been taken by a housing trust. The flat was needed for occupation by a large single-parent family. The £315 paid to Bulldog for completing this work covered materials and a portion of the labour costs.

It was intended that the work done for this Housing Trust should be of the highest quality and a point of reference for Bulldog seeking other work of a similar nature. An approach had already been made to the Surveyor's Department of the Receiver for the Metropolitan Police District, to identify probation hostels and other of the Receiver's properties needing services of the kind that Bulldog could provide. With the assistance of the Deputy Chief Probation Officer responsible for ILPAS accommodation, the Chief Surveyor and others from the Receiver's office were persuaded to visit the newly decorated flat; by early April, Bulldog had been placed on the Receiver's list of approved contractors. Bulldog has since undertaken a series of contracts for work at facilities used by the Probation Service (e.g., the After-Care and Resettlement Unit at Borough High Street, the Day Training Centre, local probation offices), and provided a small crew for the summer upkeep of a large sports ground run by the police for their officers' use.

Meanwhile, the work at the flat was completed in early February. For the next two weeks the painting and decorating crew worked, without reimbursement, painting and decorating the crypt of a West End church, for its use by alcoholics and derelicts.

The original foreman hired to provide painting and decorating skills in the supervisory role for the painting and decorating unit proved not to fully understand or appreciate the objects of the supported work programme. His ultimate replacement has been given responsibility for several crews, each led by a charge hand promoted from the ranks, and has been effective in the more subtle role combining supported work supervision with instruction, setting standards, making estimates and liaising with management. His appreciation of the necessity, for the supported work context, of tight and exact work schedules, simple and direct specifications from the customer, timely delivery of proper materials and equipment to assure a

continuous flow of work, and on arrangement of tasks to assure tangible results at the end of each day. The attendance, time-keeping and productivity of these crews has increased markedly.

Other projects serviced by the painting and decorating unit have included:

- the home of a prisoner's wife in Clapham;
- short-life housing managed by a housing trust to provide accommodation for homeless families;
- a hostel for refugees from abroad, some of whose residents have been there since the last war;
- a group home managed by a registered charity to provide accommodation for homeless ex-offenders;
- the properties of another housing association, a charity providing accommodation for the elderly;
- the crypt at a West End church (a second project at that facility for alcoholics and derelicts); and
- a facility requiring conversion to the needs of a local battered wives' association.

Bulldog's high initial investment in quality equipment and skilled supervision for this unit has been rewarded both by generally good performance at painting and decorating sites and low rates of unsuccessful terminations. Among the first to reach "job-ready" standards and to graduate to a non-supported job was "Brian":

"Brian" was already a teenager when he came to London from Jamaica with his mother and three sisters. He soon dropped out of school and found difficulties in getting work; the few jobs he had were of brief duration. He began committing property offences and was convicted of theft. He was turned out of his mother's home and lived with a Black Power commune.

When referred to Bulldog by his probation officer, "Brian" was known to have picked up the rudiments of painting and decorating over the course of his spotty work history. He was placed in the painting and decorating unit, but his attendance and his productivity when at work were poor for the first weeks. Expansion of the unit permitted "Brian's" reassignment to another crew, under the direction of a different foreman. There he flourished. It required three months of gradually increased demands and careful support (on the job and from his probation officer) to bring "Brian" to job-ready levels of self-confidence and productivity. Then there was a difficult period in which he required substantial support to face leaving the security of Bulldog for a conventional job. With a strong reference from Bulldog, however, he was accepted for the first job he went for and he now earns £60 per week as a painter in North London.

B. Delivering the Supports: Lessons Learned

The worksite experiences detailed above have taught the Bulldog management quite a bit about what kind of "support" is necessary to sustain participants in supported work schemes and how those supports can best be delivered. It may be helpful to make some of these lessons explicit and to discuss them in relation to the functions of supervisory and support staff.

1. Hiring

In keeping with normal practice in industry, hiring for supported work is done on the prospective worksite whenever possible. The referring probation officer assumes responsibility for his client's fares, if he needs them to get to the worksite for the initial interview and for the first week of work. (Wages are, as in non-supported employment, paid a week in arrears).

