



# Youth employment policies in Slovakia

EXCEPT working paper no. 46  
July 2018

Katarína Čavojská

[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](https://twitter.com/except_eu).

**To cite this report:**

---

Čavojská, K. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Slovakia*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No. 46. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

---

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-415-2 (pdf)

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



## Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Slovakia.....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview .....	7
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	13
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	16
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives .....	43
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	45
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	46
References .....	54



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

Overall, it is possible to state that in the Slovak Republic the most vulnerable to unemployment are young people with low qualification, as well as long-term unemployed young people. It is alarming that we are facing serious long-term unemployment among unemployed youth. There is 60% of long-term unemployed people in the group of 20 – 29 years old unemployed. The biggest and persistent challenge in the structure of young unemployed people are not registered NEETs. Young people who are not registered in the social system (registered by the competent authorities). The labour market has not been able to absorb these groups despite the fact that lack of labour force is currently addressed in Slovakia (mainly in Western Slovakia). We see a combination of disadvantages in the group of young NEETs in Slovakia – low or incomplete education, insufficient or inadequate qualification, ethnicity (Roma), significant regional disadvantage (living in marginalized regions with a shortage of job opportunities and low mobility, especially in the Eastern part of the country).

In the 2017 country report<sup>1</sup>, the Commission notes that long term unemployment is a major risk for the low-skilled and young. The measures for young people under the implementation of the Youth Guarantee<sup>2</sup> helped support sustainable youth employment. Short-term programs on voluntary work and traineeships proved successful for young people under the age of 29.

However there are still no individualised services targeting the specific problems of the young low-skilled or the young long-term unemployed. This will be addressed by new youth measures planned for 2017.

The Slovak education system has a long-term low potential for inclusion. Despite efforts to address this problem, Slovakia is failing to reduce social inequalities. On the contrary, the educational system continues to reproduce profound social inequalities. This fact affects the most Roma, thus reducing their chances of employment on the labour market. Combined with persistent discrimination, there is a circular problem which will require a comprehensive reform of the education system. The reform is at the stage of vision without known schedule and specific activities at the moment. However, the current situation regarding the reform preparation raises scepticism about the reality of its implementation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Country Report Slovakia 2017. Accompanying the document COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK AND THE EUROGROUP. 2017 European Semester: Assessment of progress on structural reforms, prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances, and results of in-depth reviews under Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPageId=3351>

<sup>2</sup> Youth Guarantee country by country. Slovakia, 2017. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPageId=3351>



Table 1 "Risk group" construction<sup>3</sup>

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

We can see little public interest in the problems of young people in general and in particular in relation to the labour market in Slovakia. Especially in perspective of the favourable economic development of the country and the rate of unemployment falling to the historical minimum<sup>4</sup>. Nonetheless, young people aged 15 – 24 constitute the most numerous category of unemployed people<sup>5</sup>. In public opinion, as well as in media outputs predominate the negative stereotypes and myths according to which young people are passive, have unreasonable expectations of employers in terms of salaries and working conditions, they are perceived as unreliable labour force. This is articulated by HR staff the most often in media. The category of "individual failures" is presented in the media as the most common cause of youth unemployment. The topic of higher education graduates has resonated recently, as they constitute the biggest group among young unemployed for a long time. Although a major reform of the education system is essential in this respect, a small patch for improving the employability of this target group is the introduction of a dual education system. As for the mainstream politics, mainly the category of NEETs has got to the spotlight, moreover, those who are not registered in the social system (e.g. due to removal from the register). This happened in response to

<sup>3</sup> 1=no significant role to 5=very important

<sup>4</sup> Country Report Slovakia 2017. Accompanying the document COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK AND THE EUROGROUP. 2017 European Semester: Assessment of progress on structural reforms, prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances, and results of in-depth reviews under Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011

<sup>5</sup> Správa o sociálnej situácii obyvateľstva Slovenskej republiky za rok 2016. <https://www.employment.gov.sk/files/slovensky/ministerstvo/analyticke-centrum/sprava-socialnej-situacii-2016.pdf>



the Youth Guarantee. In relation to this target group, currently, national projects and programs are designed that are supposed to focus on it.

Academic research basically duplicates the interest of mainstream politics. This is caused mainly by the way academic research is funded, or more precisely, the state defines priority themes for academic research which are subsequently funded.

It can be said that in Slovakia only one group of young people is explicitly identified as a risk group in the labour market for a long time. Employment Services Act No. 5/2004 Z. z. defines so called graduates: young people under the age of 26, maximum 2 years after the graduation. All other groups, which can be considered as risky, are hidden under other types of disadvantage (for example long term unemployed persons).

In the reference period, the transition of young people to the labour market remains the major problem. The biggest issue was unemployed secondary school graduates, who formed and still form the biggest part in the educational structure of unemployed young people.

Also with regard to Youth Guarantee, we can see a gradual shift of interest to low-skilled groups of young people or unqualified young people. NEET are becoming the main target group. However, it should be added that the core of NEETs in Slovakia are predominantly young people from excluded Roma communities. This means that in this case it is a lack of education or qualification, as well as a combination of many other disadvantages that can complicate the effective solution of the problems of this target group.

Regarding the problem of unemployment of ethnic minorities, this problem is particularly relevant for Roma in Slovakia. Given the fact that it is not possible to register ethnicity in Slovakia, it is impossible to say what is the unemployment rate among Roma. However, fieldwork particularly from excluded Roma communities, points to the fact that it affects most of the Roma population. The serious problem that this minority encounters in the labour market is strong hidden discrimination<sup>6</sup>, despite the existence of relevant anti-discrimination legislation. It should also be added that these problems, despite being highlighted, are not solved for a long time.

The current education system does not help to improve the chances of young Roma in the labour market. The last measure, so called detached secondary vocational schools in the vicinity of the excluded Roma communities further strengthen the existing barriers. The offer of 2 year study programs, mainly focused on obtaining manual skills, does not improve the chances in the labour market<sup>7</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Bez práce nie sú koláče. 2014. Available at <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=9887>

<sup>7</sup> Balážová, Z.: Elokované pracoviská stredných odborných škôl pri marginalizovaných rómskych komunitách. CVEK, 2015. Available at: <http://cvek.sk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Elokovane-pracoviska-final-1.pdf>



## Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Year	2005	2010	2015 or the last year of available data, specify
Indicator				
1	Total number of active labour market programmes	13	29	22
1.1	including youth-targeted	1	2	2
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	137890	103529	57452
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	5,23	5,11	5,07
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes: (up to 25)			
3.1	Total number	15408	23409	12388
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29) (15-24!)	4,82	9,48	5,93
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	11,17	22,61	21,56
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (mil. EUR)	64,85	152,66	127,12
4.2	% of GDP	0,165	0,227	0,163
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:			
5.1	Total amount (mil EUR)	-	31,217	16,7
5.2	% of GDP	-	0,046	0,021
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
6.1	Total amount (mil EUR)	-	20,01	8,7
6.2	% of GDP	-	0,03	0,011
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	-	13,11	6,85

### Comments on Table 2

Row 1.: numbers based on the time relevant versions of the Employment Services Act No. 5/2004 Z. z.

Row 2.: Data by Eurostat; Labour force, available at: [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tepsr\\_wc160&plugin=1](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&language=en&pcode=tepsr_wc160&plugin=1)

Row 3: Data are available only for the age up to 25, information marked by red

Row 4.: Data by Eurostat, expenditures (categories 2 – 7) <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/labour-market/labour-market-policy/main-tables>



Row 5.: According to the records of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, the data for the year 2005 is missing (because only cumulative information for the period 2004 – 2006 is available, only number of participants is available), for the year 2010: data about 7 programs are included

- §49a príspevok na zapracovanie znevýhodneného UoZ/*allowance for the training of the disadvantaged unemployed person;*
- §50 príspevok na zamestnávanie znevýh. UoZ/ *allowance on the employing of the disadvantaged unemployed person;*
- §50b sociálny podnik / *social enterprise*
- §50e príspevok na podporu vytvorenia nového pracovného miesta/ *allowance on the creation of new job*
- §51 absolventská prax/*graduate practice*
- §51a príspevok na podporu zamestnávania absolventov vzdelávania pre trh práce/*allowance to support employing of the graduates of education for the job market*
- § 53c - Podpora začleňovania znevýhodnených UoZ na trh práce/*support for the inclusion of disadvantaged unemployed person into the job market*

For the year 2015 there are 3 programs included:

- §50 príspevok na zamestnávanie znevýh. UoZ/*allowance on the employing of the disadvantaged unemployed person;*
- §51a Príspevok na podporu vytvorenia pracovného miesta v prvom pravidelne platenom zamestnaní/*dotation on the job creation in the first regularly payed job*
- §51 absolventská prax/*graduate practice*

Row 6.: For the year (2010) one program included (§51 absolventská prax/*graduate practice*).

For the year 2015, two programmes are included:

- §51a Príspevok na podporu vytvorenia pracovného miesta v prvom pravidelne platenom zamestnaní/*dotation on the job creation in the first regularly payed job*
- §51 absolventská prax/*graduate practice*

The rate on GDP is based on our own calculations.



