



Discussion paper prepared for
the Progress Exchange

22nd October 2026

Beyond employability:

Participation, opportunity and the challenge of moving forward

Executive summary

Across the region, organisations help people rebuild confidence, reconnect with learning, manage difficult circumstances and find work. The practice evidence considered in this paper shows considerable commitment and practical knowledge. It also sits within a wider national and regional picture: rising concern about young people not in education, employment or training, stubborn economic inactivity, uneven access to opportunity, fast-changing entry-level work, and renewed policy attention through Get Britain Working, the Youth Guarantee and Alan Milburn's *Young People and Work* review.

The central argument concerns how opportunity is organised. People experience health, relationships, money, caring responsibilities, education and work together. Support is still commonly organised through separate remits, budgets and measures. Progress depends on the relationships and arrangements that connect those activities, including the community life around them. When one service finishes before the next becomes accessible, the individual is left to carry the gap. We need to examine who takes responsibility, what resources make the transition possible and whether anyone knows what happened afterwards.

Practice insight describes progress as cumulative, relational and frequently non-linear. Attendance, trust, growing responsibility and the ability to recover from a setback can precede a qualification or job. Recognising those changes should strengthen our understanding of sustained employment. It should also recognise participation and contribution as valuable parts of a life, including when paid work is not an immediate or appropriate goal.

This evidence contains a productive tension. Community and youth organisations stress belonging and confidence; employment contributors press for clearer evidence of paid work, earnings and retention. Both deserve serious attention. A broader account of progress must hold institutions to higher expectations of access and continuity while protecting people from being judged against a single, predetermined destination.

For the Steve Morgan Foundation, the issue is not whether employability programmes matter. It is whether the wider system around them can turn participation into sustained opportunity. This paper argues that progress depends on the design of the pathway as much as the capability of the person moving through it. The task is to understand where responsibility is lost, what conditions make opportunity usable, and how partners, employers, funders and public systems can act on what is already known.

Eight propositions are offered for discussion:

1. Progress starts before formal outcomes become visible. Engagement, trust, agency, belonging and growing responsibility are evidence of movement, not background detail.
2. Opportunity must lead somewhere. Responsibility for a transition should continue until a meaningful next step is accessible, or the obstacle is understood and acted upon.
3. Relationships need dependable organisational capacity. Funding, staffing and handover arrangements determine whether trust can survive a programme boundary or a setback.

4. AI requires deliberate choices about access. It may widen agency or deepen exclusion depending on who can use it well and how recruitment and work are designed.
5. Place shapes the pathway. Labour markets, transport, services and community infrastructure determine whether opportunity is genuinely accessible.
6. A common language of progress is achievable. Organisations do not need identical programmes or a single universal score to connect starting point, change, next opportunity and sustainability.
7. Funding should support continuity where continuity is the intervention. Relationships, handovers and follow-up require capacity, not just goodwill.
8. Lived experience should shape decisions, not decorate them. People affected by a pathway should influence what is tested, changed and learned.

What this paper is designed to do

This paper is intended to support a focused conversation about participation, progression and employment. It does not present a finished programme of work. It sets out a diagnosis, tests a set of propositions and identifies practical questions that should shape future funding, partnership, policy and delivery decisions.

1. Purpose and approach

This is a Steve Morgan Foundation discussion paper about participation, progression and employment.

It brings together practice insight, SMF learning, national policy evidence and regional labour-market context to examine how people move towards opportunity, and why that movement so often breaks down.

It is deliberately written as a provocation rather than a final report. Its purpose is to frame the questions that matter: where people are making progress before formal outcomes appear; where opportunity exists only on paper; where policy fails to become a usable pathway; and what would need to change for participation to lead to sustained opportunity.

The paper is not a funding process, consultation exercise or organisational endorsement statement. It is a working argument from SMF, designed to support sharper discussion and better decisions. It should be read as an invitation to test the analysis, challenge the assumptions and identify where action is possible.

2. Evidence base and sources used

The evidence base combines four sources: practice insight from organisations working directly with people, families, employers and communities; SMF learning from conference, convening, portfolio and trustee discussions; national evidence and policy; and regional evidence from Liverpool City Region's skills, growth and employment agenda.

The national and regional sources include *Bridging the Gap*, *Get Britain Working*, the Youth Guarantee, Alan Milburn's *Young People and Work* interim report, ONS NEET statistics, House of Commons Library briefings, Select Committee scrutiny, Liverpool City Region's Long Term Skills Plan and the Local Skills Improvement Plan.

SMF's learning points to a simple conclusion: lasting change is rarely created by a single programme or intervention. It depends on the strength of the relationships around people, the prevention of problems

before they become entrenched, the quality of local knowledge, and the capacity of organisations to stay involved long enough for progress to become sustainable. This gives SMF a particular role: to use its independence, relationships and evidence to connect learning across places and sectors, support capacity where it is most needed, and help practical insight reach those able to change the conditions around opportunity.

Taken together, these sources support a practical question: how can local practice insight, regional economic strategy, national policy reform and philanthropic learning be brought into a more coherent account of participation, progression and sustained employment?

3. The central diagnosis: life arrives as a whole

An employability response can concentrate on skills, qualifications, confidence and job-search activity because these are things a programme can directly influence. They matter. But the evidence considered here suggests that treating them as a sufficient explanation of participation can place too much responsibility on the person seeking support and too little on the institutions controlling access.

The practical reality described by contributors is more layered. A conversation about work can quickly become a conversation about housing, money, transport, mental health, family pressure, digital access or trust. A person may want to work and possess valuable skills, but still be unable to convert that potential into participation because the surrounding conditions are unstable or the route into opportunity is inaccessible.

“In an Everton in the Community context, it is no longer enough to ask, “What support does this person need?” We also need to understand what is happening around them - their confidence, relationships, finances, health, digital access, and connection to work or community.”

Everton in the Community

This matters because apparently simple labels can conceal very different realities. “Not engaging” may describe somebody who does not trust services after repeated disappointment. “Not work ready” may describe somebody whose caring responsibilities make conventional provision impossible. “Low aspiration” may reflect a rational response to limited visible opportunity. “Skills deficit” may disguise inaccessible recruitment, poverty, discrimination or poor health.

“A common misconception is that a lack of employment or participation is primarily a skills deficit. In reality, many people already possess skills, talents and potential but have experienced barriers such as poverty, trauma, poor mental health, caring responsibilities, discrimination or a lack of opportunity.”