It has not been necessary to reject any prospective employees appearing for hiring interview. The Deputy Manager of Bulldog, who so far has conducted all hiring interviews, prepares the way by first briefing officers at any probation office from which referrals are to be accepted; Bulldog's eligibility criteria, its expectation of continuing support to the client by the referring officer, and the specific supports Bulldog can (and cannot) give to clients while they are at work are fully discussed before any referral is made from the office. Although some probation officers may over-estimate their clients' problems (e.g., difficulty in obtaining work, problems with authority) in order to secure them jobs, and although some probation officers may under-estimate their clients' problems (e.g., drinking, lack of motivation) for the same reason, referrals have by and large been quite suitable for the scheme and well within the eligibility criteria.

Although the hiring interview is modelled on industrial practice, it has been found necessary for Bulldog to use this occasion to commence the process of clarifying those aims and objectives of the company which go beyond its performance of work for its customers. For instance, the employment contract itself, which refers clearly to an ultimate aim of assisting the employee to find other employment with a conventional firm, is discussed line by line with the prospective employee. Initially this contract had a term of 25 weeks and it expressly stated the conditions upon which an employee might be sacked and the conditions he must meet if he is to be considered for re-hire on a further contract with Bulldog. It was hoped that discussion of these provisions at the hiring interview would make it clear that Bulldog offered only transitional employment, that the employee would not become entitled to tenure under the relevant statutes, that the firm would regularly review the employee's progress toward acceptable work habits, and that the firm reserved the right to terminate the contract if an employee's performance was poor and did not improve.

Despite these safeguards, several of the initial employees could not be persuaded that the contract was conditional on their progress; at one extreme case the employee proved unshakeable from the view that he was entitled to full pay for 25 weeks if he simply showed up at the worksite -- whether or not he actually worked -- and that, at the end of the period, Bulldog would guarantee him a better job elsewhere. These experiences led to a more rigorous discussion of the programme's aims at hiring interviews, and to regular weekly review by site supervisors of the terms of the contract and the employees' progress. Eventually, these methods were incorporated into a new form of contract; its duration was only six weeks, it expressly provided for review of the employee's progress, and it contained space for entry of the terms of additional agreements reached between the site supervisor and the employee (e.g., promotion to a higher rate of pay, required improvement in a specific area of work difficulty); its automatic and early termination guaranteed regular and full reconsideration of the participant's progress during, say, a six or eight month period of supported employment.

## 2. Helping Employees Get to Work Regularly.

It has been pointed out above that the first objective of a supported work programme must be regular attendance at the worksite. In the first weeks of the programme, the probation ancillaries serving as crew foremen would go to the home of any employee who failed to turn up at the worksite without having indicated in advance that he would be unavailable for work that day. Their object was to give support to the programme participant in meeting his basic responsibility; where possible, they would help the employee sort out any immediate emotional or practical difficulty standing in the way of his coming to work that day -- sometimes this required only a conversation over a cup of coffee near the employee's home, or, if he was not at home, a frank discussion of the employee's interests with relatives or friends living at his address would produce the requisite pressure on him. In other cases, contacts turned up difficulties that required casework assistance over a longer term; the ancillary would, in these cases, encourage and support the employee to take such difficulties to his supervising probation officer. It was found that the job of supervising programme participants at the worksite was facilitated by the awareness of the background difficulties that resulted from this contact by ancillaries.

It took some time to realize that this procedure was a necessary part of the supported work programme. It was properly institutionalized after it became evident that a failure to follow through systematically had substantially reduced the chances for several employees to come to terms with the challenge and opportunity offered in Bulldog. For instance, one programme participant established, from the first day, a habit of not appearing on Mondays. Because the site foreman soon knew the employee would turn up on Tuesdays, he did not feel it necessary to visit him to determine the cause of his absence; he was therefore not in a position to assist the employee to deal with the problem then and there. This reinforced the very habit which Bulldog aimed to break. When it became apparent that the employee would never show up at work on Mondays, because he used the time to recover from his weekends heavy drinking, it was all the more difficult to make believable the programme's requirement that he progress towards full attendance and full hours.

