



Youth employment policies in the Netherlands

**EXCEPT working paper no. 37
June 2018**

**Sonja Bekker
Wendy Wesseling
Evy Calon**

www.except-project.eu
twitter.com/except_eu
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:

Bekker, S., Wesseling, W. & Calon, E. (2018). *Youth employment policies in the Netherlands*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 37. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-406-0 (pdf)

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



Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in the Netherlands.....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview	5
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	11
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	12
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives	27
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	28
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	30
References	37



The key risk groups in the labour market in the Netherlands

Table 1 “Risk group” construction¹

Potential risk groups	Importance by actors		
	Public opinion/ Media*	Mainstream policy	Academic research
All young people	3	5	3
Young unemployed	3	4	3
Early school leavers	2	3	4
Young people with low skills	1	5	3
Young people with outdated qualifications ²	1	4	5
Young people without qualifications	1	2	3
NEET	1	4	5
Higher education graduates ³	3	4	3
Migrants/Ethnic minorities	2	5	4
Teenage/single parents	1	1	3
Young people from workless families	1	1	2
Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas ⁴	1	1	3
Young people with a disability	1	4	3
Other (please indicate & if necessary include new row/s)	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments on Table 1

For media we have consulted the database Lexis Nexis (website accessible via library Tilburg University <https://academic.lexisnexis.nl/>), which includes all articles of Dutch national and regional newspapers. The ratings are based on the number of times the specific target groups have been a topic in the news the past years, compared to the number of times youth unemployment has been in the news. The findings match the judgements of the researchers.

For mainstream policy we consulted the website of the national government and used the search term youth unemployment to see which policy documents have been written

¹ 1=no significant role to 5=very important

² Outdated skills is especially in policy documents and research when it comes to the mismatch between the skills of graduates and the skills required in the labour market. It especially involves the high demand for technicians and ICT personnel and the difficulty to find people with such skills.

³ For higher education graduates topics were especially higher education graduates having a job below their skill level, and related to that, them pushing low skilled out of the labour market (substitution effect). Moreover, the Work Experience Grant (see explanation below) was topic in media, policy documents and academic research

⁴ Remote areas, we interpreted as the youth unemployment difficulties large cities have (Amsterdam, Rotterdam). The Netherlands is a small country and does not really have remote areas. It rather has problems related to large cities, where e.g. migrant groups are larger



the past years, including the Dutch report responding to the EU youth guarantee plans. We added the evaluation of the European Commission of Dutch youth employment within the context of the European Semester. Sources national government: www.rijksoverheid.nl

Academic research is based on the literature reviews for the PhD thesis project of Wendy Wesseling, who is doing extensive research on local youth employment policies in the Netherlands.

Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Year Indicator	2005	2010	2015 or the last year of available data, specify
1	Total number of active labour market programmes:	N/A	N/A	N/A
1.1	including youth-targeted	N/A	N/A	N/A
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	349,050 ^(e)	390,160 ^(e)	352,760 ^(e)
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	N/A ⁵	N/A	N/A
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes: #			
3.1	Total number	N/A ⁶	17,250 ^(e)	N/A
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29)	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	N/A	4.42 ^(e)	N/A
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (in million EUR)	4,407.47 ^(e)	4,693.69 ^(e)	3,570.73 ^(e)
4.2	% of GDP	0,81 ^(e)	0,74 ^(e)	0,53 ^(e)
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:*			

⁵ The Eurostat database does not give the option to change the unit of measures from numbers into percentages.

⁶ Numbers are only partially available for the year 2010 in Eurostat database, and also these are estimates (e). See Annex below. One reason may be that the NL usually does not have specific target group policies (see explanation elsewhere in report). Moreover Dutch youth unemployment is relatively low, thus limiting the number of youngster who could be in a ALMP programme. Also, the Dutch income support system (esp. Welfare) discourages young people to flow into income support, thus limiting the size of the group that may be entitled to ALMP (see explanation elsewhere in doc and Bekker and Klosse, 2016).



5.1	Total amount (EUR)	N/A ⁷	N/A	N/A
5.2	% of GDP	N/A ⁸	N/A	N/A
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
6.1	Total amount (EUR)	N/A ⁹	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

Comments on Table 2

There is little data on the Netherlands, and the data that is available are estimations. Info on specific youth measures might be absent, as the Netherlands usually does not have specific target group policies. Moreover, as explained elsewhere in the report, much of the ALMP are decentralised to municipality level. Municipalities get budgets for this, but may spend this money as they see fit. i.e. it differs per municipality for which groups re-integration policies are developed. Often, municipalities also have general re-integration programmes and not so much specified for target groups, although exceptions exist (van Gerven and Bekker, 2017).

- n/a = not available. As will be explained in this document the Netherlands has generic activation policies and hardly has policies for specific target groups.
- # data is based on the age category 'less than 25 years old. Data on age group below age 29 is not available.
- Question 2 used code eurostat: Imp_partme_nlc
 - Total LMP measures (categories 2-7)
- Question 3 used code eurostat: Imp_partme_nl
 - 3.3 total number, can be found in question 2.1 = 390,160 → $17,250/390,160 * 100\% = 4.42\%$
- Question 4.1 used code eurostat: Imp_expme_nl
 - Total LMP measures (categories 2-7)
 - Purchasing power standard
- Question 4.2 used code eurostat: Imp_ind_exp

⁷ This is not available. There is no info on number of participants, which makes it likely that it is also unknown how large the expenditure is. Again, this may be due to the fact that NL hardly has target group policies. See http://appsso.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/nui/show.do?dataset=Imp_expme_nl&lang=en that you cannot select age groups.

⁸ If there is no info on expenditure, than the GDP% can also not be calculated

⁹ Similar as above. No specific details on youth available. This may be due to the fact that the NL usually does not have specific target group policies.



