



Youth employment policies in Czech Republic

EXCEPT working paper no. 33
June 2018

Alena Bičáková

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:

Bičáková, A. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Czech Republic*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 33. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-402-2 (pdf)

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



Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Czech Republic	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview	7
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions	11
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	12
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives	26
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 Czech Republic

The Czech Republic has one of the lowest unemployment rates in the EU, a below-average youth unemployment rate and a below-average NEET rate (see for example Table 1 and Figures 14 and 15 in Joint Employment Report 2017 at <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en>).

It is also one of the countries with the lowest share of adults who are low performers in basic skills (see Figure 10, as above).

The share of early leavers from education and training is also far below the EU average, even if slightly increasing since 2014 (Europe 2020 targets: statistics and indicators for Czech Republic, available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/european-semester/european-semester-your-country/czech-republic/europe-2020-targets-statistics-and-indicators-czech-republic_en#early-leavers-from-education-and-training).

As a result, the various youth unemployment groups, early school leavers or the low-skilled youth receive relatively smaller attention in the Czech Republic compared to other EU countries whether this is in media, public opinion or as the key topics of mainstream policy. Note that, for example, only one NUTS 2 region (Severozápad) in the Czech Republic is eligible for the Youth Employment Initiative.

Overall, the labor market in the Czech Republic has been recently very tight and suffered from labor shortages rather than excess labor and high unemployment.

The labor mobility remains, however, very low and there are substantial differences in labor market performance across regions.

Exceptions to the good labor market performance described above, there are three risk groups, which still remain underrepresented in the labor market and these are: mothers with young children, members of Roma community and disabled workers (see for example Country Report Czech Republic 2017).

These groups perform much worse in the Czech Republic compared to the EU average and (in particular the first one) receive much more attention both in media and in policy. The employment rate of women with a young child is one of the lowest in the EU and is a result of generous family policies, lack of available childcare for very young children, limited enforcement of family-leave-related job protection and still wide-spread gender role attitudes that mothers should stay at home with children. The low employment rate of women with a young child contrasts with the high employment rate among women without a young child (Joint Employment Report 2017, page 44). See also Bičáková and Kalíšková (2016).

Labor market underrepresentation of Roma and the disabled are also more in focus of the mainstream policy, which is also partly initiated by the emphasis these groups



receive in the EC documents and recommendations (see for example Country Report Czech Republic 2017).

The same is true also for the low-skilled. While the share of the low-skilled in the Czech Republic is low when compared to the rest of the EU, their labor market performance is far below the EU average (Country Report Czech Republic 2017).

As a consequence, while the young unemployed seem to receive limited attention in public opinion and media and are not necessarily the main priority of public policy, they are in focus as subsets of the risk groups mentioned above (women with young children, Roma, disabled, low-skilled).

As for the ratings concerning mainstream policy, the highest focus is to groups covered by measures related to the Youth Guarantee and Youth Employment Initiative. All young people and higher education graduates receive also more attention. See the measures described in the sections that follow (e.g. Cesta pro mladé).

As for the focus and the existence of academic research:

Unfortunately, empirical research of the Czech labor market and labor market policies is seriously underdeveloped – as reflected in the standard research paper databases, such as <https://ideas.repec.org/>.

There are only very few studies about the Czech labor market, most of which are only descriptive. Rigorous counterfactual policy evaluations – which are standard in applied economic research elsewhere - do not almost exist. One of the main reasons for the lack of adequate academic research is probably the very limited data availability. Not only academic researchers have no or very limited access to labor market data (e.g. the registered unemployed, ALMP participants etc.), but also much of the key information about the labor market participants is not even monitored, processed and centralized.

Table 1 “Risk group” construction¹

Potential risk groups	Importance by actors		
	Public opinion/ Media*	Mainstream policy	Academic research
All young people	3	3	2
Young unemployed	2	3	2
Early school leavers	2	2	1
Young people with low skills	1	2	2
Young people with outdated qualifications	1	1	1
Young people without qualifications	1	1	1
NEET	2	2	2
Higher education graduates	3	3	2
Migrants/Ethnic minorities	2	2	2
Teenage/single parents	1	1	2

¹ 1=no significant role to 5=very important



Young people from workless families	1	1	1
Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas	1	3	1
Young people with a disability	1	2	1
Mothers of young children (who often become non-employed, i.e., unemployed or inactive, after family leave)	3	3	2

The risk groups that I consider not to be adequately addressed (some of which may not even be adequately monitored) are: Teenage/single parents, Young people from workless families, Young people with outdated qualifications or no qualifications.

The labor market performance in general in the Czech Republic is currently very good and these groups are relatively small from the perspective of “national interests”. The second reason is the lack of data and the lack of information in the data available to actually “identify” members of these groups.

I am not aware of any regularly published official population statistics about labor market performance specifically focused on these groups. The only exception are single parents but even there the information is limited.

I do not think the standard officially collected data, e.g. of the unemployed registered at a labor office (publically not available), even include information about households or other family members to determine who is single/teenage parent or who comes from workless families. Similarly, detailed information about qualification and whether they are obsolete is not collected or available.

Occasionally, these groups are in focus of specific non-profit organizations.



Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Indicator	Year		
		2005	2010	2015 or the last year of available data, specify
1	Total number of active labour market programmes	15	12	14 ²
1.1	including youth-targeted ³	11	8	10
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	59,809	64,596	89,212
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	1.17%	1.24%	1.72%
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes:			
3.1	Total number	25,024 ⁴	5,813 ⁵	12,508 ⁶
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29) ⁷	5.43% ⁸	1.45% ⁹	6.66% ¹⁰
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	41.8% ¹¹	9.0% ¹²	24.6% ¹³
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (thousands EUR)	139,035.3	245,289.9	357,706.1
4.2	% of GDP	0.12	0.16	0.21
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:			
5.1	Total amount (thousands EUR)	69,101.3	30,753.9	87,714.9
5.2	% of GDP	0.06	0.02	0.05
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
6.1	Total amount (thousands EUR)	4,994	NA	1,829 ¹⁴
6.2	% of GDP	0.004	NA	0.001
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	3.59	NA	0.51

Note: Data Sources: <http://portal.mpsv.cz/sz/stat/vydaje>; <https://www.czso.cz/csu/czso/databaze-registry>; <https://www.cnb.cz>

² year 2016

³ row 1.1 shows the subset of the programmes that also involve youth

⁴ year 2016

⁵ younger than 20 years (NA for 15-29)

⁶ year 2016; younger than 25 years (NA for 15-29); 21,982 younger than 30 years

⁷ younger than 25 years (NA for 15-29)

⁸ younger than 25 years (NA for 15-29)

⁹ younger than 20 years (NA for 15-29)

¹⁰ year 2016; younger than 25 years (NA for 15-29)

¹¹ younger than 25 years (NA for 15-29)

¹² younger than 20 years (NA for 15-29)

¹³ year 2016, younger than 25 years (NA for 15-29)

¹⁴ year 2016; Youth Guarantee and Youth Employment Initiative regional projects



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 ¹⁵	Preventive / reactive ¹⁶	Youth specific	Main source of funding ¹⁷	Linked to EU initiatives ¹⁸	Main actors of delivery ¹⁹	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-) orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	2	3	Partly	1	No	1	No	Partly
Vocational guidance, career counselling	2	3	Partly	1	No	1	No	Partly
Training (with certificates)	2	3	Partly	1	No	1	No	Partly
Training (without certificates)	2	2	Partly	1		1	No	No
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	3	2	Partly	1	1,2	1	No	No
Direct job creation	3	2	Partly	1,2	No	1	No	No
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	1	2	No		No	1	No	No
Other	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments on table 3

It is rather hard to summarize the last 5-6 years, as there is not much continuation in the ALMP measures and their focus changed over that period (also partly affected by the focus and timing of the EFS projects and EU initiatives). Some of the more universal measures recently started targeting youth specifically etc. Moreover, there is little information available on the ALMP expenditures or outcomes by age of the applicants, so it is hard to assess the importance for the youth.

¹⁵ Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

¹⁶ To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems preventive = 1; reactive = 2; both=3.

¹⁷ EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

¹⁸ Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other - 6

¹⁹ 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



Employment incentives, i.e. subsidies to employers who hire young unemployed individuals as trainees or short-term employees were by far the most important measure to tackle youth unemployment. Second most important measure was direct job creation. They are mostly implemented by local Labor Offices.

Main actors of delivery are either local Labor Offices or Fund for Further Education (www.fdv.cz), agency subordinated to and co-funded by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.

The first three rows of Table 3 also reflect the features of the measure “Cesta pro mladé” described in detail in section 3.2., which is preventive (targets students in final years of school), carried out by Fund for Further Education, and which uses also feedback from the youth and other stakeholders to improve delivery.

As far as I know, no rigorous policy evaluations of ALMP measures over the given period are currently available. However, EU funds (ESF OP Employment) were allocated to the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs (<http://www.vupsv.cz/?p=index&site=en>) to carry out ALMP evaluations (http://www.vupsv.cz/index.php?p=evaluation_of_aep&site=default) but no outcomes are publically available yet.

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
There is more focus on school-leavers and youth employment in recent years.	There is lack of structured easily accessible publically available information. Centralized monitoring system of (at least) the registered unemployed and of the ALMP participants and their outcomes is missing. Important information is not collected or data is not available. To be able to create effective evidence-based policy measures, the policy makers need to improve monitoring, data availability (improve data collection, data processing, create centralized database of job seekers, active labor market policy participants, individuals supported by various measures and their labor market outcomes).
Some of the policy measures seem to make effective use of the ESF funds.	Absence of counterfactual policy evaluations. Rigorous evidence-based evaluation studies of the ALMP measures are either not carried out by public institutions or not available. Academic research institutions have very limited access to the data that exist (only at highly aggregated level). Individual-level micro data about the job seekers or ALMP participants crucial for policy evaluation not available at all.
There are recent attempts to provide job-	Overall long term situation (past decade): Lack



<p>seekers centralized internet-based information about the labor market: via a catalogue of existing jobs (their content, qualification requirements, typical wage at http://www.nsp.cz/), as well as centralized internet-based information about career counselling services available to the job seekers by various institutions in the Czech Republic (at http://www.fdv.cz/jobhub). There is also attempt to consolidate / integrate the “scattered” available services and therefore also improve their quality and effectiveness. There is also a centralized online catalogue of available traineeships offered to students (http://www.cestapromlade.cz/).</p>	<p>of cohesion between different programs, policies should be managed more centrally, the big picture should be cleared. There is also lack of communication among the various public institutions and other stakeholders. There is lack of continuity of ALMP measures (which is however also a result of time-limitations of the ESF projects / programmes and of the political cycles in the Czech Republic) and the long-term strategies are not clear. This is already apparent from the rather unstructured and scattered information (partly new, partly very obsolete) available at the main websites of the Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs and the Labour Office of the Czech Republic.</p>
	<p>The legislative grounds should be also improved to enable effective ALMP. For example, the notion of “traineeship” or “trainee” is not clearly defined by the law, making it much harder to implement “traineeship” contracts as part of the ALMP measures.</p>



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group ²⁰	Type ²¹	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Eva-luation	“Good practice” ²² example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ²³	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ²⁴
1	Cesta pro mladé	National	A	1,2,3	2016	EU and national	No	NA	Yes	NA	NA
2	Záruky pro mladé	National (regional implementation)	D	2,3,4,	2015	EU and national	Youth Guarantee	NA	No	NA	NA
3	Iniciativa podpory zaměstnanosti mládeže	Regional	D	2,3,4	2015	EU and national	Youth Employment Initiative	NA	No	NA	NA

Comments about Table 5

The three measures were selected as basically the only three major ongoing measures that are specifically targeted at youth. All three are to a great extent funded from EU sources and the latter two are directly linked to EU Initiatives.

