



Youth employment policies in Austria

EXCEPT working paper no. 29
June 2018

Manfred Zentner

www.except-project.eu
twitter.com/except_eu
www.facebook.com/excepteu

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





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

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

To cite this report:

Zentner, M. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Austria*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 29. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-398-8 (pdf)

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



Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Austria	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview	6
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	10
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	11
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives	27
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	28
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	29
References	39



The key risk groups in the labour market in Austria

All young people are not seen as the most problematic group in the labour market, on the contrary, the positive developments regarding youth unemployment in the last two years and the relatively good situation in comparison with other EU countries changed the focus now on other groups – especially on unemployed over 50 years. Research (see e.g. [7. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend](#) in Österreich – 7th report on the situation of youth in Austria) that some groups need still need certain attention.

The main focus lies on young people with low skills, with no qualification, early school leavers and NEET. Also politics focused in the last years on these groups by developing the new law on Ausbildung Bis 18 (Education Training Till 18).

Migrants (refugees as well as young people with migrant background) are also perceived as special target groups – mainly because they are over-represented in the above mentioned target groups. Minorities – “Volksgruppen” –, on the other hand, which are certain ethnic groups living in certain Austrian regions already for a very long time (e.g. Hungarian in Burgenland, Croats in Burgenland, Slovene in in Carinthia) are not perceived as groups in need of special support regarding labour market measures.

Teenage parenthood is very rare in Austria and until now is not perceived as a topic that requires special attention regarding ALMP, young single parents, on the other hand, are more likely to be recognised as a group having problems finding adequate positions in the labour market.

Table 1 “Risk group” construction

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



The youth unemployment rate in Austria was increasing since 2011 steadily (2011: 8.9%; 2012: 9.4%; 2013: 9.7%; 2014: 10.3%; 2015: 10.6%; 2016: 11.2%) but is still low compared to other EU member states. But certain groups clearly bear a higher risk for unemployment than others. Among them are – not surprisingly and like in other states – young people with low skills and without qualifications. But the main risk group in Austria are young people with migrant background – especially if they have another family language than German.

Also the rate for youth not employment, education or training (NEET) is with 7.7% low compared to other EU member states. NEET young people are not a topic in the media, but are recognised as the main group in mainstream politics and also have been a major group of interest for research in the last years (e.g. bmask: [Studie zur Unterstützung der Arbeitsmarktpolitischen Zielgruppe “NEET”](#)). This study also pointed out the high importance of this topic for the group of young people with migrant background.

The ethnic minorities in Austria are well integrated and do not show big differences to the average Austrian youth, but migrants and young people with migrant background (following the Austrian definition it is young people whose both parents were migrants) and young people with other first language (family languages) than German. These groups have in average higher rates of early school leavers, higher rates of low qualifications, higher rates of NEET and are to higher degree children in families affected by unemployment (e.g. [7. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich](#) [7th report on the situation of youth in Austria]).

The new law “Education Training till 18” (Ausbildung bis 18) targets the groups of early school leavers and of NEET to ensure better qualifications for these risk groups. It obliges everyone to stay in education or training until the age of 18 (mandatory school education in Austria is still only 9 years).

Young people in remote areas are not a risk group per se (unemployment rates of 15 to 24 year olds in cities and towns are three times as high as in the rural area) but certain disadvantaged areas exist in almost all of the federal regions in Austria which show general higher levels of unemployment – and thus, also for young people.

Teenage parents are not a big group in Austria – approximately 2000 young women yearly get pregnant before the age of 20. But single parents are a risk group for social exclusion, mainly due to part time employment and therefore less income (see also: [7. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich](#), chapter 2).



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	40	39	40
1.1	including youth-targeted ¹	3	3	3
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	130.377	175.769	149.908
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	3.3	4.2	3.5
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 ² years old) in active labour market programmes:			
3.1	Total number	35.394	67.385	57.917
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29)	6.2	11.7	10.4
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	27.1	38.3	38.6
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (EUR)	1.121.140.000	1.887.070.000	1.953.100.000
4.2	% of GDP	0.44	0.64	0.58
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
5.1	Total amount (EUR)			
5.2	% of GDP			
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active			

¹ There are three labour market programmes in the Eurostat database that have clearly youth as target groups: apprenticeship promotion, production schools and supra-company training schemes. But also career counselling and guidance have young people as target group but not alone.

In the brochure of the Federal Ministry of Labour, (<https://broschuerenservice.sozialministerium.at/Home/Download?publicationId=29>) Social Affairs and Consumer Protection 12 measures are mentioned, among them subsidies for company-based apprenticeships, measures for young people from migrant background and initiatives for young people with health-related employment handicaps.

