



# Youth employment policies in Spain

EXCEPT working paper no. 28  
June 2018

Francisco Javier Mato Díaz

[www.except-project.eu](http://www.except-project.eu)  
[twitter.com/except\\_eu](https://twitter.com/except_eu)  
[www.facebook.com/excepteu](https://www.facebook.com/excepteu)

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 649496





**EXCEPT Working Papers** are peer-reviewed outputs from the <http://www.except-project.eu/> project. The series is edited by the project coordinator Dr. Marge Unt and by the project co-coordinator Prof. Michael Gebel. These working papers are intended to meet the European Commission's expected impact from the project:

- i. to advance the knowledge base that underpins the formulation and implementation of relevant policies in Europe with the aim of enhancing the employment of young people and improving the social situation of young people who face labour market insecurities, and
- ii. to engage with relevant communities, stakeholders and practitioners in the research with a view to supporting relevant policies in Europe. Contributions to a dialogue about these results can be made through the project website <http://www.except-project.eu/>, or by following us on twitter @except\_eu.

**To cite this report:**

---

Mato Díaz, F. J. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Spain*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 28. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

---

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-397-1 (pdf)

Responsibility for all conclusions drawn from the data lies entirely with the author.



## Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Spain .....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview .....	6
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	10
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	11
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives .....	29
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	31
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	31
References .....	39



## The key risk groups in the labour market in Spain

Young unemployment in general is widely perceived as a social problem in Spain, and not just because of its very high levels (44,4% in 2016, second highest in Europe after Greece). The risk of a “lost generation” is accompanied by an inverse demographic pyramid, which feeds preoccupations on the future of the welfare state and on the pension system in particular. All young people are generally considered as a risk group due to the sum of youth unemployment and temporary employment (see below).

Early school leavers and NEET are also regarded as important problems as a result, among others, of the EU youth policy push in the last few years, of the Europe 2020 objectives, and of the recent experience with early school leavers who fled to construction jobs during the economic boom, and eventually became unemployed and without professional qualifications.

However, young people with low skills, with low qualifications or with outdated qualifications do not seem to rank so high if one looks at the comparatively low rate of non-university, post-secondary schooling; at the structure of the professional education system, where high numbers still enrol in low-demand degrees (Mato, 2014); and at the structure of the university system, where also high numbers enrol in comparatively low-cost degrees in humanities and social sciences (CYD, 2016).

Also, perceived attention on young migrants or members of ethnic minorities is yet low in Spain, despite the medium-term challenges posed by second-generation migrants (see Aparicio and Portes, 2014).

And the groups formed by young people who have a disability or who live in remote areas show a very low risk profile, according to attention paid by most agents. In fact, policies toward these groups are indistinguishable from general, non-youth specific ones.

However, academic work and policy initiatives have attended to some extent the risks of young people in workless families or in single parent families, particularly since the regions carry out minimum income schemes that deal with poverty risks, and given a growing concern for rising poverty levels as a consequence of the long duration of the recent crisis (see Ayala et al, 2016; Mato et al, 2017).

The risk group formed by young people who experience temporary employment for long periods, or youth whose careers show this type of spells and unemployment spells, has received a lot of attention from academia (see, e.g., García Pérez and Vall Castello, 2015; Echaves and Echaves, 2017) and some attention from other agents. The Spanish labour market is a segmented one, and being in the secondary labour market brings about the risk of a vicious circle whereby low qualifications and temporary jobs hinder on-the-job training, which, in turn, makes it difficult to acquire



skills needed to improve employment stability. In the policy realm, little effort has been done apart from subsidizing conversion of fixed-term contracts into open-ended ones, a policy characterized by high deadweight effects.

Table 1 "Risk group" construction<sup>1</sup>

Potential risk groups	Importance by actors		
	Public opinion/ Media*	Mainstream policy	Academic research
All young people	5	4	3
Young unemployed	5	5	4
Early school leavers	4	4	5
Young people with low skills	3	4	5
Young people with outdated qualifications	3	3	4
Young people without qualifications	3	4	5
NEET	5	5	5
Higher education graduates	5	4	4
Migrants/Ethnic minorities	2	2	2
Teenage/single parents	2	3	4
Young people from workless families	3	3	4
Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas	2	3	2
Young people with a disability	1	2	1
Other: Young people with temporary work contracts	3	3	5

<sup>1</sup> 1=no significant role to 5=very important



## Youth employment policies: a general overview

Table 2 An overview of active labour market programmes at national level (2005-2015) \*

	Indicator	Year	2005	2010	2015 <sup>2</sup>
1	Total number of active labour market programmes <sup>3</sup>		N/A	552	442
1.1	including youth-targeted <sup>4</sup>		N/A	60	33
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:				
2.1	Total number		2.720.026	2.980.774	1.878.609
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)		9,2%	9,6%	6,2%
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes:				
3.1	Total number		676.871 <sup>5</sup>	N/A	231.962 <sup>6</sup>
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29)		14,3%	N/A	5,7%
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)		21,1%	N/A	12,3%
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:				
4.1	Total amount (EUR)		5.289,9 m	7.637,2 m	4.848,1 m
4.2	% of GDP		0,57%	0,71%	0,45%
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants: <sup>7</sup>				
5.1	Total amount (EUR)		N/A	N/A	N/A
5.2	% of GDP		N/A	N/A	N/A
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:				
6.1	Total amount (EUR)		N/A	N/A	N/A
6.2	% of GDP		N/A	N/A	N/A
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes		N/A	N/A	N/A

<sup>2</sup> Or the last year of available data

<sup>3</sup> Source: own calculations from Ministerio de Empleo y Seguridad Social. *Plan Anual de Políticas de Empleo (PAPE)*. This annual plan, the only nation-wide source for the number of measures, exists only since 2012, so 2010 figure corresponds in fact to 2012.

<sup>4</sup> See the previous footnote.

<sup>5</sup> 2006 data covers age groups under 25 years old, from Eurostat. Neither Eurostat nor national sources provide data for under 30 years old.

<sup>6</sup> Eurostat data for under 25 years old. For unknown reasons start-up programmes are not included in Eurostat data or 2015.

<sup>7</sup> With regard to the lack of information on parts 5 and 6, the only reliable source for expenditure on youth-targeted ALMP is the above mentioned PAPE. Still in the process of homogenizing information, it is too early to provide synthesis data. Programme aggregation contained in PAPE is scarce, and criteria does not meet the requirements of this project. Furthermore, even if this data existed, the different programmes reported by Spanish autonomous communities have insufficient or no information regarding age bounds of schemes.