As for the lack of evaluations: note that the measure started only recently, so major evaluation is not possible yet. Nevertheless: I believe the problem is in the lack of good data and the lack of human resources capable of conducting a rigorous evaluation

²⁰ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

²¹ (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

²² 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.”

²³ 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.

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



analysis. The only information about the outcomes that I was able to get is presented in this report.

As mentioned above: EU funds (ESF OP Employment) were allocated to the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs (<http://www.vupsv.cz/?p=index&site=en>) to carry out ALMP evaluations (http://www.vupsv.cz/index.php?p=evaluation_of_aep&site=default) but as far as I know they work with data from the periods (2014,2015) before this measure was implemented and no outcomes are publically available yet.

I rated the first measure (Cesta pro mladé) as an example of only a „partially“ Good practice, as there are no rigorous evaluations of the outcomes available yet. See also my other reservations in the text. This was based on the rather strict conditions for a measure to qualify as a Good practice provided.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<p>Short name: Cesta pro mladé (The Journey for Youth)</p> <p>Long name: Cesta k uplatnění na trhu práce (The Journey to Succeed in the Labour Market)</p>
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>Increase the chance of school-leavers to find a well-matching first job by providing students (in the final 1-2 years of their education) a traineeship in a firm, a course of soft skills and career counselling.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>Provide students with at least some work experience (via the traineeship) and with additional competencies to increase their employability and job search outcomes.</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>The duration of the “course”: 80-240 hours (1 - 6 months)</p> <p>The course has three elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - internship (traineeship) in a firm in student’s field of study, with a mentor (The internship often takes place during the summer before the school completion.) - e-learning course of soft skills - career counselling with HR specialist (job interview skills, CV writing) <p>The participants receive a certificate that they completed all the components of the course.</p> <p>Objectives: Increases students’ chance to find a job and a well-matching job. Provide students with at least some work experience (via the</p>



	<p>traineeship) and with additional competencies to increase their employability and job search outcomes.</p> <p>Target groups: students in the final 1-2 years of their secondary or tertiary education</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: full-time students younger than 26 in their final 1-2 years of the schools at the secondary or tertiary education level</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Training (with certificates), Vocational guidance, career counselling,</p> <p>Level: National</p> <p>Start/ end date: April 1, 2016 – March 31, 2020</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? To some extent – via focus groups with stakeholders and potential participants (see more details below under Youth Involvement).</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Fund for Further Education (http://www.fdv.cz/) http://www.eaea.org/en/membership/eaea-members/czech-republic-fund-of-further-education-ffe-associate-member.html</p> <p>FDV is an agency subordinated to and co-funded by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 9,900,033 EUR (267 300 896 CZK)</p> <p>Funded from ESF (Operational Programme Employment, 82,39%) and state budget (17,61%).</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Planned (expected) number of people covered: 4 500</p> <p>The 4 500 planned participants correspond to about 0.5 - 1 % of the entire group of students entitled to participate over the duration of the programme.</p> <p>Number of firms involved: around 1000</p> <p>Number of courses initiated (i.e. number of supported participants) since the beginning in December 2016 till the end of 2017: 574</p>



	<p>Approximately 75% of participants of these courses were students at final years of tertiary education.</p> <p>Information from the evaluation reports submitted by the firms at the end of the traineeships:</p> <p>31 % of trainees were offered an “agreement on work performance” (onetime work contract for a specified work with limits on hours worked and total remuneration), 10 % were offered a regular full-time work contract,</p> <p>12 % were offered an external cooperation (e.g. as self-employed) and 13 % were offered other forms of (unpaid) cooperation relevant for their final year(s) of education</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis:</p> <p>NA, the program started only in December 2016</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary: 2,200 EUR (59,400.2 CZK) (calculated as total expenditure per the planned number of people covered)</p> <p>Costs per trainee covered to the firm: around 1,481 EUR (40 000 CZK)</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>The program is targeted to students in the final 1-2 years of their secondary or tertiary education.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>NA</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</p> <p>NA</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>Yes.</p> <p>The participating students as well as the participating companies fill in evaluation forms before the traineeship and when it is completed. In addition, project team members visit the trainees in companies to gather</p>