² Eurostat data and Austrian data (Bali: <http://www.arbeitsmarktpolitik.at/bali/>) provides information for the group 15- 24 year olds.



labour market programmes:				
6.1	Total amount (EUR)	78.100.000	189.130.000	222.550.000
6.2	% of GDP	0.03	0.06	0.07
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	6,97	10,02	11,39

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 ³	Preventive/reactive ⁴	Youth specific	Main source of funding ⁵	Linked to EU initiatives ⁶	Main actors of delivery ⁷	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	3	3	Partly	2	Yes, 1 and 2	1	Partly	Partly
Vocational guidance, career counselling	3	3	Yes	2	N/A	1	Partly	Partly
Training (with certificates)	3	3	Yes	2, 5		6, 7	Partly	Partly
Training (without certificates)	1	3	Partly	2	1	1, 5, 7	Yes	N/A
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	3	1	Yes	2	N/A	1		N/A
Direct job creation	2	2	No	2	N/A	2	N/A	N/A
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	2	1	Partly	2	5	1, 2, 3		
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments on table 3

(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment: Orientation courses are offered by PES included in special measures. Job orientation and talent

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

⁴ To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems preventive = 1; reactive = 2; both=3.

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

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

⁷ 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



checks are offered already in mandatory schooling. Preparation for the employment for young people is especially important for young people who are after mandatory schooling not adequately prepared to find a place for further vocational training. The pilot project “ready for education and training” (Ausbildungsfit) was an intervention focussing on young people that are not fit for apprenticeship, it was continued in the programme “Production Schools”, providing preparation for young people not yet ready to enter vocational education. The pilot was evaluated 2012: http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/evaluierung-ausbildungsfit_endbericht_2015.pdf. This production schools are a very prestigious project helping those after completing mandatory schooling (often without a positive decree) who fail to move on from compulsory school to continuing education and training. Production Schools are primarily targeted at young people who still need time to complete basic education and guidance to choose the right pathways in training and labour markets. It is both reactive and preventive since aims at those not able to enter the (first) labour market but still aims to enable them to enter an apprenticeship and thus prevent lack of training.

Re-orientation courses are a common instrument for unemployed adults with low qualifications or in certain professional fields, where vacancies are scarce. For youth re-orientation is not common.

Vocational guidance, career counselling: Job orientation and career counselling starts already in secondary school (age 10 to 14) and has the aim to enable students to make educated decisions for further education or vocational training. Career counselling is offered especially by PES centres called BIZ – Berufsinformationszentrum (job information centre) inside and outside school. Youth Coaching (Jugendcoaching) is an information and counselling programme, established in cooperation between the Federal Ministry of Education and the Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer’s protection and is implemented by the Social Affairs Ministry Service (SMS). In difficult periods of decision-making many young people need professional advice and supports for career choices and for planning their future. This youth coaching is offered at the end of the compulsory schooling directly at the attended schools in an uncomplicated, individual approach. Furthermore, teachers can nominate young persons they consider at risk for the youth coaching.

Training (with certificates): the dual vocational education/training scheme (apprenticeships in companies and education in schools) in Austria is the main approach in vocational education. In this scheme special forms of training offers exist: e.g. for young people with health problems allowing people with special needs to either do their vocational training in a longer timespan or do only certain aspects of this training. Or the supra-company training (Überbetriebliche Berufsausbildung, UBA) offering training opportunities for youth who did not find a placement for their apprenticeship training in the first labour market.



Training without certificates per se for youth is not so important, it should only be seen as a bridge towards continuing vocational training (like the Production schools) It is a clear aim of Austria social policy to get young people into education with certificates and decrees to promote the chances in the labour market. For other age groups training without certificates exist but only few of them are subsidies by PES or other institutions.

Direct job-creation as a ALPM is promoted in Austria mainly for long term unemployed over 50 years (e.g. Aktion 20.000) or the creation of additional jobs in one-person companies.

Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes are run, but they don't focus on young people (also since the beneficiaries have to fulfil certain preconditions connected to experience or further education) but youth is not excluded. One of the measures is a micro-credit programme for start-ups but also for investment in small companies, others are based on the New Companies Promotion Act, excluding new entrepreneurs of certain administration fees and lowering other costs.

Table 4 Strengths and weaknesses of the overall policy approach

Effectiveness of the overall policy approach towards tackling youth unemployment and social exclusion	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Strong focus on already identified risk groups with targeted measures	Strong believe in further, continuing education, which cannot overcome structural challenges;
Focusses on individual support and thereby on self-development of the person and thus is a sustainable investment for the future	Target groups like university graduates, high school graduates are not so much in the focus



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

These interventions aim at the identified risk groups for youth unemployment in preventive and reactive ways. They have a clear target group and are well defined for these groups

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level (national, regional, local)	Main target group ⁸	Type ⁹	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” ¹⁰ example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ¹¹	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ¹²
1	Production Schools	National	D	1,3	2015	National	Youth guarantee	Yes, mixed results	Partially	4	2
2	Youth Coaching	National	A	2	2013	National	Youth guarantee	No, but reports	Yes	N/A	3
3	Training guarantee – supra-company training programme	National	D	3	2008	National	Youth guarantee	Yes, positive	Yes	5	1
4	Apprenticeship subsidised	National	A	4	2008	National	N/A	Yes	N/A	3	3

⁸ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

⁹ (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

¹⁰ 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.”

¹¹ 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.