Table 3 Overview of types of measures and schemas against youth unemployment in the last years (both running and finished ones; time horizon – last 5-6 years, 2011-2017)

Type of measure	Names	Importance <sup>8</sup>	Preventive/reactive <sup>9</sup>	Youth specific	Main source of funding <sup>10</sup>	Linked to EU initiatives (if yes, which one) <sup>11</sup>	Main actors of delivery <sup>12</sup>	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-) orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	-Key competences courses	2	2	No	3	No	2, 3, 5	No	No
	-Second Opportunity Schools				4		3, 5, 7		
Vocational guidance, career counselling	-Job-search tutorials	3	3	No	3	No	2	No	No
	-Job shadowing	1	2				3		
Training (with certificates)	- Craft School Workshops	3	3	Yes	3	2	2, 3, 5	No	Partly
	- ESF OP Training				1	No	2, 5, 6, 7	Partly	No
Training (without certificates)	-Specific Youth Training Programme	2	3	Yes	2	No	5, 6	Partly	No
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	- Training and Apprenticeship Contracts	3	3	Partly	1	No	1	Partly	No
	- Entrepreneurs' contracts			Yes					
Direct job creation	- Local Employment Plans	2	2	No	2	No	3	No	No
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	- Capitalization of benefits for the self-employed	2	2	No	National	No	1	Partly	No
	- Self-employment subsidies for the unemployed								

<sup>8</sup> Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

<sup>9</sup> To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems preventive = 1; reactive = 2; both=3.

<sup>10</sup> EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

<sup>11</sup> Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other - 6

<sup>12</sup> state = 1, region = 2, municipality = 3, church = 4, foundations, NGOs = 5, private sector = 6, educational institutions=7 Other, please specify=8 If several, please list all



### Comments on Table 3

When two different programmes have been included, the first one is the most important. Often different values have been reported. If only one should prevail, it must be the first one in each line.

The list of programmes included in the table with their specific name is not comprehensive. E.g., none of the three measures selected as good practices is included in this table.

Regarding the importance of each type of measure, several types deserve the highest importance. First, vocational guidance and career counselling, although absent from Eurostat data, includes a measure that has grown exponentially in Spanish PES, such as individual job-search tutorials. Perhaps this measure is not effective, especially in a context of high unemployment and job scarcity. Despite this intuition and the lack of quantitative data, the large generalization of these tutorials in Spanish PES offices leads to giving it a 3. Second, both training and employment incentives deserve also the maximum value. Training means around 17 per cent of LMP measures in terms of expenditure, and probably more than that in terms of beneficiaries (Eurostat has incomplete data). Employment incentives receive over 44% of LMP expenditures, and thus are also “very important”.

Separating training with and without certificates is a delicate decision. At least in Spain, there is a tendency to promote the attainment of certificates of professionalism in an increasing number of training courses, independently of the formal name of each course. Combining both categories of training would still be result in a “very important” type of measure, i.e. 3.

Regarding start-up incentives and self-employment programmes, they mean around 23% of expenditure in LMP measures, but the number of beneficiaries is rather low, thus considering it just “important”.

With respect to evaluations, they are very scarce in general. Some exceptions may be found in research projects like those on start-up subsidies for young unemployed (Cueto et al., 2016), on the capitalization of unemployment benefits in order to become self-employed (Mayor et al., 2015) and on training for young unemployed (Mato et al., 2017). Normalized evaluation procedures only exist in some measures funded by the ESF that include a mandatory evaluation component, and even these are rather heterogeneous, despite efforts on the part of the European Commission.



Table 4 Strengths and weaknesses of the overall policy approach

Effectiveness of the overall policy approach towards tackling youth unemployment and social exclusion	
Strengths	Weaknesses
In the last few years, thanks to the Youth Guarantee / YEI programmes and the EU funding, there are an increasing number of programmes, which should provide evidence on what policies work.	As stated below (section 3.3), initial macro evaluations of Youth Guarantee in Spain produce very poor results. Transitions of participants into the labour market or into education and training are not satisfactory from a comparative perspective.
Also in the recent past there is an increasing awareness about youth-related social and economic problems. Slowly, but progressively, young people are being perceived as a social group with their own problems, as opposed to the traditional perception of young people as (mainly dependent) family members.	Coordination between work-related services and social services is scarce. Often PES have had to deal with people, some of them young, who are disadvantaged and/or at risk of exclusion. Conversely, social services have had to support ordinary unemployed populations due to the extent and duration of the recent crisis.
Schooling ratios maintain rising trends (see Europe 2020 indicators).	Fragmentation among regional administrations (autonomous communities) complicates the management and also the analysis of youth policies, while not enough evidence is observed on the expected benefits of policy decentralization, i.e. a greater effectiveness thanks to good quality, down-to-earth information.
Rates of early school leavers are decreasing.	Scarcity of young people who are on benefit in Spain makes it difficult to introduce activation mechanisms. Following the argument given by Eichhorst and Rinne (2015), even with the significant amount of EU funding, PES may not be able to effectively deliver activation strategies to young people. As stated below (section 3.3) Spanish PES coverage of young unemployed is very low. This may be a hindrance for preventive strategies regarding LTU.
	Policy evaluation activities are still very scarce.



## Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>13</sup>	Type <sup>14</sup>	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives (if yes, which one)	Evaluation	“Good practice” <sup>15</sup> example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion <sup>16</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>17</sup>
1	Employment Shuttles	National	d	2	2014	EU, regional, local, other	YG, YEI, OPYE, EGAF	Yes, mixed results	Yes	4	2
2	VE Scholars hips and study assistance	National	d	3	2014	Other	No	Yes, mixed results	Partially	4	2
3	Young person, get busy!	Regional	d	3	2015	EU, national	YG, YEI, OPYE	Yes, mixed results	Yes	4	2

### Comments about table 5

Intervention number 1 (Lanzaderas de Empleo) is addressed to the 16-35 age group of unemployed people. Apart from the fulfilment of criteria adopted for selection of interventions, this particular programme was chosen because of its innovative character, and because a serious evaluation is available. Similarly, intervention number 2 has also been seriously evaluated. Despite its traditional content, it has a national scope, and this was considered as an additional advantage for selection. Finally,

<sup>13</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

<sup>14</sup> (re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment = 1; vocational guidance, career counselling = 2; training (with or without certificates) = 3; Employment incentives, subsidies for employer = 4, direct job creation = 5, and start-up incentives, self-employment programmes =6

<sup>15</sup> EU Database of national labour market ‘good practices’ definition: “A specific policy or measure that has proven to be effective and sustainable in the field of employment, demonstrated by evaluation evidence and/or monitoring and assessment methods using process data and showing the potential for replication. It can cover both the formulation and the implementation of the policy or measure, which has led to positive labour market outcomes over an extended period of time.”

<sup>16</sup> 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable

<sup>17</sup> 1 - Significant improvement; 2 - Improvement; 3 - No change; 4 - Deterioration; 5 - Significant deterioration; N/A – not applicable



intervention number 3 is also innovative, building on the experience of the Crafts Schools Workshops. Some data is available that allows an evaluative analysis.