Rotunda College & Community Hub

Several contributors described a double hit: people are carrying more complex barriers while the external opportunity landscape has become more competitive. The implications are significant. A response that concentrates only on changing the individual can miss the conditions around them. A response that concentrates only on creating opportunities can miss whether those opportunities are visible, accessible, trusted and sustainable.

The issue is not that employability is irrelevant. It is that employability is too narrow a frame for the full journey. The wider frame is participation: the capacity to engage, contribute, make choices, sustain momentum and access expanding opportunity over time.

Who carries the gap between services?

Consider an illustrative transition, rather than a reported case. Someone completes a course and is referred to an employer, but a delayed start leaves them without a known contact. The course has recorded completion; the employer has not yet taken responsibility; the person is expected to keep the connection alive. Each organisation may have fulfilled its remit. The combined arrangement has still left a foreseeable risk unattended.

This is where the argument moves from a call for more joined-up working to a question of design. Who can keep contact during the interval? Who can resolve a practical barrier? Whose budget covers that work, and who can see whether the next step happened? Shared concern has little effect if nobody has the authority or capacity to act.

The burden of navigating these gaps is unlikely to fall evenly. Someone with money, transport and a useful personal network may recover a missed connection. Someone without those resources may lose the opportunity altogether. Continuity therefore has an equity dimension: the design of a pathway determines how much private resource a person needs to make it work.

4. What feels different now

The practice evidence does not present a single explanation, but it does reveal a consistent pattern. Helping people move forward now requires organisations to respond to greater complexity, faster change and a thinner margin for error.

The national context reinforces this local intelligence. Official statistics show that by April to June 2026, 981,000 young people aged 16 to 24 were not in education, employment or training, representing 13.0% of that age group, and around 60% of those young people were economically inactive rather than unemployed. This matters because the policy challenge is no longer only youth unemployment in the conventional sense. As Alan Milburn has argued publicly, it is increasingly a problem of youth detachment: young people without a secure route into work, training or learning in the first place. That shifts attention from motivation alone towards the availability of opportunity, the support needed to reach it and the systems that either connect or trap people at an early stage.

This makes the design of policy responses especially important: the issue is not only how quickly young people can be offered activity, but whether the activity reconnects them to learning, work, relationships and support.

The Youth Guarantee and Get Britain Working agenda represent an important policy response, particularly where they are being developed through trailblazer areas such as Liverpool City Region. The policy opportunity is significant, but so is the risk. If national initiatives focus mainly on programme access, job starts or short-term participation, they may miss the barriers that determine whether an opportunity is usable: transport, confidence, mental health, caring responsibilities, employer expectations, digital exclusion, weak handovers and lack of trusted relationships.

These accounts invite us to reconsider the level at which success is understood. If a person's next step depends on education, health, an employer and a community organisation, one programme's records will reveal only part of the story. We need to understand what their combined contribution makes possible. An effective intervention can still sit within an ineffective pathway.

This also sharpens the role of employers. Business engagement cannot be limited to vacancies at the end of a programme. Employers need routes to shape pathways earlier, offer credible encounters and experience, and help define the capabilities, support and workplace conditions that make entry and progression realistic.

The challenge is to make engagement practical for employers of different sizes, particularly where smaller businesses lack the capacity to navigate multiple initiatives.

Complexity and pressure

Mental health, cost of living pressures, insecure housing, social isolation, caring responsibilities and reduced trust were repeatedly identified as interconnected barriers. For some people, the immediate task is getting through the week. Planning for the future is difficult when the present is unstable. This makes progression less linear and increases the value of flexible, relational and long-term support.

“People are navigating far greater complexity. Challenges around mental health, cost of living, digital influences, family pressures and trust in institutions are often interconnected. Progress is less linear, meaning services need to be more relational, flexible and long-term in their approach.”

Liverpool City Council

The front door has changed

Organisations described people arriving further from a conventional employment pathway and with needs that cannot be addressed through a standard sequence. The role of support has shifted from giving direction towards helping people navigate ambiguity, make decisions and build the confidence and connections to act. Meeting people where they are is not a lowering of expectation. It is the starting point for creating a realistic route forward.

A more demanding transition for young people

Young people are entering a world shaped by disrupted education, changing entry-level work, constant digital stimulation and uneven access to real-world experience. Contributors highlighted reduced opportunities to practise communication, teamwork, negotiation and resilience. They also described the importance of trusted spaces in which young people can try, fail, return and grow.

“Open-access youth work directly addresses these challenges by providing safe, trusted environments where young people can develop confidence, independence and aspiration. Rather than doing things for young people, it equips them with the skills, relationships and agency to thrive in an increasingly complex world.”

The Dome Youth Zone

The community around the pathway

The evidence from Rotunda and The Dome suggests a further question. What makes an opportunity usable before a formal referral takes place? Familiar spaces, peers and trusted adults can help a person try something, hear about a possibility or recover confidence after disappointment. Their value extends beyond preparing someone for a service. They are settings in which people can contribute, form relationships and begin to shape the life of a place.

A pathway therefore sits within a wider community. Connecting services while neglecting the places where trust develops may leave the underlying problem intact. Equally, local networks can exclude people as well as support them. The test is whose choices and connections are expanding, including those who are not already known to the organisations involved. Community capacity should be strengthened without expecting unpaid relationships to absorb responsibilities that belong to public services or employers.

Inclusion has advanced, but access remains uneven

An anonymous supported-employment contributor describes greater awareness of neurodiversity and reasonable adjustments alongside continuing barriers in recruitment and access to diagnosis. The response also raises fears about the financial consequences of moving into work. These are observations from practice, not evidence that awareness or exclusion has changed uniformly. They ask us to distinguish recognising a need from making an opportunity accessible.

Place matters

Opportunity is distributed unevenly. Transport, local employer demand, public services, community infrastructure and the presence of trusted organisations all shape what is possible. National evidence on social mobility continues to point to persistent geographical disparities, while regional skills planning in Liverpool City Region identifies economic inactivity, employer demand, post-16 capacity, digital and AI capability and progression as live strategic challenges. A route that works in one place may fail in another. This is not an argument against shared learning. It is an argument for combining shared principles with local knowledge and testing them against the real economy of a place.