¹² 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.



by PES	the									
-----------	-----	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Production Schools (Produktionsschulen)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: Production Schools help pupils prepare for continuing training and open up (career) perspectives. They enhance stability and motivation and to provide special skills and basic qualifications in order to develop individual post-school perspectives for continuing training.</p> <p>Intended effects: Enabling young people to find vocational training opportunities in the first labour market</p> <p>Target groups: adolescents and young adults who are seeking support for their further educational or professional training after completing their compulsory education. Explicitly also targeted at young people with disabilities</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: every young person after mandatory schooling (9 years) who can't find a place for apprenticeship (admission via PES or youth coaching)</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): preparation for labour market</p> <p>Level: national; bridging between mandatory schooling and further (dual) education</p> <p>Start/ end date: since 2015</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer's Protection (bmask)</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? bmask</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 26.000, state</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. approx. 2,780 young people aged 15 to 19 and 420 between 20 and 24 were 2016 participating in production schools which equals around 0.3% of all young people aged 15 to 24. Appr. 65% ended the intervention with either a start of a dual vocational training, a further education or the entry in the labour market.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. 26 Mio €</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure</p>



	data what is available. N/A
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Adolescents and young adults who are seeking support for their further educational or professional training after completing their compulsory education and need more time to fulfil the developmental task essential for the start of a further vocational training</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Only youth</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)? Focus only on young people, not finding apprenticeship after mandatory schooling.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly; No</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one? Yes, Youth Guarantee</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? The pilot project “Ausbildungsfit” was ex-post evaluated and upon this evaluation the programme was established. http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/evaluierung-ausbildungsfit_endbericht_2015.pdf</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? External by the Institute for Advanced Studies (IHS).</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)? Since this is a measurement for (re-)orientation and development of personal stability, the mentioned effects are not applicable.</p>
Summary	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many</p>



<p>of evaluation results</p>	<p>evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>In average the participants attend the measure for 151 days, so less than half of the maximal possible time. Two thirds finished the programme successfully (female to a higher degree – 71.5% - than male – 65%). But especially those participants, who did not finish the mandatory schooling successfully, showed also in this measure very low success rates (39%).</p> <p>For 60% of those, who finished the programme, the advice for further proceeding was another qualification (mostly in apprenticeship) and strongly affected by the first language of the participant.</p> <p>More than 50% of the participants show better capabilities in cultural techniques, more than 60% show improvements in the work attitude, and more than 50% show improvements of social skills.</p> <p>In summary almost 70% of the participants had over all improvements which should help them to have better chances in the labour and training market.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention ?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Together with other interventions (youth coaching, ÜBA) this intervention enables more young people to start a fitting education and/or training programme.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? This is an important initiative and reaches many young people – especially in the identified risk groups.</p> <p>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.)? The barriers are mainly to be found in the very school-like approach to training. Thus, exactly those young people who did not want to continue their school career and were early school leavers are hard to reach.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? Since Production Schools are mainly reactive for those, who did not find an apprenticeship it leaves the needed changes in the education system untouched. Many of the mistakes of the years in school and the deficits in the education cannot be levelled out with this measurement (e.g. German language skills for non-native speakers).</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemploy</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>It addresses some of the main reasons for the risk groups (deficits in formal</p>



ent and target risk groups	education, lack of social skills) but cannot overcome others (lack of German language skills) to find an apprenticeship.
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</p> <p>The main success factor is that young people from the risk group get again accustomed to learning and working and thus improve the social skills of utmost importance to enter the labour market. Production schools do not only focus on methods of formal learning but also include methods of non-formal learning which allows young people with learning difficulties to adjust better.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? Production schools are a good practice since they enable young people after mandatory schooling to develop and establish skills and competences essential for the labour market. They are a good instrument for young people with learning difficulties, deficits of cultural competences and skills or with developmental problems to have a prolonged period of transition from school to the labour market.</p>

Name of the initiative	Youth Coaching (Jugendcoaching)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: to Inform and counsel young people near the end of compulsory schooling to provide advice and personal support regarding their career choices.</p> <p>Intended effects: young people (aged 15+) find out personal skills and interests and get information on opportunities for training and education – on a voluntary basis</p> <p>Target groups: young people at the end of the compulsory education (15 – 19) with special focus on young people in difficult situations, from migrant background or with special needs (in this case up to 24 years)</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: all, voluntary</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Orientation, information and counselling</p> <p>Level: national, implementation regional starting during mandatory schooling, up to 19</p> <p>Start/ end date: since 2013</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry of Education (BMB), Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer’s Protection (bmask), NGOs,</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p>



	<p>Training institutes, NGOs, Social Affairs Ministry Service (SMS),</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 27.500, state Social Affairs Ministry Service SMS</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. 71.000 (in 4 years approx. 400.000 young people would be in the primary target group, at the end of compulsory schooling)</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. Approx. 27.5 Mio €</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. N/A</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Youth Coaching is targeted at pupils, but also at young people under age 19 who are no longer in the education system and at young people under age 25 with special educational needs or disabilities.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Only youth</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)? Only for young people under 19 (young people with special needs under 25), not only unemployed.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly; no</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one? Yes, Youth Guarantee.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? There are yearly reports (also feedback of the participants and of cooperation partners) – the last one available for 2016 (Jugendcoaching Jahresbericht 2016) at the webpage of the coordination platform for the EducationTraining till 18 (www.bundeskost.at) and also monthly monitoring.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? internal by the Bundesweite Koordinierungsstelle</p>