Regarding the question of whether Spain has policies, initiatives and measures aimed at 'good jobs' for young people (well-paid, corresponding to the individual preferences of young people, with good career advancement opportunities), to the best of my knowledge there are no such measures.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	LANZADERAS DE EMPLEO EMPLOYMENT SHUTTLES
Short description	<p><b>Aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The main objective of this measure is helping unemployed young people under 35 to find a job either as an employee or self-employed. The programme is aimed at facilitating work insertion of team participants, guiding their professional careers and promoting the acquisition and development of key skills that are not usually part of the education system. Each Shuttle brings together 20 participants during 5 months under the direction of a coordinator who acts both as a personal coach and group coach.</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>Between 2016 and 2019 a total of 370 projects are being carried in locations throughout all of Spain. Previously, between 2014 and 2015, 55 projects were completed in 32 Spanish cities.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>The intended effects are twofold: first, ensuring that at least 40% of young people who participate can find a job, either as employees or as self-employed, or can enroll in formal education. Second, a more generic objective is the development of employability skills and transversal skills of young participants.</p> <p><b>Target groups and eligibility criteria:</b></p> <p>The target group is formed by young people (between 16 and 35 years old), of whom at least 67% must be considered disadvantaged for some reason, be it long-term unemployment, disability, low-skills, and the like. Selection into the programme takes these into consideration, as well as personal interviews aimed at evaluating attitudes towards labour market careers, and it is intended that each shuttle is formed by a heterogeneous group of people.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention:</b></p>



	<p>The “<a href="#">Lanzaderas de Empleo</a>” can be classified as a labour market service, as it involves intensive counselling and guidance, and job-search assistance, leading to the design of insertion itineraries for young participants. Particular attention is given to cooperative work, as firms or coops are formed by each shuttle whereby team work, autonomy, personal initiative, and other positive attitudes towards work are developed, which would favor employability.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b>The current stage of the programme started in March 2016 and is due to end in October 2019.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Stakeholders participate in the formulation and implementation of the measure. Specific organizations that do so are those that co-finance the programme, like private foundations (Fundación Barclays, Obra Social La Caixa and especially Fundación Telefónica), as well as regional public employment services, provincial public administrations and local councils. Other stakeholders may be participating insofar as they are present in PES boards.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>The programme is implemented through the <a href="#">Fundación Santa María La Real</a> (FSMLR), a private foundation that had the original idea and created the “Lanzaderas” in 2013. The programme budget during 2014-2015 added up to 1.620 (EUR, thousands) (each one of the 50 shuttles had a budget of 32.400 EUR). The main source of funds during that period was Fundación Telefónica, which supplied 81% of the budget. Currently the budget adds to 960 (EUR, thousands) and is funded mainly by the European Social Fund via the OP on Social Inclusion an Social Economy, and by Fundación Telefónica.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</b></p> <p>During 2014-2015 a total of 1.000 participants benefitted from the shuttles, organized in groups of 20 people per shuttle. The number of participants during the entire running period is yet unknown, but objectives for the 2016-2019 aim at reaching 11.350 young people through a total of 454 “Lanzaderas”. As of November 2017 there were 48 shuttles in action.</p> <p>The data on the number of people who are entitled is unknown, as it would require sociodemographic information on each city (and its corresponding vicinity) where shuttles have</p>



	<p>taken place.</p> <p>According to the <a href="#">evaluation of the 2014-2015 “Lanzaderas de Empleo”</a> project, 60,1% of participants had found a job that lasted a minimum of two months after the completion of the programme.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>The total expenditures for the program on annual basis during the first two years amounted to an average of 810 (EUR, thousands). Total expenditure per beneficiary amounts to 810 (EUR).</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure? Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The target groups of this measure are young unemployed people. At least 75% of participants in each shuttle must be younger than 35 years old. Thus, the remaining 25% could be older than that.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way?</b></p> <p>Partly. The programme design does not plan specific activities to involve targeted youth in the design of the programme. However, each shuttle has autonomy as regards its own functioning. Given the nature of the activities, it is clear that participants actively take part in shuttle developments.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p> <p>The programme is linked to EU initiatives (Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative). Each shuttle may get funds from different EU programmes, such as the Operational Programme on Youth Employment or the European Globalization Adjustment Fund.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by</b></p>



	<p><b>scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>There is an external evaluation<sup>18</sup> on this program available (<a href="#">link here</a>), which was carried out between October 2014 and February 2016 by the consulting firm Red de Recursos de Evaluación y Aprendizaje (REDCREA). The evaluation can be considered a permanent monitoring plus an ex-post social impact evaluation.</p> <p>The evaluation focused on 10 shuttles and, thus, on a total of 228 participants. An ex-post counterfactual evaluation design was adopted with the selection of a control group formed by people who had applied to the programme, but who had not been selected for lack of sufficient placements. Sociodemographic features of control group members were similar to those of participants, with the exception of their lower share of university graduates, and their longer time duration in unemployment (13 months vs. 9 months for shuttle members). Data was obtained three months after programme completion via online surveys.</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p> <p>The evaluation does not include estimates of deadweight loss nor substitution effects. The evolution of the programme during the last few brings about the question of whether some displacement effects may occur, since Fundación Telefónica funded over 80% of the budget initially, and there is no evidence of such a high financing share in the current shuttles. In fact, these are being co-funded by public administrations at several levels (European, provincial and local). However, it is more likely that public funds have allowed the programme to grow, providing additional funding.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>There is a positive effect on employment rates in October 2015 that amounted to 18,4% (51,1% among participants vs. 31,2% among control group members). Another positive effect on the rate of people who worked a minimum of two months added up to 20,9% (61,6% vs. 39,2%). Yet a third indicator measured the proportion of people who had had any type of</p>

<sup>18</sup> Available at: [https://www.fundaciontelefonica.com/arte\\_cultura/publicaciones-listado/pagina-item-publicaciones/itempubli/486/](https://www.fundaciontelefonica.com/arte_cultura/publicaciones-listado/pagina-item-publicaciones/itempubli/486/)



	<p>remunerated work since they entered (or should have entered) the shuttles. This indicator shows a positive effect of 12,1% (71,8% vs. 59,7%).</p> <p>Regarding the type of jobs held, a positive programme effect of 25,9% is reported on access to salaried employment, while a negative 10,8% effect is reported on access to self-employment. Access to full time jobs shows a positive effect of 5,0%, while access to internships shows a positive effect of 4,5%. Participation positively affects access to contracts that last between 2 and 6 months by 23,8%, while negatively affecting shorter contracts (-16,2%).</p> <p>Income effects among those who work add up to 115,3 EUR (896,8 vs. 781,5), although curious differences exist between holders of part-time work contracts (positive effect of 123,7 EUR) and full time workers (negative effect of 36,9 EUR).</p> <p>Adequate jobs with respect to workers' education and training, as well as with respect to individual preferences, also show significant positive effects. However, interesting results show negative effects of participation on either self-employment work or its likelihood. Also, there is no effect on the likelihood of people leaving their cities for job-search reasons.</p> <p>Overall, participants are more satisfied with their professional development than they were before the programme, especially those who work. A difference-in-differences estimation shows net positive effects of the programme on the definition of professional projects.</p> <p>Finally, a social impact analysis produced a social return on investment of 2,8 EUR for each euro invested in this programme.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>This programme seems to be achieving its stated goals and intended effects: most evaluation results are positive, producing an excellent impression of programme impacts in a diverse range of outcomes: work, income and professional development.</p> <p>The magnitudes of the numerous positive effects that have been reported are notable in all regards. Conversely, the magnitude of the few negative effects that arose from the evaluation is rather small.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Coverage data is lacking due to the difficulty of estimating the number of people who are entitled, as stated above. However,</p>