Thus, it is now the firm's policy to follow up any employee at any worksite who fails to turn up for work on a day when he is expected; the Site Supporters whose responsibilities include this task, keep the charge-hands informed so that the programme's response, when the employee next appears for work, can be geared to the circumstances of his absence. Few have had to be followed up after two or three weeks of reporting for work. After that, time-keeping and attendance seem good indicators; those who cannot, even with this support, manage to improve in this area are likely to have such overwhelming problems off the job, at this stage in their lives, that the rest will not fall into place.

### 3. Objective Performance Criteria and Graduated Stress on the Worksite

When it began, the supported work programme was necessarily without firm guidelines by which site foremen could determine, for instance, where attendance and time-keeping was bad enough to warrant suspension or, after repeated failures to improve, sacking. Although a system of promotions and pay rises had been established, there were no criteria by which employees could be assessed for the rewards. It was recognized, however, that the concept of "graduated stress" (tolerating poor attendance, time-keeping, and productivity at the beginning of a participant's employment, but steadily increasing the demands and the stress toward the standards of non-supported jobs) would require a set of objective criteria. This was the subject of a series of management meetings at which the site foremen initially took the view that it was virtually impossible to objectify the bases for their decisions about when to tolerate and when to make tougher demands, when to suspend and when

to sack. However, with experience, it became possible to find the common ground and to articulate it. Out of these discussions emerged a set of standards which now govern the first level of such decision-making: these are the minimum criteria for promotion from Improver (90p per hour) to Crewman (£1.10p per hour):

"A. Attendance:

- To be eligible for promotion the employee must put in 120 hours of work over 20 consecutive working days in which he is "available for work". (An employee is "unavailable for work" when he is absent for reasons out of his own control; if the reason is sickness, it requires a medical certificate.)
- The employee's rate of attendance cannot be in clear decline towards the end of the 20 consecutive working days.

"B. Quality of Performance:

Initially, we shall assume general agreement among site supervisors about what constitutes poor, acceptable, and excellent performance. The elements of "performance" include effort, productivity, and skill. If an employee is rated excellent, we should be considering his immediate graduation to non-supported employment rather than his promotion to £1.10p per hour. (The exception, of course, is where an excellent employee is unable to meet acceptable standards of attendance or behaviour, in which case it should be determined whether Bulldog, with the incentives and supports it offers, can be of assistance to the employee in improving his attendance and behaviour. If not, we should be considering his termination from the programme; if so, then his graduation from 90p to £1.10p per hour will rest on his progress in the attendance and behaviour categories.)

"C. Behaviour:

- If the employee has an identifiable behaviour problem at work, there must be some improvement in that behaviour over the 20 consecutive working days.
- If the employee has engaged in conduct which could qualify for dismissal under the terms of his Contract of Employment, it may disqualify him from promotion to £1.10p per hour. This is in the discretion of the site supervisor, in consultation with the Deputy Manager/Personnel, but the grounds of their decision should be explained clearly to the employee where there has been such misconduct.
- Apart from avoiding serious misconduct that could lead to outright dismissal from employment, "behaviour" means "taking direction" from the site supervisor.

"The above criteria, it should be emphasized, are "guidelines". In general, this means that a site supervisor cannot recommend for promotion an employee who does not fit the minimum criteria outlined above; equally, an employee who meets the criteria should be promoted unless there is good reason, agreed with the Deputy Director/Personnel, for promotion to be withheld. It is hoped that these criteria will be further refined or adjusted in light of experience."



It is a challenge to the Site Supporters (probation ancillary workers) and to charge-hands to give enough support without turning a "real job" into casework. One Site Supporter put it this way:

"Although it is obvious that emotional and home problems affect an employee's ability to get in on time, apply himself to the job, and accept direction, I made it clear from the start that I was prepared to share their other problems and listen to them on this only if they showed me an effort to deal with the specific problems on the job. The art is in recognizing the problems that cause bad time-keeping or non-productive working, isolating them and dealing with them or referring the employee back to the probation officer for some concentrated work on them."

It is expected that the example set by crew members promoted to charge-hands, leading hand or foreman will provide an additional kind of support for persons joining the scheme. But those promoted to greater responsibilities need support too, and the Sites Supervisor devotes considerable attention to seeing that neither the pressure nor the temptations become too great too quickly.