	<p>AusBildung bis 18 (coordination of Education Training till 18)</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)? The yearly evaluation cover only the programme as such (e.g. participation).</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>The reports highlight the positive effects of youth coaching as an instrument to reach those young people at risk not to enter the labour market due to lack of information. Especially the individualised approach is seen as the main success factor of the intervention.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? The main goal is to provide information and counselling for pupils and young people on a voluntary basis, and with this approach youth coaching can access young people when they are really interested – and not like often in formal education settings, when they have to listen to information. Furthermore, the individualised approach by coaching in possible three stages reflects the needs and wishes of youth nowadays. The cooperation with extracurricular open youth work offers (e.g. youth centres) enables an even wider reach of the intervention.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? The individual case approach is very helpful for the young people to find opportunities for further education and training.</p> <p>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.)? Especially since the use of the offer is voluntary, it is very attractive for young people. But the accessibility should be further enhanced – youth workers as trained youth coaches could further improve the low threshold approach of the measurement.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? It still needs a bigger coverage. Even if now more than</p>



	180 organisations with more than 400 youth coaches are active it still needs more and faster coverage.
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>Lack of information, false information and wrong expectations are main reasons for the wrong decisions in the education and training paths of young people, therefore overcoming this deficit is essential.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>Main success factor is the broad cooperation between different stakeholders: school, PES, social work, youth work. Thus, a low threshold approach can be established.</p> <p>Another important factor is the completely individualised coaching. Every young person has already in the first stage of information the feeling that his/her questions are singular and get all the attention possible.</p>

Name of the initiative (in national language and in English)	Training guarantee for young people – supra-company training programme (Überbetriebliche Berufsausbildung, ÜBA)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: The supra-company training programme aims to enable the transition of young people into a company-based traineeship as quickly as possible. One form (ÜBA1) is a training course that requires completion of the entire course offered by a training entity or by such an entity in cooperation with a company-run training workshop. Although participants can complete training within an ÜBA1 setting, a key objective is to help them switch to regular company-based apprenticeships during training. In the other approach of ÜBA2 is based on training contracts that do not cover the entire period of an apprenticeship, with practical training being provided in appropriate partner entities. They are designed as pathways towards placement in, and completion of, company-run apprenticeships.</p> <p>Intended effects: keeping young people in formal training and education systems.</p> <p>Target groups: Low-skilled people, People not in education,</p>



	<p>employment or training (NEETs), Young people (aged 16 to 25 years)</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: young persons registered as searching for an apprenticeship, who did not find one despite of intensive search</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): training</p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: since 2008</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer's Protection (bmask),</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Public employment services Austria (AMS); Social partner organisations represented in the AMS (such as the Economic Chamber, the Federal Chamber of Labour, the Austrian Trade Union Federation and the Federation of Austrian Industry); Companies (both private and non-profit); Schools and training bodies,</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 163 mio, PES</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. Approx. 9,800 to 10,0000 young people participate in the programme yearly (= those entitled to, since it is part of the training guarantee).</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. 163 mio</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. The participants receive a remuneration of approx. 300 Euros in the first year up to 700 in the third.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Low-skilled people, People not in education, employment or training (NEETs), Young people (aged 16 to 25 years), Registered apprenticeship-seekers who have completed compulsory education and are unable to find suitable training positions within companies in spite of placement efforts or have dropped out of apprenticeships may enter one of the supra-company training programmes.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Only youth</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to</p>



	<p>young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)? N/A</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly; no</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>Yes: Youth Guarantee.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>External evaluations were carried out by L&R Social Research (http://www.lrsocialresearch.at/files/Endbericht_UeBA_Evaluierung_final_LR.pdf) for ÜBA and by Prospect, research and solution (http://www.prospectgmbh.at/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Endbericht_UeBA2.pdf) for the second form of ÜBA, (ÜBA 2) In 2015 the PES research network published a meta-analysis of evaluations of youth LMP measures (http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/AMS_report_109.pdf).</p> <p>The results were also reflected in the further development – not only the supra-company training programme but also in other measures (e.g. Youth Coaching)</p> <p>The evaluations focus on basic information on the intervention, but also points out possible impact from other developments.</p>
Summary of	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of</p>



<p>evaluation results</p>	<p>these separately together with the source.</p> <p>Over all the programme of supra-company training is seen as a success. Some of the key conclusions of the evaluation of L&R 2012 were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were generally positive results in terms of their integration into the labour market. • Dropouts from the programme needed additional support systems, as around two-thirds were facing difficult circumstances and were not working. • Nearly half of those who took part in the ÜBA 1 training between 2008 and 2011 were of migrant roots. <p>The evaluation of the ÜBA2 highlighted the importance of a certain person (attachment figure) in the partner training company.</p> <p>In addition to this research, in 2012, a smaller case study of the supra-company apprenticeships was published in the Social Work and Society, International Online Journal. This warned that:</p> <p>Young people with learning difficulties or who were socially disadvantaged had trouble managing the strict schedule of this type of training.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention ?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes. It provides young people with the chance to start their apprenticeship and shows a high transitions rate into the regular labour market.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? Very important; appr. 8% of all apprenticeships are run by ÜBA!</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>I think a main problem is, that two different measures supra-company training for young people who do not find a fitting apprenticeship due to lack of offers, and for those who have big personal difficulties in finding a training (health problems, attitude problems, learning disabilities...) carry the same name. This leads to a transfer of (negative) image of participants and could thus endanger the effectiveness of the intervention.</p>
<p>Related to</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and</p>