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 <sup>8</sup>	Preventive/reactive <sup>9</sup>	Youth specific	Main source of funding <sup>10</sup>	Linked to EU initiatives <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	2	2	Partly	1 -2	0	6	Partly	No
Vocational guidance, career counselling	2	3	Yes	1	1	2	Partly	No
Training (with certificates)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training (without certificates)	3	2	Yes	1 – 2	0	6	Partly	No
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	2	3	No	1	6	1	Partly	No
Direct job creation	3	2	Yes	1 - 2	1	6	Partly	No
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	2	1	Partly	2	0	1	Partly	No
Other (support of mobility, travelling to work etc.)	1	2	No	2	0	1	No	No

### Comments on table 3

Basic data on the implementation of programs and measures is published annually by the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, in the report: Evaluation of the

<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



Application of Active Labour Market Measures for 2016.<sup>13</sup> Although the report is presented as an evaluation material, it is primarily a summary of data as recorded and presented by the Office at the national level. The reports are lacking qualitative information, such as the content of the programs. The evaluation does not include longer-term tracking of programs' participants and measures. Feedback from the participants is also missing. Altogether, there are 22 instruments in Slovakia at the moment. Separate measure is so called Projects and Programs within which, e.g. in 2016 projects implementing the Youth Guarantee were implemented. In practice, these projects partly overlap with the system of instruments, or more precisely, some of these projects are implemented in the context of an existing system instruments.

As stated in the study of IFP<sup>14</sup>, the structure of expenditure on ALMP instruments significantly differs from other EU or OECD countries. In comparison with EU countries (with more than 40 % rate), Slovakia finances education and training programs significantly less. In 2015 it was only 6 % of all expenditure on ALMP programs. Only 6.3 % unemployed people were supported by the training programs out of all supported unemployed people (12.4 % together with REPAS pilot retraining courses). On the contrary, incentives to employment are financed much more, as the rate of expenditure on this type of instruments is more than twice the EU average. A large part of these expenditures are tools to subsidize employers' labour costs (e.g. employment support for young people under 29 of age).

**(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment** – there are several tools, the most used is the newest one so called "REPAS" (since 2015), it enables active engagement of young people in the process. A job seeker can choose the type of work he / she wants to retrain and then ask OLSAF to cover the cost of the course. Tracked is placement within 6 months after completing the retraining – in this case it was 48% in 2016. The authorities provide information on drawing funds and number of participants. However, we do not know anything about the real meaning of the retraining for employment an individual, and the quality of the retraining courses itself is also questionable. Doubts are raised also about the efficiency of the retraining courses due to a relatively low rate of placement in the labour market within the horizon of ½ year.

**Vocational guidance, career counselling** – is implemented within the framework of the national project "Practice for Employment", but only in one region (Bratislava Self-Governing Region). The national project started on 12th October 2015 – applicants up to 24 years of age, but very little interest. We see the problem in an inadequate regional focus (the region with the lowest unemployment rate) and a lack of focus (only 1 region).

---

<sup>13</sup> Vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. UPSVAR, 2017. Available at:

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>14</sup> Institute of Financial policy. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. October 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



**Training (without certificates)** – is mainly represented by graduate practice. It has been one of the most important categories of measures aimed at increasing the employment of young people since 2004, when the current legal norm<sup>15</sup> (Employment Services Act No. 5/2004 Z. z.) was adopted. The introduction of this measure responded primarily to overcoming the inadequate practice of both secondary school, college and university graduates. The measure has undergone a major redesign in 2013, but it is still one of the most used tools. Available evaluation studies are rather old and they were conducted before the preparation of the instrument's adjustment in 2013. In this group, the volunteer service tool is also worth mentioning. According to the IFP<sup>16</sup> evaluation study, these instruments have a significant efficiency.

**Employment incentives, subsidies for employer** – represents a wide range of instruments serving primarily to maintain existing jobs. However, many of them are only formal and have not been used since 2013 (e.g. an allowance to support the retention of low-wage employees or a job-support allowance). There is a certain relevance of instruments aimed at supporting the employment of people with disabilities in relation to the target group of young people. About one fifth of them are young people under the age of 29.

**Direct job creation** – there are several instruments aimed to increase the employment of the whole range of disadvantaged job seekers, including young people. There is an instrument to promote job creation both within the private sector and the public sector (municipality, self-governing region). Within this group is also the "Successfully on the Labour Market" national project implemented since 2015. It has been one of the support measures for the integration of young people into the labour market, to support job creation in the first regularly paid job. This instrument helps to place on the labour market mainly young people under the age of 24, graduates of vocational secondary schools, college or university education. Following experience with other similar measures implemented in past, doubts raised regarding the sustainability of these jobs, as well as the future career of such young people in the labour market. According to the above-mentioned IFP study, the jobs' subsidizing tools for young people up to 29 years of age are among the most expensive tools, but at the same time the participants of these projects are significantly more likely to be in employment after the end of the subsidizing and commitment to keep the position – up to 20 – 30 %.

**Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes** – support of self-employed people, similarly to the graduate practice, is among the longest used employment tools. It consists of a facultative allowance which provides partial compensation for the costs associated with the creation of a job by self-employment. The condition for providing the allowance is a successful defence of a business plan before the commission. The

---

<sup>15</sup> Zákon č. 5/2004 Z. z. o službách zamestnanosti a o zmene a doplnení niektorých zákonov v znení neskorších predpisov.

<sup>16</sup> Institute of Financial policy. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. October 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



condition is at least 3 years of operation of the business. Approximately one quarter of the beneficiaries were up to the age of 29. It is used mainly by people with secondary, college or university education. There is data missing on the quality of the usage of this tool, as well. There is no data on "returned" allowances or more precisely unsuccessful projects of individuals. Furthermore, their work career, which would confirm the sustainability of the activity after the "critical" 3-year period, is not followed, either.

*Table 4 Strengths and weaknesses of the overall policy approach*

Effectiveness of the overall policy approach towards tackling youth unemployment and social exclusion	
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
Comprehensive understanding of young people as a risk group on the labour market, which automatically means the availability of a wide range of measures.	Targeting the tools at "prospective" applicants. Lack of capacity in targeting specific groups such as NEET, Roma, etc. Therefore, the tools and measures do not focus on priority groups.
	There is a predominance of subsidizing jobs, financing education programs lagging behind.
	Insufficient evaluation, evaluation of the effectiveness of the tools, lack of "feedback" from program participants.
	High dependence on EU funds. Consequently, the problem of sustainability of programs and projects after their end.
	Too many tools - unclear situation.
	Lower expenditure on services (ALMP and counselling) in comparison to other European countries.



## Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>17</sup>	Type <sup>18</sup>	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” <sup>19</sup> example	Assesses the impact of policy measures on youth inclusion <sup>20</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>21</sup>
1	Contribution to graduate practice §51	National	A.	3	2004	EU + national	Yes (since 2016 - YG)	Yes, positive	Yes	2	2
2	Contribution to support the job creation in the first regularly paid employment §51a	National	D.	5	2015	EU + national	Yes (YG)	Yes, positive	Partially	NA	NA
3	Contribution to	National	C.	3	2004	National	No	Yes, positive	Partially	NA	NA

<sup>17</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

<sup>18</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>19</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>20</sup> 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.

<sup>21</sup> 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.



	activation programs in the form of voluntary service §52a										
4	Contribution to self-employment §9	National	B.	6	2004	National	No	Yes, mixed results	Partially	NA	NA
5	Contribution to re-orientation (RE-PAS) §54 sec.1, letter d)	National (except the region of Bratislava)	B.	1	2015	EU + national	No	No	Partially	NA	NA
6	Contribution to activation programmes in the form of minor services for a municipality or self-governing region §52	National	C.	3	2004	National	No	Yes, negative	No	NA	NA

### Comments on Table 5

The Graduate practice §51 as well as the Contribution to support the job creation in the first regularly paid employment §51a are both measures with proved positive impact on participants. It is important to said, that those 2 measure are the only measure targeting youth. On the other side, there also available evaluation studies with proven evidence of relatively high level of effectivity.

In spite of the fact of positive effects of both measures, is must be stressed that, they do not solve all the problems of youth unemployment in Slovakia. The graduate practice has only little impact on the youth inclusion. The measure is targeting youth with relatively good chances on the labour market (with secondary school, college and university education) – they lack the practical skills of the work environment. It can significantly



improve chances of high number of young people, so the effect is mainly preventive.<sup>22</sup> On the other hand, the measure is not applicable for youth with several disadvantages (Roma, youth from excluded regions, youth with the insufficient education and qualification, etc.). The very similar situation is regarding the second presented measure (support of the job creation). It is appropriate also mainly for relatively well prepared young people with good placement possibilities on the labour market.

The system of ALMP in Slovakia is highly fragmented, there are many measures, which exist in the system, but for years have not been applicable. The measures, which are in the table (Voluntary service §52a, Contribution to self-employment §9, Contribution to re-orientation (RE-PAS) §54 sec.1, letter d)), are used by significant number of participants. According to the available data, approximately the ¼ of participants in each of this program are young people under the age of 29. There are missing serious evaluations of these measures, regarding the positive impact on youth. The annual report of the Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family provides only numbers of participant and basic structure of participants.<sup>23</sup>

The measure Contribution to activation programmes in the form of minor services for a municipality or self-governing region §52 should be mentioned, because it is targeting mainly low educated, low qualified and long-term unemployed persons. The idea behind is to use the form of public benefit activities to support working habits. Comparing to other measures, it is the only measure, which has negative effect on participant's employment opportunities after completing the program. It means, that person has even worse chances to get a job on regular labour market than before. According many experts, it should be rather evaluate as the form of social assistance than measure of ALMP. What is more, the measure is mainly used by Roma living in excluded communities.<sup>24</sup> This fact has negative impact on Roma (youth included) inclusion to the labour market.