#### 4. Job Placement and the Transition to Non-Supported Work.

In the view of the employment officer seconded to Bulldog from the Employment Service Agency of the Manpower Services Commission, the Bulldog employees who develop into good workers in the scheme should be relatively easy to place in non-supported jobs -- if their expectations of pay and type of work are realistic and if they are prepared to leave the supported environment. Most of the Bulldog employees were "unemployable", not only because of their lack of a work habit, but because they had no work record or previous employer who could give them a reference. Bulldog can, and does do this. Thus, during the past year, the employment officer, after interviews with the Site Supporter, Sites Supervisor, chargehand and the employee, would (if he agreed that an employee was "job-ready") arrange suitable job interviews with conventional employers. In addition, these employees were given paid time off the site to attend job-seeking interviews. He would present himself clothed as a worker and he would present Bulldog's letter of reference. As it is important in the long run that Bulldog's credibility back up such letters, care is taken not to misrepresent the quality of the job-ready employee's attendance, time-keeping, productivity and skills; but something favourable and specific can be said about these aspects of every job-ready Bulldog employee's work record with the firm.

In some cases where employees' ambitions were unrealistic, it was necessary to give firm reminders of the short-term and transitional nature of the employment contract while trying to help the employee gain a realistic perspective. In other cases it was possible to help him find the tutoring or training that would be prerequisite to the job he wanted. For instance, illiterate employees who want entry to several government training programmes must first pass a written test.

But job satisfaction with Bulldog tends to be too great for transition to non-supported settings to be smooth. This is not necessarily because Bulldog is "soft" or "easy". The employment officer's view was that the resistance to seeking other employment arises from the satisfaction of having a real job to do, for a real wage, which is appreciated by others. In addition, it is no surprise that suitable work is not in abundant supply, particularly for Bulldog employees who cannot qualify for RSSL (Recruitment Subsidy for School Leavers) and who, by and large, have little or no prior experience of any particular type of work. Placements in suitable training programmes are also in short supply, but Bulldog employees are likely to fare better than peers who have been unemployed and lacking any regular routine for some time.

The job development effort took shape, using three basic methods:

- It proved useful for Bulldog's employment officer to liaise with local employment offices to identify suitable firms and notify vacancies and to draw information from the offices' records of potential employers; the employee would then be released from the worksite when a job interview looked promising.
- Such pre-arranged interviews seemed less useful when suitable employment was sought on building sites; for this, the job-ready employee was provided with a list of local sites and was released from the Bulldog site to apply in person (and with his letter of reference).
- Transfer onto the workforces of other firms that are working the same site, or of agencies using Bulldog's services both appear to hold some promise. In time, it is hoped that direct approaches by Bulldog, to employers with large workforces, might yield referral relationships that would provide a pool of different types of jobs.

##### 5. Liaison with the Referring Probation Officer

The supported work programme depends upon the referring probation officer, not only to refer suitable clients who need and can benefit from the scheme, but to use the change in the client's life -- a steady job -- as an opportunity to surface and focus on particular emotional and practical problems. The scheme's success requires that the probation officer be the main provider of professional social work support and guidance, so that the work and its demands remain "real".

Probation officers are increasingly using the scheme as such a resource. At first some seemed only partially to have understood the scheme's strategy and philosophy, they expressed full satisfaction when a client who had never worked regularly was putting in, say, 25 hours a week at a Bulldog site; this made it difficult for the site supervisor or charge-hand to enforce the full attendance standards prerequisite to job-readiness and graduation out of the scheme. But the liaison mechanism seems now to have resolved such difficulties.

#### IV. RESEARCH

It was noted in Section I that research officers from the Home Office Research Unit and a Senior Economic Assistant from the Home Office Urban Deprivation Unit were assigned to monitor the developing programme and to explore the possibilities for more systematic research of any larger, long-term demonstration. They have attended weekly meetings of Bulldog's management, where by offering their ideas they have contributed to the development of the supported work programme itself. The Home Office Research Unit officer, for instance, regularly interviewed recently hired employees, employees recently terminated, and referring probation officers; she also explored the possible methods for drawing a comparison group from the caseloads of referring probation officers, against which the performance of Bulldog employees could be assessed. And the Urban Deprivation Unit's Senior Economic Assistant, in addition to monitoring the public expenditure implications of the project investigated means of systematically obtaining data about supplementary and unemployment benefit costs and savings associated with programme participation.

