



Youth employment policies in France

EXCEPT working paper no. 36
June 2018

Isabelle Recotillet

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:

Recotillet, I. (2018). *Youth employment policies in France*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 36. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-405-3 (pdf)

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



Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| The key risk groups in the labour market in France | 4 |
| Youth employment policies: a general overview | 5 |
| Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions..... | 9 |
| Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures | 10 |
| Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives | 27 |
| Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion..... | 28 |
| Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures | 28 |
| References | 39 |



The key risk groups in the labour market in France

Table 1 “Risk group” construction¹

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| Young people with outdated qualifications | 2 | 3 | 2 |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

Comments on Table 1

Public policies to promote youth employment primarily target young people with educational disadvantages, who face severe difficulties in having a smooth school-to-work transition. As the Court of Auditors (Cour des comptes) points out in a 2015 report on youth schemes for unqualified young people, the Ministry of Education (Ministère de l'Éducation nationale), the Ministry of Labour (Ministère du Travail) and the administrative regions, as well as social partners, are all engaged in implementing strategies in favour of this target group. It is young people without qualifications and NEETs (those Not in Education, Employment or Training) that benefit most from the government's specific schemes and youth labour contracts.

Public policies to promote access to employment for young people facing difficulties are supported by a large national Plan, set in 2013 at the request of the European Commission and of the Council of the European Union². France was one of the first countries in Europe to elaborate such a plan and benefitted of 310,2 million euros for the period 2014 to 2018 (under the Youth employment initiative) and of the same amount under the European Structural Fund. France was the third-largest beneficiary of the Youth employment initiative (after Spain and Italy).

¹ 1=no significant role to 5=very important

² http://travail-emploi.gouv.fr/IMG/pdf/dgefp-france-plan-garantie_jeunesse_1_.pdf



Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

| | Year | 2005 | 2010 | 2015 or the last year of available data, specify |
|-----------|--|-----------|-----------|--|
| Indicator | | | | |
| 1 | Total number of active labour market programmes | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 1.1 | including youth-targeted | | | |
| 2 | Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes: | | | |
| 2.1 | Total number | 1,523,797 | 1,610,207 | 1,878,418 |
| 2.2 | % of the labour force (15-64) ³ | 5,6% | 5,7% | 6,4% |
| 3 | Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes: | | | |
| 3.1 | Total number ⁴ | 737,946 | 657,346 | 728,463 |
| 3.2 | % of the labour force (15-29) ⁵ | 25.2% | 22.8% | 27.0% |
| 3.3 | % of the total number of participants (stock) | 48.4% | 40.8% | 38.8% |
| 4 | Expenditures on active labour market programmes: | | | |
| 4.1 | Total amount (EUR) (billion euros) | 11,812,34 | 16,521,38 | 16,485,94 |
| 4.2 | % of GDP | 0.70% | 0,85% | 0,76% |
| 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 labour market programmes: | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| 6.1 | Total amount (EUR) | | | |
| 6.2 | % of GDP | | | |
| 6.3 | % of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes | | | |

Comments on Table 2

The Eurostat database provides 15-25 age category. These figures are reported in table 2 1) as they could be compared to other countries; 2) as they are in accordance to expenditures data.

³ active labour market population in 2015, source Eurostat; active labour market population in 2005 and 2010, source Insee (French Statistical National Institute)

⁴ source: Eurostat database

⁵ active labour market population in 2005, 2010 and 2015 aged 15-24, source Insee (French Statistical National Institute). Category 15-29 is not displayed by the national institute since it doesn't correspond to the target of youth labour market policy



Active labour market programmes exclude unemployment allowance.

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 ⁶ | Preventive/reactive ⁷ | Youth specific | Main source of funding ⁸ | Linked to EU initiatives ⁹ | Main actors of delivery ¹⁰ | Evaluation present | Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery |
|---|-------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|---|
| (Re-) orientation courses, preparation for training or employment | 2 | Reactive | No | National, regional | Youth Employment Initiative | PES | Partly | No |
| Vocational guidance, career counselling | 3 | Preventive: Regional council for vocational guidance | No | Regional councils and State | Youth Guarantee | State, regional councils, Information and Guidance Centers | No | No |
| Training (with certificates) | 3 | Reactive | Apprenticeship : youth specific Professionalisation contract: partly youth specific | Private | Youth Employment Initiative | Educational institutions and private sector | Yes | No |
| Training (without certificates) | 2 | Second chance schools: reactive. Epidemic program: reactive | Youth specific | National, regional and private funding | No | Educational institutions and private sector | Partly | Partly |
| Employment incentives, subsidies for employer | 2 | Unemployment tax exemption for employers: reactive | Youth specific (under 26) | Unemployment fund | No | Private sector | No | No |
| Direct job creation | 3 | Subsidies contracts | Youth specific | State | Youth Employment | State, region, | Yes | No |

⁶ Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) ->

Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

⁷ To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

⁸ EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

⁹ Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other - 6

¹⁰ 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



| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|---|---|--------|--------|
| | | (CIE-CAE, <i>emploi d'avenir, starter contract</i>): reactive | (emploi d'avenir and starter contract) Not youth specific (CIE-CAE) | | nt initiative -> "emplois d'avenir" | municipalities, private sector | | |
| Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes | 2 | Individual support for the unemployed when creating a company | Not Youth specific . Crea Jeunes: youth specific (18-32). CAP'jeunes: youth specific (under 26) | Unemployment fund. Unemployment Fund and European Structural Fund | Some are linked to the Youth Employment initiative. Youth employment initiative | State | Partly | Partly |
| Other | 3 | Youth Guarantee | Youth specific | State | Youth Guarantee | State, Regions, French Departments | Partly | Partly |
| Other | 1 | Preventive: National Day for Defense and Citizenship | Youth specific (age 17) | State | No | State, Ministry of Defense | No | No |
| Other | 2 | Preventive: National platform for tracking drop outs | Youth specific | State and Regions | Youth Employment Initiative | State, region, French Departments, Missions locales | Partly | No |

Comments on Table 3

A general comment about ALMP for French young people is that they have not demonstrated their efficiency to improve access to labour market (Simmonet, 2014; Cahuc, Carcillo & Zimmermann, 2013). Nonetheless, the most effective scheme measures rely on training with certificate (Card, Kluve & Weber, 2010; 2014; Ehrel, 2014). Efficiency of ALMP requires to carry out rigorous evaluation analysis, since the most important issue in evaluation of ALMP is to control for selection bias (Givord, 2014). That saying, the famous meta-analysis from Card (2010, 2014) reports that short term impact should be distinguished from medium impact and long-term impact when obviously data are available. At short term, collective and individual supports to find a job are the most efficient; whereas training programs and subsidies jobs provide negative



impact, but positive in the mid-term. Apprenticeship contracts and professionalisation contracts significantly improve the employability of their beneficiaries, even if there are strong selection effects.