For SMF, this creates a practical place-based question. Regional policy conversations in Liverpool City Region, Cheshire and Warrington and North Wales may all offer routes for learning, but their arrangements should not be assumed to be identical. The useful task is to identify, in each place, the specific decision about education, employment support or commissioning that partner experience could inform, and the body able to take that decision.

Several responses describe greater personal pressures alongside a more difficult route into work. This makes the link between support and actual opportunity more important. Which roles or placements are available? Which requirements prevent access? Where is a willing host unable to offer sufficient supervision? Local evidence on those questions should shape any practical test; the practice evidence alone cannot establish the scale or causes of changes in vacancies.

Questions for practice and policy

- Which changes are genuinely new, and which long-standing barriers have simply become harder to ignore?
- Where are people arriving further from a conventional pathway, and what has changed about the support they need at the front door?
- Which pressures can organisations respond to themselves, and which require a change in the surrounding system or opportunity landscape?
- What would we need to stop, redesign or invest in differently if progression is now more relational, individual and non-linear?

Action

Name one current assumption, process or funding condition that no longer fits the reality described here. Identify who is able to change it and the smallest credible first step.

5. Seeing progress before the outcome

One of the clearest messages is that the earliest signs of progress are often behavioural, relational and easy to overlook. They appear before a qualification, a job or a formal milestone. They are visible to practitioners because practitioners see the starting point, the barriers and the effort required.

Across the responses, early progress included:

- showing up, returning and staying for longer;
- communicating preferences, asking a question or contributing in a way that is meaningful for that person;
- travelling independently or arriving without intensive support;
- trying something unfamiliar and returning after a setback;
- moving from “I cannot” to “I might try”;
- expressing an aspiration or making a decision;
- helping another participant or accepting responsibility;
- building a trusted relationship and asking for support;
- leading part of a review, setting a goal or taking ownership of a next step;
- seeing oneself as somebody who can contribute, rather than only somebody who needs help.

“One of the strongest indicators is when an individual begins to see themselves as someone who has something to contribute rather than someone who simply needs support.”

Rotunda College & Community Hub

These signals matter for two reasons. First, they indicate a change in agency: the person is beginning to believe that their actions can influence what happens next. Secondly, they create the conditions for a formal outcome to be sustained. A job obtained without confidence, stability or support may be fragile. A qualification achieved without a route onward may become a destination rather than a bridge.

“The earliest indicators are usually around engagement and confidence. Showing up consistently, building trusted relationships, taking small steps towards participation, expressing aspirations, or believing their voice matters often come well before measurable outcomes.”

Liverpool City Council

Making early progress visible requires judgement. A person may attend because they feel able to choose, or because they fear the consequences of absence. Increased eye contact, mentioned in some responses, is not a universal measure of confidence or engagement. Indicators must be interpreted with the individual, including their communication preferences and circumstances. The question is what the change enables them to do or decide.

Stability can also be meaningful progress when circumstances deteriorate. Yet that judgement needs an account of the starting position and the person’s priorities, not a retrospective claim that any outcome counts as success. Practitioners and participants should be able to explain what changed, why it matters and what decision follows.

Nor should independence mean the absence of help. Some people will need ongoing adjustments or trusted support to participate on terms they value. Reducing assistance is useful when it expands choice and works for the individual; it is a poor outcome if it simply transfers difficulty back to them.

A useful test

If an indicator cannot distinguish between somebody who is stuck and somebody who is building the capacity to move, it is unlikely to tell the whole story of progress.

Questions for recognising progress

- Which early signs are sufficiently meaningful and observable to guide practice across different settings?
- How should re-engagement after a setback be understood alongside continuous attendance?
- What evidence would show growing agency rather than passive compliance?

- At what point should an early sign of progress trigger a new opportunity, reduced support, additional challenge or a different response?

Action test

Select no more than three early indicators that the group would be willing to test. For each, specify what decision the indicator should improve and what burden its collection might create.

6. Opportunity is a sequence, not an event

Opportunity is often discussed as a single moment: a vacancy, a course, a placement, a grant, a referral. People rarely build secure futures through one moment. They build them through a sequence of experiences and relationships that accumulate. The central issue is not only whether an opportunity exists, but whether it opens access to another one.

These experiences can reinforce one another. Trust may make an unfamiliar opportunity worth trying; practical experience may reveal capability; being trusted with responsibility may make a future role imaginable. The order varies. Employment itself can create confidence, stability and connection, so people should not be held in preparation until every difficulty has been resolved.

This changes the questions we ask. Instead of asking only whether a programme achieved its own outcome, we also ask:

- Did the person leave with more choice, confidence and control?
- Did the experience create a relationship or network that remains useful?
- Did one opportunity lead to another?
- Was progress sustained after the formal intervention ended?
- Where was momentum interrupted, and could that interruption have been anticipated?
- Was the opportunity genuinely accessible, or available only in theory?

“Real environments where young people feel trusted, valued and part of something accelerate confidence, capability and aspiration.”

LSSP

Real environments were a recurring theme in the practice evidence. A placement, youth space, community role, apprenticeship or volunteering opportunity can provide a setting in which people practise human capabilities, build identity and become known by others. The quality of that experience matters. Participation that offers activity without responsibility or progression can become another disconnected moment.

The practical challenge is continuity. Organisations often encounter different chapters of the same story, but funding, referral systems and institutional boundaries can make those chapters feel unrelated. The task is not necessarily to create larger structures. It is to make handovers, relationships and progression routes more intentional from the perspective of the individual.

LSSP gives a concrete example of the difference between a funded route and an available opportunity. Its response describes school budget pressures limiting the placements that schools can host. A course or apprenticeship offer therefore depends on the capacity of another organisation to provide a worthwhile setting. The practical questions concern supervision, host costs, brokerage and a credible route onward. Additional training alone cannot resolve a missing placement.

Making the transition dependable

A useful handover has a receiving person, an agreed next step and a way to check whether contact actually occurred. With the participant's agreement, relevant understanding can travel with them so that they do not repeatedly have to explain their circumstances. The originating organisation needs a clear point at which responsibility transfers, and a route back when the transition fails.

Continuity also requires permission to return. A disrupted placement need not mean starting the whole process again or being labelled disengaged. Partners could agree how to reconnect, review what went wrong and identify a suitable alternative. That takes funded time and manageable caseloads; it cannot depend indefinitely on a practitioner staying late or making an unofficial exception.

This does not require one organisation to own a person's whole journey. It requires bounded responsibilities at the moments where support changes. The participant should know who to contact, what is supposed to happen next and how to challenge a next step that does not fit.