Regarding measures aimed at "good jobs" we must say, that there is not any state national or regional initiative focusing on this target group. Nowadays we are facing to the serious brain drain in Slovakia. There are some initiatives by NGO's (for example LEAF<sup>25</sup>), which are trying to motivate and support young, well educated professionals to return back to Slovakia. They are trying to help them to find attractive jobs in private sector as well as in public administration.

---

<sup>22</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>

<sup>23</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce  
Za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>24</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>

<sup>25</sup> More about the program Slovak Professionals Abroad Program at <https://spap.leaf.sk/>



## Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Príspevok na vykonávanie absolventskej praxe <b>Contribution to graduate practice</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to gain practical skills and experiences, relevant to level of education and qualification of youth</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to gain skills and practical experiences by employer, relevant to the level of completed education, to increase employability of youth – especially graduates</p> <p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The measure is targeted at young people, graduates, registered by the labour offices as job seekers<sup>26</sup>, for at least one month. The practice has to correspond strictly with the participant's education.</li><li>- Formally, the graduate practice is being held under the agreement between the job seeker and OLSAF and OLSAF and employer. The employer can be both public and private company. The beginning and the length of the graduate practice is determined by the employer. During the graduate practice the participant stays in the status of the registered by OLSAF.</li><li>- Duration of the participation in program is from 3 months to 6 months with the maximum of 20 hours per week and without the possibility to prolong or repeat it. During the graduate practice, the participant is not allowed to have any other employment contract.</li><li>- After the completing of the practice, the employer issues to the participant confirmation about the completing of the practice.</li></ul> <p>If the company is satisfied with a participant's graduate practice, it may offer him a permanent job.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> graduates</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> young people until 26 years, maximum 2 years after the finishing of the study, without any regular payed employment during this period, person must be registered at least 1 month at OLSAF<sup>2728</sup></p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> training without certificate</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2004 – undefined</p>

<sup>26</sup> The term „job seeker“ is used according to the relevant legislation in case the unemployed person is register by OLSAF. This is the main condition of eligibility for participation in the most of measures.

<sup>27</sup> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family (further also „OLSAF“)

<sup>28</sup> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family: Príspevok na vykonávanie absolventskej praxe - § 51: [http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-obcana/51-prispevok-na-vykonavanie-absolventskej-praxe.html?page\\_id=12940](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-obcana/51-prispevok-na-vykonavanie-absolventskej-praxe.html?page_id=12940)



	<p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> OLSAF</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> in 2016 there were 2 sources 3,446 thousand € / national sources (state budget) + 2,449 thousand € / EU funding</p>
Achieved results	<p><b>Number of young people covered (entire running period)<sup>29</sup> (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>In the period of 1 May 2013 – 30 June 2014, there was 5760 participants, 5.9 % of all ALMP participants in Slovakia during this period.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Total expenditures are different between years, for example in 2012 (15,9 milion €). Since 2013 total expenditures are significantly lower. From 8,8 milion € in 2013 to 3,4 milion € in 2016 (or 5,9 milion € with the EU funding)<sup>30</sup>.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> The allowance is 129,66 € per month/person and it is defined as the 65% of the living wage sum. So the allowance can vary in the time. The length of the graduate practice can be from 3 to 6 months. (According to the evaluation study of IFP, the total expenditure per beneficiary is 584 €).</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Young people, under the age of 26, with the completed education. They must be registered at OLSAF.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Since 2004, from the very beginning of the measure, it is targeting only young people.</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> It is targeted to all unemployed young people, if they fulfil the administrative conditions.</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 (Yes/Partly/No). No. Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></p>

<sup>29</sup> Data are not available for the whole period. There are also different data published between years, so there is serious problem to obtain data which will describe the system as a whole. According my study and my experiences, the best reference is the evaluation study of IFP, which compares data from 2013 and 2014.

<sup>30</sup> Data from the databases and reports of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family. Available at: [http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page\\_id=1248](http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page_id=1248)



Links to EU initiatives	<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> In the recent period (since 2015) the measure is partially linked to the Youth Guarantee.
Available evaluations	<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?</b> There are several evaluations of the program available, but most of them are on the ad-hoc principle. Several evaluations appeared before the latest re-design of the measure in 2013. The only permanent monitoring is being held by the Central Office of the Labour, Social Affairs and Family. But data, which are presented by the Office, are very basic. Furthermore, the data is incomplete for very a long time (“under the reconstruction”). <b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> Mainly state agencies. <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> The evaluation report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family <sup>31</sup> provides in case of this measure also the information about the level of employment after the program completing, which is 59,2 % after the 6 months (in 2016). The latest evaluation done by the ILP <sup>32</sup> is from our point of view the most valuable. It is considering mainly economic aspects of the selected measure (graduate practice included). Authors were working in analysis also with the control group, when comparing outputs (chances to gain a job). The comparison of program participants and control group reveals difference more than 10%, in favour of participants of the program. So there is evidence of the employment opportunities improvement after the completing of the program.

<sup>31</sup> Ústredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>32</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



	<p>Generally said, the biggest challenge is to track all participants of the measures after completing the activity, not only from time perspective (employed yes/no after 6 or 12 months), but also from the qualitative perspective of the occupied positions.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>There is a compliance in evaluations about the measure of graduate practice, as a relatively effective and successful measures. According to the latest one (ILP) the measure improves chances to get a job significantly. Regarding costs there is better return comparing to other existing measures (e.g. directly supported jobs).</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b> Yes, this measure is successful in this meaning. But the measure really targets groups of young people who are not so seriously disadvantaged on the labour market. It helps them to overcome lack of practice or working experience, or knowledge of the working environments etc.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The highest effect of the program is in 3 months after the completing the program. If the participants stay without job longer, all positive effects will disappear. After six months, there is almost no effect of the program, or hardly identified effect of the program. According to the evaluation report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family<sup>33</sup>, there is approximately 1/3 of participants, which stay registered as unemployed also after the graduate practice. According my own experiences as well as survey I held in 2014, the positive effect of the graduate practice depends a lot on the type of employer where it was held as well as the content of the practice (real inclusion in working process, not just formal). Very important is also the situation on local labour market. If there is lack of opportunities relevant to the education and qualification of the person, combined with the very formal content of practice, the positive impact is missing. According to me, the problem, is, that after six month being again registered without any job activity brings all negative aspects of the long term unemployment to the person and personality.</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>

<sup>33</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p>There is not the problem of coverage, the measure is well known and has good references. There are plenty of information also on the specialized information web pages for youth, graduates, etc. On the other side, the attractiveness of the measure depends on the level of the allowance, which is related to the measure. In 2013, when the allowance decreased significantly, there was also significant decline of the interest in target group (according to my references from OLSAF). There is also limit of the practice related to the field of the study, so for many young unemployed people with qualification that is not covered in the regions, there are no positions available.</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 is the employer, by which the graduate practice is realised. It is very helpful and meaningful, when it is being held by private companies. The biggest problem is, that it is very sensitive on the employment situations in regions. For example, in poor regions, with high unemployment rate, the graduate practice is often only by state institutions. According to my study in 2014, in this case graduate practice tends to be very formal and not very useful for further successful career on the job market. It would increase the value of the measure, if there would be any kind of supervision and counselling both for employer and participant.</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 has strong preventive effect for those young people, which are educated and qualified, and their only disadvantage is the lack of practice or experiences. The measure links young people directly to the job market. It is designed to get over weaknesses and deficiencies of education system. On the other side, it is not applicable for serious risky group, which challenge deep and complex set of disadvantages (low or no education, low or inadequate qualification, young Roma, ...)</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> According to my experiences and also according to realized evaluations, this measure brings relatively high effect on low costs. It has long term and stable results in form of the improving chances for getting the employment.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>It has great prevention potential for those young people, which have only simple handicap (insufficient practice). This measures successfully protects important number of unemployed young people before long-term unemployment.</p>



	<b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b>
--	---

## Sources:

Evaluation reports of ALMP by the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family.

Available at: [http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page\\_id=1248](http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page_id=1248)

Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

BAROŠOVÁ, Margita a kol.: *Uplatňovanie aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce v kontexte s aplikačnou praxou Európskej únie*. [online]. Bratislava: Inštitút pre výskum práce a rodiny, 2012. Available at:

[http://www.sspr.gov.sk/IVPR/images/IVPR/vyskum/2012/Barosova/2159\\_kolekti\\_v.pdf](http://www.sspr.gov.sk/IVPR/images/IVPR/vyskum/2012/Barosova/2159_kolekti_v.pdf)

BOŘÍK Vladimír, CABAN Matúš. *Pilotné hodnotenie dopadov vybraných opatrení aktívnej politiky trhu práce*. [online]. Bratislava: MPSVR SR, ÚPSVR, 2013.

Available at: <http://www.esf.gov.sk/new/index.php?id=3178>

GYÁRFÁŠOVÁ, Oľga, a kol. *Evaluácia sociálnej politiky zameranej na zníženie dlhodobej nezamestnanosti – výskumná správa*. [online] Bratislava: IVO, 2006.

Available at: <http://www.ivo.sk/4908/sk/aktuality/evaluacia-socialnej-politiky-zameranej-na-znizenie-dlhodobej-nezamestnanosti---vyskumna-sprava-z-projektu-k-dispozicii>

HANZELOVÁ, Eneke a KOSTOLNÁ, Zuzana. *Služby zamestnanosti v nových podmienkach: Analýza implementačnej praxe*. In *Rodina a práca* [online].