	<p>additional feedback from them, their mentors and employers.</p> <p>Moreover, the project team members organize focus groups with participating students, companies, as well as with potential (prospective) student participants (i.e. students in the last stage of their secondary or tertiary education). The topics include not only the traineeships and the provided courses and counselling, but also the current situation in the labor market etc.</p> <p>The feedback from these activities is used to design or adjust the rules, eligibility conditions, methods, processes etc. of the project.</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, the program is not linked to any of the EU initiative from the list. It is, however, mostly funded (over 80 % of its budget) from ESF Operational Programme Employment.</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?</p> <p>No, the program started only in December 2016.</p> <p>Internal evaluations are going on, the first interim report should be available in December 2017. Information requested from FDV on the first results is summarized above.</p> <p>Medium-term effects will be also monitored. Information about future labor market outcomes (employment – when, type and duration, job match etc.) of the beneficiaries will be collected via a survey among the participating students conducted one year after the completion of the course.</p> <p>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>NA</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>08.01.2018:</p> <p>1. The procedural evaluation should be ready in February.</p> <p>2. The Fund shared the following information with me about the immediate outcomes of the project (at the end of the traineeships):</p> <p>Up to date (on January 8, 2018) information from the evaluation reports submitted by the firms at the end of the traineeships:</p> <p>Out of all the traineeship participants:</p> <p>50 % were offered (by the end of the traineeship) some kind of cooperation by the firm</p> <p>in the case of other 27 % of the participants, the firm was considering to offer some kind of cooperation</p> <p>Out of the 50 % who were offered cooperation:</p> <p>60 % of trainees were offered an “agreement on work performance” (onetime work contract for a specified work with limits on hours worked and total remuneration),</p> <p>23 % were offered a regular work contract,</p> <p>the remaining 17 % were offered some kind of other cooperation, e.g. external cooperation (e.g. as self-employed) or some unpaid cooperation relevant for their final year(s) of education</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage?</p> <p>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>This measure has the potential to considerably improve the matching process between the school leavers and firms. It provides students with at least some work experience and additional skills for the job search. It helps reduce the informational asymmetries both on the side of students as well as employers. Based on the first results, the traineeship lead to future cooperation between the student and the firm in 66% cases.</p> <p>As the measure is likely to also improve the match, i.e. the fit between the</p>



	<p>student and the firm, it has also potential to enhance the quality and duration of the subsequent employment.</p> <p>However, to assess the real impact of the measure would require an evidence-based counterfactual evaluation, as the results may be affected by “self-selection”. In particular, the course is being offered to any eligible students who apply for it. May be, it is the most able, industrious and capable students who apply for the course, i.e. those who would have found a good job when they finish the school even in the absence of this measure (i.e. even if they had not participated in the course). I.e. part of the success may be just given by the ex-ante quality of the pool of the applicants. Note that 75% of the students who have already started participating in the course were tertiary-education students, who are likely to have higher chance to find a job than the secondary-education students.</p> <p>There are many channels through which the provider delivers the information about this programme to the target group (eligible students), including internet sources, visits to schools and universities, job fairs, visits to firms; there are also 7 regional managers to helps spread the information etc. However, there is no priority in terms of the types of students approached.</p> <p>The measure should try to identify and specifically target the risk groups among the students and give them priority.</p> <p>The measure is rather costly. If the process proves beneficial for both students and the firms, maybe the funds for the firms could be reduced or the firms could even co-finance some of the activities.</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. School-leavers are less attractive to employers and often become unemployed due to the lack of work experience, lack of soft-skills and job search competencies, due to the lack of information about firms, types of work, vacancies etc. Firms are also reluctant to hire school-leavers due to the lack of work experience and no information about their productivity. This measure is preventive and helps overcome at least some of these problems - i.e. reasons for high unemployment among school leavers. However, it does not include the most risky groups, which are individuals who do not reach the final years of secondary or tertiary education (i.e. the low-skilled with less than secondary education).</p> <p>Moreover, as a new program, it invites anybody eligible to participate up to the limit of 4500 individuals. The program does not specifically target the most risky groups among the eligible participants, as any eligible applicant</p>



	is offered the course.
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>With the reservations concerning the implementation (see above), I consider this an example of good practice.</p> <p>The idea is to connect students with employers before they finish school and therefore facilitate the matching process between school-leavers and firms. It helps improve employers' information about students and students' information about jobs. This should result in a better quality of the match as well. The measure increases employers' chance to choose students and students' chance to choose employers.</p> <p>School leavers with some work experiences (a traineeship) are preferable to school leavers with no experience. Soft-skills and career counselling helps school-leavers during the job search. Moreover, the traineeship may directly result in future cooperation between the student and the firm and subsequent employment.</p> <p>I think this measure should be easily replicated in other contexts.</p>

Name of the initiative	<p>“Záruky pro mladé v ...“ (“Youth Guarantee in ...”)</p> <p>This is a series of 11 regional projects. The name of the specific measure contains the name of each region instead of “...”.</p>
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>To help young job seekers (registered as unemployed for at least 3 months) to get work experience, gain work habits and find jobs.</p> <p>Intended effects: To increase employability of the young job seekers and help them find jobs.</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>The main component of this measure is providing financial incentives (subsidies) to employers to create jobs for young job seekers with no or little work experience. This is based on the co-operation between local Labor Offices and employers, who receive wage subsidies - subsidy to cover part of the wage cost up to 890 EUR per month (24 000 CZK). The subsidy lasts between 6 and 12 months. Jobs are “tailored” to selected job seekers – i.e. labor offices cooperate with the specific firm that offers a newly created job to the selected job seeker. In some cases shorter</p>



	<p>employment contracts of a maximum of 0.5 of workload and a maximum of 3 months are offered instead as “A work to try” (“Práce na zkoušku”) to help prepare the unemployed for their future jobs. The monthly subsidy in this case is between 370-444 EUR per month (10,000-12,000 CZK).</p> <p>Moreover, employers may get additional subsidy for providing on-the-job training or a reorientation course to the participant. They can also get a subsidy to cover the cost of a mentor for the participant for 4-7 months.</p> <p>In addition, labor offices provide or cover motivational courses, counselling, and services to help in finding a job etc. The actual list of measures varies by region but the main focus is very similar.</p> <p>Target groups: young job-seekers (up to 29 years of age), registered as unemployed for at least three months</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>To be eligible for the subsidized job: job-seekers (younger than 29) must be registered at Labor Office for at least 3 months with a maximum of three year work experience since they left education.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Employment incentives; Training; Reorientation; Counselling;</p> <p>Level: regional, 11 regional projects “Youth Guarantee in”</p> <p>Start/ end date: December 2015 – December 2019</p> <p>implemented gradually, so timing varies by region</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p> <p>No, only the employers cooperate with Labor Offices in designing the subsidized jobs for the job seekers.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>Local Labor Offices in the selected regions.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: approx. 34,556 thousand EUR (933 million CZK)</p> <p>Funded from ESF (Operational Programme Employment, 85%) and state budget (15%).</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Expected / planned number of participants: 4,500</p> <p>Results by September 25, 2017:</p> <p>3 700 participants entered the program</p>