7. What systems consistently misunderstand

The evidence identifies several recurring misunderstandings that shape policy, commissioning and funding.

Misunderstanding one: disengagement means a lack of motivation

What appears as disengagement may reflect low trust, poor mental health, previous negative experiences, inaccessible provision or too many competing pressures. Re-engagement following a setback may be a stronger sign of progress than uninterrupted attendance from somebody who began with fewer barriers.

"What can look like disengagement from the outside may actually be a lack of trust, low confidence, previous negative experiences, or simply having too many competing challenges at the same time."

Everton in the Community

Misunderstanding two: potential is visible in present circumstances

Several contributors argued that people are too often viewed through current circumstances rather than capability. The challenge is not a deficit of talent or aspiration. It is whether people can access belief, networks, relevant experience and an opportunity that allows their capability to be seen.

Misunderstanding three: a standard intervention can be applied consistently

Consistency of quality matters. Uniformity of response is different. People begin in different places, move at different speeds and need different combinations of challenge and support. The demand for a simple, scalable model can unintentionally strip out the flexibility that makes an intervention work.

Misunderstanding four: the final outcome explains the impact

A job start matters, but it does not tell us whether the work is secure, suitable, paid fairly or sustainable. A training start matters, but it does not show whether the course leads anywhere. A participation number matters, but it does not reveal who was excluded or what it took for somebody to attend.

Misunderstanding five: opportunity exists because provision or funding exists

Availability on paper does not guarantee access in practice. A placement may disappear because a host lacks capacity. A digital tool may be inaccessible because somebody lacks a device, data or confidence. A

vacancy may be screened through a process that excludes the person it was intended to reach. The existence of a route is not the same as the ability to travel through it.

Misunderstanding six: a national initiative automatically becomes a local pathway

A policy commitment can create direction and resources, but it does not automatically create a usable pathway. A Youth Guarantee, skills plan or employment programme has to be translated into local practice: who identifies people, who builds the relationship, who brokers the opportunity, who supports the employer, who resolves practical barriers, and who follows up when the first step fails.

This is where policy and delivery often lose each other. National initiatives can describe entitlement or access, while local organisations deal with whether the person has data on their phone, money for transport, confidence to attend, a trusted worker to contact, or an employer prepared to offer a realistic first step. If these translation points are not designed and resourced, the policy may technically exist while remaining unusable for the people most in need of it.

What incentives make difficult to see

A short reporting period can favour a quick, visible outcome over a slower transition. Funding confined to delivery sessions can leave employer liaison or follow-up unfunded. Separate reporting can encourage several organisations to claim the same success while nobody records the interval between them. These are risks to examine in actual arrangements, not assumptions about every funder or provider.

The response requires funders and commissioners to inspect their own decisions alongside providers' practice. If continuity matters, its cost should be visible. If partners are expected to share responsibility, they need an agreed way to recognise their different contributions. Otherwise collaboration remains an additional expectation attached to funding that rewards separate performance.

Questions for system design

- Which misunderstanding most directly shapes an unhelpful rule, target, referral threshold or commissioning decision?
- Where does a focus on deficits obscure capability, contribution or aspiration?
- Which forms of flexibility are essential to quality, and which risk becoming inconsistency without accountability?
- What should funders, commissioners, employers or providers stop doing because it mistakes availability for genuine access?

Action test

Convert one misunderstanding into a change proposition: the current assumption, the practical consequence, the alternative approach, who must act and what evidence would show improvement.

8. Artificial intelligence: a participation question

AI is already entering job search, learning and organisational administration. The immediate participation question is not whether technology will change work in the abstract, but who can use the tools well, who can still demonstrate capability, and who can obtain human help when the process fails.

Where AI may expand opportunity

- Lowering barriers to information, learning and career exploration.
- Helping people structure a CV, prepare for an interview or begin an application.

- Supporting written communication for people who may not know where to start.
- Creating organisational efficiencies that can release capacity for human support.
- Enabling more personalised or responsive learning and guidance, where used carefully.

Where AI may deepen exclusion

- Unequal access to devices, connectivity, paid tools and digital confidence.
- Applications that are generic, inaccurate or insufficiently personal, reducing the chance of success.
- Automated recruitment processes that filter people out before their capability is visible.
- Misinformation, bias and weak critical evaluation of generated content.
- The possibility that automation removes introductory tasks through which new entrants learn, meet colleagues and demonstrate capability.
- Loss of human contact in services where trust and judgement are central to progress.

“So, for me, the opportunity is to use AI as a tool that increases people’s agency and access to opportunity, rather than becoming another barrier they have to overcome.”

Everton in the Community

“For the people we support, trust, empathy and peer connection remain essential to meaningful progress.”

Rotunda College & Community Hub

One anonymous employment contributor reports that poorly personalised AI applications can undermine job search, while describing useful efficiencies in administrative work. The same response cautions against treating AI as the main explanation for fewer entry-level opportunities. This qualification matters. A credible response should test observable barriers and benefits rather than build a programme around an assumed account of technological change.

AI should therefore sit within the wider questions of access, skills, job design and human support. AI literacy may become increasingly important, but it should include critical judgement, personalisation, ethical awareness and knowing when human help is needed.

The regional skills context makes AI more than a future-facing theme. Liverpool City Region’s Local Skills Improvement Plan identifies digital and AI capability as a growing priority across sectors. This means AI is likely to affect both job search and job design. It may change what employers expect from applicants, how vacancies are filtered, how training is delivered and which entry-level tasks remain available for people to learn through work.

Protecting the route into experience

AI may help an applicant express existing capability, but an improved application does not create the experience an employer expects. If introductory tasks are removed, employers need to consider how new entrants will learn and demonstrate ability. The practical discussion should therefore include supervision, task design and entry routes alongside digital skills.

An access test could examine one application journey from start to finish: the device and connection required, the help available, the accuracy of generated material, the way candidates are assessed and the feedback they receive. This is where Milburn’s warning about a “rejection economy” is useful: repeated applications, automated filtering and no response can erode confidence before any human judgement is made.

Participants should understand and be able to explain their applications. Employers should be able to describe the role of automated screening and provide a route for human consideration where the process obscures capability.