<p>the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not? It addresses the individual causes by intensive support and the structural causes in certain branches. In combination with company subsidies for taking over an apprentice of the supra-company training it directly increases the chances of the target group in the labour market. And it targets the risk groups among the youth (with health handicaps, migrant background...)</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention. Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? The main reason for success is the strong personal support and the efforts to get young people into the first labour market while they already are receiving an apprentice training. Furthermore, the fitting with other measures (Youth Coaching, subsidies...) is important.</p>

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>Apprenticeship subsidised by the public employment service</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: Increase the number of apprenticeships for certain target groups Intended effects: enabling more young people to enter the labour market directly in company-based training Target groups: companies providing apprenticeships for: Girls/women in apprenticed trades with a low proportion of women; Particularly disadvantaged apprenticeship-seekers (people with physical, psychological or mental impairment; people having social problems; people who spent part or all of their education in special needs schools or in general secondary/new secondary schools with special needs; slow learners after completion of compulsory schooling, etc); Participants in programmes offering extended apprenticeship training or the acquisition of partial skills; Young people aged 18+ and earning a standard apprentices' remuneration with at least one of the characteristics of the above groups, or early school leavers Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: companies and training institutions that are certified to provide a integrated vocational training (resp. extended vocational training)</p>



	<p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): company subsidies</p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: (in various form since the 1990ies) since 2009</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? PES</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Public employment services Austria (AMS)</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 2.800; PES</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. Number of entitled persons N/A.. 14,264 young people are funded per year.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. 28 Mio €</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. Subsidies up to 400 €/month (for 18+ in certain circumstances up to 755€/month) average per beneficiary: 1,932.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Girls/women in apprenticed trades with a low proportion of women;</p> <p>Particularly disadvantaged apprenticeship-seekers (people with physical, psychological or mental impairment; people having social problems; people who spent part or all of their education in special needs schools or in general secondary/new secondary schools with special needs; slow learners after completion of compulsory schooling, etc);</p> <p>Participants in programmes offering extended apprenticeship training or the acquisition of partial skills;</p> <p>Young people aged 18+ and earning a standard apprentices' remuneration with at least one of the characteristics of the above groups, or early school leavers</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Only youth</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)? N/A</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly; no</p>
Links to	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth</p>



<p>EU initiatives</p>	<p>Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>No</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>External evaluation by ÖBIF and ibw in 2015 shows high success rate and good integration of participants in the labour market. (http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/985_Lehrstellenfoerderung_AMS_Endbericht_Endversion_final.pdf)</p> <p>The evaluation provides basic information and does not focus on deadweight loss, substitution or displacement effects.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>The subsidy systems reached 2014 almost 14% of all who finished apprenticeships. The success of the intervention is high: 60% of the subsidised apprentices were successful in their training and 70% of those who finished a subsidised training scheme were also 2017 employed. This are high rates for disadvantaged young people. Of those young people who did not finish the subsidised apprenticeship only 32% were employed at the same time.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? Medium, since the coverage could be increased, but it helps reaching the aim.</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage?</p>



<p>the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)? more information (especially for certain target groups) is advisable, differences between the federal regions are irritating.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>A broadening of the target group (e.g. non-German speaking)</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>It focusses on certain groups with higher risks of not finding adequate apprenticeships, help them to finish their training, and thus enter the labour market. But for special risk groups (health issues) further labour market integration might need additional funding.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>Often companies don't want to take the risk to offer apprenticeships for certain risk groups. Especially in these cases the financial subsidies are a good trigger to involve the companies.</p>

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>Subsidies to company-based apprenticeships</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: Increase the number of offered apprenticeships, support quality of training</p> <p>Intended effects: number of apprenticeships is increased, coaching for apprentices, support for trainers in companies, establishment of training clusters</p> <p>Target groups: apprentices; companies providing apprenticeships:</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: companies have to provide vocational training, they can apply for various subsidies for internal further education and training, competitions, tutoring, for special target groups (like girls in technical professions, migrants...)</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of</p>



	<p>social policy): company subsidies</p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: since 2008</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry for research, science and economy (bmwfw), Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection, IEF (Insolvenz Entgelt Fonds), chamber of economy, chamber of labour, companies, training institutes,</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? IEF,</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: appr. 16.000/year</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. N/A</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. 160 Mio €</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. N/A</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? All apprentices</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Only youth (apprenticeships)</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly; no</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one? No</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? 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</p>



	<p>(original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>No evaluation but a synthesis report by ÖBIF and ibw in 2016 shows the effect, the costs of the basic subsidy system for apprenticeships, also evaluates certain support and coaching features for employers and apprentices: http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/Synthesebericht_Endbericht_ibw_oeibf_neu.pdf)</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>Especially the individual support and coaching methods (tutoring, trainings competitions...) are seen very positive both by employers and by apprentices.</p> <p>90% of the interviewed young people two years after finishing the apprenticeship are happy with their profession. Also the training and the education in the dual system is rated very positive.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention ?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Yes.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? High, the programme is a well established form of an incentive for companies to invest in apprenticeship training – not only to offer it, but to improve the quality.</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>I would not call it weakness but further promotion of train the trainer programmes would further enhance the quality</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>This programme focusses on all apprentices, so it does by this also reach risk groups, but it is not targeted on them.</p>



groups	
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention. Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts? The intervention initially helped companies to provide vocational training (again) lately it is a very good instrument to promote high quality vocational education in apprenticeships and to focus on the inclusion on certain target groups in certain branches (e.g. girls in technical profession) or special groups with difficulties entering the labour market (migrants, refugees)

Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

The European initiatives were very important for Austria, since the Austrian approach of the Training Guarantee served as an example and thus supported the acceptance of the measures in Austria. Further developments for LMP measures for youth were strongly integrated into the Youth Guarantee scheme and also the new law on Education Training till 18 can be seen in this development. Austria's Implementation Plan revolves furthermore around the Training Guarantee, Future for Youth Action and Youth Coaching schemes

School social work as a measure to reduce school-dropout rates is co-funded with means of the European Social Funds.

A good overview is provided here:
<https://broschuerenservice.sozialministerium.at/Home/Download?publicationId=29>



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 ¹³	Starting year; end year (if not ongoing)	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures ¹⁴	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ¹⁵
1	Extended periods of apprenticeship training and acquisition of partial skills	National	d)	(2003) 2015	National	No	Yes, positive	4	2
2	Personal assistance in the workplace	National	c)	1992	National	No	Yes, positive	4	2
3	Children and youth services	National/Regional	a)	N/A	National	No	No	3	3

Comments on Table 6

The examples of youth employment interventions related to social policies highlight on the one hand the clearly targeted approaches for young people with special needs or disabilities (Extended periods of apprenticeship training and acquisition of partial skills; personal assistance in the workplace) enabling youth from the target group to gain more independency by entering the labour market and living a more autonomous life. The example of children and youth services in general, on the other hand, is not an active labour market policy measure per se, but without these services - starting from advice and support for the guardians to the provision of save lodging in foster care - young people coming from families in need of the services would in many cases not be able to fulfill the tasks in education and training. Social workers, family support, socio-pedagogues in institutions build the frame in which the young people are enabled to

¹³ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

¹⁴ 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable

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



follow their training. Therefore these measures and interventions should be counted among the youth unemployment interventions.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Extended periods of apprenticeship training and acquisition of partial skills (Verlängerte Lehrausbildung und Teillehre) (successor of integrated Vocational Training)
Short description	<p>Aim of the measure: create opportunities for disadvantaged persons with special placement handicaps to get a vocational training</p> <p>Intended effects: integration of people with special placement handicaps</p> <p>Target groups: individuals who could not be placed in formal-sector apprenticeships and who belong to the following groups: individuals with special educational needs at the end of compulsory education spent, at least in part, under the curriculum of a special-needs school; individuals who have not finished their schooling at general lower secondary schools or have finished schooling with too many negative marks; people with disabilities within the meaning of the Disability Employment Act (BeinstG) and/or the Länder's disability legislation; or socially disadvantaged individuals who, under vocational guidance, have been found to be unlikely to succeed in apprenticeships</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: defined in the Disabled People Employment Act or the provincial Disability Laws</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): training, support for people with disabilities</p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: (integrative vocational training since 2003) since 2015</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection, Federal Ministry for Health, Federal Provinces</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Social Affairs Ministry Service (SMS),NGOs,</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 150; national</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. 2015: 6.787 (of all 109.963 apprentices)</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. approx. 15 Mio €</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure</p>



	data what is available. n/a
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</p> <p>Young people with special needs (health related placement handicaps) or with severe learning problems .</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>No</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>No</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>In the year 2008 an evaluation of the Integrative Vocational Training (IBA) was carried out externally by KMU Forschung Österreich (https://www.bmfwf.gv.at/Berufsausbildung/LehrlingsUndBerufsausbildung/Documents/Endbericht_IBA.pdf) and in 2012 the ibw carried out an evaluation: (http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/iba_2012_ibw_fb167.pdf)</p>
Summary of evaluation	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p>



<p>n results</p>	<p>The evaluation of 2008 described the target group (2/3 male, more than 50% coming from special schools, appr. 60% with severe learning difficulties, appr. 30% emotional problems) and the success of the measure: almost all participants of the part-apprenticeship and 70% of the extended apprenticeship completed the exam successfully. In 2008 the acceptance of the partly-qualification was not widely spread in the economy, so – it was stated – the graduates will need further work assistance later on and thus will be targeted by another LMP measurement.</p> <p>Also the evaluation of 2012 presented the IBA as success-story: 52% of the graduates were still in employment one month after finishing the programme, 22% entered a regular apprenticeship. It was pointed out that company-based IBA proved more effective than supra-company IBA regarding the further employment chances. It also was pointed out that there was a big improvement over time regarding the success rate in the final exams.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? yes</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? For the risk group of people with special needs and severe learning problems: high</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</p> <p>Information for the companies regarding the support they might receive when offering extended periods of apprenticeship training and acquisition of partial skills should be intensified to widen the field of professions.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>The extended periods of apprenticeship training allow young persons with special needs (e.g. learning difficulties) to stay in the dual education system, and for the majority of beneficiaries also to finish the vocational education successfully. But the chances for employment after the intervention – especially when fulfilled in supra-company training institutions – are still very challenging.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>It addresses challenges to enter vocational training for certain groups of young people. The challenges for further employment cannot be overcome</p>



target risk groups	by this measurement alone.
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention. Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>Success factor is the intensive individual support for the young person by a Vocational Training Assistant. The apprentices as well as the trainers in the companies have a personal contact person thus providing an additional attachment figure for the young person.</p>