	<p>2 210 signed (temporary / short-term – see above) work contracts</p> <p>Expenditure on subsidies to employers so far: 13,926 thousand EUR (376 million CZK)</p> <p>The highest share of job-seekers below 29 who participate in a given region was 5 % (Pardubický region) and in a given district 18 % (Rychnov nad Kněžnou).</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>This cannot be determined as the measure started only recently and the timing of implementation varies across regions.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Young job-seekers (up to 29 years of age), registered as unemployed for at least three months, with no or little work experience.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>To young unemployed.</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)? NA</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>Youth Guarantee</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>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>Note that the measure started only recently, so major evaluation is not possible yet. Nevertheless: I believe the problem is in the lack of good data</p>



	<p>and the lack of human resources capable of conducting a rigorous evaluation analysis.</p> <p>There are “some” internal evaluations (records of individual outcomes are stored) but these are not available.</p> <p>As mentioned above: EU funds (ESF OP Employment) were allocated to the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs (http://www.vupsv.cz/?p=index&site=en) to carry out ALMP evaluations (http://www.vupsv.cz/index.php?p=evaluation_of_aep&site=default) but as far as I know they work with data from the periods (2014,2015] before this measure was implemented and no outcomes are publically available yet.</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)? NA</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>NA</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage?</p> <p>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>The measure is rather important – in terms of the budget, expected number of participants, as well as its objectives, but there is little information about the actual implementation, about the participants and about their future labor market outcomes.</p> <p>The participants and their future labor market outcomes should be closely monitored and data collected and centralized at national level, so that this particular measure could be evaluated.</p>



	No information about the share of supported participants who continue in employment with the same employer is available so far.
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>The measure is reactive, so it does not address the primary causes of the unemployment among young in order to prevent unemployment. However, it helps activate the young unemployed by providing them with motivation, counselling and additional skills, and in particular allowing them to gain work habits and work experience. In this sense, it helps prevent subsequent unemployment and helps shorten the unemployment spells.</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>To activate the young unemployed with little work experience by offering them at least a short-term / temporary employment in companies is surely beneficial but there is no information about the specific groups who are activated or what are the consequences of the activation. E.g. how many of the activated people would have found employment even without the support?</p>

Name of the initiative	<p>"Iniciativa podpory zaměstnanosti mládeže pro region NUTS 2 Severozápad v Ústeckém kraji"</p> <p>Youth Employment Initiative for NUTS 2 Region (Severozápad) in Ústecký kraj</p>
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>This is a measure implementing the Youth Employment Initiative in one of the two sub-regions (Ústecký kraj) of NUTS 2 region (Severozápad). The aim is to assist NEET people (15 - 29) in finding long-term employment (or continue in education).</p> <p>Intended Effects:</p> <p>Participants will find long-term employment or return to school to increase their qualification.</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>The measure offers services to help participants get work habits and other competencies crucial for finding-long term jobs or to help participants increase their qualification via return to school / further education.</p>



	<p>The measure provides three types of support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Participants undertake traineeships or short-term work (possibly with a mentor) to gain work experience. The measure provides employment incentives (subsidies) to the firms who hire participants as trainees or for short-term work to cover part of the wage costs.2. Alternatively, the measure provides support (language course, preparation for interview, help with application, financial support to cover part of the costs of transportation, accommodation or food) for a traineeship abroad.3. Finally, the measure provides support for those participants interested in returning to education (skills evaluation, help prepare for entrance exams, financial support to cover part of the costs of transportation, accommodation or food). <p>Target groups: NEET people between 15 and 29</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: NEET people between 15 and 29 who live in a given subregion, however, some forms of support are only available to young people registered at the local Labor Office. The registered young unemployed are also the main pool from which the participants are selected.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): Employment incentives; Training; Vocational guidance, career counselling</p> <p>Level: Regional</p> <p>Start/ end date: 1. 11. 2015 – 31. 10. 2018</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? No, but evaluations by the trainee, mentor, Labor Office assistant and firm are collected after the traineeship.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Labour Office Ústecký kraj.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 18,424 thousand EUR (497,447,592 CZK) Funded from ESF (Operational Programme Employment, approx. 92%) and state budget (approx. 8%).</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Planned number of people covered: 3,500 (the original plan was to cover 2500)</p>



	<p>Number of people covered: almost 3000 (by Sept 30, 2017). For comparison: There were 7 935 unemployed younger than 29 registered at the regional Labor Office (of Ústecký region) on Sept 30, 2017.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. NA Total expenditures for year 2016: NA</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? NA</p> <p>If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary on a traineeship is up to 740 EUR per month (20,000 CZK) and per beneficiary on a short-term work (“A work to try” - “Práce na zkoušku”) is up to 444 EUR per month (12,000 CZK).</p> <p>Unfortunately, no further information about the outcomes are currently available. While (some) information is being monitored and collected, the evaluations are managed by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs and not (yet?) available.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? NEET young people (15-29)</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? Young people.</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)? NA</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). No. Only evaluations (survey via email) from participants at the end of the participation are collected. The information is used for future implementation of the measure.</p> <p>Please describe if Yes/Partly</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>Youth Employment Initiative</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>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>Note that the measure started only recently, so major evaluation is not possible yet.</p> <p>There are “some” internal evaluations (records of individual outcomes are stored) but these are not available.</p> <p>As mentioned above: EU funds (ESF OP Employment) were allocated to the Research Institute for Labour and Social Affairs (http://www.vupsv.cz/?p=index&site=en) to carry out ALMP evaluations (http://www.vupsv.cz/index.php?p=evaluation_of_aep&site=default) but as far as I know they work with data from the periods (2014, 2015) before this measure was implemented and no outcomes are publically available yet.</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)? NA</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. NA</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</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>It looks like the registered unemployed have substantial priority over other NEETS, as the measure is implemented by the local Labor Office and they select the participants from the pool of registered job seekers. However, other NEETS are in principle also eligible.</p> <p>The measure comprises of a series of alternative services provided and it is not clear how participants are selected and assigned to the various services. No evaluations or outcome information is currently available.</p>