Bratislava: Stredisko pre štúdium práce a rodiny, Február 2006. Available at: <http://www.ceit.sk/IVPR/images/IVPR/bulletin/Bulletin-01-2006.pdf> .

HARVAN, Peter. *Hodnotenie efektívnosti a účinnosti výdavkov na aktívne politiky trhu práce na Slovensku*. [online]. Bratislava: Inštitút finančnej politiky MF SR, 2011.

Available at: <http://www.expak-at.sk/expak/img/uploads/expak1364.pdf>

*Ukazovatele a systém hodnotenia efektívnosti aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce (AOTP) v Slovenskej republike (analytická štúdia)*. Bratislava: INFOSAT a TRIXIMA, 2009.

Name of the initiative	Príspevok na podporu vytvorenia pracovného miesta v prvom pravidelne platenom zamestnaní <b>Contribution to support the job creation in the first regularly paid employment §51a</b>
------------------------	---



<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to support employer to create new positions for young people under the age of 29, in case it is their first, regularly paid job</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to support the integration of youth into the job market</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>OLSAF can provide the contribution to the employer, which employs on the new job the job seeker under special conditions regarding age, length of registration at the OLSAF, and no previous employed in regular job.</p> <p>The job seeker must be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- younger than 25 years of the age, registered by the OLSAF for at least 3 months, or</li><li>- younger than 29 years of the age, registered by the OLSAF for at least 6 months.</li></ul> <p>Another necessary conditions is, that the job seeker has not had any regularly payed job for at least six month.</p> <p>Regarding the conditions on the employer side, the new job must be at least part time, and the employer must ask for the contribution. The contribution is provided by the OLSAF regional office, relevant to the region, where new job position is created.</p> <p>The contribution is provided under the agreement between the OLSAF and employer, for at least minimum of 6 months or maximum of 12 months.</p> <p>The employer must keep supported job, for at least half of the agreed period of the support. In case the employer do not fulfill these obligation, he must return the proportional of the contribution – covering the period of not sustained job.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> youth under the age of 25 or 29 (different administrative criteria)</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: young people under the age of 25, registered at least 3 months at OLSAF, or young people under the age of 29, registered at least 6 months at OLSAF; both target groups without any previous experience with regularly payed job</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> job dotation</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2015 – 2018</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> OLSAF</p>
--------------------------	---



	<p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> it is possible to observe significant increase, from 4,223 thousand € in 2015, to 12,978 € in 2016. The increase is caused by the administrative limits in 2015, because of the change in source of the EU funding. Main source – EU funding, partially by national sources.</p>
Achieved results	<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>Total number of people who take part: 6401 Total number of people who are entitled: NA (for 2016) Total number of new jobs: 2448</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis:</b> NA (changes every years)</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> In 2016 it is 5301 per one position (according to my calculation). Official data are not available.</p> <p>The system of dotation is quite difficult, there are different levels of contribution between regions (according to the unemployment rate). Second condition, which is taken into account, is the defined state average income. The value of the average income is changing every 6 months in Slovakia. According the information published on the web page<sup>34</sup> of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family, for the well-developed region of Bratislava, in 2017 the level of contribution is 265,80 €, in regions with the average unemployment rate or lower is 443 €, in regions with the unemployment rate higher than average is 531,60 €.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Young people, under the age of 25 or 29, with the completed education. They must be registered at OLSAF.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> This program is targeting only young people.</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> It is targeted to unemployed young people under the age of 29, if they fulfil the administrative conditions. It is possible to see the incentives in the regional differentiation of the amount of the allowance. Higher allowance are in regions with higher unemployment.</p>

<sup>34</sup>[http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-zamestnavateľa/prispevok-na-podporu-vytvorenia-pracovneho-miesta-v-prvom-pravidelne-platenom-zamestnaní-51a.html?page\\_id=465400](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-zamestnavateľa/prispevok-na-podporu-vytvorenia-pracovneho-miesta-v-prvom-pravidelne-platenom-zamestnaní-51a.html?page_id=465400)



Youth involvement	<b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). No. Please describe if Yes/Partly</b>
Links to EU initiatives	<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> The program is linked to the Youth Guarantee.
Available evaluations	<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?</b> There is available only annual report of Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family <sup>35</sup> . It is the permanent monitoring of basic data. <b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> internal <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> The provided information is very basic, simple description. There is information about the number of supported jobs, number of participants and total expenditures for the measure in the year (2016). Regarding the structure of participants, following variables are available: gender, age, length of the registration by OLSAF (length of unemployment), level of participant's education, qualification, and structure according legal form of employers where jobs were supported. According to all of these data it is clear, that most of participants are older than 25, often men, unemployed less than 6 months, qualified professionals with completed secondary or university education.
Summary of evaluation results	<b>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.</b>

<sup>35</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.  
[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p>According to the available data, it is not possible to evaluate running of the program and its results.</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>It is possible to consider this measure as successful. According the evaluation study<sup>36</sup> of similar program, this type of program is one of the most expensive, but the chance to stay employed is significantly higher comparing to the control group. Very good results were observed for employing both in the public and private sector.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The same evaluation study brought the evidence about efficiency also after the 12 month after the end of participation in the program.</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>It is possible to see also weaknesses of this program: relatively high administrative burden for employer as well as motivation of employer to create such a position. In economic terms it can be seen as not enough worthy. According to the available data<sup>37</sup>, not all applications of employers are successful. There is information about 88% successful applications, but no explanation of the unsuccessful rest of application.</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 is the employer, his motivation and the way, how he manages this newly employed person. There is always the danger of abuse of the system by the employers (in Slovakia we have many bad experiences of this kind).</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>In spite of the fact, that this measure directly creates new positions and brings young people directly to the regular jobs, it does not address the main causes of unemployment. According to the available data of Central Office, it is being used mainly by those young unemployed people, who have</p>

<sup>36</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky (ILP). Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>

<sup>37</sup> Ústredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p>relatively good chances on the labour market. Most of beneficiaries were with completed high school education or higher. In 2016, only 0.26 % of participants were with incomplete elementary education.</p> <p>The serious risky target groups challenging several disadvantages and discrimination (low or no education, low or inadequate qualification, Roma, etc.) are not covered by the program.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b> The measure is focusing target group, which has very good chances on the labour market. According to my opinion, there is high probability that these young people could employ also without the state support. In this sense I do not see the idea of value for money behind.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts.</b> According to me the measure is replicable, but it is not targeting the core problems of youth unemployment in Slovakia. This is the reason, why it should not be referred as good practice.</p>

Name of the initiative	<p>Príspevok na aktivačnú činnosť formou dobrovoľníckej služby (§52a)</p> <p>Contribution to activation programmes in the form of voluntary service</p>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to gain practical skills for the job market</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to gain practical skills and habits to improve opportunities for the inclusion to the job market</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>The voluntary service is defined as a form of activation of the job seeker by volunteering. Participants gain practical skills and experiences needed for the job market by the volunteering. Voluntary service can be held:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- in social services (care for unemployed, person with disabilities, migrants, people in post-penitentiary care, children in needs, other persons in need), social care, health care, education, culture, sport, environmental activities, cultural activities, charity, etc.</li> <li>- in situations of natural disasters, ecological disasters, humanitarian crisis and in civil defense</li> </ul> <p>Voluntary service is held for 20 hours per week, for maximum of 6 months</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> registered unemployed person</p>



	<p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> registered unemployed person <sup>38</sup>The support in case of this measures goes to the non-profit organisation to cover costs related to the managing of the volunteer as well as to the volunteer (participant of the voluntary service. Both sides must formally ask for the support by OLSAF.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> training without certificate</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2004 – undefined</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> OLSAF</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> in 2016 the total spending within this measure was 15 402 815€. Comparing to the year 2015 there was increase of 4 987 2285 €.</p>
Achieved results	<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>According to OLSAF<sup>39</sup>, in 2016 the total number of participants was 9 441, out of this number 2 380 of participants were under the age of 29. In 2015 the number of participants was higher (12 941).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Total expenditures are different between years, for example in 2016 it was 15,4 milion €. In 2015 total expenditures was 20.3 milion €.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> The allowance is on the level of the living wage sum (since July 2017 - 199,48 per adult). So the allowance can vary in the time. The length of the voluntary service can be maximum 6 months.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Unemployed persons, which are registered at OLSAF. The secondary target group are providers of the programs – non-profit organisations, where voluntary service is being held.</p>

<sup>38</sup> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family: Príspevok na aktivačnú činnosť formou dobrovoľníckej služby - § 52a: [http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-na-trhu-prace/aktivacna-cinnost/prispevok-na-aktivacnu-cinnost-formou-dobrovolnickej-sluzby-52a.html?page\\_id=13088](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-na-trhu-prace/aktivacna-cinnost/prispevok-na-aktivacnu-cinnost-formou-dobrovolnickej-sluzby-52a.html?page_id=13088)

<sup>39</sup> Ústredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017. [http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Since 2004, from the very beginning of the measure, it is targeting all unemployed. Approximately 25% of all participants of the program are young people under the age of 29.</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> The measure has no special target to young group. It is targeting the whole variety of risky groups of unemployed 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 (Yes/Partly/No). No. Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></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> No, the program is not linked to any EU initiative.</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?</b> The only permanent monitoring is being held by the Central Office of the Labour, Social Affairs and Family. But data, which are presented by the Office, are very basic. Furthermore, the data is incomplete for very a long time (“under the reconstruction”).</p> <p>The most relevant evaluation study was done by IFP<sup>40</sup>.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> All these studies were held by the state agencies.</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 report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family<sup>41</sup> provides the information about the level of employment after the</p>