Questions for AI and access

- Who currently benefits from AI-supported job search, learning and service delivery, and who is least able to benefit?
- What practical capabilities sit inside AI literacy beyond access to a tool?
- Where might automated recruitment or changing job design remove a route through which people previously gained experience?
- Which uses of AI could release capacity for human support, and which would weaken the relationships that make progress possible?
- What should employers and support organisations make transparent about their use of AI?

Action test

Identify one practical AI and access test that can begin with existing partners. Define the user group, the risk being addressed, the human safeguard and the evidence that would justify continuation.

9. Knowing whether people are genuinely moving forward

The evidence supports a wider account of progress, but it does not settle how progress should be measured. Some perspectives emphasise personal change and community participation; others want more transparent reporting of paid employment and earnings over time. That difference should sharpen the framework. Early change, access to opportunity and sustained outcomes answer different questions, and none should be used to conceal weakness in another.

Meaningful work needs to be defined clearly enough for outcomes to be compared. It also needs to be assessed against the person's goals, circumstances and scope for progression. A universal hours threshold could make reporting simpler while overlooking a valuable, chosen step for somebody who needs fewer hours. Reporting actual pay, hours, duration and suitability would allow a fuller judgement than counting a job start alone.

A shared measurement approach should not attempt to compress every journey into one score. It should provide a disciplined account across three connected levels. What follows is a proposed model for consideration, informed by practice evidence and SMF's wider learning.

Level one: foundations of progress

- Engagement and re-engagement.
- Confidence, self-belief and hope.
- Agency, choice and ownership of next steps.
- Belonging, trusted relationships and social connection.
- Wellbeing, stability and the ability to manage setbacks.
- Essential skills, communication and digital confidence.

Level two: participation and expanding opportunity

- Participation in learning, volunteering, community activity or work experience.

- Increasing choice over how support is used, with reduced intensity where appropriate and continuing assistance where needed.
- Access to positive networks, mentors and employers.
- Responsibility, contribution and leadership.
- Progression from one opportunity to another.
- An increase in the range and quality of choices available.

Level three: sustained social and economic outcomes

- Entry into education, training, paid work or enterprise.
- Retention and progression over time.
- Quality, suitability and security of work.
- Earnings and financial independence where these can be measured appropriately.
- Reduced crisis and greater stability.
- Continued capacity to adapt, make decisions and move forward.

“Collectively, I think organisations could adopt a simple progress framework that captures three things: where someone started, what has changed, and whether that change has been sustained.”

Everton in the Community

An anonymous employment contributor argues for essential skills and outlook measures alongside employment and earnings tracked over several years. Another seeks a clear definition of meaningful paid employment. These perspectives guard against a framework in which every activity can be presented as progress while access to decent work remains unchanged. Equally, the value of community participation should be reported honestly in its own terms.

A practical common framework

A small common framework could be tested without replacing useful local measures or flattening individual context. Its purpose would be to improve decisions: whether to offer a next step, change support, challenge an access barrier, or review an ineffective arrangement. The following six questions provide a starting point:

1. Where did the person start, including the context that shaped their ability to participate?
2. What changed in confidence, agency, stability, skills or connection?
3. What new opportunity became accessible as a result?
4. Did the person move into a meaningful next step?
5. Was that change sustained, and what helped or disrupted it?
6. Does the person now have greater choice and control over their future?

Evidence that can guide a decision

A proportionate record could combine the participant's chosen goal, a brief account of their starting point, an observable change, the next opportunity and an agreed follow-up. Practitioner observation and the person's own account may differ; that difference is useful evidence to discuss rather than average away. A short explanation of context may be more useful than adding another numerical score.

Organisations should distinguish an offered opportunity from one that was accepted, started and sustained. Follow-up should include people whose next step failed, where they agree to remain involved. Report how many were eligible for follow-up and how many were reached; people who cannot be contacted should remain unknown rather than silently disappearing from the account.

The pathway itself also needs to be visible. Time between referral and first contact, repeated assessments, unresolved barriers and failed handovers can show where institutional action is needed. These measures should sit beside personal outcomes. Otherwise a framework intended to widen accountability may simply ask more questions about the individual.

Finally, observed change is not automatically impact caused by a programme. Other support, changing circumstances and employer decisions may all contribute. Partners can give an honest account of their contribution without claiming sole credit. Shared learning should use only information needed for an agreed purpose, with clear arrangements for participant choice, access and responsibility.

Measurement discipline

The purpose is not to make every organisation collect everything. It is to establish a shared language that can connect qualitative change, practical progression and sustained outcomes without pretending they are interchangeable.

Questions for measurement

- What should be visible about starting point and distance travelled without reducing a person to their barriers?
- Which indicators of confidence, agency, belonging or stability are credible enough to inform decisions?
- How should short-term change connect to sustained education, employment, earnings, progression or independence?
- What would a meaningful definition of a good next step need to include?
- What information is useful locally but should not be forced into a shared framework?
- How can lived experience remain part of the evidence rather than becoming an illustrative add-on?

Action test

Agree the minimum useful common language, not a universal score. Any proposed measure should state what it reveals, what it cannot reveal, how it will be used and whether the value of collecting it exceeds the burden.

10. From preparing people to changing pathways

Participation cannot be treated as the responsibility of individuals and support organisations alone. Employers, education providers, public services, commissioners and funders shape the routes through which people are expected to move.

Employers shape who can enter work and what makes staying possible. A useful conversation would examine a real role: which requirements are essential, how applicants can demonstrate ability, what support a supervisor can offer, and whether hours, location and expectations fit the people being invited to apply.

“Opportunity is not distributed equally. Participation is most powerful when people are involved in shaping decisions, not simply consulted on them.”

Liverpool City Council

Education and employment also need a clearer relationship. Young people may struggle to see how learning connects to future work, careers advice can be inconsistent, and employers are not always sufficiently connected to schools or community organisations. Stronger pathways require more than occasional engagement. They require visible routes, trusted intermediaries and real experiences that build both capability and social connection.

The same principle applies to the employer offer. A smaller organisation may be willing to provide a role but lack time to manage multiple contacts, arrange specialist support or absorb the risk of taking on someone with limited work history. Milburn's wider argument is relevant here: policy has too often assumed that if young people are made more employable, the labour market will absorb them. Preparing candidates and adapting the opportunity need to happen together, through brokerage, supervision, clear expectations and help during the early weeks.

For funders and commissioners, the implication is equally direct. If trust, continuity and flexibility are part of the intervention, then funding models should not unintentionally remove them. Short-term funding, rigid outputs and insufficient investment in organisational capacity can make it harder to build the relationships and follow-up that sustainable progression requires.