	<p>Effectiveness of this intervention very much depends on the ability of the Labor Office to choose the right participants and to offer them the best fitting services. Again, counterfactual policy evaluation is necessary to assess the real impact of these measures. If the Labor Office selects those participants who are the most likely to succeed, simple descriptive evaluations may overvalue the effectiveness of this measure when offered to lower-quality participants.</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? The measure is reactive but providing additional skills, competencies and work experience via traineeships and short work contracts increases employability of the participants. Some of the traineeship or short-term contracts may result in long-term employment. Motivating participants to increase qualification via further education also increases future employment prospects of the participants.</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? To activate young unemployed by offering them at least short-term / temporary employment in companies is surely beneficial but there is no information about the specific groups who are activated or what are the consequences of the activation. May-be the support is provided to individuals who are the most likely to succeed but not necessarily to those who need it most etc. To assess this would require not only detailed information about the participants but also additional information about a comparison group of those not supported.</p>

Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

EU initiatives seem crucial for the implementation of youth-targeted active labor market policies in the Czech Republic. In particular, Youth Guarantee Schemes and Youth Employment Initiative, which support 85% of the budget of the two measures described above. The implementation of these two initiatives at the regional level basically initiated the active labor market measures specifically targeted at young unemployed during the last couple of years.

Note, however, that rather than implementing new measures to target youth unemployment, some of the previous measures were only adjusted to target specifically the young under the two EU initiatives.



ESF funds from the OP Employment also cover major part of the expenditures on measures (such as “Cesta pro mladé”) that are available to or specifically target young individuals.

On the other hand, active labor market policy based on time-limited ESF funded projects sometime result in temporary nature of some of the measures that cause discontinuities in their implementation, monitoring as well as evaluation.



Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

There are only few ALMP policies specifically targeted to youth and they are mostly related to Youth Guarantee Schemes and Youth Employment Initiative. I am not aware of any policy debate or strategy that would consider relating the the youth employment policies to other components of social policies in Czech Republic more generally. So I would say they are not related at all.

The only exception would be the concern of policy makers about low employment rate among mothers of children younger than 3 (due to long parental leaves, lack of childcare, possibly ineffective job protection etc.). There were series of measures supporting mothers' earlier return to the labor market taken over the last couple of years, including, in particular, childcare subsidy and provision of affordable childcare.

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group ²⁵	Starting year; end year (if not ongoing)	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	PROKOP	Regional/national ²⁶	C	2017	EU and national	No	Not available	NA	NA
2	Příspěvek na podporu regionální mobility	National	C	2016	National	No	Not available	NA	NA

Comments on Table 6

There are currently not many measures that would represent the synergies between the employment and other social policies. I selected specifically these two measures as they try to address the two important causes of unemployment and non-employment (including youth) in the Czech Republic.

First measure is related to indebtedness and financial problems of the non-employed.

Long-term unemployment often leads to debt accumulation, insolvency and personal bankruptcy. When high share of wages go towards repayment of debts, the motivation

²⁵ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

²⁶ Project PROKOP consists of three regional subprojects (Východ - East, Central, Středo západ - Middlewest) that will cover the whole Czech Republic. The first two projects have already started (preparation phase, pilot projects, testing). The actual project PROKOP-Východ started supporting the participants in March 2017. In Section 4.2 below, I therefore describe only PROKOP-Východ.



to start (legal) employment is very low. Moreover, the direct debt repayments from wages impose further administrative burden on employers, who are less willing to hire people with debts. So debts are also one of the important obstacles to (re)enter employment.

Second measure is related to low regional mobility. The regional mobility in the Czech Republic remains still very low. Low labor mobility in the Czech Republic is one of the reasons for regional mismatch between labor supply and labor demand and significantly contributes to regional unemployment. Note that there are substantial and persistent differences in labor market performance across regions.

Evaluations are not available for these two measures but I discuss their potential impact and relevance in the detailed tables below.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<p>“PROKOP – Východ“ (Prohlubování kompetencí pro zvýšení zaměstnatelnosti I) “PROKOP – East” (Deepening of Competencies to Increase Employability I)</p>
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>Help job-seekers improve their chances to find a job, as well as assist them in solving other problems they have to deal with and that often accumulate during unemployment spells, in particular resolve indebtedness or prevent debt traps.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>The course will increase participants’ employability, facilitate job search, as well as help them better manage their finances and solve financial problems.</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>Participants attend a two-week course of 1. basic job search skills and work competencies, 2. soft skills, and 3. financial literacy followed by 14 counselling sessions (45 mins) over the following 3 months.</p> <p>E.g. counsellors also provide information about available active labor market policy measures that may be suitable for the participants etc.</p> <p>Soft skills include dealing with customers / clients, partners and superiors, team work, conflict resolution, assertiveness, time management, self management, stress resistance.</p> <p>The topics of the financial literacy course include individual and household budget, over-indebtedness prevention, insolvency and</p>