<sup>40</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>

<sup>41</sup> Ústredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p>program completing, which is 39,51 % after the 6 months (in 2016). The other data in this evaluation provide the description of the structure of participants.</p> <p>The latest evaluation done by the ILP<sup>42</sup> is from our point of view the most valuable. It is considering mainly economic aspects of the selected measure (graduate practice included). Authors were working in analysis also with the control group, when comparing outputs (chances to gain a job). The comparison of program participants and control group reveals the difference of almost 15%, in favour of participants of the program. So there is evidence of the employment opportunities improvement after the completing of the program.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>According to the study done by ILP the measure improves chances to get a job significantly. Regarding costs there is better return comparing to other existing measures (e.g. directly supported jobs).</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b> Yes, this measure is successful in this meaning. On the other side, it focuses on the target group, which do not challenge so difficult and combined disadvantages. The structure of participants shows, that most of participants have secondary education. The setting of the measure enable to gain positive impacts, which brings volunteering as such.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The situation with this measure is comparable to graduate practice. The highest effect of the program is in 3 months after the completing the program. If the participants stay without job longer, all positive effects will disappear. After six months, there is almost no effect of the program, or hardly identified effect of the program. What is possible to observe is also kind of fluctuation between several measure (for example they start with graduate practice, then they continue with the voluntary service, etc.). This is often the only way in marginalized regions, where there is lack of jobs on regular labour market.</p> <p>The program is attractive mainly in regions with the lack of job opportunities. The reason is the level of support, as well as the meaningful content.</p> <p><b>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of</b></p>

<sup>42</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



	<p><b>system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</b></p> <p>There is not the problem of coverage, the measure is well known and has good references. The program is also very attractive, so there is high demand on it, which is not always possible to satisfy.</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>Definitely, the question of effectiveness should be taken more into account. If only 1/3 of participants can get regular employment, the serious evaluation should be held as a base of redesign of the measure. Nowadays it looks more like a support to the non-profit organisation active in various fields of social services than real help to unemployed people.</p> <p>According to me, the serious weakness is that it has possible negative effect on idea of volunteering, because the existence of the allowance. This is what I see as the contradictory aspect of the measure.</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 does not address the main causes of the unemployment. It helps to people with better opportunities (for example educated and qualified). It does not focus on the serious and cumulated disadvantages, which creates the hard core of unemployment in Slovakia (ethnicity, social and regional exclusion, low or no education and qualification, etc.).</p> <p>Also, in this sense it is not relevant to risk groups among young people.</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> According to my knowledge and experiences, it has positive impact on people with relatively good chances on labour market. The positive impact is given by the concept of volunteering as such.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>I would not value this measure as a good practice, mainly because it is "stealing" the idea from the NGO sector and concept of volunteering. What is missing is the innovative idea behind this measure.</p>
<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>Príspevok na samostatnú zárobkovú činnosť (§49)</p> <p>Contribution to self-employment</p>



Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to cover partially costs related to starting the self-employment</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to support generation of new jobs on open labour market</p> <p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- OLSAF can provide the contribution to the job seeker for partial covering of the costs related to the self-employment, in case the person meets the defined conditions of registration. The job seeker must ask for the contribution and operate the self-employment continuously for at least 3 years.</li><li>- The job seeker apply for the contribution by the regional office of the OLSAF in the region, where he will be self-employed.</li><li>- The application consists of the business plan as well as calculation of costs related to the operation of self-employment. The application is considered and evaluated by the special commission created by the committee for the employment issues at OLSAF. The applicants also presents personally his business plan to the commission. Only projects, which are considered by the commission as realistic, are finally supported.</li></ul> <p>The regional office of the OLSAF can provide to applicants the preparation training for the self-employment.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> registered unemployed person</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> registered unemployed person, which will operate self-employment for at least 3 years<sup>43</sup>.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> direct job creation</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2004 – undefined</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> OLSAF</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> in 2016 the total spending within this measure was 8 249 299 €. Comparing to the year 2015 there was decrease of 1 509 885 €.</p>
Achieved results	<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>

<sup>43</sup> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family: Príspevok na samostatnú zárobkovú činnosť - § 49: [http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-obcana/prispevok-na-samostatnu-zarobkovu-cinnost-49.html?page\\_id=13191](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-obcana/prispevok-na-samostatnu-zarobkovu-cinnost-49.html?page_id=13191)



	<p>According to OLSAF<sup>44</sup>, in 2016 the total number of participants was 1 951, out of this number 525 of participants were under the age of 29. In 2015 the number of participants was higher (2 656).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Total expenditures are different between years, for example in 2016 it was 8.2 milion €. In 2015 total expenditures was 9.8 milion €.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> The level of the allowance depends on the total price of the work, type of the region, and the average level of registered unemployment in the district, where the self-employment will be operated. There are 3 different levels:</p> <p>1/ region of Bratislava - 2994,62 €,</p> <p>2/ regions with the unemployment rate lower than average - 3 593,55</p> <p>3/ regions with the unemployment rate higher than average - 4 791,4</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Unemployed persons, which are registered at OLSAF at least 3 months, or at least 6 months in case they were self-employed in the past.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Since 2004, it is targeting all unemployed. In 2016 the young people involved in the program created 27% of all participants.</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> The measure has no special target to young group. It is targeting the whole variety of risky groups of unemployed 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 (Yes/Partly/No). No. Please describe if Yes/Partly</b></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> No, the program is not linked to any EU initiative.</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?</b> The only permanent monitoring is being held by the Central Office of the Labour, Social Affairs and Family. But data, which are</p>

<sup>44</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p>presented by the Office, are very basic. Furthermore, the data is incomplete for very a long time (“under the reconstruction”).</p> <p>The most relevant evaluation study was done by IFP<sup>45</sup>.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> All these studies were held by the state agencies.</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 report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family <sup>46</sup> provides the information about the structure of supported participants. Serious and continuous data about the further sustainability the self-employment are not systematically monitored.</p> <p>The latest evaluation done by the ILP<sup>47</sup> is from our point of view the most valuable. Anyway, in this case authors reminding the missing existence of control group, which is the serious obstacle for evaluation of the effectivity. The success of the measure is in this case evaluated on the number of existing self-employed positions after completing of the state support, which is approximately 40%.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>According to the study done by ILP the level of self-employment after the closing of the state support is approximately 40%.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b> Yes, this measure is rather successful in its definition. In this case the qualitative data are seriously missing. Statistics show, that 18% of all new self-employers are in the field of construction. This can be very confusing,</p>

<sup>45</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>

<sup>46</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>47</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



	<p>especially regarding the Slovak context, where there are in fact thousands of self-employer working for a big construction companies.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>As well as other measures, also in this case we are challenging many practical problems especially in poor, excluded regions.</p> <p>My experiences from the excluded regions show, that it is very difficult to be self-employed, when there is very low interest of potential customer, or low purchasing power of customers.</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>There is not the problem of coverage, the measure is well known and has good references. Numbers of participants show, that this measure is not very important, it is rather marginal. Also according the report, more than 20% of applicants are not successful. It is a big challenge for OLSAF to be a real support for applicants to start their own business.</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>Definitely, the question of effectiveness should be taken more into account also in this case. It is warning, that only 40% of participants can run sustainable business after the completing off the support. The measure need to be evaluated more seriously, with the focus on the identifying weaknesses. In my point of view, there is systematic lack of support from the counsellor at OLSAF</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 direct support of jobs as well as self-employment makes has big potential of effective solution of the unemployment. On the other side there are doubts because of not clear effectivity of this program. Regarding unemployed youth and their cumulated disadvantages it seems to be insufficient. If this measure should target more the specific youth unemployment, it would definitely need to be redesigned in sense of providing more support, training and counselling, as the current system is able to provide.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b> The main success factor of this measure is in the direct support of the self-employment in open job market. But if the</p>



'good practice' example	<p>person faces several disadvantages, low qualification and education, low experiences, and discrimination, this measure would not help.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b>  <b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>I would not value this measure as a good practice, because in its current form it has no potential to tackle effectively the core problem of youth unemployment.</p>
-------------------------	---

Name of the initiative	<p>Príspevok na rekvalifikáciu RE-PAS          Contribution to re-orientation</p>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to prepare unemployed people for the labour market by gaining new knowledge and skills by specialized education courses</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to support flexibility of unemployed on the offer of the labour market</p> <p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The job seeker can decide to solve his unemployment through the professional re-orientation. He/ She can choose different type of qualification as well as provider of the re-orientation course.</li> <li>- Eligible qualifications: courses provided new knowledge and skills, different to current qualification of the participant.</li> <li>- Not eligible courses (update to 1.1.2018): development of communication skills, computer skills, and management, social, business and language competences. Also the driving license of type B is not allowed to be covered under this program.</li> <li>- OLSAF supports courses realized in attendance form, or by combined form (with the distance learning). In case of combined form, the course is accepted only in case at least 50 % of the course is realized by the attendance form.</li> <li>- Eligible costs are: course costs; travel costs and meal allowance costs.</li> <li>- The job seeker must apply for the contribution. The regional office of the OLSAF after the consideration of the rational and effectivity of the course decides about the supporting or not supporting of the application.</li> </ul> <p>The participants must graduate the course successfully (to obtain the final certificate). Together with other administrative conditions (in 15 days after the graduation, together with the invoice and application for covering of the course related costs) it enables to obtain the contribution. In case</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> registered unemployed person</p>