In depth analysis of subsidies job emphasises that subsidies jobs (such as *Emploi d'avenir*) in the profit sector display positive results, whereas subsidies jobs in the non-profit sector presents negative results. Very targeted programmes for the most vulnerable seem to provide positive results, even there is no impact evaluation available, except for YG which benefits from a steering committee in charge of the evaluation of the scheme measure (Ministry of Labour, 2016). Lastly, self-employment programmes that have been evaluated using a control group exhibits no significant result on the unemployment rate (poverty Lab).

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 |
| Provide a lot of scheme measures to tackle youth unemployment | Too many existing instruments for a same target group |
| Priority given to the youth risk group (NEET, youth without qualification) | Lack of coordination between the existing instruments |
| A quite high level of expenditures | High costs accompanied by mixed impact on youth unemployment that remain at a very high level |
| | Subsidies job suffer from deadweights; subsidies job often lack of a significant training component |



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

| No | Name | Level | Main target group ¹¹ | Type ¹² | Starting year | Funding source | Part of EU initiatives | Evaluation | “Good practice” ¹³ example | Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ¹⁴ | Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ¹⁵ |
|----|-------------------------------|----------|--|------------------------------|---------------|---|--|---------------|---------------------------------------|--|--|
| 1 | Professionalisation contracts | National | Targeted youth (under 26) and targeted risk group (unemployed over 26) | Training with certificate | 2004 | National and regional | Framework for Quality traineeships | Yes, positive | Partially | Medium to strong | Improvement |
| 2 | Second chance schools | National | Targeted youth risk group (youth without diploma, NEET) | Training without certificate | 1997 | National, regional and private fundings | No | Yes, positive | Partially | Medium | Improvement |
| 3 | Emplois d’avenir | National | Targeted youth risk group (NEET) | Training without certificate | 2012 | National | In line with the Europe 2020 strategy: . “Youth on the Move” . “An agenda for new skills | Mixed | Partially | Weak to medium | No significant change |

¹¹ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

¹² (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

¹³ 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.”

¹⁴ 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.

¹⁵ 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.



| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | and new jobs") . Youth Employment Initiative supporting NEET. . Youth Guarantee approach (source: MLP) | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|

Comments on Table 5

The choice of these three interventions is based on the following main aspects:

- Offering diversity of interventions (actors and targets; functioning of the intervention)
- national interventions
- recent (Emplois d’avenir) and old interventions (Professionalisation contracts, Second Chance schools)
- delivering national certifications (Emplois d’avenir; Professionalisation contracts) and unrecognised certificate (Second chance schools)
- all aiming at improving employability by training, over longer or shorter period of training. A broad rank based on the duration of training period could be as follows: Emplois d’avenir, Second Chance Schools, Professionalisation contracts.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Name of the initiative | Professionalisation contract Contrat de professionnalisation |
| Short description | <p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: <i>the professionalisation contract allows young people under 26, people over 45, and job seekers to obtain a certification (recognised at national level). Incentives for people over 45 and job seekers should prevent these categories from unemployment.</i></p> <p>Intended effects: <i>improving the level of qualification, reducing youth unemployment and unemployment of the elderly, by delivering a national certificate and by providing professional experience. The professionalization contract is based on in-company training and training in the training centre.</i></p> <p>Target groups: youth under 26 and unemployed over 26, as well as people benefiting from social incomes.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: age and being unemployed.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): training with certificate</p> |



| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>Description: <i>the professionalisation contract is an instrument of the continuing vocational education policy that enables people to get a diploma once they have left school.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><i>. The professionalization contract is based on alternating training in training centers and on-the-job training in companies.</i><i>. The duration is between 6 and 12 months (and could be extended to 24 months) with a minimum training of 15% at training center.</i><i>. The prepared diploma must belong to the national qualification framework.</i> <p>Level: National</p> <p>Start/ end date: created in 2004; still on-going</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? <i>Policy makers elaborate the general orientation. Social Partners, Ministry of Education are involved in the definition of the vocational certificates that are elaborated at a sector level (CQP) (these certificate could be obtain through a professionalisation contract).</i></p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? <i>Social Partners through Joint collecting bodies (OPCA), companies and training centres.</i></p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: public financing 1,1 million euros (2015) and private financing 1,675 billion euros in 2015 (Source: Jaune Budgétaire).</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.</p> <p><i>Number of individuals entering a professionalisation contract in 2016: 195 326 (source: Ministry of Labour). Six months after a professionalisation contract, 75% of the recipients are in employment (source: FPSPP, 2014). They mostly obtain a long-term employment contract (60%) and are mainly employed by the same company (75% of the cases) (source: Ministry of labour). After a professionalisation contract 24% are unemployed whatever the level of the diploma obtained.</i></p> <p><i>Number who actually take part: not available. Data come from administrative source in which new contracts are registered.</i></p> <p><i>Number of who are entitled: not available.</i></p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. Around 2,8 million euros (2015). Public expenditures: 1,1 million euros (2015) (source : Jaune Budgétaire) ; private expenditures: 1,675 billion euros in 2015 (total amount paid by companies for professionalisation contracts)</p> |



| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. Not available. Expenditure per beneficiary varies according to the level of the prepared diploma, age of the beneficiary and to the characteristics of the company that recruits a young people under a professionalisation contract.</p> <p>Since we don't know a given year how many young people are employed under a professionalisation contract, it is not possible to estimate an average cost per beneficiary (using the total expenditure).</p> |
| Targeting | <p>Which are the target groups of this measure? <i>Youth aged 16-26, job seekers over 26, people benefitting from social benefits.</i></p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? <i>Not especially to young people and not to all the unemployed. Young people under 26 can enter a professionalisation contract (whether they are employed or unemployed) as well as job seekers over 26 or people benefitting from social incomes. It also mixes criteria of age, of situation on the labour market and of level of income.</i></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)? It is not targeted to all the 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</p> <p><i>No</i></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>Framework for Quality traineeships</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><i>Ex-post evaluation and permanent monitoring (entries)</i></p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p><i>Both</i></p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic</p> |



| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| | <p>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><i>They generally include basic information, like the number of entrants, age, field of education and level, activity sector and size of the company. A survey was carried out in 2014 by the National Fund in charge of career paths to monitor their transition into the labour market 6 months after ending a professionalisation contract.</i></p> <p><i>Some scientific studies pay attention to substitution effects but not at the level of the professionalization contract, but at a more general level (meaning subsidies contracts with or without training vs regular contracts).</i></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> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>The boundary between professionalisation contract and apprenticeship contract is tight (Borras and Bosse, 2016) even if they are dissimilarly used according to the activity sector (Arrighi and Mora, 2010). In France, a same diploma can be obtain through apprenticeship or through a professionalisation contract. 80% of the entries into professionalisation contract affects young people under 26 that could also sign an apprenticeship contract (Cahuc and Ferracci, 2014).</i>- <i>Most of the evaluations combines apprenticeship and professionalisation contracts. They generally stress that worked-linked training (alternating off-the-job training and on-the-job training) wide access to jobs and display higher wages, in comparison to scholar vocational training (all things being equal; that means at equal diploma) (Bonnal Fougère and Sérandon, 1997; Bonnal et al., 2003; Simonnet et Ulrich, 2000 ; Sollogoub et Ulrich, 1999). In France, a same diploma can be obtained by the way of apprenticeship or scholar vocational track. Results are varying according to the level of diploma and to the field of training (Beaupère, Collet, Issehnane, 2017). Access to job is negatively correlated with the level of diploma: at secondary level, apprenticeship and professionalisation contracts widen significantly access to jobs and reduce duration between graduation and the first job (Cart and Joseph, 2013). This effect comes mostly from the relationship between the youth and the company in which they were in apprenticeship or professionalisation contract (around one third of graduates are</i> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><i>hired by the company, so that the part of youth in employment immediately after the program is higher). A few months later, this effect tend to disappear (Cart and Léné, 2014). Wages discrepancies between apprentices and other graduates are observed at higher education level. At secondary level, they are mostly paid at minimum wage level. Lastly, regarding the skill mismatch, professionnalisation and apprenticeship contracts display lower skill mismatch than vocational school tracks, even few years later (Cart and Léné, 2015).</i></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><i>The good results observed for professionalisation contracts should be tempered with the high selective characteristic of this contracts. The professionalisation contract was launched to increase the level of qualification of those with the most difficulties to integrate the labour market (it implied that a lack of qualification is a barrier to integrate the labour market). Finally, when analysing the characteristics of young people in professionalisation contracts, it appears that they are not really the expected target: young people entering a professionalisation contract are already qualified. This contract does not offer a second chance to young people without diploma or having a certification at the first level (Arrighi and Mora, 2010).</i></p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? Not available</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><i>Yes, there are specific issues addressed by the professionalisation contract, they are explained above (see stated goals and intended effects). They are linked to the high selective degree to enter a professionalisation contract whereas it was launched to tackle unemployment of young people without qualification.</i></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>Weaknesses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>For young people under 26, professionalisation contract is less attractive than apprenticeship contracts since financial resources are lower.</i> - <i>For employers, professionalisation contracts is less attractive than apprenticeship contracts since tax incentives are lower even nil.</i> - <i>For young people or for employers, professionalisation may be seen as competitive to apprenticeship contract; nonetheless they</i> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><i>fall under different financing scheme. This could be seen as competitive, preparing to common diplomas.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>professionnalisation contracts are selective and do not address the issue of unemployment of the less qualified.</i> |
| 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><i>Professionnalisation contracts are selective and do not address the issue of an employment of the less qualified. Most of the young people entering a professionnalisation contract hold a baccalaureate and prepare a higher education diploma.</i></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><i>Professionnalisation contracts are a relevant instrument to master occupational skills and work-related skills, as well as social skills. They offer the opportunity to young people to obtain a national diploma, while employed at the companies and earning a salary. They also combine productive work and acquisition of theoretical knowledge. This is quite valued by companies.</i></p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p><i>Professionnalisation contracts require that a financing system would be set up (taxes and mechanism for redistributing collected funds) and that companies are willing to host young people alternating training and work periods. That means that social partners should be effectively involved in the implementation of the training scheme.</i></p> |

| | |
|------------------------|--|
| Name of the initiative | <p>Second chance Schools E2Cs</p> <p>Écoles de la deuxième chance</p> |
| Short description | <p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: the primary aim of the Second Chance school is to offer a second chance of training to drop outs young people and to promote their employability on the labour market.</p> <p>Intended effects: <i>The main objective of the E2Cs is to tackle the social exclusion that hits disadvantaged young people, especially those living in deprived neighbourhoods. E2Cs do not offer labour contracts, but they support the school-to-work transition by providing individualised training. They may also support students to take up vocational training, typically through an apprenticeship. E2Cs are labour-oriented, and do not belong to the set of educational policies in which France is also very active,</i></p> |



including the development of apprenticeships and various actions to improve the attractiveness of vocational training.

The programme aims to provide them with vocational preparation, both in the interest of personal development and for easing the school-to-work transition process. It also aims at providing them with social competences so that they are better integrated into society and can cope in the workplace

Target groups: *The E2Cs target 16–25 year olds who are experiencing severe challenges in finding a job. The participants are mainly identified by local mission officers (Missions locales), who decide whether to send them to an E2C based on an assessment of their needs. In practice, the average age of young people registered in the E2C network is 20, and almost all (87 percent) have no qualifications. One in every five is an early school leaver: they have left school before the end of the junior cycle of secondary education – probably the day they turned 16, which is the school leaving age in France. This group is educationally disadvantaged, and often suffers from additional issues such as family conflict or legal issues. These are young people severely at risk of social exclusion.*

Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: *see above; age (16–25) and unemployment*

Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): *training without certificate*

Description: The work-based learning methodology of the E2Cs is based on a scheme alternating internships in businesses with classroom-based sessions.

. The key aims are to update the academic knowledge of participants and to provide learning sessions that take place in the workplace. Young people work with trainers on their career plan, in an approach different to that of the traditional school system and which is a key success of these second chance schemes.

. E2Cs do not offer labour contracts, but they support the school-to-work transition by providing individualised training in second chance schools. The training duration is about 6 months. At the end of the training, young people get a training certificate which is not nationally recognised.

. All E2Cs are organised into three hubs:

- Training Hub: This hub is in charge of updating young people's basic competences. The approach, through e-learning, allows each young person to progress at their own pace. There is grading of each participant's performance, so that young people are not put in a position of failing outright, but acquired competences are still validated. It also prepares*



| | |
|------------------|---|
| | <p>participants for occupational integration, with three hours per week devoted to CV design, drafting cover letters for job applications, writing memos and rehearsing for job interviews</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Business Hub:</u> This hub is responsible for establishing partnerships with local companies. Contacts are established through the E2C staff designated to approach businesses and establish partnerships, and to organise communication campaigns and specific cultural events involving local businesses. This hub works to provide young people with internship opportunities and personalised guidance for the development of an occupational project. Among the operating principles of E2Cs is that an internship must represent half of the participant's overall training time.• <u>Social Life Hub:</u> This hub is the responsibility of educators, project leaders for inclusion in the community and facilitators. It is in charge of organising extra-curricular activities (sport, cultural and social events) and ensuring that young people respect the school regulations. <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: first second chance school in 1997. Still on-going and expanding.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? The E2C network is composed of independent units, each of which benefit from a large degree of autonomy and the capacity to adapt to local contexts. At national level, stakeholders are involved in the general orientation of the network.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? E2Cs network</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 85 million euros (source: Cour des comptes, 2016)</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.</p> <p>The 42 E2Cs hosted around 15,000 young people in 2015, on 107 sites in 11 regions and 51 administrative units. Since 1997, the E2CS hosted around 80,000 young people (source: https://reseau-e2c.fr/chiffres-cles)</p> <p>In 2016, 6 months after leaving an E2C, 44% of the young people have found a job (subsidies job or regular job).</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. Not available.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. Total expenditure per beneficiary:</p> |



| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>5300 euros in average (source: Senat report, 2010). The cost is varying a lot depending on the localisation of the school.</p> |
| Targeting | <p>Which are the target groups of this measure? <i>disadvantaged young people: young people unemployed without diploma.</i></p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? <i>Only to unemployed young people aged 16-25.</i></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)? The program especially targets young people and not all the 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</p> <p><i>No.</i></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><i>Framework for Quality traineeships and Youth employment initiative</i></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><i>Permanent monitoring (entries and exit, situation on the labor market 6 months later) available at the website of the E2Cs network and ex-ante evaluation (Rostam, 2014; French Senate, 2015; Recotillet and Werquin, 2017)</i></p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p><i>Internal (E2Cs network and Ministry of Labour; Rostam, 2014) and external (French Senate, 2015; Recotillet and Werquin, 2017)</i></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</p> |



| | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| | <p>salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p><i>They generally include basic information: number of young people hosted a given year, percentage of young people in employment or training 6 months later. In 2012, a qualitative survey aimed at depict the functioning of E2cs, how do they recruit young people, how is the training organised (at school and in a company), how young people are supported along the training (individual and collective support), what is the added-value for the youth (discovering trades, self-esteem, development of a professional project) and some indications about the situation on the labor market (links with companies)</i></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>. Recotillet and Werquin, 2017</p> <p><i>*E2C combines education and training to develop basic competences, using appropriate pedagogy, based on e-learning approaches; immersion internships in partner businesses; and extra-curricular activities for the development of social competences. The success of the programme is largely due to its personalised support (lectures are more like private lessons with a tutor), individual guidance and emphasis on individual commitment. A consequence of this is that the number of young people entering E2C is low. There is evidence that, among existing education policies in the OECD countries, those aiming at reforming pedagogical methods seem to be the most effective.</i></p> <p><i>*Partnerships with local businesses are a fundamental pillar of E2C success. The E2C staff plays a central role in approaching businesses, explaining the work of the E2Cs and forging partnerships.</i></p> <p><i>Rostam (2014): This paper is not really an evaluation but addresses the functioning of the E2Cs. It underlines the key role of personal (health, accommodation, financial issues...) and professional support throughout the training, as well as social-cultural activities.</i></p> <p>. French Senate, 2015: <i>In France, there are high numbers of programmes devoted to tackling youth unemployment. Coordination at local or regional level would enhance the exchange of information with the target group and the attractiveness of E2C units. Duplication of similar programmes carried out by different government departments is the main risk. For instance, the development of the Youth Guarantee programme could present an alternative that limits the attractiveness of the E2C network.</i></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? <i>Regarding the available qualitative surveys (previously referenced), the program achieves its stated goals: acquiring basic skills, social skills and finding a job or coming back to school (vocational school).</i></p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? <i>No quantitative data available to answer this question.</i></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.)? <i>There is no problem of coverage not of barriers for participation. However, there is a problem of dropout that is not addressed by the program. Actually, the empowerment of young people entails a selection process, operating over a period of time as part of the registration process for a E2C. The rule is to keep only the most motivated young people: those 'ready'. In this inception period – which lasts between two and seven weeks according to the particular E2C – the overall dropout rate varies between 10 and 25 percent. Once this inception period is over, the selection process continues. A contract is signed between the E2C team and the young person in question. Every three months, this contract is revisited on the basis of an assessment of the young person's acceptance of the E2C's rules; in exchange, the team offers intensive guidance, with a weekly meeting and appointed tutor. This could be considered as a success factor as well as a difficulty for young people.</i></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>In my opinion, coverage and take-up are well addressed. The main weakness that could be underlined is the local value of the certificate delivered by each E2C. A national accreditation by delivering a certificate of learning outcomes should enhance the effectiveness of the program.</i></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? <i>Yes, the measure addresses the main challenge of unemployment for the less qualified. They give us the opportunity to discover several trades, then to choose one and to acquire valuable skills. The pedagogy developed by the E2Cs is particularly adapted to young people who failed in the traditional educational system. The key feature is that teaching within an E2C is tailored to the career plan of each participant. For example, a sales person will need to work out percentages and VAT, whereas young people leaning toward the construction industry will need</i></p> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>measurements and surface area. Young people are assessed in the classroom and also in the context of their internship, so that all competences they have acquired are validated.</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? <i>. See Main evaluation results: E2C combines education and training to develop basic competences, using appropriate pedagogy, based on e-learning approaches; immersion internships in partner businesses; and extra-curricular activities for the development of social competences. The success of the programme is largely due to its personalised support (lectures are more like private lessons with a tutor) and personal support (health, financial issues...), individual guidance and emphasis on individual commitment.</i> Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> |

| | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| <p>Name of the initiative</p> | <p>Jobs for the future Emplois d'avenir</p> |
| <p>Short description</p> | <p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: Intended effects: <i>The main objective of the Emplois d'avenir is to tackle the social exclusion that hits disadvantaged young people, especially those who are not in employment or in training and living in disadvantaged areas (urban and rural).</i> Target groups: <i>The 'Emplois d'avenir' target 16–25 year olds who are experiencing severe challenges in finding a job and who lack of qualifications.</i> Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: <i>age (16–25), being unemployed, holding a diploma below the baccalaureate (level Isced 3c), and unemployed during at least 6 months during the last 12 months.</i> Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): <i>training without certificate</i> <i>Description: The description comes from the MLP Database. The “Emplois d'avenir” correspond to subsidised job contracts in the non-profit or private sector. The non-profit sector has been given priority. It has been scheduled that approximately 10% of the contracts should be dedicated to the private sector.</i> <i>. The job contract can last up to three years and should at a minimum last one year. In the private sector open-ended contracts are given priority.</i></p> |



| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| | <p>. EA have been from the start conceived as full-time jobs. The possibility is however left for local operators to conclude a part-time job (no less than a half-time i.e. 17.30 hours a week) if the situation of the young people calls for it (for instance young people with specific problems to solve, like in the health or housing fields).</p> <p>. The EA must incorporate an individual training plan that should mix on-the-work training, mentoring, guidance and a possible access to a formal qualification.</p> <p>. A tripartite engagement is signed by the employer, the young people and the Mission locale, where the nature of the job, the training plan and the follow-up activities are synthesised.</p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: 2012 and still on-going.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Yes at national level through general youth labour market policy orientation. Regarding implementation, local public service officers and companies may play a role (assignment, training, individual support).</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? Public service employment (“Missions locales”) and companies.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 1,7 bn euros in 2016 (source: Cour des Comptes, 2016)</p> |
| <p>Achieved results</p> | <p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p><i>In 2015, 121 672 young people were taking part to the programme (source: Ministry of Labour, 2015). There is no available data regarding the number of “Emplois d’avenir” who have found a job. Data that have been recently published combine all the subsidies contracts (CUI-CIE – subsidies contract in the profit sector, CUI-CAE – subsidies contract in the non-profit sector, and Emplois d’avenir). “Emplois d’avenir” can be signed in the profit sector and in the non-profit sector. The main results are the following: Six months after the end of the program, 67% of the beneficiaries in the profit sector are in employment, this is 41% for those who were in the non-profit sector (Bernard and Rey, 2017).</i></p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis. 1,7 bn euros in 2016 (source: Cour des Comptes, 2016).</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available. Total expenditure per beneficiary: 11000 euros in average (source: Cour des Comptes, 2016).</p> |



| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <p>Targeting</p> | <p>Which are the target groups of this measure? <i>disadvantaged young people: being unemployed, holding a diploma below the baccalaureate (a vocational diploma such as CAP or BEP, ISCED level 3c) , and unemployed during at least 6 months during the last 12 months. Priority is given to young people living in deprived areas.</i></p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? <i>Only to unemployed young people aged 16-25.</i></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)? <i>The program targets especially unemployed young people.</i></p> |
| <p>Youth involvement</p> | <p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p><i>No.</i></p> |
| <p>Links to EU initiatives</p> | <p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p><i>The Emplois d’avenir scheme measure is in line with the Europe 2020 strategy (in particular with the flagship initiatives “Youth on the Move” and “An agenda for new skills and new jobs”) and with the Youth Employment Initiative supporting young people not in education, employment or training. It is also in line with the Youth Guarantee approach, in the sense that it offers concrete job and training opportunities to young people under 25 (though with a different timeframe). Source: MLP Database.</i></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><i>Permanent monitoring (entries), no evaluation at this time but an impact survey is on-going. An ex-ante evaluation was carried to estimate the cost and the impact of such a program (Heyer and Plane, 2012). Some qualitative elements can be found in Le Bissonais, 2015, regarding the success points and weaknesses seen by stakeholders that implement the program.</i></p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p><i>Internal (Ministry of Labour) and external regarding the ex-ante evaluation (Heyer and Plane 2012)</i></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><i>A quantitative survey was launched in 2013 by the Ministry of Labour to follow beneficiaries of “Emplois d’avenir” and other young people that didn’t enter the program. This impact survey will be deliver relevant information on the trajectories of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. For now, the available publication is about training during the program but not the situation after the program.</i></p> <p><i>Another quantitative survey was launched by the Ministry of Labour in 2008 aiming at follow beneficiaries of public instruments for young people. It includes substitution effects and dead-weight effects.</i></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><i>. To understand the results of evaluations, it is necessary to shortly describe the scheme measure. The Emplois d’avenir are “long-term contracts up to three years and access to training leading to a qualification. Both these elements (a job experience and access to training and qualification) are supposed to enhance the beneficiaries’ opportunities on the labour market.” (source: MLP data base). By the law, each “Emploi d’avenir” is accompanied with a training project.</i></p> <p><i>. A part of the evaluation is about access to training. One year after entering a “Emploi d’avenir”, 3 young people on 4 benefited from a training and 1 young people on 2 benefited from a training with certificate (Rostam, 2016). Access to training is higher in the non-profit sector (83%) than in the profit sector (58%) (ibid.) Access to a certification if the national certification framework was a key point of the scheme measure. 47% of the Emplois d’avenir benefitted from a training with a certificate, a proportion that is double those for a comparable population. A positive point is that access to training with certificate benefitted in the same proportion to young people without diploma. In the profit sector, 41% of the training with certificate of young people without diploma are level ISCED 3c (vocational diploma: CAP). This stresses a particular relevant</i></p> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><i>effort of institutions in charge of training to address the needs of the more vulnerable (Le Bissonais, 2015).</i></p> <p><i>. Evaluation of the impact of training during the “Emplois d’avenir” is not available at this time. It should be published in 2018. However, few elements can be drawn from a panel of beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries carried out by the Ministry of Labour (Benoteau and Rémy, 2017). This panel was launched to provide evaluation of public job policy measures. From these data, we can conclude that youth scheme measures in the profit sector enhance significantly the job opportunities of the beneficiaries, whereas those in the non-profit sector reduce them slightly. The total effect is mixed.</i></p> <p><i>. The dead-weight effect is as follows. In one hiring on two in the profit sector, 47% would have been effective had the program not existed ((Bernard and Rey, 2017). In comparison, 25% of the hiring would not have been done had the program not existed. The latter effect is higher in the non-profit sector (56%).</i></p> <p><i>. The rate of employment six months after the program is 67%, but this rate combines the two scheme measures in the profit sector (CIE and Emplois d’avenir). The rate of employment for Emplois d’avenir is not available (Cour des Comptes, 2016). The rate of unemployment remains at a high level, 29%. It is worst in the non-profit sector: 6 months after the program, 51% of the beneficiaries are unemployed. The rate of employment and the are the rate of unemployment of the beneficiaries are naïve indicators. They should be compared to the rate of unemployment of those who didn’t enter the program but who have similar individual characteristics. Estimations carried out in the profit sector present positive significant results (Bernard and Rey, 2017): beneficiaries have higher probabilities to get a stable job than comparable non-beneficiaries. In the non-profit sector, the results are not so positive. The probability to get a stable job is higher for comparable non-beneficiaries than for beneficiaries (Bernard and Rey, 2017).</i></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><i>. Regarding access to training, the program achieves its stated goals: acquiring a certificate in most of the cases, or solely basic and social skills. This was a challenge to young people for which school is mostly seen as a failure.</i></p> <p><i>. Regarding access to employment, the program has not achieved its stated goals, since it was expected 75% of the beneficiaries to get a job in the next 6 months (Court of Audit, 2016).</i></p> |



| | |
|---|--|
| | <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? See <i>previous box</i>. One year after entering a “Emploi d’avenir”, 3 young people on 4 benefited from a training and 1 young people on 2 benefited from a training with certificate (Rostam, 2016). Access to training is higher in the non-profit sector (83%) than in the profit sector (58%) (<i>ibid.</i>) Access to a certification if the national certification framework was a key point of the scheme measure. 47% of the Emplois d’avenir benefitted from a training with a certificate, a proportion that is double those for a comparable population.</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.)? There is no problem of coverage not of barriers for participation.</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>In my opinion, coverage and take-up are well addressed, since they really focus on the less qualified, especially in deprived areas. This point is coincides with stakeholder’s views (Le Bissonais, 2015).</i></p> <p><i>The main weakness regarding the coverage and take-up could be the high number of new contracts that the French State assigned to the stakeholders (namely the Missions locales, which is – shortly said- the PES for young people), an objective which is hard to achieve in a short time. The risk is to impede the primary target of this youth scheme, which is to offer a job and a training to the less qualified.</i></p> <p><i>Regarding the effectiveness of the scheme, the main weakness could be the training component which is quite short in average (26 days throughout the fist year of the contract, see Rostam, 2016). The elaboration of a training plan is quite difficult to set up for the Missions Locales which partially failed to coordinate all the training stakeholders (joint collecting bodies, training centres) due to a lack of resources (human and financial). It could be considered as the negative side of an ambitious program.</i></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><i>Yes, the measure addresses the main challenge of unemployment for the less qualified. They give us the opportunity to participate in a training, with or without a certificate, and to acquire valuable skills.</i></p> <p><i>But, the analysis of the characteristics of the beneficiaries indicates that there is a failure regarding the targeting of the main risk groups. The</i></p> |