Their reports of the experience during the feasibility study are in preparation. Already, however, two complementary research perspectives are emerging with regard to current evaluation and any research that might be undertaken in the future.

The first of these looks at supported work as a method of reducing unemployment. This involves consideration of the costs and benefits to participants, to the exchequer and to society. As regards efficiency, it is important to examine which are the best types of jobs to provide, to compare the scheme with non-supported employment, to look at the economic value of the goods and services produced and the acceptability of former participants to outside employers. Among the wider considerations is the question of possible displacement in the labour market at a time of high unemployment in Inner London and the impact on local communities.

The second line of research examines supported work as a method of assisting a specific sub-group of the unemployed, namely probation clients with employment problems. Judging by those so far employed by Bulldog, this group appear to be unlikely to be assisted by programmes merely finding jobs for them, since their poor work records and unemployment were not primarily due to the unavailability of work but were reflections of these individuals' inability to hold jobs or their lack of motivation to work. Although lack of a current job figures prominently among their

problems it could rarely be thought to be the root of them.

Thus, examination of the impact of the scheme should in time, include reports of cost-effectiveness and:

- the ways in which participants' unemployment is relevant to and related to the other problems they present to their probation officers;
- the individual participant's response to the employment opportunity, changes in behaviour and attitudes related to the work context and to social circumstance and, at a later date when appropriate, the influence of participation on future employment and criminal behaviour; and
- the extent to which the referring probation officers find the supported work programme a useful and relevant resource.

V. COSTS, AND RUDIMENTARY COST/BENEFIT ANALYSIS OF THE SUPPORTED WORK PROGRAMME

A report of Bulldog's company accounts is being prepared by the auditors for submission to the Board of Directors. That is the conventional forum for displaying such information. But Bulldog is not a conventional or commercial firm; its costs are covered by public funds as an investment in rehabilitating non-productive, delinquent members of the community and the intention is that the supported work programme return to the exchequer savings that at least cover the public subsidies.

Although a full cost/benefit analysis of a programme as complex as Bulldog would require a longer time span and a greater investment in data collection than was permitted by the relatively small-scale and brief feasibility study reported here, it is possible to make rough calculations of the net costs to and recoveries by the exchequer even on the basis of the feasibility year's data. The results are impressive.

A conservative measure of the public expenditure implications, adopted by the Senior Economic Assistant assigned by the Urban Deprivation Unit to monitor this side of the Bulldog scheme, is to calculate the public investment (the cash subsidy of programme overhead and operating costs) that is necessary to "graduate" each of the participants who succeeds in developing "job-ready" habits of work in the scheme and transits to non-supported employment. Then, by projecting the future supplementary benefits saved because these successful participants are working and by estimating the tax and National Insurance payments their work will generate (assuming they receive no raise in pay), it is possible to calculate the time it will take before the exchequer recovers its investment. The Urban Deprivation Unit's analysis based its calculation of the expenditure required to graduate a successful participant upon the programme's first six months; during that period the management and supervisory costs were constant but the workforce and income figures were artificially low because the scheme was building slowly to its mid-year size. But even when the investment necessary to graduate a successful participant is calculated upon such artificially high per capita expenditure data, the investment appears likely to be fully repaid within three years. This is judged unusually cost-efficient for a training programme.

Another way to examine the public expenditure implications is to focus on current net costs and current benefits to the exchequer realized during any given week, month or year of Bulldog's operation. For example: at mid-point in the feasibility year, for a week during which the Bulldog workforce was 33, the week's overhead and operating costs totalled

£1,927.\* For that week's work, Bulldog received payments from customers totalling £365 (this income is the portion of labour and material costs payable to Bulldog on some of its work sites). The week's programme activity generated VAT, income tax and National Insurance returns to the exchequer totalling £509. Thus, the net cash subsidy from public funds was £1053, or £32 per programme participant.

There are other immediate cash benefits to the exchequer that have not so far been considered in calculating the net cost. Foremost among these is the saving of public expenditure on the supplementary benefits

---

\* These costs are calculated by allocating to the week a proportionate share of management, supervisory and clerical personnel's annual gross salary costs (gross pay plus employers' National Insurance payments and superannuation where applicable), a proportionate share of annual expenditure on insurance, legal services, plant, and equipment which are assumed to have life expectancy of one year, and the week's real expenditures on expendable supplies and materials, travel and subsistence, and miscellaneous items. To this sum is added the gross wages of programme participants during the week (pay plus employers' National Insurance payments).