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	Importance ¹⁰	Preventive/reactive ¹¹	Youth specific	Main source of funding ¹²	Linked to EU initiatives ¹³	Main actors of delivery ¹⁴	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-) orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	3 ¹⁵	2	YES	1, 2, 4 Municipality (sometimes partly ESF, according to the co-financing regulations of the ESF, and the municipality making local budgets available)	No (1) ¹⁶	3, 6, 7, 8 (Public Employment Service; UWV)	YES Link	YES
Vocational guidance, career counselling	3 ¹⁷	3	YES	2	6 Reducing drop-out rate (early schoolleaving), part of EU 2020 quantitative targets	2, 3, 7, 8 (if needed actors providing care services or debt reduction services, i.e. social work)	YES Link current figures; Link evaluation 2009 ; Link evaluation 2013	YES

¹⁰ Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

¹¹ To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

¹² EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

¹³ Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other - 6

¹⁴ 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

¹⁵ To training: back to school. To employment: especially matching youth to vacancies/employers. There is no data on coverage or expenditure

¹⁶ Programmes in the Netherlands hardly ever refer to the EU as a source of inspiration. However, viewing the content of the programmes, you could argue that they fit the general idea of the EU Youth Guarantee

¹⁷ Ongoing initiative also active before crisis There is no data on coverage. Support from national funds: about 137 million EUR per year. Between 2012-2015 additionally 67 million EUR per year funds from Ministry of Education for regional covenants to reduce early school-leaving and 58 million EUR per year for performance-related subsidies for schools. Moreover, municipalities within the scope of regional desks for reporting school drop-out, receive in total 32 million EUR per year. Schools at intermediate professional level receive 150 million EUR per year to reduce early school-leaving.



Training (with certificates)	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Training (without certificates)	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Direct job creation	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

General system of Dutch income and re-integration support

The governance structure of the Dutch welfare state, including youth policies, are centralized in terms of law making and policy formation, and decentralized for the execution of labour market policy, social security and welfare. This means that many projects are developed at the local level ([Bekker et al., 2015](#)). Regional and local authorities thus have discretionary power and a degree of autonomy. The Public employment service (UWV) is responsible for the provision of unemployment benefits (UB). Municipalities are responsible for social assistance scheme (income provision and re-integration activities). Young people are served often by municipalities, as they mostly are not entitled to UB or receive UB only for a short time-period (as entitlement to UB is related to tenure in jobs). As of January 1, 2015 the municipalities are responsible for implementing the Participation Act, which includes a wage-subsidy scheme for the employer to warrant employment of vulnerable groups on the labour market. This is not specifically designed for youth, but often includes measures to support the young disabled ([Bekker et al., 2015](#)). The Act Work and Welfare (Social assistance - WWB) contains a waiting period for those below the age of 27, expecting the youngster to find a job or to return to education him or herself (Bekker and Klosse, 2016). The impact of this rule has not systematically been evaluated, but there is indications from seven municipalities that 30% to 48% of youth does not return after the 4 weeks waiting period (Ministry Social Affairs and Employment, 2013; Bekker and Klosse, 2016).

Of all types of policies mentioned in the table, only the first two are of relevance in the Netherlands. The others are not relevant. There are no specific policies set-up for youth. Generally, the Netherlands develops general ALMP and has little explicit target group policies. This has been confirmed also in an interview with the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment held in 2014 on the ESF programme of the Netherlands between 2007-2013 (Van Gerven and Bekker, 2017). At times, it might be the case that young people are included in measures that involve training or direct job creation, however, these are always generic policies which are not focused on young people.



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
<p>Cooperation with regional and local partners, including employers, municipalities and schools. i.e. the national government (2015) has allocated money to support four types of cooperation at the decentral level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Matching vacancies and youth. Implemented by Dutch Public Employment Service, municipalities, and other partners. Specifically for young people who lack 'employee skills, have insufficient job search skills or do not have a starter qualification. b) City Deal. Five cities and their partners will develop innovative solutions to combat (migrant) youth unemployment in specific neighbourhoods; c) Career skills. Education institutes and their partners will assist youth in developing career competencies, making suitable choices for further education (keeping in mind the job perspectives as well) and developing 'employee skills' and effective job-search skills; d) Agreements with employers. In cooperation with employers, increasing job chances by developing career skills, job inflow, combinations of working and learning, and diversity policy. 	<p>The Netherlands mostly has a generic approach to solving unemployment/stimulating economic growth, not that much of a targeted policy to youth, especially not during the first years of the crisis. This might have caused the Netherlands to react rather late to growing youth unemployment rates.</p>
<p>Activities to reduce early school-leaving has generated good results. The rate of early school-leaving has decreased from 15.3% in 2002 to 8% in 2016, according to Eurostat data (code t2020_40). Returning to school and getting a diploma which is suitable for the labour market, improves the chances at sustainable inclusion in the labour market.</p>	<p>The Dutch Participation Act, including income and re-integration facilities to people on social assistance, has a specific rule for youth under age 27, which poses obstacles to some groups of vulnerable youth. The rule denies active support to youngsters in the first 4 weeks after the request for social assistance. This risks alienating vulnerable youth from government support (see Bekker and Klosse, 2016).</p>
<p>Matching activities of young people with employers in existing jobs (eg Work Experience Grant).</p>	<p>High and growing labour market flexibility, and especially the high percentage of youth in temporary jobs, makes that the steps of youth into the labour market are not always steady. Especially for those with lower qualifications or slightly less developed competences, the risk of falling back into unemployment or inactivity is relatively high. They risk making exclusionary transitions from temporary employment into unemployment. Generic labour market policies could be installed to</p>



	decrease labour market segmentation, as is also recommended by guideline 6 of the EU Employment strategy.
Having a system of income support that gives you a means for a living and allows being a volunteer.	Lots of attention for youth who are distanced from labour market, whereas groups of youth with a good diploma receive less support. The idea is that youth with a high level of education should be able to make it on their own. However, having a good level of education is neither the same as having a good labour market position nor the same as having the capacities to apply for jobs. Thus policies should include more often the needs of high skilled unemployed youngsters.
Overall unemployment is decreasing and also the economy is going well. Obviously, this also has a positive effect on the chances of young people to move into a job.	Information provided by the government is at times difficult to understand. For instance, many web interfaces (E-government) whereas not all youth has ict-skills to find their way in the E-government facilities and/or does not have the language skills to fill out all the form without help. Thus, the implementation of policies should not rely too heavily on computer interfaces, but should include human interaction as well (e.g. between civil servants and young unemployed).
	Exchanging information about a young person between different institutes: school, municipality, etc. should be developed better. Due to a lack of information sharing among the different organisations, young persons need to repeat his/her story several times for each institute and institutes have to rely on the memory of their clients (e.g. which reintegration projects they have already done). This is difficult for some youth. On the other hand, privacy should be minded as well.
	Difficult to combine part-time and temporary income with part-time and temporary income support. This makes it discouraging to find a temporary and/or part-time job – it is for some a way into debt. Policies, especially income provision, should mind better that the current labour market and its types of jobs requires more flexibility in income provision.