	<p>transparency of the shuttles is remarkable. Each one has its own web page where coaches and members introduce themselves, and where the shuttle blogs inform of activities carried out. No significant barriers for participation seem to exist, for the “Lanzaderas” count on collaboration from PES and on ample media coverage, which is well managed by FSMLR. The programme seems to be attractive for young people, according to online references like shuttle blogs.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>Regarding the main weaknesses of this intervention, they may be related to effectiveness. The intervention seems to be very good in all regards but two: the promotion of territorial mobility and the promotion of self-employment, as concluded in the evaluation results.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>The measure addresses one of the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people in Spain: the scarcity of soft skills regarding job-searching processes. Factors like motivation, team work, creativity, perception of self, communication skills, career analysis and strategy are poorly developed by the Spanish education system and/or the families. Job scarcity is a hindrance for the development of these personal skills, but they are nevertheless important when time comes to pursue work contracts.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as ‘good practice’ example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b></p> <p>This measure can be considered a good practice because it combines an innovative design; the participation of both private and public institutions; good results coming from a serious evaluation effort; and a clear potential to expand which, in fact, is already being exploited. The main “success factor” of this intervention is its ample funding, which results from the fund-raising capacity of the FSMLR.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>One reason why it can be valued as a good practice is because of its socialization of the job-searching process, which entails positive attitudes towards work and job-search, and peer-learning.</p>



Name of the initiative	BECAS Y AYUDAS AL ESTUDIO DE FORMACION PROFESIONAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIPS AND STUDY ASSISTANCE
Short description	<p><b>Aim of the measure:</b> Vocational education scholarships and study assistance is a project aimed at helping students enrolled in vocational education centers of the Society of Jesus, in order to improve their employability. The rationale of the project is helping young people who are at a social disadvantage to enroll and/or to continue their studies and complete their degrees. <a href="#">The project</a> is part of the Fundación Telefónica's <a href="#">Young Employability Programme</a>, in which young people are the protagonists and the recipients of assistance. A general objective is promoting equal opportunities in access to vocational education by covering students' expenses, especially in post-compulsory levels and on concepts outside the realm of public funding, according to their needs.</p> <p><b>Intended effects and target groups:</b> Target groups are students who can show proof of social exclusion, who enrolled in technology-related vocational education in one of the 20 centers, and who timely applied to the public, standard scholarship. The aim is helping those who do not receive government grants for some reason (e.g. for not having been enrolled in the education system the previous year) and/or helping students to finance expenses that are not covered by public grants.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date; level:</b> The programme started in 2014-2015 and is still ongoing during 2017-2018. Scholarships were obtained by 696 students in 20 centers across Spain during the academic years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016. Average age of recipients is 20 years old. There is a strong gender bias in the programme: up to 93,2% of recipients are men (this is most likely related to the technology bias of the programme). Distribution of scholarships by vocational education level shows 18,1% of them in basic levels, 55,4% in intermediate levels, and 26,3% in higher vocational education.</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> Eligibility criteria was based on 12 items related to families or</p>



	<p>households: family size; single-parent family; foster care; family housing costs burden or substandard housing; gross family income below EUR 23.000; unemployment condition; pension recipients; minimum income recipients; social services dependency; disability; victims of terrorism condition; victims of domestic or gender violence condition. These criteria go well beyond those used for allowing standard scholarships, related to family income and student's academic performance.</p> <p>Expected results affect, firstly, employability, since completion of degrees is expected to favour young people's insertion into work and professional projects. Secondly, it is envisaged that the programme would help improving personal development and life projects, perhaps leading to further education or training. An expected side effect would be the expansion of recipients' social capital.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention:</b></p> <p>The type of ALMP is institutional training (each academic year involves 2000 hours of training, of which 380 hours should be practices in firms). The social policy component is related to the eligibility criteria described above.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>There is no evidence of stakeholders' involvement in the project, other than the funding institution, Fundación Telefónica. The project was implemented by the Society of Jesus through the 20 centers included in it.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>Financial information has allowed knowing both budget and cost data. Total budget amounted to 683,3 (EUR, thousand). Total costs of the project amounted to 671,9 (EUR, thousands), which includes scholarships, personnel, technology and project management. Up to 77,1% of the budget was financed by Fundación Telefónica. Data source is the <a href="#">social impact evaluation report</a>.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</b></p>



	<p>Number of young people covered: 696 students. There is no information on the number of people who were entitled. Further results five months after school year end are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 59,3% of recipients either had completed their degree or had successfully continued their studies towards completion.</li> <li>- 85,9% of recipients were in education or training 5 months after the end of the second year with scholarship.</li> <li>- 29,9% of recipients were working and studying at the same time.</li> <li>- 2,4% were searching for work and 0,7% were inactive.</li> </ul> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis: 308,9 (EUR, thousands).</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary: 965,51 (EUR). Total expenditure per beneficiary per year: 482,5 (EUR).</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The target groups of this measure are young people who are at risk of disengaging from their vocational education because of economic problems and/or social exclusion. The program is especially targeted to young people.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way?</b> No. Specific activities do not appear in the programme that are aimed at including targeted youth actively in <u>designing</u> the programme. However, targeted youth have been contacted during the <u>evaluation</u> stage.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p> <p>No.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add</b></p>



	<p><b>Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>There is an external evaluation available (<a href="#">link here</a>), done by the consulting firm Red de Recursos de Evaluación y Aprendizaje (REDCREA). It is an ex-post social impact evaluation carried out between October 2016 and September 2017.</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p> <p>The information provided includes basic information, an analysis based on theory of change, and a social impact return on investment estimate. No information on deadweight loss, substitution effects or displacement effects is included.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p>Nine out of ten young people who received the scholarship report that it was influential in the continuation of their education itinerary, underlining not just the financial aid, but the accompanying programme features. Four out of ten scholars state that they could not have continued their studies without the scholarship, and five out of ten state that the assistance allowed them to prioritize education over other activities aimed at obtaining income. Only one out of ten states that receiving assistance produced no changes.</p> <p>Both continuation of studies and job-search efforts vary depending on students' education level. Scholars in basic and intermediate levels of VE continued their studies at rates of 95,1% and 90,4% respectively, five months after the end of the academic year. Regarding employment rates, the average rate adds up to 40,9%, but graduates in higher vocational education report the highest rate of employment: 60,2%.</p>



	<p>Job quality is rather poor. The 40,9% employment rate comes down to 22,3% if a minimum of two months contract duration is imposed. Likewise, considering work contract conditions such as over 4 hours per day, social security-covered (i.e. not internship), or degree-related tasks, employment rates fall to between 11% and 16%. Restricting the analysis to those who work, there is a correlation between vocational education levels and work contract quality. E.g., higher VE graduates report the best indicators: 95% have some social coverage; two thirds have work contracts and 20% have internships; 68,7% have contracts for two months or more; and 57% work full time.</p> <p>The evaluation includes an analysis of skills matching whereby scholars were compared to a control group formed by recipients of the same scholarship in the school year 2016-2017 (i.e. two years after the group being evaluated). Matching indicators are significantly higher for the scholars from previous years. A difference also exists among scholars being evaluated depending on the different VE levels, with intermediate and higher VE graduates showing over 10% positive differences with respect to basic VE scholars.</p> <p>The same control group was used to compare scholars' job satisfaction during the last five months, showing a 22% difference (5,12 vs. 4,17 in a scale from 0 to 10) in favour of programme scholars. Thus, scholarships show positive effects on non-economic outcomes.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b></p> <p>This program achieved its stated goals and intended effects to a large extent. VE completion is notably high among young people who got assistance. Job-search-related, employment-related and satisfaction indicators allow obtaining a highly satisfactory perspective of the functioning of scholarships.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The magnitude of the effects on skills matching and job satisfaction, supported by a counterfactual evaluation, can be considered high, as both estimated effects have two digits.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree</b></p>