	<p>personal bankruptcy, consumer credit etc.</p> <p>The course and counselling are provided by internal lecturers and councillors working for FDV. These are either full-time employees or they are “outsourced” via one-time short-term work contracts (“agreement on work performance”). They are hired from non-profit organisations, social service organisations or other entities that specialize in career counselling.</p> <p>Target groups: long-term unemployed, other job-seekers, inactive individuals</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>This measure is available to registered long-term unemployed but also other job-seekers registered at a Labor Office, inactive individuals, as well as members of risk groups (over 50, low-skilled, disabled, mothers after parental leave...). Priority is given to the registered long-term unemployed or other registered job seekers.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): career counselling, training, vocational guidance & training in financial literacy</p> <p>Level:</p> <p>“PROKOP-Východ“ is a regional measure (available in 3 regions) but the overall project PROKOP will eventually (via three regional sub-projects (Východ - East, Central, Středozápad - Middlewest) cover the whole Czech Republic.</p> <p>Start/ end date: March 1, 2017 – February 28, 2020</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? No but feedback is gathered from the lecturers and counsellors.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>Fund for Further Education (http://www.fdv.cz/)</p> <p>(FDV is an agency subordinated to and co-funded by the Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs)</p> <p>and Local Labour Offices.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 3,464.5 thousand EUR (93 540 504 CZK)</p> <p>Funded from ESF (Operational Programme Employment, 85 %) and state budget (15%).</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/</p>



	<p>number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Planned number of people covered: 4,500</p> <p>Number of people covered so far: 1,600.</p> <p>Number of young people not available – first information and first internal evaluation report will be in Q1 of 2018.</p> <p>90 % of people covered were long-term (over 1 year) unemployed.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis:</p> <p>1,000 – 1,500 thousand EUR (30-40 million CZK)</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary: 481.5 EUR (13 000 CZK)</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Registered long-term unemployed (over 1 year) but also other job-seekers registered at a Labour Office, inactive individuals, as well as members of risk groups (over 50, low-skilled, disabled, mothers after parental leave...). Priority is given to the registered long-term unemployed or other registered job seekers.</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>All unemployed (and also inactive).</p> <p>If it is targeted to all unemployed, does it include special focus to young people (for example, by providing more incentives if young unemployed are targeted)?</p> <p>No.</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?</p> <p>No.</p> <p>(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</p>



	<p>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>No evaluations available yet, as the project started only this year.</p> <p>First information and first internal evaluation report will be available in Q1 of 2018.</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>No evaluations are available yet.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</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>The two week course of soft skills and basic competencies may activate the long-term unemployed in their job search effort. The question is how the participants are selected and whether the course is followed by further assistance from the Labour Office to make the best use of the acquired skills. What I consider a very important component of this measure is teaching financial literacy and providing advice to solve financial problems.</p> <p>However, there is only little information available so far to assess the measure. Long-term consequences in terms of future employment and its duration should be collected. The structure (characteristics) of beneficiaries should be also monitored.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among</p>



<p>and target risk groups</p>	<p>young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>This measure is not targeted at young people specifically. However, young unemployed with little work experience may be able to benefit more from the course. They are also one of the key risk groups who tend to accumulate debt (impulsive buying habits, lack of self-control etc.) and face the risk of debt traps.</p> <p>The measure therefore helps prevent overall social exclusion, not just the exclusion from the labour market.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>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>Financial problems are closely related to unemployment. The causality may lead in both ways and the two phenomena are also often associated with psychological stress. Dealing with only one of the problems may be much less effective than dealing with multiple problems at the same time. Stress from financial problems affects one's work incentives, one's productivity at work etc.</p> <p>According to Labour Office press releases, beneficiaries of this measure report that the course improved their skills, motivation as well as self-confidence, which helped them prepare for the job search and job entry.</p>

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>"Příspěvek na podporu regionální mobility"</p> <p>(Contribution to Support Regional Mobility)</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>To increase employability of the unemployed by enhancing their regional mobility.</p> <p>Description:</p> <p>Two types of financial support (benefits) are available to job-seekers who are registered at Local Labour Offices and who accept jobs outside of the area of their permanent residence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Commuting Support</i> (can be also used for any work-related costs incurred to a person that accepts a distant job (such as cost of transportation, fuel expenditures, accommodation or child care costs) - <i>Reallocation Support</i> (helps cover the cost of moving to a new area because of the new job) <p>Intended effects: Help the unemployed to find jobs by increasing their mobility (via commuting or reallocation).</p>



<p>Target groups: long-term unemployed, unemployed due to mass dismissals, the job-seekers who are unlikely to find job locally</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- long-term unemployed (registered at Labor Office for at least 5 months)- registered unemployed who lost their job as a consequence of mass dismissal- registered job-seeker, for whom it is hard to find a job locally (given his/her qualifications and the situation in the local labor market) <p><i>Commuting Support:</i></p> <p>Beneficiaries who will start a job in the Czech Republic at least 10 km from their residence (even less if there is no public transportation) and who have signed employment contract that is permanent or with at least 6 months duration.</p> <p><i>Reallocation Support:</i></p> <p>Beneficiaries who change residency due to the new job at least 50 km from their original residence (within the Czech Republic) and who have signed employment contract that is permanent or with at least 6 months duration.</p> <p>Person who receives reallocation benefit has to remain in the new job for at least 6 months (otherwise the person has to pay the proportional part of the benefit back).</p> <p>Eligibility for a subsequent reallocation benefit – after at least three years provided the person worked for at least 12 months in the meantime</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p> <p>the measure is complementary to Labor Office's help in finding a (distant) job & it provides financial support to help cover commuting and reallocation costs</p> <p>Level:</p> <p>first regional (a pilot phase - in 6 regions), then national (since November 2016 available at national level)</p> <p>Start/ end date:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Commuting support – available in 6 regions since April 2016 (at national level available since November 2016)- Reallocation support – available since December 2016 <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p>