For commissioners, the corresponding task is to examine what their arrangements make possible. Can a provider remain involved during a handover? Is employer liaison funded? Can partners explain a stalled transition without losing credit for useful work already done? Where procurement or programme rules prevent a change, the issue needs to reach somebody with authority to alter them. Convening alone cannot resolve a decision held elsewhere.

Health, welfare and employment provide a useful test of this approach. A person may need support with health while exploring work, and continued help after starting. Requiring one part of their life to be resolved before another service will engage can create avoidable delay. Milburn's description of the welfare system needing to become more of a springboard and less of an "elephant trap" is helpful because it focuses attention on the practical route into activity: support, health help, training, work experience and a plan, rather than only an assessment of incapacity or income entitlement. A serious pathway review should identify the actual restriction and distinguish what practitioners can change from what requires a wider decision.

Questions for pathway design

- Where is responsibility currently placed too heavily on the individual?
- Which recruitment, placement, education or funding practices make an opportunity inaccessible in practice?
- Where could a stronger handover or clearer route make an immediate difference without creating a new programme?
- Who is missing from the design of current pathways, and what support would make their participation possible?
- What could this group connect, standardise or test that no organisation could achieve alone?

Action test

Choose a pathway, place or cohort where there is both a visible problem and a credible route to action. Map the first institutional change required, not a new offer for the individual.

11. The Steve Morgan Foundation approach

The Steve Morgan Foundation occupies a distinctive position in this conversation. It has visibility across organisations working with young people, adults, families and communities, and across work focused on confidence, wellbeing, mentoring, skills, leadership, employability and participation.

That role is grounded in SMF's recent learning. Trustee, conference and portfolio discussions have repeatedly pointed to the importance of place-based working, prevention, structural barriers, lived experience

and the value of independent convening when it helps organisations move from shared concern to practical action.

That breadth gives SMF a useful line of sight. The Foundation can see organisations encountering different moments in the same kinds of journeys. One partner may help somebody rebuild trust. Another may provide a place to practise skills or assume responsibility. Another may connect that person to employment. Each organisation has a distinct purpose. From the perspective of the individual, they may be chapters of the same story.

The Foundation's contribution should be judged by whether its position helps partners act on a problem they could not resolve alone. Convening becomes useful when it identifies an obstacle, connects those with the authority to address it and keeps attention on what follows. A larger meeting or another framework is not, in itself, evidence of progress.

Employment-strategy discussions within SMF also link this agenda to Steve's own social mobility story, the importance of good work as a route to long-term life chances, and the need to understand and align with Liverpool City Region's growth and skills agenda rather than duplicate existing activity. The Foundation's distinct contribution is therefore not to create a parallel employment system, but to use portfolio intelligence, partner relationships and convening power to identify where routes into opportunity are breaking down and who is able to act.

Independent funding could help pay for the work between established remits: overlap during a transition, shared employer liaison, practitioner time to examine failed handovers, or follow-up beyond a programme's end. These are possible uses of philanthropy for discussion, not Foundation commitments. Each would need a clear problem, proportionate cost and an account of what should happen when the funding ends.

Additionality needs to be specific. If charitable funding makes an existing public pathway usable, which institution will act on the learning and consider the continuing cost? If the activity meets an enduring community need, is sustained charitable support an honest option? A pilot should not imply that future commissioning is assured. The choice between adoption, continued support, redesign and closure belongs in the initial discussion.

Funding the capacity that continuity needs

If relationships are part of how progress happens, staff supervision, manageable workloads, reliable systems and organisational resilience belong in the account of impact. Describing them as overhead does not make them optional. A pathway that works only because committed people absorb its unfunded costs remains fragile, however persuasive its success stories.

Longer funding should create room for adaptation and scrutiny. Partners could agree what evidence will be reviewed, how participants can challenge the offer and when a model should change. The aim is dependable support with the capacity to learn. Continued organisational existence is not sufficient evidence that the support is still useful.

A practical contribution

- bringing frontline experience into conversation with policy, employers and skills leaders;
- using portfolio intelligence to identify patterns, gaps, strengths and points of connection;
- creating space to test questions that sit between programme delivery, labour-market change and system design;
- supporting relationships and shared learning across places and sectors;
- using funding thoughtfully to strengthen the conditions around people and organisations;

- helping turn credible insight into a small number of practical actions.

The Foundation also has to examine its own influence. Partners may hesitate to challenge a funder's preferred explanation, even when attendance is explicitly unrelated to grant decisions. A serious learning process should make room for confidential challenge, record disagreement and show what changed as a result. People with lived experience should help decide which problems matter, with practical support and clarity about the decisions they can influence.

SMF's role should therefore be judged by the quality of its contribution to action and learning. The strongest outcome would be a small number of practical tests linked to live opportunities, with clear leadership, a first step and a review point. Where ownership is absent, the issue should remain an honest unresolved question rather than being presented as a commitment.

12. What this means for the policy and employment landscape

The employment landscape facing young people and adults at risk of exclusion is being reshaped by five overlapping developments: renewed national policy attention through Get Britain Working, the Youth Guarantee and the Young People and Work review; the growing importance of economic inactivity and hidden NEETs; stronger place-based responsibilities through devolution, trailblazer programmes and regional skills plans; the need for employers to be practical partners in pathway design; and the accelerating impact of digital and AI capability on access to work.

The common thread is that temporary schemes are unlikely to be enough. Milburn's public commentary reinforces this point: previous youth employment initiatives have often failed to last because they were programmes rather than strategic system change. The current moment therefore requires attention to the architecture around opportunity: early prevention, work experience, employer participation, health and welfare support, local labour markets and the institutional conditions that keep people connected over time.

Together, these developments strengthen the case for a holistic approach. Practice insight, public evidence and policy direction all point towards the same practical challenge: how to build pathways that are early enough, trusted enough, local enough, employer-connected enough and sustained enough to change outcomes. For SMF, the opportunity is not to replace public policy or direct the regional labour market, but to use independence, relationships and portfolio learning to make the system more honest about what is happening between ambition and access.

Turning separate insight into shared learning

Partners may each know something different about the same interruption: a school sees absence, a community organisation hears the reason, and an employer sees an unfilled place. Bringing those perspectives together can change the explanation of the problem. The Foundation's useful contribution would be to make that learning possible and help it reach the people able to act.