	<p><b>of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Coverage and take-up of this measure cannot be properly assessed because it is a privately funded and managed programme and there is no information on the number of students entitled, as stated above.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The main weakness can be related to the programme being private and, thus, having a potential benefit only for young people who self-select themselves and enrol in the Society of Jesus vocational education centres.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>This privately funded programme contributes to fulfilling Europe 2020 objectives by increasing vocational education levels and by reducing school dropouts. Its concentration on technology-related VE courses has a positive component insofar as the skills involved are relatively more demanded than other specializations. But it also has as a negative component the extremely high gender bias that was observed. Overall, given that Spanish young men show relatively worse educational outcomes, as compared to women, the programme can be considered a success, even if it could obviously improve by incorporating a significantly higher share of female recipients.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention. Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>The intervention is assessed as a good practice because its descriptive results are good and because it has been explicitly evaluated. The main "success factors" of this intervention are, first, the short-term incentives that it provides to young students who, otherwise, may have been pushed out of the education system without a work-oriented degree. Secondly, another "success factor" may be that the programme was privately managed by a single organization, i.e. without the complications that would emerge if numerous centres had to manage the complex set of selection conditions that was mentioned above (e.g. public scholarships take several months to be awarded and often students may have abandoned school by the time they are decided upon). In this</p>



	regard, potential for replication may be limited by both financial and management factors.
--	--

Name of the initiative	JOVEN, OCUPATE YOUNG PERSON, GET BUSY!
Short description	<p><b>Aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The initiative aims at facilitating the work insertion of unemployed young people and improving their employability through the development of training, work contracts or non-work practices in firms.</p> <p><b>Intended effects and target groups:</b>The <a href="#">Public Employment Service of Asturias</a> (Northwestern Spain) created "<a href="#">Joven Ocúpate</a>" as a measure targeted to young people who lack a Compulsory Secondary Education degree. The programme is inspired in the long-standing Spanish measure of Craft School-Workshops ("Escuelas Taller y Casas de Oficios") insofar as it combines training and work. However, "Joven Ocúpate" has a relatively short duration (6 months only) as it tries to minimize the number of early-leavers from the programme. The intended effects are providing participants with a basic certificate of professionalism (level 1) in order to ease their employment access. Target groups are people between 16 and 30 years old who are registered in the Youth Guarantee system, and who preferably (but not necessarily) lack the degree of Compulsory Secondary Education.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention and eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>The programme is a labour market policy measure that can be classified as an intervention in alternate training. Young participants are members of a group or team in which a maximum of 8 people take part, dividing their time between training and work. Apart from having teachers in the corresponding craft, each team is accompanied by a person who acts as a coach. Apart from work, the coach looks for animating participants to continue their training, upgrading their learning into professional certificates of level 2 and/or into vocational training degrees. Also, the pursuit of a Compulsory Education Degree may be present, so there is an implicit element typical of second-opportunity schools</p>



	<p><b>Start/ end date; level:</b></p> <p>The program duration is divided into three stages. The first lasts three months and is devoted primarily (80% of the time) to training activities involving basic skills and contents of the corresponding certificate of professionalism. The remaining time is devoted to actual work. The second stage lasts two months and divides participants' time in two halves devoted respectively to training and work. Finally, during the last month participants dedicate 75% of their time to work and the rest to training. During the first two stages, participants receive the proportional part of the wage that corresponds to their working day, but during the last month they receive 100% of the wage. At the end of the program, participants are supplied with support and accompaniment services during six months, which are aimed at easing their insertion into work.</p> <p>The first "Joven Océpate" groups were carried out during 2015-2016, and the second wave is currently being developed (since mid-2017). Measures are implemented through local councils, associations, foundations and/or firms, by means of open calls (see the first call from December 2014 <a href="#">here</a> and the regulations governing its concessions <a href="#">here</a>).</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Stakeholders are indeed involved in the formulation of the measure because they are represented in the Governing Council of the Asturias PES, which debates and approves each measure adopted by the Service.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source; How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>The respective budgets of the two waves of the programme add up to 2.510,5 and 2.895,0 (EUR, thousand), according to the implementation agency, the Public Employment Service of Asturias.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</b></p> <p>The number of young people covered during the first wave added up to 465 (361 men and 104 women). There are no data on the second wave yet. The people who could access</p>



	<p>the programme can be estimated by looking at the registered unemployed population below 30 years old. In December 2015 this group amounted to 4.795 people in Asturias (2.668 men and 2.127 women).</p> <p>Out of the 465 participants, the programme was completed by 91,8% (a total of 427 people, 330 men and 97 women). The intended qualifications were achieved by 413 people (88,8% of participants). During 6 months after participation, a total of 57 people (42 men and 15 women) had work experiences, and 6 people returned to education or training systems. Adding up young people who achieved a professional certificate, found work or entered an education or training programme after “Joven Océpate”, a total of 440 people show a positive insertion result. Figures by sex are 341 men (94,5% of participants) and 99 women (95,2% of participants).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>The total expenditures for the program on annual basis can be interpreted as expenditure by waves. The 2.510,5 thousand euros of the first wave mean a total expenditure per beneficiary of 5.879 EUR.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure? Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>The target groups of this measure are young people (16-30 years old) who are out of work and whose educational qualifications are below Compulsory Secondary Education.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way?</b> Partly. Youth involvement was twofold. First, it was modestly present via the involvement of Youth Information Centres (“Oficinas de Información Juvenil”) in the diffusion of the programme. Second, some of the associations that implemented the programme were formed by young people.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</b></p>



	<p>The programme is linked to Youth Guarantee and Youth Employment Initiative. EFS funds cover around 90% of programme costs via the Operational Programme on Youth Employment.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</b></p> <p>There are no formal evaluations available. However, ex-post internal evaluation work has allowed obtaining data on programme results. The source is the Public Employment Service of Asturias. The available information consists of descriptive data, without causal inference analysis, but which allows comparisons with other programmes.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>With the data that is available, results of “Joven Océpate” can be compared with results of Craft School Workshops in Asturias. The reference period for the latter is the year 2013. These results were set as basis for the new programme. The comparison produces the following: 20,8% improvement in completion rate (91,8% vs. 71%); 58% improvement in qualifying rate (88,8% vs. 30%); 1,23% improvement in working rate (12,3% vs. 11%); and 48,6% improvement in positive insertion rate (94,6% vs. 46%).</p> <p>Disaggregating result comparisons by sex, women show the following improvements: 22,3% in completion rates (93,3% vs. 71%); 59,4% in qualifying rate (90,4% vs. 31%); 3,4% in working rates (14,4% vs. 11%); and 49,2% in positive insertion rates (95,2% vs. 46%). The improvements for men are the</p>