	<p>No.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>Local Labor Offices</p> <p>Beneficiaries apply for the support and if granted, contract is signed between the Office and the beneficiary.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: state budget</p> <p>As this is not a “project” (rather a “measure”), it does not have its own budget.</p> <p>Reallocation support is onetime benefit of 1,852 EUR (50, 000 CZK),</p> <p>Commuting support ranges between 37-130 EUR (1,000 – 3,500 CZK) a months for a maximum of 12 months.</p> <p>Below is the information about the total expenditures so far.</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p><i>Commuting Support</i></p> <p>In 2016, commuting support was granted to 664 beneficiaries, out of which 164 were younger than 30.</p> <p>The total expenditure was 56,660 EUR (1, 529, 810 CZK).</p> <p>Expenditure per beneficiary: 85 EUR</p> <p>In 2017, by June 30: commuting support was granted to 1 621 beneficiaries. The total expenditure was 332,686 EUR (8, 982, 510 CZK).</p> <p>Expenditure per beneficiary: 205 EUR</p> <p>In 2017, by September 30, commuting support was granted to 2 193 beneficiaries, out of which 621 were younger than 30.</p> <p><i>Reallocation Support</i></p> <p>In 2016, the support just started and 0 benefits were granted.</p> <p>In 2017, by September 30, reallocation support was granted to 65 beneficiaries, out of which 35 were younger than 30.</p> <p>Expenditure per beneficiary: 1,852 EUR (50,000 CZK) – amount of the benefit.</p>



	Source: Kateřina Beránková, Press Agent, Labour Office of the Czech Republic
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure? long-term unemployed, unemployed due to mass dismissals, the job-seekers who are unlikely to find job locally</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? No.</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)? No. But the information on the share of people younger than 30 is monitored / collected.</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? No, not yet.</p> <p>(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</p>



	even eliminate private sector spending)? NA
Summary of evaluation results	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. No evaluations (yet).
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)? In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? <p>In general, this is a very good idea. Low mobility in the Czech Republic is one of the reasons for regional mismatch between labor supply and labor demand and significantly contributes to regional unemployment.</p> <p>The size of the benefits is rather small but provides additional incentives for people to accept more distant jobs (increases mobility, helps regional mismatch), in particular in low-income regions.</p> <p>The take-up rate is still very low but increasing and the measure has started only recently.</p> <p>The long-term unemployed (including the young) may face rather high work disincentives and be often welfare dependent. The decision to accept a job is not only affected by the offered wage but also the work-related costs. The commuting cost can play a substantial role among these costs. The support makes the (distant) jobs more attractive to the beneficiaries.</p> <p>However, it is not clear how the beneficiaries are selected among the unemployed and there is only little information about the beneficiaries available. So the impact is very hard to assess.</p> <p>Data is collected on the share of beneficiaries younger than 30 but, for example, no information about education level etc. It is crucial to have information about who benefits from the support to be able to perform at least a descriptive (not counterfactual / causal) evaluation analysis. Moreover, it seems that no data is collected about the (actual) duration of the new employment, which, again, is crucial for assessing the long-term impact of these policies.</p> <p>May-be the beneficiaries (people who apply for and are granted the support) are just more flexible people who would have moved/commuted anyway, even in the absence of the financial support.</p>



<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>Yes. See above.</p> <p>As for young people specifically:</p> <p>Young people are likely to be more flexible, so I would expect the willingness to commute or move and the take up rate among them higher. While the share of young among beneficiaries went up, it is still relatively small.</p> <p>Low mobility is one of the key causes of regional unemployment. Increasing mobility of the young people should increase their employability, as well as improve the quality and duration of the job.</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>Good idea but little information available to assess whether the measure is effective.</p> <p>See above.</p>



References

Bičáková, A. & Kalíšková, K. (2016). Výskyt a vznik nezaměstnanosti u žen s předškolními dětmi: případ České republiky [Occurrence and Rise of Unemployment of Women with Pre-School Children: the Case of the Czech Republic]. *Politická Ekonomie*, 6, 695-712.

European Commission (2017). *Country report Czech Republic*. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/publications/2017-european-semester-country-reports_en

Europe 2020 targets: statistics and indicators for Czech Republic. Available at https://ec.europa.eu/info/strategy/european-semester/european-semester-your-country/czech-republic/europe-2020-targets-statistics-and-indicators-czech-republic_en#early-leavers-from-education-and-training

Fond dalšího vzdělávání (2017). *Výroční zpráva 2016*. [Annual Report 2016 of Fond of Further Education]. Available at <http://www.fdv.cz/vyrocní-zpravy>.

Joint Employment Report 2017 (2017). Available at <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en>

Labour Office of the Czech Republic. Press Releases. Available at: <https://portal.mpsv.cz/upcr/media/tz>

Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs (2017). *Analýza vývoje zaměstnanosti a nezaměstnanosti v roce 2016*. [Analysis of the Evolution of Employment and Unemployment in 2016 by Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs]. Available at <https://portal.mpsv.cz/sz/politikazamest/trh.../rok2016/anal2016.pdf>.

Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs. Press Releases. Available at: <https://www.mpsv.cz/cs/32>

Websites describing the measure “Cesta pro mladé“

<http://www.cestapromlade.cz/>

<http://portal.mpsv.cz/sz/politikazamest/esf/zajimave>

<http://www.cestapromlade.cz/detail-clanku-69-staze-s-cestou-pro-mlade-v-kostce>