Of course, there are some tangible costs which have not been taken into account because of the difficulty of determining their amount. Bulldog's office at 210 Chiswick High Road, for instance, is in Probation Service property owned by the Receiver. The programme pays no rent and thus there is no direct cost to the exchequer to subsidize Bulldog's use of the premises. But there is some opportunity cost. As it happens, ILPAS is large enough, its properties so many, and a sufficient number of rooms in its properties are at any given time not being used, or being used only part of the time, that the opportunity cost of Bulldog's use of several rooms in one of these properties cannot approach the rental value. Similarly, no account is taken of the value of services provided free to Bulldog from the commercial sector. The secondment of executives, from the Esso Corporation and from McAlpine's, represented some income to Bulldog, as it saved paying a part-time salary to someone with skills necessary to do the work which was in fact undertaken by the secondees. Conversely, there must have been an opportunity cost to the seconding companies. But any such opportunity cost is not a charge on public expenditure, and these secondments flow from the propositions that such costs are the necessary costs of doing business in a modern society, that public acknowledgment of such secondments has the net effect of increasing the businesses' profitability, and that any opportunity cost is reduced substantially by the value to the company of exposing its personnel to business and personal experiences different from those available in the commercial sector for training and staff development.

which Bulldog participants would have claimed had they not been brought into the "real job, real wage" supported work scheme. Not all Bulldog participants were in fact claiming their entitlements in the period immediately prior to employment -- some were living off their parents or girlfriends and others were scraping by on whatever cash they could beg, borrow (from acquaintances) or (in some instances) steal. But if the total of weekly supplementary benefits paid to those who had been claiming is divided by the number of all programme participants the saving to the exchequer from withdrawal of supplementary benefits as a consequence of Bulldog's existence can be calculated as averaging £10 per week per participant. Taking this saving into account reduces the net public cash expenditure during that mid-year week to £22 per participant.

This figure (£22) was, of course, higher at the beginning of the year when there were fewer participants among whom to divide the overheads and no contract income to offset those costs. But, as the workforce continued to grow toward its highpoint of 46 in September, and as the proportion of labour costs recovered through contract income increased over the months, the net public cash subsidy required per participant each week dropped from £22, at mid-year, toward £17.

In addition, the supported work programme is unlike a programme of "pure" treatment where the only economic benefits derive from long-term changes in the participant's behaviour (e.g., saving of penal resources through reduced recidivism, generation of tax and National Insurance payments by the employment over subsequent years of a client who would otherwise have remained unproductive or incarcerated). Although supported work may generate returns of this kind, they are considered too speculative for inclusion in a cost/benefit discussion at this stage. But the programme participants in supported work produce direct benefits to the community, as by-products of the scheme that aims to help them overcome the difficulties which keep them out of work, in their cycle of offending and institutionalization. Thus, through the labour of programme participants at the South east London dock site, the borough will gain for this deprived area workshops that will in turn generate employment. The social and economic benefits of the renovation scheme at that side -- where decay and disuse presently exact a substantial social cost -- should be considerable; some portion of those gains are attributable to Bulldog (which provided necessary services at less than



commercial cost) and could properly be applied to further offset the net costs of the programme to the exchequer. More obvious is the public benefit represented by Bulldog's work on the crypt at the West End church. This facility is an essential contribution from the voluntary sector to society's provision for a desperately deprived group. That group would otherwise represent some charge on the statutory agencies providing services of a similar kind. Bulldog's work at the crypt, for which it made no charge, represents income to the voluntary sector roughly equal to the commercial value of the work done -- and the exchequer is, at least indirectly, <sup>the</sup> beneficiary.

These benefits are tangible, but their exact value to the exchequer is difficult to calculate. It could be argued, for example, that the work contributed by Bulldog to the crypt, although representing income to the church in the amount of the commercial cost of the work done, does not benefit the exchequer because, from a social policy point of view, this work would not have been purchased commercially in the present economic climate. (Indeed, if priorities permitted placing a value on this work at its commercial cost, the church could successfully have applied to statutory sources for funds to cover the full cost.) But this seems too rigid. It may be that the return to the exchequer from Bulldog's work at the crypt and similar sites should be valued at less than commercial cost, to account for social policy priorities that place a lower value on contributions of this kind, but there is some public benefit and this benefit has some economic value.