	<p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> registered unemployed person<sup>48</sup>, have not been participated in the re-orientation course for 5 years before applying</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> (re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national (except the Bratislava region)</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2015 – undefined</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> OLSAF</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> in 2016 the total spending within this measure was 6 769 209 €. In 2015 to total spending was 6 777 313 €.</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>According to OLSAF<sup>49</sup>, in 2016 the total number of participants was 15 351, out of this number 34% of participants were under the age of 29. In 2015 the number of participants was higher (16 994). According to the available data, 48% of participants get employment in 6 months after the completing the re-orientation course.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Total expenditures are different between years, but the difference is not significant. While in 2016 it was 6 769 208 €, in 2015 total expenditures was 6 777 313 €.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> OLSAF covers the whole price of the course (prices are not available). The price is in the application, after the approval of the office it is directly provided to the provider of the education.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Unemployed persons, registered at OLSAF.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Since 2015, it is targeting all unemployed. In 2016 the young people under the age 29 involved in the program created 34% of all participants.</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</b></p>

<sup>48</sup> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family **RE-PAS**: [http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-na-trhu-prace/repas-pre-uchadzacov-o-zamestnanie.html?page\\_id=720988](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-na-trhu-prace/repas-pre-uchadzacov-o-zamestnanie.html?page_id=720988)

<sup>49</sup> Ústredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017. [http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<b>unemployed are targeted)?</b> The measure has no special target to young group. It is targeting the whole variety of risky groups of unemployed people.
Youth involvement	<b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). No. Please describe if Yes/Partly</b>
Links to EU initiatives	<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? No, the program is not linked to any EU initiative.</b>
Available evaluations	<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?</b> The only permanent monitoring is being held by the Central Office of the Labour, Social Affairs and Family. But data, which are presented by the Office, are very basic on the annual basis. <b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> This study is held by the state agency. <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> The evaluation report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family <sup>50</sup> provides the information about the structure of supported participants as well as the number of participants employed 6 months after the completing of the program.
Summary of evaluation results	<b>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.</b>

<sup>50</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



	<p>According to the report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family<sup>51</sup> the employment rate 6 months after the completing of the program is 48%.</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> Yes, this measure is rather successful in its definition. The program is quite short in the practice and also better evaluation is missing. First numbers provided by OLSAF are quite optimistic. It is important to add, that for many years there was missing in the system the function measure of re-orientation. Finally it is here, and it looks to have potential of effectivity.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>As well as other measures, also in this case we are challenging many practical problems. Especially how to design courses of high quality, which will be really helpful and targeting effectively needs of labour market. As the measure is not very long applied, it is quite difficult to assess its effects and limits.</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>There is not the problem of coverage, the measure is well known and has good references. Numbers of participants show, that this measure is becoming rather important.</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>It seems that there is still potential to improve the offer of the courses, which will better targeting the needs of job market. In spite of the relatively important success of 48%, there are still 52% of participants, for which it was not helpful.</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>In generally, re-orientation courses were missing for a long time in the Slovak system of ALMP. It can successfully address the lack of adequate qualification for the labour market. Relatively high rate of youth participating in the project can show also higher relevance for unemployed young people.</p>

<sup>51</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)



Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b> The main success factor of this measure is in increasing the knowledge and skills adequate for the labour market.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>At the moment, I would not consider this measure as an example of good practice, because of short period in practice and missing evaluation.</p>
---	---

Name of the initiative	<p>Príspevok na aktivačnú činnosť formou menších obecných služieb pre obec alebo formou menších služieb pre samosprávny kraj (§52)</p> <p>Contribution to activation programmes in the form of minor services for a municipality or self-governing region</p>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to support the maintaining of the working habits of long-term unemployed person, which is eligible for contributions under the social assistance</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to support and develop working habits by long-term unemployed people</p> <p>Description</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- There are 2 types of services: for municipality and for self-governing region.</li><li>- In case of municipality activities in following fields are available: improving economic, social, and cultural conditions, environment of the community, cultural heritage, education support, support and development of social services, development and protection of spiritual and cultural values, development and support of the community activities.</li><li>- Regarding self-governing region the activities are eligible in the field of environmental issues and help and support by extraordinary events (disasters and crisis).</li></ul> <p>The length of the participation – 6 months, 20 hours per week, with the possibility of the repeated participation (maximum 12 months).</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> registered long-term unemployed person</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> registered unemployed person<sup>52</sup>, eligible also for social assistance provision, on the other side there are</p>

<sup>52</sup> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family / Príspevok na aktivačnú činnosť formou menších obecných služieb pre obec alebo formou menších služieb pre samosprávny kraj - § 52: [http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-na-trhu-prace/aktivacna-cinnost/prispevok-na-aktivacnu-cinnost-formou-mensich-obecných-sluzieb-pre-obec-alebo-formou-mensich-sluzieb-pre-samospravny-kraj-52.html?page\\_id=13087](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-na-trhu-prace/aktivacna-cinnost/prispevok-na-aktivacnu-cinnost-formou-mensich-obecných-sluzieb-pre-obec-alebo-formou-mensich-sluzieb-pre-samospravny-kraj-52.html?page_id=13087)



	<p>eligible types of activities of municipalities and regions, in which can be participants involved</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> training (with or without certificates)</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2004 – undefined</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> OLSAF</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> in 2016 the total spending within this measure was 5 679 430 €.</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>According to OLSAF<sup>53</sup>, in 2016 the total number of participants was 18 545, out of this number 23% of participants were under the age of 29. In 2015 the number of participants was higher (24 156). According to the data of OLSAF, 15% of participants get employment in 6 months after the completing the re-orientation course.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Total expenditures are different between years. The difference is related to the changing number of participants. In 2016 was total spending in the program 5 679 430 €.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary?</b> The level of contribution depends on the agreed number of participants (5 different levels) and on agreed weekly length of activity. According to the IFP study, the average expenditure is 137 € per participant.<sup>54</sup></p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Long-term unemployed persons, registered at OLSAF, who are eligible to social assistance</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Since the introduction in 2004 it is targeting all long-term unemployed.</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</b></p>

<sup>53</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>54</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



	<b>unemployed are targeted)?</b> The measure has no special target to young group. It is targeting the whole variety of risky groups of unemployed people.
Youth involvement	<b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). No. Please describe if Yes/Partly</b>
Links to EU initiatives	<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> No, the program is not linked to any EU initiative.
Available evaluations	<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?</b> The only permanent monitoring is being held by the Central Office of the Labour, Social Affairs and Family. But data, which are presented by the Office, are very basic on the annual basis. <b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> This study is held by the state agency. <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> The evaluation report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family <sup>55</sup> provides the information about the structure of supported participants as well as the number of participants employed 6 months after the completing of the program. The latest evaluation done by the ILP <sup>56</sup> is from our point of view the most valuable. It is considering mainly economic aspects of the selected measure. Authors were working in analysis also with the control group, when comparing outputs (chances to gain a job). The comparison of program participants and control group reveals, that this measure is the only one with

<sup>55</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>56</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



	negative effect on participants. So the chances to get a job on open job market are even worse than before the participation in the program.
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>According to the report of the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family<sup>57</sup> the employment rate 6 months after the completing of the program is 15%.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b> This measure is very problematic, from its definition. There are not available data about the real effects on working habits. Available data shows (both OLSAF as well as IFP), that it does not help participants to find a job after it, and this can be considered as problem.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>Numbers as well as experiences show, that this measure has almost no effect on employability of participants. It should be rather considered to be the form of social support than measure of ALMP.</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>This measure serves as a support for municipalities and regions, the concept of activation is the part of the system of social assistance. According to the IFP study, the most important part of participants are Roma. <sup>58</sup> This measure should be considered rather as the form of social support.</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 most serious problem is the covering mainly the Roma minority (Roma youth included). This measure has very low effectivity, as well as capacity to improve chances of Roma to enter the open job market.</p>
Related to the causes of unemployment	<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>

<sup>57</sup> Ustredie práce, sociálnych vecí a rodiny: vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. Máj 2017.

[http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

<sup>58</sup> Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>



and target risk groups	This measure has very little capacity to target main causes of the social exclusion of youth (especially Roma youth). In its definition participants are not prepared for open job market. The measure is targeting mainly needs of municipalities or regions – for example cleaning the public spaces like streets, parks etc.).The skills they gain are applicable only in this type of services. According my experiences, the jobs they gain after the participation are related to the measure as well (for example they can get a position of the coordinator of activation on the municipality).
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b> This is very bad example of designing the active labour market measure. It is not targeting the causes, as well as not pushing participants to the open job market. <b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b> <b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b> Experts are criticising this measure for a very long time, but with no results. In its definition it should be rather considered as a measure of social support. The most serious problem is the application among unemployed Roma in excluded communities, usually as the only measure targeting this part of population.

## Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

Slovakia was eligible for the Youth Employment Initiative: it had an allocation of 72.17 million euros. As requested by the European Council and European Parliament, the Commission's Youth Employment Package included a proposed Recommendation to Member States on introducing the Youth Guarantee to ensure that all young people up to age 25 receive a quality offer of a job, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of leaving formal education or becoming unemployed. A Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan was presented in 2014.