A short shared record of each test could set out the barrier, the change attempted, what happened and what partners would do differently. It should include disappointments and unresolved questions, with contributors agreeing what can be shared. Personal information need not become public for practical learning to travel. The value of this work increases when its knowledge remains useful to people who were not part of the original discussion.

13. Propositions for discussion

The propositions below are offered as working hypotheses. They are not conclusions to be endorsed. Their value lies in whether they change a decision, expose a dependency, or point to a practical test.

Proposition 1: Progress begins with agency, not compliance

Attendance matters, but the more important shift is whether a person is beginning to make choices, take ownership and recover from setbacks. Systems should distinguish passive compliance from growing agency.

Proposition 2: The quality of the next step matters as much as the existence of one

A progression outcome is meaningful when it expands future opportunity. A poor-quality or unsupported next step can interrupt momentum rather than build it.

Proposition 3: Relationships are infrastructure

Trusted relationships are not an optional delivery style. For many people they are the mechanism through which information becomes usable, opportunity becomes credible and setbacks become recoverable.

Proposition 4: Place shapes the pathway

Shared principles are valuable, but local labour markets, transport, services, institutions and community assets determine how opportunity is experienced. Place-based responses should connect these assets without turning coordination into an end in itself.

Proposition 5: AI requires deliberate choices about access

AI may widen agency or deepen exclusion depending on access, use and the design of recruitment and work. Test these effects in a real pathway and preserve a usable route to human support.

Proposition 6: A common language of progress is achievable

Organisations do not need identical programmes or a single universal score. They can still agree a small set of questions that connect starting point, change, next opportunity and sustainability.

Proposition 7: Funding should support continuity where continuity is the intervention

Funders should examine whether grants cover the staff, supervision, handover and follow-up on which progress depends. Longer funding deserves clear review points and evidence of learning; it should not become automatic protection for an ineffective model.

Proposition 8: Lived experience should shape decisions, not decorate them

Participation is strongest when people influence how support and opportunity are designed. This requires time, safe routes into involvement and practical support for people who are most often excluded from advisory roles.

How the propositions should be tested

Each proposition should be tested against practice, policy and the practical constraints facing organisations and employers. The question is not whether it sounds reasonable, but whether it helps partners act differently.

- What evidence from practice supports or challenges the proposition?
- What would be different if the proposition were taken seriously?
- Which actor has the authority, capability or convening power to move it forward?
- What is the smallest useful test, and what would we expect to learn?
- What existing activity could it connect to rather than duplicate?

Action test

A proposition should move forward only if it can be linked to a decision and a realistic first test.

14. From insight to action

The purpose of this paper is not to produce a long list of ambitions. It is to identify where insight can be turned into bounded action. The following action areas are deliberately framed as practical tests. They should be refined, combined or rejected based on the strength of the evidence, the feasibility of action and the presence of a willing owner.

A shared progress framework

Compare existing records across a small group of willing organisations. Agree three to five shared indicators, each linked to a decision, then try them alongside participants' own accounts. Record collection time and missing information. The first deliverable should show what the measures helped partners decide, including any that proved too burdensome or misleading.

A pathway test in one place or cohort

Choose one transition that people regularly struggle to complete and recruit participants with different experiences, including people who left support. Trace what happened between referral and arrival. Test one change, such as a named contact remaining involved until the next organisation has made contact. Compare completed transitions, delays, participant experience and staff time with the starting position, recognising the limits of a small test.

An AI and access practice group

Use a real recruitment or application process with willing employers and participants. Examine whether supported AI use helps applicants communicate their own experience accurately, and whether the route remains usable without the tool. Record barriers, practitioner time and participant understanding. Agree in advance where human review is needed and what finding would lead partners to change or stop the approach.

A meaningful employer opportunity standard

Work with a small number of willing hosts on actual roles or placements. Define the purpose, supervision, practical access, any payment or expenses, and the next opportunity the experience could open. Ask participants whether the experience delivered those conditions. Identify which improvements the host can make and which need shared capacity or funding.

A longitudinal learning commitment

Agree proportionate follow-up after a next step, for example at three and six months, subject to feasibility and participants' agreement. Record retention, suitability, further progression and the person's own judgement, alongside who could not be reached. Identify the cost and owner of follow-up before beginning. Treat these intervals as a test design, not a universal standard.

A route for lived experience into decision-making

Invite people affected by the selected pathway to help choose the test, interpret findings and review the response. Budget for their time and practical access needs. Offer ways to contribute beyond a formal

meeting, including confidential feedback, and report back on which decisions changed. This should run through the other actions rather than sit beside them as a separate consultation.

Action discipline

Select three to five actions in total, combining proposals where useful. Each needs a willing lead, participating organisations, a first deliverable, dependencies, an agreed review point and an account of the time or money required. At review, decide whether to continue, change, stop or seek a wider decision. Items without ownership remain unresolved questions.

From discussion to action

These action areas are starting points rather than a predetermined programme. To keep the conversation productive, each group should work from an observed problem towards a bounded test, rather than from a broad ambition towards a new structure.

- What is the specific problem or interruption in the pathway?
- Who experiences it, and what does existing insight tell us?
- What change is within the influence of the partners involved?
- What is the first deliverable, and what must be true for it to happen?
- Who is willing to lead or convene the first step?
- What evidence would show progress by the agreed review point?
- What remains unresolved, and whose voice or authority is missing?

Action test

No action should be treated as a commitment unless it has a clear proposition, willing ownership, a first deliverable, dependencies, evidence of progress and a review point. Everything else should be recorded honestly as an unresolved question or future opportunity.

15. What would challenge this argument?

A discussion paper should make its central argument open to correction. The practice evidence makes a persuasive case for examining continuity, access and system design, but it does not prove that fragmentation is the main barrier in every place. Future decisions should test competing explanations before deciding what to fund or change.

When the next opportunity does not exist

A better handover cannot create a suitable vacancy, an affordable journey or a placement with adequate supervision. Where demand or capacity is missing, coordination may produce little benefit. The first task is to identify whether a route is broken, inaccessible or absent; each requires a different response.

When continuity does not improve outcomes

Consistent support can build trust, but it can also sustain activity that no longer helps. If a participant remains engaged without gaining choice, capability or access to a wanted next step, the response should be reviewed with them. Relationships need both continuity and constructive challenge, and people need the freedom to choose a different source of help.