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

The following three interventions have been selected because they specifically target youth, they are ongoing, and they target different youth sub-groups. Moreover, these three interventions have been evaluated to some extent. Especially the Starting grant (*Startersbeurs*) aims at assisting unemployed young people to enter jobs with real progression opportunities. Candidates are matched (or match themselves) to preferred internships. See explanation below. The Buzinezzclub also aims at inclusion in good jobs or good entrepreneurship. Buzinezzclub says to avoid shallow successes and quick-wins, but instead looks for lasting solutions, i.e. decent work, meaningful jobs and, if at all possible, the set-up of a business reflecting one’s dream. But it may also include self-employment. See explanation below. The VET Agenda has a wider range of different targets, some of which also aim for improving the quality of education and reducing early school-leaving. See explanation below.

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

N	Name	Level	Main target group ¹⁸	Type ¹⁹	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” ²⁰ example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ²¹	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ²²
1	<i>Startersbeurs</i> (Work Experience Grant)	Moved from local to national level	A.	Other: work experience scheme	April 2013	Local (both municipality and employers)	No	Yes, positive	Yes	4 Link first evaluation Link second evaluation	2

¹⁸ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

¹⁹ (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

²⁰ 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.”

²¹ 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable. Please provide a brief explanation of the ratings, incl. references if relevant.

²² 1 - Significant improvement; 2 - Improvement; 3 - No change; 4 - Deterioration; 5 - Significant deterioration; N/A – not applicable. Please provide a brief explanation of the ratings, incl. references if relevant.



2	Vocational Education and Training (VET) Agenda	National regional local	D. (youngsters in VET education, low to intermediate skill level)	1,2,3	2015	Local, EU (co-financed via ESF)	Yes part of EU “youth Guarantee” implementation	Yes positive	Partially. Has not proven to be sustainable.	4 Source: tweede_voortgangrapportage_mbo-agenda	2
3	Buzinezzclub	Local	A	1,6	2009	Other: social impact bond.	N/A	Yes, positive	Yes	N/a	N/A

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<i>Startersbeurs</i> (Work Experience Grant)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: Providing work experience to unemployed youth in regular work place</p> <p>Intended effects: Providing youth with the opportunity to get meaningful work or work experience after graduation, thus improving their labour market position; preventing that young graduates get distanced from the labour market by inactivity</p> <p>Description of activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • providing information on vacancies via a national website; Companies can upload vacancies and young jobseekers can find vacancies; • getting work experience in companies. This is work experience by doing tasks in the company, and by engaging with colleagues; • providing guidance and advice by a coach. This coach is someone who also works at the company; a colleague or supervisor; • giving a voucher for further training or schooling (600 EUR) at the end of the work experience programme. <p>Target groups: all young job seekers after graduation</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: Depends on the municipality the young person lives in. Often, the criteria are; job seeker aged 18 to 27; having an education degree equaling a starter qualification²³; living in the municipality that provides support; neither receives education scholarship nor public benefits. A participant may not use the starter grant more than</p>

²³ Medium professional education diploma at level 2 (MBO2) or higher.



	<p>two times, and not more than once in the same company. Having a (side-)job is allowed, but only if the working hours are 12 hours or less per week.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Preparation of employment: Getting work experience in regular work place and a network among employers</p> <p>Level: having an education degree equaling a starter qualification. Local level: municipalities.</p> <p>Start/ end date: Maximum duration 6 months for 32 hours per week. Start April 2013-ongoing.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Yes. In set-up trade unions, municipalities, scientists, employers</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Employers, municipalities, young people. Young people can find a match via the website https://www.startersbeurs.nu/</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: The grant is given by the Municipality (about 400 EUR per month) and the employer (about 100 EUR per month).</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered: By March 2015 there were 2150 participants and 128 of the 400 Dutch municipalities took part in the project (Source: Lievens et al., 2015). By now, 150 municipalities have joined the <i>Startersbeurs</i> and 3000 youngsters have benefitted from it (source: website startersbeurs.nu, accessed 7 Nov 2017). In the evaluation of March 2015, covering 652 participants, almost 68% of participants said to have a paid job three months after having finished the <i>Startersbeurs</i>. Youngsters found a paid job at the company offering the work experience place (34%) or returned to the student job they had before starting the <i>Startersbeurs</i> (7%). 46.5% says that the job fits the type of education which they have followed (content-wise) while 67.2% mentions that the job fits the level of education they followed (e.g. high, intermediate, etc.). 51.8% finds that the job has good career perspectives (Lievens et al., 2015).</p> <p>(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. Data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part, this data is not available.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. n/a The annual expenditure is unknown, as the expenses are per municipality and not calculated at national level.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? The grant is 500 EUR per month. If the work experience place runs for the maximum amount of time, then the expenses of the benefits paid is 6*500 EUR = 3000 EUR. Usually the municipality pays 400 EUR per month and the employer 100 EUR. But the</p>



	<p>division of the number of EUR paid by the employer and by the municipality may differ across municipalities. Additional costs could be providing supervision / guidance to the youngster at the work place by the employer. These costs are not calculated and are given in men-hours. Moreover there are costs to keep the website with vacancies running. Municipalities have made an agreement on the payment of these costs with the website host. The costs of one Work experience grant is estimated to be around 400 EUR (of which about 3306 EUR direct costs per grant) (Source: Region Midden Brabant 2014).</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? All young job seekers after graduation</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Young aged 18-27</p> <p>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)? N/A</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Yes. Youth may search for an employer themselves to start a work experience grant. The young job seeker may make use of the vacancies posted on the website of startersbeurs.nu, but may also find an employer him or herself. This way the work experience place will match well with the competencies of the graduate. If a youngster starts a work experience scheme, than he or she makes a plan, in joint cooperation with the employer, including which skills or competencies will be developed. At the start and the end of the project, the youngster makes a competence test, revealing how the youngster has developed him or herself.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>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? There is no causal link, however, the programme says to fit in the plans of the EU Youth Guarantee by offering a high quality work experience place.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Yes, ex-durante. Sources: Lievens et al., 2015; Lievens et al., 2014.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? External by academic institute (Tilburg University).</p> <p>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</p>