In the 2017 country report<sup>59</sup>, the Commission notes that long term unemployment is a major risk for the low-skilled and young. The measures for young people under the implementation of the Youth Guarantee helped support sustainable youth employment. Short-term programmes on voluntary work and traineeships proved successful for young people under the age of 29. However there are still no individualised services targeting the specific problems of the young low-skilled or the young long-term unemployed.

<sup>59</sup> Country Report Slovakia 2017. Accompanying the document COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK AND THE EUROGROUP. 2017 European Semester: Assessment of progress on structural reforms, prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances, and results of in-depth reviews under Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPageId=3351>[https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/2017-european-semester-country-report-slovakia-en\\_0.pdf](https://ec.europa.eu/info/sites/info/files/2017-european-semester-country-report-slovakia-en_0.pdf)



Overall, Slovakia has made limited progress in addressing the 2016 country-specific recommendations. Some progress has been made in a number of policy areas, including on improving activation measures for the long-term unemployed. Rapid job creation and support measures for low-wage earners have helped reduce the unemployment rate, although labour market challenges persist. Slovakia has recently adopted several active and passive measures to tackle the unemployment of specific vulnerable groups, including an action plan aiming to provide personalized services and training for the long term unemployed. These measures, if implemented in a timely manner, are likely to help reduce long-term unemployment, which remains very high. Roma and low-skilled remain one of the most disadvantaged groups in the labour market.

According to the Youth Guarantee Country Fiche<sup>60</sup>, the Youth Guarantee (YG) scheme reached a total of 132,500 young people by the end of 2015. Steps have been taken to improve school-to-work transitions, (including vocational education and training reform, subsidised first jobs, job counselling delivered via e-services, support to job creation through self-employment). In 2015, a dual vocational education training systems was introduced, however, interest among potential participants remains limited. A campaign on the benefits of the system is planned for 2016. There are several remaining challenges: to strengthen outreach to non-registered NEETs, in particular to the low-skilled ones; to provide timely and quality offers; to develop local partnerships between PES, schools and employers; to increase the uptake of dual VET (to address the increasing skills shortages reported by employers); to improve the evaluation of the labour market relevant of VET; to strengthen the evaluation of YG measures' sustainable impact (including second chance education, subsidised employment). As regards both the YEI and YG, there is a need to raise awareness among the inactive NEETs, register and monitor their progress, as well as further improve the information system to measure and evaluate progress in the implementation (e.g. tracking of participants upon leaving).

From the point of view of the practice, all mentioned initiatives were implemented, but not systematically and very often without adequate expertise. They were implemented mainly on level of project grants, so final measures are a lot fragmented and difficult to track. Because of this, the target groups and institutions (relevant grantees) are not effectively informed in an open and transparent way. Also the serious information campaign is missing. Besides, many technical obstacles related to the projects are present, as well as huge administrative burden and time pressure. This is the reason why relevant organisations are not motivated to participate in the initiatives.

On the state level, this topic is only in minor level presented. There is no implementation in relevant legislation. Problem of youth unemployment is not considered to be the problem which needs to be solved. Nowadays, there are only 2 measures focusing only on youth, only 10 – 12 % of unemployed youth participates in them. The latest

---

<sup>60</sup> Youth Guarantee country by country. Slovakia, 2017. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPagelId=3351>



novelization of the Employment Services Act No. 5/2004 Z. z. caused the lower availability and attractiveness of the measure (restriction of the graduate practice to the completed field of study, shortening of the duration and sum of the allowance).

What is seriously missing is the systematic evaluation of impact of this initiatives on target groups.

## Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>61</sup>	Starting year; end year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Assess the impact of the policy measures	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	Contribution to job mobility §53a	National	B.	2008	National	No	Yes	NA	NA
2	Contribution to sheltered jobs §60	National	C.	2004	National	No	Yes	Helps to support inclusion of people with disabilities	NA
2	Childcare Allowance	National	B.	2008	National	No	No	NA	NA

### Comments on Table 6

The reason for choosing the contribution to job mobility is how this measure related to housing policy. Housing policy is a weak part of social policy in Slovakia. This measure in current design really supports the job mobility by covering the housing costs caused by moving because of new job. Young generation is very open to migration. So it is not surprising, that the measure is mostly used by young people, under the age of 29 (68%). As the contribution is possible to consider also for the family, it can effectively help especially to young people to start also the family life in other city, with better job opportunities.

Childcare Allowance is the example from the segment of family policy, which is aimed to support the employment of parents (both men and women) of small children. In spite of the missing data, it is very probable, that mainly young people (young parents) are beneficiaries of this allowance. Besides, the measure respect principles of gender balance. Together with motivating level of support it presents the example of good practice.

<sup>61</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



Regarding the relation of youth employment policies to other components of social policies in Slovakia we must say, that situation is not very positive. The relation is weak, the position of youth is very minor. It is possible to say, that youth is not considered to be the important target group, which is worthy to be solved. It is also minor in employment policy, and it is the same also in other segments. What is strongly missing, is the cross-sectoral approach to solving problems of youth in Slovakia. What we can see by presented measures (contribution to migration and childcare allowance) is typical characteristics: the impact on youth is rather the unintended than planned effect.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Príspevok na podporu mobility za prácou (§53a) <b>Contribution to job mobility</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> to cover housing costs, related to the moving because of the new job gaining</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> support the regional mobility</p> <p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Monthly contribution to cover housing costs related to the change of the place of the living because of getting new job</li> <li>- New living place must be in the distance of at least 70 km from the place of the permanent residence</li> <li>- Eligible costs – costs related to the apartment usage or renting an apartment</li> </ul> <p>Husband and wife are asking for the contribution together, in the application is stated, which of them should be granted</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> unemployed person, registered at least 3 months at OLSAF</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> proven costs related to moving because of the new job</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> support for housing</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2008</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> No.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> 621 thousand € (2016), national</p>
Achieved results	<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>Because of incomplete data, it is not possible to present data for the whole period. In the year 2016, there was 816 beneficiaries.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> Changing from year to year according the number of applications. There was recorded increase in the year 2016 because of the legislative change of the measure. The most important changes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- except the condition of the change of the permanent resident also the condition of the change of the temporary residence is accepted,</li><li>- the change from the disposable contribution to contribution provided maximum of 6 months, which means also total increase of the allowance on maximum 2400 € per family, and</li><li>- the significant simplification of administration.</li></ul> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>There are 2 different types of costs related to housing, which can be covered for 6 months. Also the moving of partner (husband or wife) is being considered. The first type of the allowance is from 250 € to 400 € per month. The second type is from 125 € to 200 € per month.</p> <p>There can be covered 2 types of expenditure <sup>62</sup></p> <p>a/ Costs related to the housing</p> <p>b/ Costs related to the renting of the flat</p> <p>For maximum of 6 months is the contribution is provided to the employee, which was before getting the job registered and considered as belonging to risky group. The contribution covers 80% of costs. Monthly contribution of 80% or maximum</p> <p>1/ 250€, if both husband and wife fulfil conditions of receiving the contribution, maximum of 400 €</p> <p>2/ 125€, if both husband and wife fulfil conditions of receiving the contribution and at least one of them was before registered unemployed in risky group, maximum of 200€.</p> <p>In the application, husband and wife are applying together. Information, to which of them should be contribution provided, is in the application.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Individuals and families, which are moving because of the job (both husband and wife are considered).</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people. or to all unemployed?</b> It is not targeting especially youth, but youth is using the program most often.</p>

<sup>62</sup> Príspevok na podporu mobility za prácou. [http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-obcana/prispevok-na-podporu-mobility-za-pracou-53a.html?page\\_id=572524](http://www.upsvar.sk/sluzby-zamestnanosti/nastroje-aktivnych-opatreni-trhu-prace/prispevky-pre-obcana/prispevok-na-podporu-mobility-za-pracou-53a.html?page_id=572524)



	<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>
Youth involvement	<p><b>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.</b></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> No</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?</b> Permanent monitoring by the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family. The statistic as well as evaluation report are available on the website of the Central office<sup>63</sup>.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> Internal</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 by the evaluation are very basic. Only total sum, number of participants and their basic structure is available.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>Because of the latest changes in the measure, its popularity is increasing. The most motivating change is the release the condition of the permanent residence change. Now the confirmation of the change of the temporary residence is considered as the fulfilment of the migration condition. Also the maximum sum of the allowance is higher. Motivating is also the fact, that allowance can be provided for xi months. Before it was disposable allowance payed in one payment.</p>
In your view: How	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b> Partially.</p> <p>This program is in practice since 2008. But it was used very rarely. It is caused</p>

<sup>63</sup> [http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page\\_id=1248](http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page_id=1248)



<p>would you assess the quality of the intervention ?</p>	<p>partially by the strong bonding to the place/ region of living, which historical reasons. Moving is very difficult, flats are very expensive, and there is only minimum of state rentals. Commercial prices are very high. After the last legislative changes there is chance to become more popular.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b> NA</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> The possible barrier is the level of the allowance. We have deep regional differences in Slovakia, which are present also in the housing costs. In many case the sum is not adequate as well as not motivating.</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 intervention should solve problem of the lack of job opportunities in regions. According my opinion, it is not really solving problems of regions. It has also serious potential negative effect – emigration of higher and middle class from the regions. So negative trends of the exclusion of problematic regions can continue.</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>No, definitely no. It does not help to really excluded young people with low chances and cumulate disadvantages to overcome all the problems. The most serious problem is lack of education, qualification, discrimination, and poor living conditions in excluded regions.</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> Support of the regional migration</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b> NA</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b> We face to a big problem of emigration in Slovakia (the most serious is brain drain, but not only). So there is significant decrease of cultural capital in many problematic regions. This measure is making the situation worse. Of course in a small scale. There should be solved the question, how to support people in their regions, how to start the development of these regions. State should not support emigration with its negative effects.</p>
<p>Name of the initiative (in national language and in English)</p>	<p>Príspevok na starostlivosť o dieťa (Act. No. 561/2008)</p> <p><b><u>Childcare Allowance</u></b></p>