When wider measurement conceals exclusion

A richer framework can still reward organisations for working with those easiest to support. Review who was offered a place, who could not access it, who left and who is missing from follow-up. Where practical and appropriate, examine whether experience differs by disability, ethnicity, caring responsibilities or place. A positive average can coexist with a route that remains closed to a particular group.

When collaboration costs more than it changes

Shared meetings and reporting consume capacity that could otherwise support people. A proposed arrangement needs to remove a specific obstacle and earn the time it requires. If the test creates more administration without improving access, experience or sustained outcomes, partners should change or stop it. More connected activity is useful only when it improves the pathway.

The evidence that should change a decision

The strongest test would follow a defined change through to the person's next step and examine alternative explanations. A small pilot may establish feasibility and reveal problems; it will rarely establish causation. Promising findings should justify further learning at an appropriate scale. Findings that contradict the argument deserve equal attention.

16. Conclusion: ensuring opportunity has somewhere to lead

The work described in this paper starts with people making space for others to move forward. A trusted conversation, a return after a setback, responsibility in a school or support through a first placement can alter what somebody believes is possible. The organisations creating those conditions deserve more than a request to deliver another isolated outcome.

They also deserve a serious challenge. Good intentions, strong relationships and successful programmes cannot tell us everything about whether people's lives are improving. We need to know what became possible next, whether it lasted, who remained excluded and which institutional decisions made the difference. That demands attention to employment quality and earnings alongside choice, belonging and contribution.

Participation gives us a wider way to examine that responsibility. It recognises that people bring capabilities and preferences, and that progress can take different forms. It asks institutions to account for the routes they control and funders to understand the capacity on which those routes depend. A person's need for continuing support should not diminish their claim to agency or opportunity.

For the Steve Morgan Foundation, the opportunity is to use its relationships and independence to help this knowledge become actionable. That means allowing challenge, connecting people able to change a barrier and supporting honest learning about the result. The Foundation need not own the pathway to make a consequential contribution to it.

The value of this work will be measured after the discussion: whether a person can reach an opportunity that was previously out of reach, whether the people around them understand what made the difference, and whether partners are prepared to change the arrangements that currently make progress harder than it needs to be.

Opportunity, once found, needs somewhere meaningful to lead. Our responsibility extends to what makes that next step possible.

Appendix 1. Contributor insight used in this paper

The themes below summarise practice perspectives. They should not be read as organisational endorsement of every interpretation or proposed action in this paper.

Attributed organisational voices

- Everton in the Community: complexity around the person; trust, agency and small steps; AI as a tool that should increase access; a progress framework based on starting point, change and sustainability.
- Rotunda College & Community Hub: belonging, confidence and trust as foundations; the limits of a skills-deficit frame; community ownership, lived experience and social connection.
- Liverpool City Council: interconnected pressures; confidence and trusted relationships as early indicators; participation in shaping decisions; removing systemic barriers.
- LSSP: meaningful real-world environments, responsibility and belonging; human skills in an AI-enabled labour market; locally rooted pathways through schools.
- The Dome Youth Zone: digital pressures, reduced real-world practice and the value of open-access youth work; sustainable progression and shared responsibility across employers, education and support organisations.
- The Reader: social isolation, small signs of confidence, independence and the need for creative, non-formulaic pathways.

Anonymous and paraphrased insight

- Young people's mental health and wellbeing require a more central place in programme delivery; qualitative distance travelled is difficult to evidence under short funding horizons; participation differs by ethnicity, place and personal circumstances; youth voice requires properly supported routes into leadership.
- People may face a double hit of greater personal barriers and fewer opportunities; personalised support matters; AI-generated applications can be counterproductive when not adapted; essential skills, outlook, employment and earnings all have a place in measurement.
- Greater awareness of neurodiversity and reasonable adjustments sits alongside persistent exclusion; supported internships can show progress through independent travel, growing confidence and reduced job-coach support; meaningful paid employment requires clarity and transparency.
- Increasing SEND needs and deeper-rooted barriers require more individualised provision; attendance, communication and re-engagement after setbacks can indicate progress; digital poverty may widen AI-related inequality.
- Potential often sits below the surface; people need access to opportunities, networks and belief rather than lowered expectations; confidence, agency and adaptability are important signs of sustained progress.

Appendix 2. Public references and evidence base

Social Exclusion Unit. *Bridging the Gap: New Opportunities for 16–18 Year Olds Not in Education, Employment or Training*. Cm 4405. London: The Stationery Office, July 1999.

Department for Work and Pensions. *Young People and Work: Interim Report*. Independent report authored by Rt Hon Alan Milburn. Published 28th May 2026; updated 10 August 2026.

Department for Work and Pensions, HM Treasury and Department for Education. *Get Britain Working White Paper*. CP 1191. Published 26th November 2024; updated 2 September 2025.

House of Commons Library. *Youth Guarantee*. Research Briefing CBP-10827, Andrew Powell, published 10th July 2026.

House of Commons Library. *NEET: Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training*. Research Briefing SN06705, Andrew Powell and Brigid Francis-Devine, published 28th August 2026.

Office for National Statistics. *Young People Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET), UK: August 2026*. Statistical bulletin, released 27th August 2026.

House of Commons Work and Pensions Committee. *Youth Employment, Education and Training*. Third Report of Session 2026–27, HC 180, published 22nd July 2026.

Social Mobility Commission. *State of the Nation 2025: The Evolving Story of Social Mobility in the UK*. Published 18th December 2025.

Youth Futures Foundation and RAND Europe. *What Works in Reducing NEET Rates: A Comparative Study*. Joanna Hofman, Emily Hutton and Madeline Nightingale, November 2025.

Liverpool City Region Combined Authority. *Liverpool City Region Long Term Skills Plan*. Approved 20th September 2024; decision published 27th September 2024.

Liverpool Chamber of Commerce. *Liverpool City Region Local Skills Improvement Plan 2026–29*. July 2026. Approved by the Secretary of State in accordance with section 1 of the Skills and Post-16 Education Act 2022.

The Rest Is Politics: Question Time. Alan Milburn interview on young people not in education, employment or training, youth detachment, welfare reform, AI and the labour market. Podcast transcript supplied to SMF, October 2026.

Permission to quote or reproduce: Please seek permission from the Steve Morgan Foundation before quoting from this paper or reproducing it, in whole or in part, in any format, whether digital or printed. This includes sharing extracts in publications, presentations, websites, reports or other external materials.