	<p>loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless) NO, not included;</p> <p>substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries) No, not included;</p> <p>displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)? No, not included.</p> <p>The evaluation is detailed, but more on the effects of the programme on young people who have followed the programme: did they enhance their skills and capacities (both self-assessment and assessment by internship coach/employer); are they satisfied with the programme; were they able to find a (good quality) job?</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source. In the evaluation of March 2015, covering 652 participants, almost 68% of participants said to have a paid job three months after having finished the <i>Startersbeurs</i>. Youngsters found a paid job at the company offering the work experience place (34%) or returned to the student job they had before starting the <i>Startersbeurs</i> (7%). 46.5% says that the job fits the type of education which they have followed (content-wise) while 67.2% mentions that the job fits the level of education the followed (e.g. high, intermediate, etc.). 51.8% finds that the job has good career perspectives (Lievens et al., 2015).</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? For high skilled youngsters this is practically the only scheme they can make use of. Positive is that it connects them with regular employers. A good part of these young people flow into a job.</p> <p>The key success factors in ensuring the effective formulation and implementation of the policy or measure, which could help replication in another territory or context, depend on the scale the Work Experience Grant will be implemented. The Work Experience Grant started as a local initiative, but is now a national instrument.</p> <p>Key success factors when the Work Experience Grant were to be replicated <u>locally</u>,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local budgets for unemployed youth • Local jurisdiction to implement policy <p>General success factors include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-financing between government and businesses (i.e. financial incentive for employers) • Financial incentive for youth • Clear regulation and legislation about what constitutes "work experience"



	<p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? No Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)? n/a There is no data on this. The evaluation shows however that the scheme is predominantly used by university graduates or higher professional education graduates. It seems less accessible to youth with an intermediate education level.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? The general impression is that the scheme works relatively well. In media, concerns have been raised that internships for graduates allow employers to make use of cheap labour (ie letting graduates work in real jobs for only a small grant instead of a real wage). However, the limited period for which an employer may hire via the Work Experience Grant (6 months) is thought to decrease this risk. Conversely, the compensation youth receive during the programme is controversial. One the one hand, youngsters are protected by the programme in that they will receive at least €500/ month (the employer is free to complement the fee). On the other hand, €500/ month is below the Dutch social minimum, making the Startersbeurs not feasible for everyone. Although the economy is recovering, the compensation is not adjusted. Also, no arrangements have been made about vacation days, etc. The quality of the internship is not guaranteed, checked or monitored.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>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? Yes, certainly for graduates from higher education, the main obstacle to work is a lack of work experience and/or a lack of a network among employers. The Work Experience Grant helps to take away such obstacles.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention. Getting work experience at regular employer. Matching the wishes and education level of the graduate with the demands of the employer, via an open website with vacancies.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? It has been a good tool in giving young people meaningful work experience, especially in the years of high youth unemployment. It is far better than being unemployed. It is also better than flowing into regular reintegration programmes of municipalities, which are often designed for people who have a large distance from the labour market.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? n/a</p>



<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>VET-Agenda (<i>MBO-agenda</i>) Vocational training and education</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: to innovate vocational education and training practices for improving the chances for ‘good’ transitions into the labour market. The main difference with the Work Experience Grant is the target group and the geographical level. The target group of the VET-agenda is only the pupils in vocational education and training (intermediate skill level), whereas the Work Experience Grant is mostly used by youngsters who have followed higher level education (and only a small proportion of the users is schooled at intermediate level). Moreover pupils in the VET-agenda are partly still in school, whereas the target audience of the Work Experience Grant are recent graduates. In addition, part of the VET-Agenda money also supports the improvement of the quality of the teaching staff. Moreover the VET-agenda is specific for the Amsterdam region. The Work Experience Grant is offered by many more municipalities and not limited to Amsterdam.</p> <p>Activities of the VET-Agenda: see for many details below. Main activities are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training • Ensuring high quality internships (to be followed as part of the VET curriculum) • Preparation for transition into employment • Developing and strengthening a network among stakeholders • Improving quality teachers • Reducing early school-leaving. <p>Intended effects: improving the employment position of youngsters</p> <p>Target groups: youngsters with low or intermediate education levels and diverse ethnic backgrounds</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: Students of VET-schools located in Amsterdam</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Training, preparation for employment</p> <p>Level: VET-schools</p> <p>Start/ end date: 2015-2018 (current programme period)</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Yes, there is regional-and municipal-level cooperation between public authorities, business and schools. The students’ needs to participate and follow trainings.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Municipality of Amsterdam</p>



	<p>Budget (EUR, Thousand) and source:</p> <p>For the years 2015-2016: 1 million EUR</p> <p>Source: Aanvalsplan Jeugdwerkloosheid 2015-2018, Investeren in de toekomst van Amsterdam, p. 18</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Around 11.100 young people in Amsterdam belong to the larger target group of young people who could use assistance at school or in making a step to the labour market. Not all of these young people belong to the group of VET however. The size of the group of young people needing assistance and belonging to the VET group is unknown.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>2015-2016 € 2.480.000 (same as reserved budget) (Source: first progress report)</p> <p>2016-2017 € 4.828.538 (while the budget was € 4.780.000) (Source: second progress report)</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>2016-2017</p> <p>Teachers grant € 244.025</p> <p>Study grant € 1.039.531</p> <p>Talent program € 250.000</p> <p>Project plans € 2.827.866</p> <p>Communication, research, knowledge, coordination costs € 476.116</p> <p>183 teachers received a teachers grant</p> <p>42 teams received a study grant</p> <p>65 projects are started</p> <p>Viewing the specific targets of the programme it is not possible to break expenditure down to individual students. E.g. one of the targets is improving the quality of intermediate professional education (<i>MBO - Middelbaar beroepsonderwijs</i>) in Amsterdam, not only by executing the talent programme, but also by giving grants to teachers to engage in training.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? youngsters with low/intermediate education levels and diverse ethnic backgrounds</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Yes to VET-school students</p>