	<p>following: 20,4% in completion rates (91,4% vs. 71%); 58,4% in qualifying rates (88,4% vs. 30%); 0,6% in working rates (11,6% vs. 11%); and 48,5% in positive insertion rates (94,5% vs. 46%).</p> <p>These comparisons are the product of a descriptive analysis and, therefore, no causal effects can be confirmed. But the magnitude of the improvements, together with the fact that this programme lasts between one third and one fourth of the duration of Craft School Workshops, suggest that “Joven Océpate” is a cost effective programme.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The program achieves its stated goals and intended effects because its relatively short duration has been accompanied by excellent completion rates –which was one of the original objectives-. At the same time, young participants show a clear positive transition towards further training or education. The programme shows that the challenge of increasing working rates remains as an important one. However, the intervention is being able to improve work-oriented education or training. This is a necessity in a region where in December 2016 one third of registered unemployed youth (<a href="#">35,2% of those between 16 and 30 years old in 2016</a>) had not obtained the Compulsory Secondary Education degree, and where an additional 23,5% had achieved just that degree and no work-oriented skills whatsoever.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>Regarding coverage rates, two factors seem to hamper a precise estimation. First, this programme is part of a policy mix in which low-qualified young people are offered other alternatives as well: second opportunity schools, ordinary training programmes, training on basic competences and the like. Second, the programme is not offered in the entire region, although it could be argued that distances are not so large as to impede young people’s commuting to a place where one of the groups is being trained. However, <a href="#">one estimation of the take-up rate can be calculated by looking at the number of 8-people groups offered in 2015, a total of 91</a>. Thus, the take-up</p>



	<p>rate amounts to 63,8%. Barriers for participation do not seem to be significant, and the programme seems attractive for young people, if only for its short-term objectives, as compared with Craft School Workshops or other training schemes.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The main weakness of this intervention may be the relatively low participation of firms in the implementation of the programme. In 2015-2016, only 10 groups out of 91 were implemented by firms, the rest having been formed by local councils and associations. This weakness may be related to the still low working rates of participants.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</b></p> <p>This measure addresses one of the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people, i.e. their lack of work-related education or training skills. Data was produced above that supports this conclusion beyond reasonable doubt.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</b></p> <p>This programme can be considered a good practice because building on previous experience (Craft Schools Workshops), it develops a carefully designed, cost-effective, mixed work-training plan, which is helping young unemployed jobseekers to progress into education and/or work.</p> <p>"Success factors" are its short duration, the progressive shift of programme contents from training to effective work, and the accomplishment of the intended training objective, i.e. having participants reach a professional certificate. Further, its decentralized implementation can also be considered a success factor: under an indicative PES prioritization of different training families, it is up to the associations, councils and firms that implement the programme to propose its specific content.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p>



	<p>Regarding this programme as a good practice comes from the belief that it could be easily replicated elsewhere. In fact, training programmes similar to the Craft School Workshops in content, but with a limited time duration, like “Joven, Océpate”, have been carried out, at least, in the <a href="#">Canary Islands, where a similar scheme</a> was designed that lasts slightly less than a year (unfortunately, no evaluation data has been obtained yet from this programme).</p>
--	--

## Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

EU initiatives are extremely important for the implementation of youth inclusion policies in Spain. The literature on ALMP and on youth sociological and economic analysis has made clear that explicit youth policies were left behind for many years in Spain. An intergenerational pact resulted in the 1990s whereby both employment and unemployment protection were benefitting older Spanish cohorts (Garrido, 1996). When temporary employment boomed in the mid-1990s it became concentrated on young people, and it has been that way ever since. Additionally, unemployment compensation was linked to contributions and family dependants, and young people had few of these. From that pact, young cohorts gained increasing access to educational resources, and gradually extended periods living in the origin family household. As Flaquer (1997) and Moreno (2004) put it, intra-family resource sharing took on the role of the welfare state regarding the protection of youth. A generalized pattern of preferences for home ownership vis-à-vis other residential options (around 80% of Spanish households are home-owners) has traditionally aggravated transition processes of young people, making emancipation costly and difficult for them. It is not a coincidence that the fertility rate in Spain is one of the lowest in the world.

The extent of the crisis that struck the Spanish economy from 2008 onwards worsened the working environment for the youth. Fixed-term employment rates fell, but it was only due to the destruction of many more temporary jobs than permanent ones. Massive groups of young people who were in the secondary labour market became unemployed, and there was a severe growth of NEET, despite some young people returning to the education system and, most of all, despite a drastic fall in incoming international migration, which experienced negative net flows between 2012 and 2015. The extent of unemployment was such that the bulk of public funds were devoted to unemployment insurance and assistance schemes. These had not been changed, and young people still face entitlement problems, as stated above.

Activation policies have not worked in Spain, neither for young unemployed people nor for the unemployed population in general (see García-Serrano, 2007; Mato, 2013). The necessary resources for providing the services envisaged by the European Employment Strategy were not made available. And the breach of activation compromises made by unemployed benefit recipients were not penalized. The



novelties in unemployment policies during the 2000s (both before and after the crisis struck) were additional long-term unemployment compensation funds that required potential recipients to have run out of existing benefits. As young people were usually not receiving benefits, they were de-facto left out of the new schemes.

The only changes that affected the 1990s intergenerational pact in favour of young people accessing the labour market were the labour market reforms adopted in 2011 and 2012. These weakened employment protection, lowered firing costs and thus reduced the importance of tenure during firms' decisions to adjust employment levels. In other words, young people might have profited in relative terms by the worsening situation of older workers after such reforms.

Thus, the context described suggests that European Union policies, funds, and criteria towards youth unemployment should become key elements of labour market policy in Spain. It may be too early to know if policies are working, nonetheless due to the scarcity of rigorous micro policy evaluations. However, the first pieces of evidence are not very promising. Earlier this year, the European Court of Auditors (2017) produced a general report on Youth Guarantee in Europe that signals Spain as the exception among seven European countries. France, Croatia, Italy, Portugal and Slovakia show positive and stable transitions of young people into education, training or work, but Spain reflects that 47% of NEET who participated in Youth Guarantee during 2015 were neither in the labour market nor in education six months later. Also, Spain shows the lowest rate of positive transitions (37%), and a shameful value of a general indicator of YEI objectives that had been reached at the end of 2015, which adds to 2% of the total number of objectives (e.g. Portugal shows a value of 38% in this indicator).

The same report shows some financial issues related to the pace and amount of EU transfers to the Spanish Government that reflect a deficient management of Youth Guarantee and YEI during the first stages (see Jansen, 2017). But it also acknowledges the value of reforms introduced by Spain, like the establishment of a nation-wide system that eases young people's access to Youth Guarantee, trying to overcome the regionally segmented system of PES-related resources. Another recent change, introduced at the end of 2016, is the automatic registration in YG-YEI of young people who are registered as job-seekers in the regional PES.

Finally, microeconomic evaluations of different EU initiatives are almost non-existent, and these could shed light over the pros and cons of each element in the policy mix. And, regarding the question of whether there have been specific waves or political shifts where EU policies were particularly important, there does not seem to exist enough variation in the importance of these policies as to allowing for its analysis.



## Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

The previous section has tried to introduce and clarify the traditional deficiencies of youth-related labour market policies in Spain. In the environment that was described above, the task of finding interventions with synergies between social policies and labour policies becomes very difficult. The highly decentralized system of social services and labour market policies, both of which fall under regional competences, makes this part of the report a hard challenge.