If a method could be agreed for giving a proper economic weight to these contributions -- and to the savings that appear to accrue from reduction in participants' offending and involvement while they are in the programme (as distinct from the speculative long-term savings from reduced recidivism after leaving the "treatment") -- it would be possible to express in pounds the costs and benefits to the exchequer of each

Bulldog contract and, thus, the overall programme.\*

Whatever that cost/benefit ratio was for the supported work programme at the end of the feasibility year, the cash subsidy required per participant per week can be further reduced by expanding the workforce to make more efficient use of existing and additional management and supervisory personnel. (Also, the past year's experience indicates that a larger project has other advantages: a greater number and wider variety of work-sites and site foremen would permit more flexibility in the composition of crews and the matching of employees to the sites and the foremen most likely to engage their interest and facilitate their progress towards job-readiness; and a larger project might permit the construction of a Control contract group of sufficient size to make more accurate assessments of the impact of the scheme on the participants, on the community and on the exchequer.)

---

\* It would be necessary, if this were to be done, to have a comparison group which matches as nearly as possible the group participating in the programme. This would permit account to be taken of the difference in DHSS costs, income and taxes, offending, and institutionalization between persons who are in the programme and similar persons who are not. Vera's New York supported work programme ("Wildcat") was accompanied by a random-selection controlled experiment — only half those referred to the scheme were employed and the decision was taken randomly so that the two groups were as well-matched as possible. Thus, not only has it been possible to compare the long-term adjustment of those who were in the programme with those who were not, but it has also been possible to bring substantially greater rigour to the cost/benefit calculations. Almost all of Wildcat's services were provided to the various agencies of the City of New York. Following consultations with the City's Bureau of the Budget, economic values were placed upon each of the contracts performed by participants in the scheme. Current savings in supplementary benefits and penal resources were easily ascertained by direct measurement of the charges incurred for those who had been included in the programme and those who had not. Thus, it was possible to calculate with some accuracy the current cost/benefit ratio, and it was found that the subsidy from public funds necessary to cover Wildcat's operating costs was more than fully recovered through the supplementary benefit savings and contributions of labour by participants in the programme.

*without inclusion of*  
It is highly unusual for any social action programme, aiming to induce positive change in those receiving the "treatment", to show a positive cost/benefit ratio ~~unless~~ the speculative long-term benefits (e.g., avoidance of future supplementary benefit costs and generation of new tax revenues through the retention by programme participants of better work records than the control group, in years after they leave the programme; future savings of penal resources through the programme participants' continuing to show a lower criminal recidivism rate than the controls in subsequent years).

For the present, it is assumed from the year's experience that the ideal size of Bulldog is roughly 100 participants. The <sup>subsidy required</sup> ~~actual cost of~~ such a programme would be in the region of £156,000, of which £56,000 <sup>contract</sup> ~~represents~~ represents the costs of management, supervision, accommodation (and other overheads). If it can be accepted that this operation is a legitimate social work activity for a probation and after-care service, the management costs could properly be absorbed within the Service's budget. In fact, the Home Office has agreed that these costs should be so borne during the second year of Bulldog's operation. The remaining £100,000 will be seen to represent an outlay of £1,000 per annum for each participant. However, the net public expenditure, as previously defined, would be minimal taking into account the generation of VAT, income tax and National Insurance contributions (probably £50,000) and the saving of a comparable sum in respect of supplementary benefit payments. Additionally, the public good would be furthered by the productive work performed and the social and economic benefits accruing from reduced offending by programme participants during and following the course of their employment, a value which could legitimately be set against the "social work" costs being carried by the Service.

*Handwritten notes:*  
- *78 and cost* (with arrow pointing to 'actual cost of')  
- *contract* (with arrow pointing to 'represents')  
- *subsidy required* (written above 'actual cost of')  
- *for* (written to the left of 'such a programme')  
- *from public funds* (written above 'actual cost of')  
- *actual costs less actual revenues* (written below 'actual cost of')