	<p>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)? n/a</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly No the program is designed by the Municipality in Amsterdam, the only way they are included is by taking into account their feedback every year.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>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? Yes to Youth Guarantee</p>
Available evaluations	<p>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)? Yes, there are on a yearly basis mid-term permanent monitoring evaluations which are internal. They can be found on this website: https://www.amsterdam.nl/bestuur-organisatie/organisatie/sociaal/onderwijs-jeugd-zorg/onderwijs-leerplicht/amsterdamse-mbo/ (called eerste voortgangsrapportage and tweede voortgangsrapportage) Besides this there are also a mid-term evaluation done which are done externally. (Sources: Regional governance of youth unemployment: A comparison of three Innovative Practices of Multi-Level Cooperation in the Netherlands Muffels, R., van der Meer, M. & Bekker, S. 12 Dec 2016 STYLE Horizon 2020 Project, p. 1-22 AND Style handbook: learning from the Dutch case: innovating youth (un)employment policies in Amsterdam, Eindhoven and Tilburg. Marc van der Meer, Rudd Muffels and Sonja Bekker.)</p> <p>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</p>



	<p>sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>The external sources are evaluating the functioning the cooperation among actors and which groups are included.</p> <p>The internal evaluation is very detailed, about numbers, evaluations of students, teachers and companies.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>The results differ per school type and per indicator, but overall the progress reports are rather positive.</p> <p>There is a drop in the percentage of early school-leavers, the students are facing less problems with finding a good quality internship (which is often mandatory to finish their education and get a diploma), and there are hardly cases any longer where pupils drop out of school because they could not find an internship. For instance, in types of education where internship shortages appeared, an internship mediator was appointed to ensure enough internships. 750 pupils benefitted from this.</p> <p>Unaccounted leave from school reduced and a larger proportion of pupils feels safe at school. The Operation or impact of this kind of network communities is always limited by the time and resources. Especially by the authority assigned to and the power these networks can unfold. At regional level a further prioritization of ambitions and goals in policy making is necessary. A Tailor-made approach is needed, with room for: Mediation, Individual coaching and involving the parents.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Yes the rates related to early school leaving, youth-unemployment, hours of absence and problems of finding an internships and apprenticeships slowly drops.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? The rate of NEET people drops slowly. However, low educated migrant workers are still facing higher barriers to find work.</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? No because, there is a cooperation with vet-schools. This makes it more easy to cover all the VET-students of the VET-schools in Amsterdam Sources: Municipality of Amsterdam (2016), Eerste voortgangsrapportage Amsterdamse MBO-Agenda, April 2016.</p>



	<p>Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)? You already need to be a VET-student.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>The programmes success depends on cooperation of actors at strategic, tactical and operational levels. This cooperation should be further strengthened. Knowledge sharing facilities have been set-up, which also benefits evaluation and reflection. Future developments include reflecting on developing learning communities among teams of teachers in VET-schools; creating a better link with social policies, labour market policies and education policies (e.g. understanding better the local economy and what types of workers the local economy requires).</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>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?</p> <p>Yes it prevents people to become NEET. And it helps people to make the transition from education to the labour market which prevents social exclusion.</p> <p>It is a collaborative and co-maker ship approach between policies and schools. The municipality made resource available to all education teams of VET-schools to strengthen not only their pedagogical and didactical tooling but also to better tune the vocational education to the requirements of the labour market.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>Innovative regional-and municipal-level cooperation between public authorities, business and schools.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Good practices because this approach covers a wide range of professions, skills and talent management of young vulnerable people. Especially, the cooperation on all kind of levels contributes to the drop of early school leavers and prevent youngster to become NEET.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? n/a</p>



Name of the initiative	Buzinezzclub
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>The primary goal of the Buzinezzclub is to offer opportunities for a good future for all young people between 17 and 27 years, who are on social assistance in the Netherlands through a unique empowerment program. Buzinezzclub is a program of 26 weeks (6 months). The first 16 weeks are intensive (i.e. 4 days/week). All participants receive joint masterclasses, training and intensive coaching, but the focus of these activities depends on the chosen track:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training for entrepreneurship: writing own business plan. • Improving school-to-work transition: job application skills and study choice. <p>The following 10 weeks are less intensive. Participants have a weekly return day with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training • individual coaching on request. <p>The participants receive a certificate after completing the program. After completion, former participants can continue to use the services of the Buzinezzclub on request. Participants are members for life.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>The intended effects of the Buzinezzclub include: increased self-awareness, talent development and integration into society (through regular work or self-employment). Buzinezzclub avoids shallow successes and quick-wins, but instead looks for lasting solutions, i.e. decent work, meaningful jobs and, if at all possible, the set-up of a business reflecting one's dream.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>Youths between 18 and 30 years old who are not in employment, education or training and are entitled to welfare allowance.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>If a youngster fits the eligibility criteria, he/she does not automatically become a member of Buzinezzclub. To become a member, one has to be able to work (i.e. not prosecuted by the law, not homeless, not physically unable through drug addictions etc.), and one has to be motivated to take all necessary steps to relaunch oneself into a life with a purpose.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p>



	<p>Preparation for training or employment</p> <p>Level: Local</p> <p>Start/ end date: Ongoing since 2009 in (a combination of) different municipalities, including some of the biggest cities in The Netherlands such as: The Hague, Utrecht, Rotterdam and Eindhoven.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? The Buzinezzclub is developed by a variety of method developers and trainers. Stakeholders of municipalities have also been consulted. Most of the youth who enter the Buzinezzclub program are referred by Municipal Youth Desk of the department of work and income (Dutch: <i>jongerenloket</i>), where they had applied for their welfare allowance. Some find the program through hearsay.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: Unknown.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>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. # youth who were entitled to: 1400 # youth who actually took part: 1200 # youth who found a job: 850</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. Unknown</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. This is not a fixed amount, due to its finance structure (SIB: Social impact bonds). Municipalities repay the investors if pre-determined outcomes are achieved (i.e. youth are no longer depending on a welfare allowance, and their risk to become welfare-dependent is deemed very low), which in practice means an expenditure between €0 and €5,000 per beneficiary.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Youths between 18 and 30 years old who are not in employment, education or training and are entitled a welfare allowance.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? The Buzinezzclub is especially targeted to young, unemployed people.</p>



	<p>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)?</p> <p>N/A</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>Youth are partly involved in designing the programme, as youth are regularly (once a week) asked to provide feedback on training sessions and guidance and the programme is redesigned/ refined accordingly. The programme is always tailored to the needs of each group.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>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?</p> <p>No</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Permanent monitoring is inherent to Buzinezzclub due to the finance structure (SIB).</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>Internal and external evaluations have been announced, of which a part will be done by the University of Utrecht (see link for announcement in press release). As yet there are no evaluations executed by independent experts. There are annual reports written by Buzinezzclub, e.g. link to the 2015 annual report. http://buzinezzclub.nl/buzinezzclub-jaarverslag-2015/</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>External evaluations by the ILO (International Labour Organization) and Utrecht University are ongoing regarding the</p>