However, two interesting projects have been detected in this context. None of them is addressed exclusively or specifically to unemployed young people, but these may surely take advantage of either.

Innovation in social and work-related services is still very scarce in Spain.

*Table 6 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions related to components of social policies*

No	Name	Level (national, regional, local)	Main target group <sup>19</sup>	Starting year; end year (if not ongoing)	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation
1	ERSISI	Local	C	2016	EU, regional, other	EiSI	Yes, pending
2	Work contract for battered women	Regional	C	2018	N/A	N/A	N/A

### Comments about table 6

The ERSISI project is a novel, very promising intervention that combines work and social services, focusing a common effort on a few municipalities of Navarra that have been hit hardest by unemployment. The work contract for battered women is a project that should begin in 2018.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	REFUERZO DEL DERECHO A LA INCLUSION SOCIAL A TRAVES DE LA INTEGRACION DE SERVICIOS ENHANCING THE RIGHT TO SOCIAL INCLUSION THROUGH SERVICE INTEGRATION (ERSISI)
------------------------	--

<sup>19</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>The primary aim of the measure (see web page <a href="#">here</a>)<sup>20</sup> is promoting access to employment of a group of 500 people at risk of social exclusion in several counties of Navarra (Spain) by means of integrating public employment services and social services in the area. Additionally, the project intends to be a pilot experiment for a future reform of the minimum income scheme in that region. It also aims at promoting new local partnerships formed by public and private agents. The ultimate objective would be to find evidences of good results that may be replicated in the rest of the Foral Community of Navarra.</p> <p>The specific content of the measure is providing high quality individualized support to citizens at risk of social exclusion who simultaneously receive higher social protection. The social policy component is directly related to the objective of increasing the regional minimum income scheme coverage and duration. ERSISI aims at demonstrating that an increased protection will not act as a disincentive for returning to work if it is accompanied by strengthened, tailor-made, high-quality orientation and case-management services.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b></p> <p>Target groups of the measure are registered unemployed people who fulfil the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- They may be recipients of the regional guaranteed minimum income scheme, recipients of unemployment subsidies that are close to completion, or non-benefit recipients who are at risk of social exclusion.</li><li>- They should have “a reasonable employability potential”.</li><li>- They should have the will to sign the reciprocal agreement of social inclusion.</li></ul> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries are based on residence in the counties of Tudela and Sakana, plus on having the above-mentioned conditions.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> individual case management &amp;</p>
--------------------------	---

<sup>20</sup> Available at: [https://www.navarra.es/home\\_es/Temas/Asuntos+sociales/Proyecto+ERSISI/](https://www.navarra.es/home_es/Temas/Asuntos+sociales/Proyecto+ERSISI/)



	<p>minimum income support, together with social policy professional attention and counselling.</p> <p><b>Description:</b> The defining component of this measure is the joint effort of social services and employment services in order to provide intensive, personalized job-search support to the unemployed people in the municipalities covered by the programme. The measure aims at overcoming a traditional separation of both staff and approaches in the realms of social services and employment services. Professional qualifications of staff, as well as models of intervention in these two departments are traditionally different. Even communication and data sharing between them may be absent. It could occur that an unemployed job-seeker receives orientation and job-search support from both departments during the same period of time. Thus, ERSISI intensified attention will be provided by teams with a balanced composition of staff, which work together and make consensual decisions. These teams, in turn, will also be integrated in larger “Local Working Groups” where other partners participate, such as the municipalities. A triple emphasis on coordination, info management and info transferral is present in the programme.</p> <p>A specific feature of this measure is the search for flexible arrangements. Thus, a contingency fund is provided for the teams to use based on the specific needs of participants, such as expenses that may be needed, especially along the expected process of exiting the regional minimum income scheme by programme participants. Another feature is the creation of a new employability diagnosis system, which should be the result of the joint efforts of the social and employment staff who form the ERSISI teams. All in all, the focus is on a much greater intermediation intensity, as compared with the previously existing mechanisms in either the Public Employment Services or the Social Services.</p> <p><b>Level:</b> local.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> from September 2016 until September 2019.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/ implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Yes. Apart from the regional government organizations, the municipalities of Tudela and Sakana are involved, plus Fundación La Caixa and Fundacion Caja de Navarra. Insofar</p>
--	--



	<p>as they are represented in the regional PES, the social agents are involved too. The Public University of Navarra is in charge of assessment and evaluation works.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>Through the Navarra Foral Government, the Navarra Employment Service, the council of Tudela and the Association of Community Social Services of Alsasua.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> 1.852,3 (EUR, thousands). The EU is funding around 80% of the project, the rest being covered by the private foundations (120.000 EUR) and the regional and local governments.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>It is too early to present results. However, some data are already available:</p> <p>Number of people covered: the goal is reaching 500 people (young and old).</p> <p>Number of <u>young</u> (below 30 years old) people <u>who are entitled</u>: depending on the criteria used to account for unemployed population (2014-2016), the expected entitlements vary (continuous unemployment: 21; intermittent unemployment: 105; occasional unemployment: 1.583 people).</p> <p>Young people <u>who actually take part</u> and young people who find a job are indicators that will be available in the future.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis add up to 617,4 (EUR, thousands).</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary (young and old) adds up to 1.234,8 EUR.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Unemployed people at risk of social exclusion who are residents of the municipalities of Tudela and Alsasua.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> To all unemployed who may be at risk of social exclusion.</p> <p><b>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</b> No</p>
<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p>No.</p>



Links to EU initiatives	The measure is funded by the European Programme for Employment and Social Innovation (“EaSI”)
Available evaluations	For the time being, there are no evaluations available. However, the programme includes a systematic assessment of interventions and a non-experimental impact evaluation based on counterfactual methods. The evaluation will be carried out by the Public University of Navarra.
Summary of evaluation results	It is too early to have results of this measure.
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	It is too early to assess program achievements, magnitude of the effects, coverage and take-up. <b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b> This is an experimental programme with excellent perspectives.
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	This measure addresses the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of target risk groups, but it is unclear to what extent the subgroup formed by young people will require specific measures.
Interventions assessed as ‘good practice’ example	<b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b> Although it is too early to reach conclusions, this intervention could be a “good practice” because of its comprehensive dealing with risks of exclusion. The main success factors of this measure may be the coming together of the social and the employment services of the Navarra administration, plus the local institutions and private foundations. The common effort should produce good results, if only because of the novel approach to work inclusion. <b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b> The reason why this may become a good practice is the comprehensive approach to work inclusion. However, two hindrances may risk its potential for replication: its relatively high costs per beneficiary and the possibility that an indirect effect on immigration brings into the participating councils additional job-seekers.