<p>Short description</p>	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b> By providing a childcare allowance, the state contributes to a parent or natural person being entrusted with the care of the child to cover the costs incurred in caring for the child</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b> to enable the parents of small children to carry out gainful work and also ensure quality care of their children by a childcare provider</p> <p>Description:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The contribution is intended to cover costs related to the care for children, during the time, when parent is at work or at school (daily study at the secondary high school, or at the university).</li> <li>- The contribution is eligible to maximum of 3 years of the child's age, or to maximum of 6 years of the child's age, in case of the long-term adverse health status of the child.</li> <li>- Eligible type of care: the family environment, or the public or private provider of childcare.</li> </ul> <p>The contribution is designed for each child of the parent, which is eligible.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> employed or studying parents with children under the age of 3 years, or under the age of 6 years in case of long-term health difficulties</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> regular employment or self-employment or study of parent, childcare provided by other person or childcare provider</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> family policy – financial support of families with children</p> <p><b>Level:</b> national</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> 2008</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b> I do not have such an information.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> In 2016 there was total spending of 9 727 313 € (a year - on - year increase of 75.6 %). The growth of the number of beneficiaries was influenced mainly by increasing the maximum monthly amount of the allowance and simplifying its provision (change of the legislation in 2015).</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>Such data are not available.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b> 9,727,313 € in 2016.</p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p>



	<p>according to the legislation, there are 3 categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- 280 if childcare is provided, by a private facility, natural person by virtue of a trade licence, a civic association, and others;</li><li>- 80 € if childcare is provided by a kindergarten which is included in the network of schools and school facilities of the Slovak Republic and is established by a municipality or a local government authority</li><li>- 41.10 € if childcare is provided by a natural person without a trade license (such as a relative of the child's parent)</li></ul>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> Families with small children.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people. or to all unemployed?</b> It is not targeting especially youth, but it is very probable, that young families are covered by the program.</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, the measure is not targeting unemployed, it is to support the families by enabling the participation on the job market for both parents.</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 (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly No.</b></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? No</b></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?</b> There are only basic descriptive data published yearly in the Report on the Social Situation of the Population of the Slovak Republic. The report is available online, each second year also in English language.<sup>64</sup></p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b> Internal</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</b></p>

<sup>64</sup> Správy o sociálnej situácii obyvateľstva Slovenskej republiky.  
<https://www.employment.gov.sk/sk/ministerstvo/vyskum-oblasti-prace-socialnych-veci-institut-socialnej-politiky/spravy-socialnej-situacii-obyvatelstva-slovenskej-republiky.html>



	<p><b>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 by the evaluation are very basic. Only total sum, number of participants and their basic structure of supported providers are available.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>There was recorded a year - on - year growth of the number of beneficiaries, influenced mainly by increasing the maximum monthly amount of the allowance and simplifying its provision. With regard to the use of the allowance, there are persisting regional differences caused by several factors; the growth of the number of beneficiaries was not reflected uniformly throughout the territory of the Slovak Republic, therefore these differences further deepened.<sup>65</sup></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> Yes, this program achieves its goals and its effect. After the latest legislative change all types of provider are included (family included) as well as the level of allowance is very motivating. The increase of number of beneficiaries is a good indicator of good design.</p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b> This is not possible in this case.</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> I would say that there are concerns about good information of all eligible parents. On the other side there is still the public discussion about the length of maternity and parental leave, which allow to stay at home to the age 03 years of the children. There is deep regional difference in number of beneficiaries. It is more often used in the western part of the countries, and in the urban areas. This can be caused by different job opportunities, as well as tradition ideas about mothers caring about children at home instead of going to payed job.</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 intervention is very progressive and really supporting gender balance. Also the level of allowance is adequate. The biggest challenge is support its usage also in the more traditional regions.</p>

<sup>65</sup> Report on the Social Situation of the Population of the Slovak Republic in 2016. Bratislava, 2017. <https://www.employment.gov.sk/files/slovensky/ministerstvo/analyticke-centrum/report-on-social-situation-2016.pdf>



<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 has very good preventive potential and enables sooner return of parents (mainly women) to the open job market. In spite of the missing data we can presume, that many young women are eligible for this measure, so it can protect them before losing working habits, as well as help them improve their social situation (income is definitely higher than state support they receive during maternity or parental leave).</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> The main success factor is the level of allowance as well as the range of providers (from private to public, family included).</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b> Return of women after maternity/ parental leave back to job is considered to be risky situation. With this measure the risk is decreased. What is more, the design of the measure is reflecting principles of gender balance.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b> At the moment there are huge regional differences, which are difficult to understand without better data. The potential of the measure could increase the wider regional usage of the measure.</p>



## References

### Studies and evaluations

- BALÁŽOVÁ, Zuzana: Elokované pracoviská stredných odborných škôl pri marginalizovaných rómskych komunitách. CVEK, 2015. <http://cvek.sk/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/Elokovane-pracoviska-final-1.pdf>
- BAROŠOVÁ, Margita a kol.: Uplatňovanie aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce v kontexte s aplikačnou praxou Európskej únie. [online]. Bratislava: Inštitút pre výskum práce a rodiny, 2012. Available at: [http://www.sspr.gov.sk/IVPR/images/IVPR/vyskum/2012/Barosova/2159\\_kolekti\\_v.pdf](http://www.sspr.gov.sk/IVPR/images/IVPR/vyskum/2012/Barosova/2159_kolekti_v.pdf)
- BOŘÍK Vladimír, CABAN Matúš. Pilotné hodnotenie dopadov vybraných opatrení aktívnej politiky trhu práce. [online]. Bratislava: MPSVR SR, ÚPSVR, 2013. Available at: <http://www.esf.gov.sk/new/index.php?id=3178>
- GYÁRFÁŠOVÁ, Oľga, a kol. Evaluácia sociálnej politiky zameranej na zníženie dlhodobej nezamestnanosti – výskumná správa. [online] Bratislava: IVO, 2006. Available at: <http://www.ivo.sk/4908/sk/aktuality/evaluacia-socialnej-politiky-zameranej-na-znizenie-dlhodobej-nezamestnanosti---vyskumna-sprava-z-projektu-k-dispozicii>
- HANZELOVÁ, Eneke a KOSTOLNÁ, Zuzana. Služby zamestnanosti v nových podmienkach: Analýza implementačnej praxe. In *Rodina a práca* [online]. Bratislava: Stredisko pre štúdium práce a rodiny, Február 2006. Available at: <http://www.ceit.sk/IVPR/images/IVPR/bulletin/Bulletin-01-2006.pdf> .
- HARVAN, Peter. Hodnotenie efektívnosti a účinnosti výdavkov na aktívne politiky trhu práce na Slovensku. [online]. Bratislava: Inštitút finančnej politiky MF SR, 2011. Available at: <http://www.expak-at.sk/expak/img/uploads/expak1364.pdf>
- Inštitút finančnej politiky. Veľa práce na úradoch práce: Efektivita a účinnosť služieb zamestnanosti. Október 2016. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=11228>
- Inštitút finančnej politiky. Bez práce nie sú koláče. 18.11.2014. <http://www.finance.gov.sk/Default.aspx?CatID=9887>
- Správa o sociálnej situácii obyvateľstva Slovenskej republiky za rok 2016. <https://www.employment.gov.sk/files/slovensky/ministerstvo/analyticke-centrum/sprava-socialnej-situacii-2016.pdf>
- Ukazovatele a systém hodnotenia efektívnosti aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce (AOTP) v Slovenskej republike (analytická štúdia). Bratislava: INFOSAT a TRIXIMA, 2009.



Vyhodnotenie uplatňovania aktívnych opatrení na trhu práce za rok 2016. UPSVAR, 2017. Available at: [http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp\\_2016/Vyhodnotenie\\_AOTP\\_2016.pdf](http://www.upsvar.sk/buxus/docs/statistic/aotp_2016/Vyhodnotenie_AOTP_2016.pdf)

Evaluation reports of ALMP by the Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family. Available at: [http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page\\_id=1248](http://www.upsvar.sk/statistiky/aktivne-opatrenia-tp-statistiky.html?page_id=1248)

## European documents

Country Report Slovakia 2017. Accompanying the document COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT, THE COUNCIL, THE EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK AND THE EUROGROUP. 2017 European Semester: Assessment of progress on structural reforms, prevention and correction of macroeconomic imbalances, and results of in-depth reviews under Regulation (EU) No 1176/2011. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPageId=3351>

Youth Guarantee country by country. Slovakia, 2017. Available at: <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPageId=3351>

## Data

Eurostat

Databased of Central Office of Labour, Social Affairs and Family in Slovakia

## Legislation:

Employment Services Act No. 5/2004 Z. z. (Zákon č. 5/2004 Z. z. o službách zamestnanosti a o zmene a doplnení niektorých zákonov v znení neskorších predpisov)