	<p>long-term effects of Buzinezzclub. Due to the recent nature of the program, a sufficient number of member has to be reached first before it is possible to make valid and reliable conclusions.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>On average, 10% of a group (N=40) has started a proper business, 20% is enrolled in a fitting vocational training, 30% has found a fitting – and decent – job after six months. This makes a success rate of 60% (2015 annual report. http://buzinezzclub.nl/buzinezzclub-jaarverslag-2015/), i.e. members who are no longer depending on a welfare allowance, and whose risk to again becoming welfare-dependant is deemed to be very low.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? 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.)?</p> <p>Buzinezzclub works with groups of about 40 unemployed youngsters. There is a pre-defined start and end date, a weekly program and a pre-defined number of young people has to be reached before the programme can start, making it less flexible and accessible for youth who become unemployed during the program. The programme requires a minimum number of 100 participants per year, which makes it unsuitable for smaller municipalities. The program leaves little room for tailoring it to the specific needs of individual youngsters, because of the well-developed nature of the day-to-day program/ methodology. However, in my view, given the proven effectiveness of the programme that might be of less importance.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>See above</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and</p>



	<p>target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>The Buzinezzclub addresses all the problems that youth encounters on three levels. At the micro level, Buzinezzclub addresses the skill deficits of youth by learning them new skills and behavior. At meso level, Buzinezzclub addresses the lack of a (professional) network, by connecting young people to new networks and domains, for example, through a volunteer coach and the deployment of networks of partner organisations. At macro level, Buzinezzclub addresses the lack of collaboration by closing partnerships and influencing stakeholders, such as the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, the foundation of Dutch municipalities (VNG), Employers' association AWWN, PSO Netherlands (part of research institute TNO) and other parties to increase the chances of disadvantaged young people.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>The success factors of the Buzinezzclub include: the method of financing (pay for success via Social Impact Bonds), the well-developed methodology, the active involvement of business, the young and mixed staff allows for identification, the positive approach (i.e. focus on youth's talents, dreams, etc), the involvement of volunteers who act as buddies. The volunteer is employed or owns a business and is selected and trained by Buzinezzclub, the broad range of the programme: (re) orientation, motivation augmentation, learning job search skills, and where possible: matching / mediation.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>Idem + I believe the Buzinezzclub is a good practice, because of the well-developed methodology, which fosters showing the potential for replication. Since municipalities only pay for success (i.e. when a youngster is not dependent on social welfare anymore and no longer at risk to become dependent on welfare again), Buzinezzclub is thorough monitored by several stakeholders (including scientific institutions). Due to the finance method the Buzinezzclub is less susceptible to political agendas, because it does not rely on subsidies and special projects.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>N/A</p>



Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

Generally, the EU is not very relevant to stimulate Dutch policies to fight youth unemployment.

At the beginning of the crisis, the national government neither seemed to give priority to new policies to fight youth unemployment nor to provide employment support to youngsters (Bekker et al. 2015a). The expectation was that youngsters would flow into jobs quickly once the economic recovery would set in. Among others, the Dutch Youth Guarantee Plan, as input for the EU policy, reflects this modest ambition, and consequently did not result in significant policy changes. New policies were notably at the local or regional level, including action plans for youth unemployment, the sector plans to increase job-to-job mobility within the sector and the measures to reduce early school dropout rates. The common denominator of these policies was that they aimed at extending the school period of young people to prevent unemployment (Bekker et al. 2015b).

In addition, compared to other countries, youth unemployment was not among the most pressing socio-economic challenges, and the EU did not address youth unemployment when monitoring the Netherlands. For instance, none of the country-specific recommendations to the Netherlands in the European Semester addressed labour market challenges of young people.

During the crisis, ESF-funds could be reallocated to youth unemployment. The Netherlands made use of this opportunity, and added the priority to fight youth unemployment. In 2009 and 2010 103 million EUR on ESF-fund was used to fight youth unemployment. In 2011, 38,035 unemployed youngsters were included in ESF-funded projects (co-finance) (Source: Ministry Social Affairs and Employment, 2011). Also for the period ESF 2014-2020, funds are allocated to fight youth unemployment.

There have not been political shifts regarding this issue. This could also relate to the fact that youth unemployment is not a large problem in the Netherlands, compared to other EU countries.



Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

Following the decentralisation of large social welfare dossiers to the municipality level, the social policies that support job inclusion of youth are developed and given at the local level as well. Therefore, there is no national policy prescribing how different social policies should be linked. However, at municipality level and at regional level, there are ample examples of synergies of youth unemployment activities with different policies (e.g. Berenschot and Baanwijs, 2017; Baan and Zwaveling, 2017). There is a national database filled with local and regional practices to fight youth unemployment, at times also in cooperation with actors who implement other social policies. Examples are institutes helping to reduce debts, social work, etc. There is a database with examples, and this database is accessible via the website of the foundation for Dutch municipalities: <https://praktijkvoorbeelden.vng.nl/databank/werk-en-inkomen/jeugdwerkloosheid.aspx>.

Two examples are included in the matrix below:

1. For example, distilled from a regional practice to bring vulnerable youth (e.g. young people with learning deficiencies who have followed special education) from school to work, one of the established success factors is facilitating cooperation between different disciplines, including education, (health) care, re-integration and labour market. This involves the cooperation between actors such as the municipalities, schools, public employment service, social work and organisations delivering (health) care services) and employers. It is acknowledged that each organisation alone cannot reach success without cooperating with the other. The other success factors are a central focus on the young person, getting parents involved, high quality and continuous support (also if young people move from school to an employer, or from school to income support schemes), getting employers involved, one contact person who guides the young person long-term, assuring knowledge and quality.