Name of the initiative	Personal Assistance in the Workplace (Arbeitsassistenz)
Short description	<p>Aim of the measure: enable people with severe functional impairment to gain and keep a position in the labour market</p> <p>Intended effects: integration of people with disabilities</p> <p>Target groups: people with disabilities/illness who are in work or available for the labour market and have a degree of disability of 50 percent (proof: e.g. notice on belonging to the group of people with disabilities in receipt of benefits in accordance with the Disabled People Employment Act or the provincial Disability Laws)</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: defined in the Disabled People Employment Act or the provincial Disability Laws</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): work adjustment and job assistance for disabled</p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: since 1992</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection, Federal Ministry for Health, Federal Provinces</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Social Affairs Ministry Service (SMS),NGOs,</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 2.400, national</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. 4.977</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. approx. 24 Mio. For the whole programme.</p>



	Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. N/A
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • people with disabilities/illness who are in work or available for the labour market and have a degree of disability of 50 percent • young people with special educational needs, with learning disabilities or with social and emotional disabilities up to the age of 24 years and • > businesses and companies that employ or are prepared to employ these people.
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>No</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>No</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>Even this programme runs already 25 years, only two external evaluations are available: Blumberger (ibe) 2002 (http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/arbeitsassistentz%20evaluierung.pdf) and from P und P Sozialforschung 2012</p>



	<p>(http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/aass2012_poeschko_et_al.pdf). Of the work assistance for young people no evaluation could be found.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>Both evaluations highlight the importance of the work assistance for the affected individuals for their integration. They also point out the growing acceptance of the offer as well as the growing need.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? yes</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? For the risk group of people with disabilities: high since yearly more than 13.000, persons who would not have equal opportunities on the labour market, can work and lead a more autonomous life.</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</p> <p>The report of P und P Sozialforschung points to resources / budget restrictions that limits the coverage – implying that the whole target group would need more (more intense) counselling and support, and upholding the quality of the personal support is often very difficult.</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? This is difficult to answer, it is generally seen as a very good initiative, the only weakness might be in the coverage – since many companies are still afraid to employ people with disabilities, thus more places are needed.</p>
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>Yes, this programme addresses the needs of young people with severe functional impairment and helps them to enter the labour market and receive vocational training. Since the programme is not restricted to the age group of youth the affected youth also have good chances to stay in the labour market.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good'	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p>



practice' example	<p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>The individual counselling and support system for people with severe functional impairments helps to address the needs of each beneficiary in the most appropriate way.</p>
-------------------	---

Name of the initiative	Services of child and youth welfare in general
Short description	<p>Aim of the measure: One of the main concerns is to increase the ability of families to bring up their children as an indispensable condition for an optimal development of children and young people. They lie primarily in the preventive field, and thus include a series of social services, which offer a broad range of advice, support, help and guidance as well as parental education.</p> <p>Intended effects: promote well-being and save environment for children and youth</p> <p>Target groups: Families where the parents or guardians objectively endanger the well-being of the child</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: children and young people in need of support, of promotion of the development of an autonomous personality and of protection of violence (respectively their parents/guardians) with (at least temporarily) residence in Austria</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): social services</p> <p>Level: national / regional</p> <p>Start/ end date: federal act on children and youth welfare 2013</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Federal Ministry of Families and Youth, Federal Provinces, Youth Offices (on municipal/district level)</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Youth Offices</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 2016: 606 Mio €, national and regional</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job. 2016: 34.053</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>2016: 606 Mio €</p>



	Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. n/a
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</p> <p>Children and youth who are endangered in their wellbeing and safety in their families. They receive different forms of support from parents education to accommodation in foster families.</p>
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>No</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>No</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)? If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>There exist various evaluations of different offers of child and youth services. Regarding the impact on labour market integration of youth the external evaluation of ibe for the Federal Province Upper Austria is of interest: http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/evaluierung-angebotslandschaft-oberoesterreich_ibe_april-2015.pdf The evaluations / report do hold basic information on the usage and implementation of the services-</p>



<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>The effect of social services (direct or indirect, connected to child and youth services or in other fields of social work) are pointed out. Especially the importance of provision of accommodation and thus the provision of save surroundings for growing up as a basis for successfully staying in education or entering the vocational training field is pointed out.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention ?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? partly</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? The numbers of cases indicate the importance of the intervention, but the impact for the labour market cannot be evaluated.</p> <p>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.)? In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>Especially the offers of accommodation in residential care (e.g. shared apartments with support of social workers, youth institutions, socio-pedagogic institutions...) are important to provide shelter and the opportunity to continue training, but since it is not the intention to keep the children completely out of the family many return too early and revive their problems – which they then take back into the work place inducing more problems....</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>The social work measures of the child and youth services do not address causes of unemployment, but they tackle social exclusion. They provide stabilisation for young individuals in demanding situations and help them to develop self-efficiency to reach better social inclusion.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>Since social services for children and youth (in general) can provide the</p>