Name of the initiative	CONTRATO DE TRABAJO PARA MUJERES MALTRATADAS(*) WORK CONTRACT FOR BATTERED WOMEN(*)
Short description	<p>(*) As of November 2017, this initiative is being designed by the Instituto Balear de la Mujer, part of the regional administration of the Autonomous Community of the Balearic Islands. It has been recently announced (see <a href="#">here</a> and <a href="#">here</a>), but it does not have a formal name yet. <sup>21 22</sup></p> <p><b>The primary aim of the measure</b> is preventing gender violence to women who have been abused. The policy instrument is the direct creation of jobs in the realm of the public administrations and NGOs. Women would have a guaranteed work contract lasting 12 months. The measure builds on a previously existing service that is available for women, and for abused women on a blind basis, by an all-female team, providing LMP orientation. It is envisaged that some women victims, who currently do not denounce abuses because of financial dependence, will become self-sufficient thanks to these contracts.</p> <p><b>The target group</b> of the measure will be formed by women who have denounced abuse and who are at risk of becoming victims of gender violence. Women are derived from the courts, from hospitals or health centres, or directly from the Balearic Institute of the Woman itself.</p> <p><b>Specific eligibility criteria</b> are not yet known, but this is clearly a regional project addressed to women in the Balearic Islands.</p> <p><b>The type of intervention</b> (ALMP) is direct job creation, which will be accompanied by individual case management from the services for victims of sexual abuse of the Balearic Institute of the Woman.</p> <p><b>Description</b></p> <p>This programme aims at changing the traditional view of supported public employment, by which job openings in public institutions are designed according to the institutions' needs and only then the jobs are offered to potential</p>

<sup>21</sup> See: <http://www.diariodeibiza.es/pitiuses-balears/2017/11/23/trabajo-malos-tratos/953735.html>

<sup>22</sup> See: [https://elpais.com/economia/2017/11/11/actualidad/1510427777\\_452466.html](https://elpais.com/economia/2017/11/11/actualidad/1510427777_452466.html)



	<p>participants. <b>The innovation lies in starting from the occupational profile of the woman who is a victim of abuse, and who is in need of work in order to get income and break her economic dependence from the abusive partner. With her profile, a tailor-made job will be searched in public institutions, most likely city councils near her, where the woman can work.</b></p> <p>The eligibility criteria is being a victim of gender abuse. The consideration of a woman as a victim could be originated by a previous judicial complaint from her, but also by a decision made by social services in the absence of a judicial case, given that sometimes women are unwilling to report gender abuse.</p> <p>The target group is formed by women who are victims of gender abuse, who are at least 16 years old.</p> <p>Intervening institutions, apart from the Women's Institute of the Balearic Islands, who had the initial idea, are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- PES of the Balearic Islands, through which the programme will be implemented and funded.</li> <li>- Municipalities in the region, as well as other public institutions, which will receive the working women during 12 months.</li> </ul> <p>Currently, it is not expected that this programme receives EU funding.</p> <p><b>Level:</b> regional.</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> from 2018 onwards.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/ implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Yes. Social agents have publicly supported this measure.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>Through the Balearic Institute of the Woman.</p> <p>A provisional, tentative budget has been announced that will devote up to 2.000 (EUR, thousand) to this programme. However, no details exist yet on the time duration of these.</p>
Achieved results	It is too early to present results.
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Unemployed women who have denounced abuse.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people?</b> No.</p>



	<b>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</b> No special treatment for young women is envisaged.
Youth involvement	No.
Links to EU initiatives	Not yet known.
Available evaluations	No.
Summary of evaluation results	-
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	The programme details are not yet known.
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	This measure addresses a very specific target risk group for whom unemployment is only part of a more severe problem. Providing jobs to this group may not be an objective, but an instrument instead. It could save the lives of women who become economically independent from their partners.
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	The programme details are not yet known.



## References

- Aparicio, R, and A. Portes (2014). Crecer en España. La integración de los hijos de inmigrantes. La Caixa. Colección Estudios Sociales. Núm. 38.
- Ayala, L., J. M. Arranz, C. García Serrano y L. Martínez Virto (2016). “El sistema de garantía de ingresos en España: tendencias, resultados y necesidades de reforma”. Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad.
- Consejo de la Juventud de España (2016). Observatorio de Emancipación, segundo semestre 2016.
- Cueto, B., M. Mayor and P. Suárez (2016). Start-up subsidies for youth: Do they work? Mimeo.
- CYD (2016). Informe CYD 2016. La contribución de las universidades españolas al desarrollo. Fundación Conocimiento y Desarrollo.
- Echaves, A. and C. Echaves (2017). Jóvenes aún más precarios: crisis económica y desigualdad laboral en España. Cuadernos de Investigación en Juventud (2), pp. 1-19.
- Eichhorst, W. and U. Rinne (2015). Promoting Youth Employment Through Activation Strategies. IZA Research Report No. 65.
- Eichhorst, W. and U. Rinne (2017). The European Youth Guarantee: A Preliminary Assessment and Broader Conceptual Implications. IZA Policy Paper No. 128.
- Escudero, V. and E. López Mourelo (2015). The Youth Guarantee programme in Europe: Features, implementation and challenges. ILO Research Department. Working Paper No. 4.
- European Commission (2017). Youth Guarantee country by country. Spain. March 2017.
- European Court of Auditors (2017). Youth unemployment – have EU policies made a difference? An assessment of the Youth Guarantee and the Youth Employment Initiative. Special Report 2017 No. 5.
- Flaquer, L. (2004) Familia y Estado de bienestar en los países de la Europa del sur. Papers 73, 27-58.
- García Pérez, J. I. and J. Vall Castello (2015). “Youth unemployment in Spain: More issues than just high unemployment” in J. J. Dolado (ed.) No Country for Young People. Youth Labour Market Problems in Europe. CEPR Press.
- García Serrano, C. (2007). “Las políticas del mercado de trabajo: desempleo y activación laboral”. Política y Sociedad, vol. 44, nº 2, pp. 135-151.
- Garrido Medina, L. (1996), “La temporalidad: ¿pacto intergeneracional o imposición?” en *La duración del contrato mercado de trabajo*, Consejo Económico y Social de la Comunidad de Madrid, Madrid, pp.47-91.



- Jansen, M. (2017). [La garantía juvenil cronica de un fracaso anunciado](#). Nadaesgratis.es.
- López Rodríguez, F. and B. Cueto (2017). Evaluación del contrato de formación y aprendizaje en España. Mimeo.
- Mato Díaz, F. J. (2013). Spain: a fragmented unemployment protection system in a segmented labour market (1990-2010). In J. Clasen and D. Clegg (Dirs.) *Regulating the risk of unemployment: National adaptations to post-industrial labour markets in Europe*. Oxford University Press, pp. 164-186.
- Mato Díaz, F. J. (2014). La Formación Profesional en España desde la perspectiva del empleo. Cuadernos del Círculo Cívico de Opinión nº 13, pp. 69-96.
- Mato Díaz, F. J. and I. Escudero (2016). Lost in transition? Effects on young graduates' employment of internships in public and private organizations. Mimeo.
- Mato Díaz, F. J., I. Escudero and R. González (2017). Evaluación del PO-FSE 2014/2020 del Principado de Asturias". Mimeo.
- Mato Díaz, F. J. (dir.), S. Otero, S. Sánchez and E. Valdavidia (2017). Evaluación Socioeconómica del Salario Social Básico. Principado de Asturias.
- Moreno, L. (1997). The Spanish Development of Southern Welfare, Working Paper 97-04/1997, Madrid: IESA-CSIC.
- Moreno Minguéz, A. (2012). La invisibilidad de los y las jóvenes en los servicios sociales del Estado de bienestar español. Revista de Estudios de Juventud. Junio 2012, nº 97, pp. 93-108.