2. The social services in the municipality of Drechtsteden, increased the level of active cooperation of stakeholders to support vulnerable youth to a job or some form of work. The main partners in cooperation are the social service of the municipality, Dutch PES (UWV), and different types of schools for special education for youth with learning deficiencies. The municipality developed a specific approach to make sure this cooperation works well. This should make sure that young people do not get lost when they move from school to work or income support (i.e. do not get lost if they move from falling within the responsibility of one to the responsibility of another organisation). Ingredient of success: start cooperation early (ie before youngster flows from school) and try to complement each other also when 'handing over' the youngster to a new organisation, e.g. from school to a job. Place central the needs of the youngster, e.g. think in terms of what solutions work for the particular youngster and stop thinking in



terms of protocols. This means sometimes also dealing with issues that strictly fall beyond the scope of the organisation's responsibility. Continuous improvement by seeing what could improve. This way of working has inspired the stakeholders to also start cooperating in other areas, for instance with organisations that help people reducing their debt, or organisations that support young refugees. Results: in the first semester of 2016 the status of 180 youngsters has been discussed in a preventative stage. The largest part of these young people have been supported by their school in their first steps on the labour market. 80 youngsters have gotten support by social services of the municipality.

See <https://praktijkvoorbeelden.vng.nl/userpages/Unthemed/DownloadDocument.aspx?id=7170> account:

At the national level: in 2015, 2016 and 2017, the national government has allowed employers to focus vacancies to the age group of 18 to 27, with the aim to decrease youth unemployment. The vacancy should then include the sentence "This is a vacancy for young people aged 18 to 27 years in the context of the plan to fight unemployment ('Dit is een vacature voor jongeren van 18 tot 27 jaar in het kader van de 'Aanpak jeugdwerkloosheid'.'). It allows, as way of exemption, unequal treatment based on age.

(Source: <https://www.aanpakjeugdwerkloosheid.nl/actueel/nieuws/2016/09/21/ook-in-2017-mogen-werkgevers-weer-werven-op-jongeren>, News item date 21-09-2016, Last accessed 14-11-2017). website

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group ²⁴	Starting year; end year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	Baanwijzen (job smart)	Regional	d.	2015 (stakeholders sign covenant) Ongoing	EU (ESF), regional, local	Related to ESF-financing	yes	Regional initiative, so small in number. Yet the cooperation among stakeholders is inspiring.	Tailor-made guidance
2	Municipality Drechtsteden	Local	d	2015-ongoing	Local	NO	Account of stakeholder view on programme.	Small initiative, and not systematically reviewed by	Making sure that actors really cooperate; be proactive in approaching youth (instead

²⁴ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



								independent expert, yet, positive	of waiting until they ask for help); think in terms of solutions for the youngster also if this means taking up responsibilities that go beyond the scope of your organisation.
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	-----------------------------------	---

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Baanwijs (Job smart)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: to facilitate the step from special education (for youth with learning difficulties) into a job, further education, day centre, reintegration programme or voluntary work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate transition between school to work or an alternative for work e.g. (volunteering), by activities (see details below): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Guidance of youngster; ○ Involving network of stakeholders <p>Intended effects: create a next step that comes right after the pupil has left school: avoid that a pupil comes from school without having a new place to go to. In the end this is also about preventing NEET.</p> <p>Target groups: vulnerable youth who have learning deficiencies and who study in special education.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: vulnerable youth who are flowing from special education into a job, day centre, further education or voluntary work.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): preparation for training or employment, vocational guidance.</p> <p>Level: regional</p> <p>Start/ end date: 2015-present</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Yes, municipalities, school, PES, employers. But also pupils and parents. How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Mainly municipalities and schools.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: unknown. There is no info shared on this, also because it is a regional activity connecting different actors (which each have different funding sources).</p>



<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>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. n/a Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. n/a Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. n/a</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? vulnerable youth who have learning deficiencies and who study in special education. Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? to young 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)? n/a</p>
<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly Yes, e.g. the job coach at times searches for jobs actively together with the young person who is looking for a job. Guidance and coaching of the young person is key part of the programme.</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>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? It is co-financed through ESF.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Yes, during. See Baan and Zwaveling, 2017) Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? External by research institute. 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)? Yes, there is an evaluation, which is based mainly on interviews with 30 youngsters. Mainly based on qualitative information, e.g. on which success factors and obstacles the youngster has encountered (See Baan and Zwaveling, 2017).</p>



<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>There are employment experts (<i>arbeidsdeskundigen</i>) and youth caches who are present at schools, but also have an external network e.g. among Dutch PES (Public Employment Service) and employers. At school these professionals have contact with pupils but also with teachers and parents. At the start of each school year they make an overview which youngster will flow out of school and will go into which direction (e.g. further education, employment or a trajectory which aims to bring the youngster into employment, or a place which gives a worthwhile use of people's time (at a day centre). This enables early signaling of obstacles. The evaluation is positive about the fact that the employment experts have been seconded from the PES, as their expertise and network are very valuable. e.g. the relationship between the particular type of work deficiencies of a youngster and his/her capabilities to enter into employment. Moreover, it relieves schools from having to adjust to legislative changes which were introduced by the Participation Act (2015) (making the municipalities instead of PES as the main actor implementing measures for vulnerable youth in special education), and provides an additional network among employers, enlarging the options for suitable work places. Moreover, the close cooperation between PES, municipalities and schools facilitates decisions on granting wage cost subsidies (Baan and Zwaveling, 2017). Also the job coaches are a valuable link between schools, pupils, parents and teachers. If a school signals that a pupil cannot find a suitable internship, then the job coach starts searching as well. The job coach also plays an important role when a young person becomes a NEET.</p> <p>The 30 youngsters in the evaluation do not form a representative part of vulnerable youth in special education. Looking at the 30 youngsters, the variation of their trajectories after school is large. Eventually, with or without detours, 10 ended up in a job, 11 in further education. 4 go to day centers or work as a volunteer. 3 had a job but did not get a prolongation of their employment contract, and subsequently entered a reintegration trajectory. 2 were temporarily out of sight, but are now in sight again because they have gotten income support (Baan and Zwaveling, 2017).</p> <p>The youngsters were interviewed about factors of success and failure and also these factors differ widely from person to person. Among the success factors are coaching/guidance; personal circumstances (e.g. parents who are involved and supportive), motivation and ambition; school, the municipality; the work place; organizations providing care services. These same factors however also form an obstacle, for instance temporary employment contracts that are not renewed, too little</p>
--------------------------------------	---