	<p>framework helpful for social inclusion, but are not focussing on employability and integration in the labour market I would not consider it as a good practice but rather as a supportive factor or even prerequisite for other targeted measures.</p>
--	---



References

Amg Tirol: Analyse des aktuellen Übergangsmagementsystems für junge Menschen zwischen 15 und 25 Jahren in Tirol (2016), online: http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/kost-tirol_uebergang-schule-beruf_integrationsmodule_2016.pdf

bmask - Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection (ed.): Studie zur Unterstützung der arbeitsmarktpolitischen Zielgruppe „NEET“ (2012), online: https://www.sozialministerium.at/cms/site/attachments/2/6/0/CH3434/CMS1459845044_748/26_bmask_neet-studie.pdf

bmask – Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection (ed.): Youth and Work in Austria, Reporting Year 2015/2016 (2016) online: <https://broschuerenservice.sozialministerium.at/Home/Download?publicationId=29>

bmask – Federal Ministry of Labour, Social Affairs and Consumer Protection (ed.): Aktive Arbeitsmarktpolitik in Österreich 2016 (2016), online: http://www.ams.at/_docs/001_Aktive_Arbeitsmarktpolitik.pdf

BMFJ – Federal Ministry for Families and Youth (ed.): Kinder- und Jugendhilfestatistik 2016 (2017), online: <https://www.bmfj.gv.at/familie/kinder-jugendhilfe/statistik.html>

BMFJ – Federal Ministry for Families and Youth (ed.): 7. Bericht zur Lage der Jugend in Österreich (2016) online: <http://www.bmfj.gv.at/jugend/jugendforschung/jugendbericht/siebter-bericht-zur-lage-der-jugend-in-oesterreich-2016.html>

BMSG – Federal Ministry for Social Security and Generations (ed): Arbeitsassistentz in Österreich (2002), online: <http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/arbeitsassistentz%20evaluierung.pdf>

BundesKOST (ed): Jugendcoaching Jahresbericht 2016 (2017), online: <http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Jahresbericht-Jugendcoaching-2016.pdf>

BundesKOST (ed): Online-Befragung: Zusammenarbeit Jugendzentren und Jugendcoaching (2016), online: http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Zusammenarbeit-Jugendzentren-Jugendcoaching_Bundeskost-Bericht-2016.pdf

Heckl E., Dörflinger C., Dorr A., Klimmer S. (KMU Forschung Austria): Evaluierung der integrativen Berufsausbildung (IBA) (2008), online: https://www.bmfwf.gv.at/Berufsausbildung/LehrlingsUndBerufsausbildung/Documents/Endbericht_IBA.pdf



L&R Sozialforschung: Evaluierung der überbetrieblichen Lehrausbildung (ÜBA) in Österreich (2011), online:

http://www.lrsocialresearch.at/files/Endbericht_UeBA_Evaluierung_final_LR.pdf

Lentner M., Rigler S., Niederberger K. (ibe): Evaluierung der Angebotslandschaft für Jugendliche in Oberösterreich (2015), online:

http://www.ibe.co.at/fileadmin/AblageBox/Projektdownloads/Evaluierung_Angebotslandschaft.pdf

Litschel Veronika, Löffler Roland: Meta-Analyse zu rezenten Studien im Bereich „AMP-Maßnahmen für Jugendliche“, Betrachtungen mit dem Schwerpunkt „Berufsausbildung“ (2015), online:

http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/AMS_report_109.pdf

Dornmayr Helmt: Berufseinmündung von AbsolventInnen der Integrativen Berufsausbildung. Eine Analyse der Beschäftigungsverläufe (2012), online:

http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/iba_2012_ibw_fb167.pdf

Dornmayr H., Löffler R., Litschel V. (öibf & ibw): Evaluierung der Lehrstellenförderung des AMS Österreich (2017) online:

http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/985_Lehrstellenfoerderung_AMS_Endbericht_Endversion_final.pdf

P und P Sozialforschung: 20 Jahre Arbeitsassistenten in Österreich (2012), online:

http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/aass2012_poeschko_etal.pdf

Pessl G., Steiner M. Wagner E.: Evaluierung AusbildungsFit („Produktionsschule“) – Endbericht (2015), online: http://www.bundeskost.at/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/evaluierung-ausbildungsfit_endbericht_2015.pdf

Prospect Research: Begleitende Evaluation der Überbetrieblichen Berufsausbildung 2 in Wien. Vergleichende Analyse der ÜBA-Februarlehrgänge 2011 differenziert nach ÜBA-Modell (2013), online: http://www.prospectgmbh.at/wp/wp-content/uploads/2015/02/Endbericht_UeBA2.pdf

Schlögl P., Dornmar H., Mayerl M., Winler B. (öibf & ibw): Hintergrundanalyse zur Wirksamkeit der betrieblichen Lehrstellenförderung (gemäß §19c BAG) (2016) online:

http://www.forschungsnetzwerk.at/downloadpub/Synthesebericht_Endbericht_ibw_oelib_neu.pdf