| | |
|---|--|
| | <p><i>Court of Audit (2016) features that young people aged 16-20 having the most difficulties didn't enter the Emploi d'avenir scheme measure. In addition, the objective of priority given to young people living in urban disadvantaged area is not achieved.</i></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>. Access to employment and to training at the same time is a positive key point of the program. In addition, the labour contract under the Emplois d'Avenir is quite long (up to three years) for a young to improve employability.</p> <p><i>Individual guidance and tutoring in the company is a success factor of the Emplois d'avenir. Nonetheless, tutoring is addressed in a different manner depending of the size of the company, and this point should be enhanced and reviewed in the future.</i></p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p><i>The success of such a program should take into consideration the local context, to avoid coverage issues, to offer a better coordination between the PES (namely Missions Locales) and training stakeholders, and a better engagement of local companies.</i></p> |

Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

France has a long tradition of employment and social public policies for youth, facing increasing unemployment rates since the middle of the seventies. The first youth schemes already intended to offer subsidized jobs and training as well as subsidized jobs in the public sector for the less qualified. They were launched with three successive national Pacts dealing with youth unemployment (1977-1981; see Aeberhardt, Crusson and Pommier (2011)). The main objective of the first measures was to promote the employability, to foster the access to employment and to tackle social exclusion (Werquin, 1997); The first national Pacts make the assumption that unemployment comes from a lack of qualification of part of the youth. We already were not so far from the assumptions that prevail the Youth Guarantee launch or the Quality traineeship and apprenticeship initiatives.

With the creation of local entry points for young people in 1981 – the *Missions locales* – transition from school to work schemes shift from employment issues to social issues (accommodation, health, ...). Social issues require to be treated before or in parallel of difficulties on the labour market, at least for the most disadvantaged groups. The CIVIS, the ancestor of the YG, targeted young people under 26 encountering difficulties to get a job and to remain in employment. Here again, we observe that the adoption of a European Youth Plan in the frame of EU2020 was largely implemented in the country.



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 ¹⁶ | Starting year; end year | Funding source | Part of EU initiatives | Evaluation | The impact of the policy measures | Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people |
|----|-----------------|----------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--|--|
| 1 | Youth Guarantee | National | Targeted to youth risk group | 2013-on going | EU, national and regional | Yes | Yes positive | The number of NEETs has decreased (source: European Court of Auditors, 2017) but not the youth unemployment rate | The number of NEETs has decreased (source: European Court of Auditors, 2017) but not the youth unemployment rate |
| 2 | EPIDE | National | Targeted to youth risk group | 2005-on going | National | No | N/A | N/A | N/A |

Comments on Table 6

YG in France has a strong social policy components, as it targets disadvantaged young people (NEET young people) and offers financial support to tackle social difficulties (like in the other program described here). It seems that this financial support is used in France but not in other countries. Moreover, YG is implemented by local entry points of the PES for young people - named « Missions Locales », whom the objective is to treat simultaneously labour market difficulties and social difficulties (health, accommodation....). The reason why YG is implemented by Missions Locales is twofold: first, they are at the right place to reach NEET young people, and secondly, their way of working is to support young people for all the aspects of the social life. This is very different from the PES (Pole Emploi for France) which treats only the labour market difficulties. The support in the framework of YG is not only linked to labour market like in programs described in part 3.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Name of the initiative | Establishment for Integration Into Employment of the French Armed forces / EPIDE |
|------------------------|---|

¹⁶ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



| | |
|--------------------------|---|
| <p>Short description</p> | <p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: <i>the scheme gives young people aged between 18 and 25 with no qualifications a chance to become acquainted with Group professions through presentations, internships and introductory training courses over a period of several months. It offers a second chance to vulnerable young people, mostly of them being early school leavers experiencing legal issues and familial issues.</i></p> <p>Intended effects: social inclusion and access to the labour market.</p> <p>Target groups: <i>early school leavers without qualifications, experiencing familial and legal issues.</i></p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries: aged 18-25 years old, unemployed, without qualifications.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): <i>training without certificate. The scheme measure has a duration of several months (less than one year), the main difference with E2Cs for instance is the internship characteristic. Young people benefit from training and citizenship education, they also work for the profit sector during the programme. They are compensated for their work since they receive a monthly allowance. Young people in a EPIDE sign a Corporate Volunteer contract.</i></p> <p><i>Description: the EPIDE program is based on internships and introductory training courses over a period of several months (8 to 10 months, and could be extended to 24 months).</i></p> <p><i>The school is based on strict discipline and regulations. Young people must wear an uniform to avoid social discrimination.</i></p> <p><i>The class size is limited to 15 which allows the inclusion of the children.</i></p> <p><i>The program is based on individual support: general training to foster basic skills, specific training to develop social skills. An action plan is elaborated to support the professional plan of each beneficiary.</i></p> <p><i>It offers a collaborative approach to get behavioral codes and rules.</i></p> <p>Level: national</p> <p>Start/ end date: 2005, still on going</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? Ministry of French Armed forces and EPIDE training Centres are involved in the formulation and implementation of the measure.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? EPIDE Centres</p> |
|--------------------------|---|



| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: <i>85 million euros a year</i> Source: <i>Court of Auditors, 2017</i>)</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.</p> <p><i>Number of young people taking part a year: around 3,500 (Source: Court of Auditors, 2017)</i></p> <p><i>Number of young people covered since 2005: around 30,000 (source: www.epide.fr)</i></p> <p><i>Rate of positive return (in employment or training): 50% (source: www.epide.fr)</i></p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis: 85 million euros a year (Source: Court of Auditors, 2017)</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? Total annual cost per beneficiary: 26,700 euros (source: Court of Auditors, 2017)</p> |
| Targeting | <p>Which are the target groups of this measure? <i>Unemployed and vulnerable young people, experiencing legal and familial issues, without qualifications, being marginalized. 3 beneficiaries on 4 are NEET (source: http://www.epide.fr/actualites/detail/article/lepide-publie-lenquete-2016-sur-le-profil-des-volontaires/)</i></p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? <i>Only to young people aged 18-25 years old.</i></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</p> <p><i>No</i></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><i>Youth Employment Initiative</i></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><i>Permanent monitoring</i> (http://www.epide.fr/actualites/detail/article/lepide-publie-lenquete-2016-sur-le-profil-des-volontaires/) and ex-post evaluation</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p><i>Internal and external (Court of Auditors)</i></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><i>Basic information is delivered: number of entries, number of young people in employment after the program, number of young people entering another training program. To our knowledge, there is no information delivered regarding deadweight loss or substitution effect.</i></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><i>Results about EPIDE are scarce. We can find figures about participants produced by the EPIDE centres. A survey of beneficiaries was carried out in 2010. It stresses that more than 70% of them were in employment or training afterwards and that more than 95% were satisfied about the programme.</i></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? Difficult to answer without significant evaluation results.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect? N/A</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.)? N/A</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> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | The main weakness refers to cost per beneficiary which is considered as really expensive and for which there are no valuable evaluation results (Court of Auditors, 2016). |
| 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><i>It mainly addresses social exclusion of this target risk group (NEET with legal/familial issues) providing intensive individual support, internship and training.</i></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><i>The main success factors are: - a global solution for marginalised and vulnerable young people (internship, education and training, job experience); - The success of the programme is largely due to its personalised support, individual guidance, emphasis on individual commitment and appropriate pedagogy. A consequence of this is that the number of young people entering EPIDE is quite low;</i></p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? The number of EPIDE centers is extending, a sign that this model is functioning, despite the highly cost per beneficiary. It is the only scheme measure for marginalised and very vulnerable young people. This could be considered as a good practice since it treats several aspects of issues of the targeted young people (lack of qualification, social exclusion, lack of job experience, lack of community rules and social norms).</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> |

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Name of the initiative | Youth Guarantee (YG)/Garantie Jeunes |
| Short description | <p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: Remedial program to foster the access to the labour market to NEET young people. YG provides reinforced counselling, professional immersion, financial allowance to vulnerable youth (European Commission, 2017¹⁷). Young people receive 461 euros each month as they enter the YG program.</p> <p>Intended effects: the YG intends to promote self-sufficiency for young people in a very high precarious situation by organising</p> |

17

YG

Country

Fiche,

<http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1161&langId=en&intPageId=3335> , 2017, March.



| |
|---|
| <p><i>personal and professional support, and managing employment or training paths.</i></p> <p>Target groups: <i>NEETs, young people aged 18-25, considered as vulnerable, facing a precarious situation like financial difficulties</i></p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- <i>to be neither in education, employment or training (NEET),</i>- <i>earn less than the social income level (RSA – approximately 545 euros),</i>- <i>without familial support,</i>- <i>to be prepared to commit in an intensive support</i> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): <i>preparation for training or employment, vocational guidance/career counselling, training without certificate.</i></p> <p><i>Description: the YG provides reinforced counselling, professional immersion, financial allowance to vulnerable youth.</i></p> <p><i>Youth Guarantee Country Report (EC, 2017):</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">. <i>The YG provides through the French National Public Employment Service (Pôle Emploi) personalised support and mentoring actions for young people, including tailored support provided on a one-to-one basis (with a maximum duration of 6 months) or via group activities (up to 3 months).</i>. <i>A specialised mentor is dedicated exclusively to the actions which consist of the individual profiling of young people (analysis of their personal characteristics and needs) and the preparation and provision of personalised support actions and related counselling. Such actions include measures to increase self-esteem and social inclusion, support for the preparation of CVs, support in job-search and orientation towards training opportunities.</i> <p>Level: <i>experimented in few regions first, and national since 2017.</i></p> <p>Start/ end date: <i>social cohesion law (2013), came into effect in 2014 in few regions and extended in 2017.</i></p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? <i>no</i></p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented? <i>Access points for youth for employment and social services, called Missions Locales.</i></p> |
|---|



| | |
|-------------------------|--|
| | <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: 255 million euros in 2016 (source: Court of Auditors, 2017)</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.</p> <p><i>Number of young people taking part since 2014: 71544 (source: French Senate, 2017)</i></p> <p><i>Number of young people taking part in 2015: 16733</i></p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis: 255 million euros in 2016 (source: Court of Auditors, 2017)</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? 6000 euros per beneficiary in 2015 source: Court of Auditors, 2017</p> |
| Targeting | <p>Which are the target groups of this measure? NEETs</p> <p>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed? <i>Young people only</i></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)? <i>It doesn't target all unemployed but only young people under 26.</i></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><i>No</i></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><i>Youth Guarantee and Youth Employment Initiative</i></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><i>YG benefits from a complete evaluation program (qualitative and quantitative) carried out mid-term (on going) and permanent monitoring (see next box for references)</i></p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p><i>Internal and external (scientific committee and scientific institutes)</i></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><i>Include basic information and more, such as evaluation of the intervention using recent impact methods (quantitative evaluation of YG) (Ministry of Labour, 2016). For the needs of the impact evaluation, a platform has been launched at the same time the YG was experimented in 13 regions. At this platform, Missions Locales registered legally of age eligible young people (pilot group); in other Regions, Missions locales registered eligible young people to build the control group. The Ministry of labour draws on three data sources to estimate the impact of the YG: . the register of Missions Locales (contains level of education, place of living, age, career paths...), . the platform (contains individual characteristics, difficulties the young encounters, ...), . an ad-hoc panel survey (3 waves to follow-up young people in and after they leave the program; contains situation on the labour market, job search, training, support by the Missions Locales, living conditions, well-being, social involvement).</i></p> <p><i>Besides the quantitative evaluation, the qualitative evaluation display relevant elements regarding the implementation of the YG (Farvaque, Kramme and Tuczirer, 2016)</i></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><i>A qualitative evaluation was carried out in 2015-2016 (Loison-Leruste, Couronné and Sarfati, 2016). The main results are reported here.</i></p> <p><i>The target group of the YG is that expected. The analysis of the target group present three factors of vulnerability: early school leaving, familial issues (precariousness of the parents' job situation, large families) and social integration issues. It is important to have in mind the main sociological characteristics of the targeted population: young people that have failed in the traditional education and training</i></p> |



| | |
|--|---|
| | <p><i>system, often suffers from additional issues such as family conflict or legal issues. These are young people severely at risk of social exclusion, who are frequently already targeted by PES (Missions Locales) and participated in other social inclusion programme. These young people present low mobility and most of them do not hold a driving licence.</i></p> <p><i>The analysis of job trajectories beneficiaries' shapes three categories: one characterised by access to a job, mostly a short-term duration contract; one characterised by positive signals to integrate the labour market; a last one for which their situation didn't improved despite the program. The group that manages to get a job are often more qualified and more mobile.</i></p> <p><i>Another qualitative survey was carried out on FARVQUE 2016</i></p> <p><i>- The first interim report of the scientific committee in charge of the evaluation of the YG stresses positive results in terms of access to stable employment (Ministry of Labour, 2016). The part of young people in stable employment in around 5 points over those of the control group (20,5% instead of 15,9%).</i></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><i>Source European Commission 2017: "Results of YG monitoring for 2015 show that the YG scheme in France successfully reached 80.5% of NEETs aged under 25, though this represents a decrease of 9 percentage points compared to 2014 (89.6%). Less than a quarter (24.3%) of those leaving the scheme in 2015 took up an offer within 4 months of registration, marginally up from 2014 (23.4%). The difficulty to deliver timely offers is reflected in the fact that three-quarters of those in the scheme (75.6%) at any point during the year had been registered for more than 4 months, with a third of these (24.8% of the total) registered for more than 12 months."</i></p> <p><i>Source European Commission 2017: "Counselling is also being stepped up, but integrating young people into the labour market remains problematic. France has developed a wide range of measures for the 'Youth Guarantee'. However, there is a lack of a comprehensive monitoring system and the visibility is generally low with no coordinated communication strategy. To help young people facing multiple obstacles in finding work, the experimental scheme youth guarantee ('garantie jeunes'), launched in October 2013 and managed by the Missions locales, has been extended to 50,000 young people in 2015 and is projected to reach 60,000 in 2016 and</i></p> |



| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>100,000 in 2017. The PES has also developed a special individual and group counselling offer for young people ('accompagnement intensif jeunes') with 740 counsellors at the end of 2015. An agreement between the State and the regions also aims to better coordinate regional efforts targeted at early school leavers. This agreement is part of the broad action plan to fight early school leaving, launched under the ongoing education reform."</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>First quantitative results seem to indicate that there is no accurate problem of targeting (Ministry of Labour, 2016). However, qualitative investigations report that covering the NEETs is a population quite difficult to reach, especially the inactive NEETs. Improving the coverage of NEETs requires a narrow collaboration of actors in charge of employment and social policies.</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 weakness of the YG could be the difficulty for the Missions Locales in charge of the intervention to identify and cover the target (the NEETs). They need to develop their partnership with the profit sector and social stakeholders (Farvaque, Kramme and Tuchziner, 2016; European Court of Auditors, 2017).</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, the YG address the main cause for unemployment and social exclusion of the target group. It offers intensive and personalised support during the first 2 months of the YG and financial support to prevent from drop out. However, 20% of the young people entering the YG leave before the first 12 months. Few of them drop out (9%), other are fired due to non-respect of the rules (12%).</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>Conversely to other instruments of the youth employment policies, YG target the most vulnerable group, addressing financial issues,</p> |



training issues and labour market issues. Leaned back to employment and social services for young people only – Missions locales – the YG benefits from the experience and professionalism of counsellors to receive NEETs young people. A success factor of the YG is to offer a financial allowance to young people who enter the program. This reinforces the commitment of young people to build their professional future. Despite this, 20% of young people leave prematurely the program (Ministry of Labour, 2016).

A second success factor is the commitment of young people with their counsellor. YG is a contract between a young and the Mission Locale. Young people have to respect rules in relation to job search and training. If they do not respect the rules, the contract (and then the allowance) could be ROMPU. Young people benefit from a ACCOMPAGNEMENT RENFORCE intending to tackle obstacles to manage their transition to the labour market.

Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?

The success of the YG relies on the Missions Locales network. Actually there are 450 entry points for young people aged 18-25 in France. The replication in other contexts is not easily feasible without such a network.



References

- Aeberhardt, R., Crusson, L. & Pommier, P. (2011). Les politiques d'accès à l'emploi en faveur des jeunes: qualifier et accompagner. *Dossier France Portait Social*.
- Benoteau, I. & Remy, V. (2015). Le Panel 2008 de la Dares: un outil d'évaluation d'impact des contrats aidés sur la trajectoire professionnelle des demandeurs d'emploi. *Economie et Statistique*, 477.
- Bernard, S. & Rey, M. (2017). Les contrats aidés: quels objectifs, quel bilan? *DARES-Analyse*, 021, June.
- Cahuc, P., Carcillo, S. & Minea, A. (2017). The difficult school-to-work transition of high school dropouts: Evidence from a field experiment. *IZA DP*, 10842.
- Cahuc, P., Carcillo, S. & Zimmerman, K. (2013), L'emploi des jeunes peu qualifiés en France. *Note du Conseil d'Analyse Economique*, 4.
- Card, D. (2015). L'évaluation des politiques actives du marché du travail: quels enseignements? *Travail et Emploi*, 139, July-September.
- Card, D., Kluve, J. & Weber, A. (2010). Active labour market policy evaluations: a meta-analysis. *The Economic Journal*, 120, November.
- Cour des comptes européenne (2017). *Chômage des jeunes: les politiques de l'UE ont-elles changé le cours des choses?* Rapport spécial, numéro 5.
- Court of Auditors (2016). *L'accès des jeunes à l'emploi*.
- Crépon, B., Duflo, E., Huillery, E., Parienté, W. & Seban J. (2014). *Les effets du dispositif d'accompagnement à la création d'entreprise Créajeune: résultats d'une expérience contrôlée*,
https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/publications/Rapport_Final_Evaluation_ADIE-CREAJEUNES_J-PAL_PSE_Mai_2014.pdf
- DGEFP (2013). *Plan national de mise en œuvre de la garantie européenne pour la jeunesse*.
- Ehrel, C. (2014). *Les politiques de l'emploi*. Coll. Que Sais-Je.
- Farvaque, N., Kramme, C. & Tuchzirer, C. (2016). *La Garantie Jeunes du point de vue des Missions locales: un modèle d'accompagnement innovant, mais source de bouleversements organisationnels*. Rapport pour le Comité scientifique en charge de l'évaluation de la Garantie Jeune.
- Fontaine F. & Malherbet F. (2012). Les effets macroéconomiques du Contrat Unique d'Insertion. *LIEPP Policy Brief*.
- French Senate (2017). *Information Report on 'Missions Locales'*.
- French Senate (2015). *Information Report on Second Chance Schools*.



Givord, P. (2014). Méthodes d'évaluation des politiques publiques. *Economie et Prévision*, 204-205.

Heyer, E. & Plane, M. (2012). Les emplois d'avenir : quel impact sur l'emploi et les finances publiques? *Revue de l'OFCE*, 8 (Supp.1).

Ministry of Labour (2017). Les dispositifs spécifiques d'emploi aidés et de formation au premier trimestre 2017. *DARES-Indicateurs*, 039.

Rostam, W. (2016). Les jeunes en emploi d'avenir : quel accès à la formation, pour quels bénéficiaires. *DARES-Analyses*, 056.

Rostam, W. (2014). L'école de la 2^e chance, la Grande école des décrocheurs motivés. *DARES-Analyse*, 068.

Simmonet, V. (2014). Évaluation des politiques actives du marché du travail: Introduction. *Travail et Emploi*, 139, July-September.

Werquin, P. (1997). 1986-1996 : dix ans d'intervention publique sur le marché du travail des jeunes, *Economie et Statistique*, 304-305.

Websites:

<http://www.droit-de-la-formation.fr/vos-rubriques/actualites/actualite-juridique/Contrat-de-volontariat-pour-l-2828.html?>

www.epide.fr

www.reseau-e2c.fr

<http://poem.travail-emploi.gouv.fr>