	<p>guidance at work, but also illness or teenage parents (Baan and Zwaveling, 2017).</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? N/a too little info as evaluation only follows 30 people.</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? No. Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)? Barriers seem to depend on the individual and may be linked to the satisfaction with coaching/guidance; personal circumstances (e.g. illness, little motivation, teenage pregnancy), motivation and ambition; school; the work place (e.g. temporary employment contracts that are not renewed, too little guidance at work); organizations providing care services (e.g. no continuation of guidance) (Baan and Zwaveling, 2017).</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? n/a</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>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? No, it tries to avoid unemployment and inactivity and is aimed at a group who is very vulnerable.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention. The evaluation mentions as success factor for the entire programme: facilitating cooperation between different disciplines, including education, (health) care, re-integration and labour market. This involves the cooperation between actors such as the municipalities, schools, public employment service, social work and organisations delivering (health) care services) and employers. A central focus on the young person, getting parents involved, high quality and continuous support (also if young people move from school to an employer, or from school to income support schemes), getting employers involved, one contact person who guides the young person long-term, assuring knowledge and quality.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? The cooperation of stakeholders and the tailor-made and close guidance of vulnerable youth.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? n/a</p>



Name of the initiative	Municipality Drechtsteden. The main difference with the scheme above is that it is executed in a different region/city.
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: to facilitate the step from special education (for youth with learning difficulties) into a paid job, or any other type of employment.</p> <p>Activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance of youngster; • Involving stakeholders in a network <p>Intended effects: make sure that youngsters are not left alone when making the step from school to work or income support. Make sure that they do not get 'lost' when making such a transition.</p> <p>Target groups: vulnerable youth who have learning deficiencies and who study in special education.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: vulnerable youth who are flowing from special education.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): depends on the needs and possibilities of the youngster.</p> <p>Level: local</p> <p>Start/ end date: 2015-present</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Yes, municipality, school, PES. How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Mainly municipalities and schools.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: unknown. There is no info shared on this, also because it is a local activity connecting different actors.</p>
Achieved results	<p>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. n/a In the first semester of 2016 there have been conversations about 180 pupils.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. n/a</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. n/a</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? vulnerable youth who have learning deficiencies and who study in special education.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? to young</p> <p>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)? n/a</p>



Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>Probably yes. The programme says that it is very important to give the young person a central focus.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>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? n/a</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? There is an account of the programme with some figures in it. Ee https://praktijkvoorbeelden.vng.nl/userpages/Unthemed/DownloadDocument.aspx?id=7170</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? Account of one of the strategic advisor of the social service. No independent expert evaluation.</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>We only know how many young people were included in a preventative discussion and how many young people needed additional support and via which programme they got support.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>In a preventative discussion the situation of 180 youngsters was discussed. 100 of them could be guided to a job by the school itself. For 80 youngsters additional support was needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 9 of them found (sheltered) employment where they work while getting full income support (welfare). - 26 youngsters managed to transform their internship into a paid job, while this job was subsidized by the municipality as the youngster had a lower productivity level than the average young employee (wage cost subsidy). - 15 youngsters started a paid job.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 10 youngsters used other types of re-integration instruments via which they could get a job (e.g. a trial placement period). - 1 youngster flew onto a day centre and 2 youngster got the exemption from the duty to look for employment and receive income support instead. - The other youngsters are still in the phase of having conversations about their future options and aspirations.
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? N/a too little info.</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? N/a unknown.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? n/a</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>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? It tries to avoid unemployment and inactivity and is aimed at a group who is very vulnerable. It takes a preventative approach by early intervention and improving the cooperation among the different stakeholder organisations.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention. The evaluation mentions as success factor: facilitating cooperation between different actors such as the municipalities, schools, public employment service. A central focus on the young person, thinking terms of solutions for the problem of the youngster and not in terms of protocols. Having only a few and steady contact persons who guides the young person. Try to learn continuously and discuss with the stakeholders what could be improved. Be proactive in approaching youth and do not wait until they ask for help.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? The cooperation of stakeholders and the tailor-made and close guidance of vulnerable youth.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? n/a</p>



References

- Baan, A. and E. Zwaveling (2017), Kwetsbare jongeren van school naar werk; Praktijk gericht onderzoek in de regio Noord-Limburg [Vulnerable youth from school to work. Practices in the Dutch region North Limburg], Berenschot. <https://praktijkvoorbeelden.vng.nl/userpages/Unthemed/DownloadDocument.aspx?id=7263>
- Bekker, S., van der Meer, M., Muffels, R., & Wilthagen, A. (2015a), Policy Performance and Evaluation: Netherlands. *STYLE Working Papers*, WP3/nl. CROME, University of Brighton, Brighton. <http://www.style-research.eu/publications/working-papers>.
- Bekker, S., van der Meer, M., & Muffels, R. (2015b), Barriers to and triggers of policy innovation and knowledge transfer in the Netherlands. *STYLE Working Papers*, WP4.1/NL. CROME, University of Brighton, Brighton. <http://www.style-research.eu/publications/working-papers>.
- Berenschot and Baanwijs (2017), Kwetsbare jongeren van school naar werk, de zeven succesfactoren, [Vulnerable youth from school to work. Seven success factors], Berenschot, Baanwijs. <https://praktijkvoorbeelden.vng.nl/userpages/Unthemed/DownloadDocument.aspx?id=7264>
- Ministry Social Affairs and Employment (2015), *Betreft Aanpak Jeugdwerkloosheid* [On youth unemployment], Letter to Parliament, Date 29 November 2015
- Ministry Social Affairs and Employment (2011), News item, ESF-PROGRAMMA 2007-2013: ECONOMISCHE GROEI VERSTERKEN (ESF-Programme 2007-2013: strengthening economic growth, date 30-09-2011, Website <https://www.agentschapszw.nl/actueel/nieuws/2011/09/30/economische-groei-versterken-voortgang-esf-programma-2007-%E2%80%93-2013>, last accessed 14-11-2017.
- Lievens, R., Wesseling, W., Wilthagen, T. and R. Muffels (2014), [Eerste Evaluatie Startersbeurs; Instrument voor werkzoekende jongeren](#) [Eerste evaluation Work Experience Grant; instrument for job-seeking youth], ReflecT, September 2014.
- Lievens, R., Wesseling, W., Wilthagen, T. and R. Muffels (2015), [Tweede Evaluatie Startersbeurs; Instrument voor werkzoekende jongeren](#) [Second evaluation Work Experience Grant; instrument for job-seeking youth], ReflecT, March 2015.
- van Gerven, M. and S. Bekker (2017), Cash or more? The legitimacy and construction of the European Social Fund in the Netherlands, Paper prepared for the ESPANET conference, Lisbon September 2017.