



Youth employment policies in Ireland

EXCEPT working paper no. 39
June 2018

Nuala Connolly
Sophie Burfurd

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:

Connolly, N. & Burfurd, S. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Ireland*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 39. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-408-4 (pdf)

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



Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Ireland	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview	7
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	12
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	15
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives	35
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	36
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	38



The key risk groups in the labour market in Ireland

Table 1 “Risk group” construction¹

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Young people with outdated qualifications	2	2	2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

Comments on Table 1

All young people: Young people as a broad category are not considered at risk in Ireland. Among those considered at risk are early school leavers, youth people in unemployment, young people experiencing homelessness, and young people in the justice system.

Young unemployed: Since the economic crisis in Ireland, young people in unemployment have been a political priority, and the subject of [research and advocacy](#).

Early school leavers: There is a strong evidence-base for early school leavers in Ireland, with a number of studies and publications undertaken over time relating to school-leaving², school transitions³. This is mirrored in policy, with initiatives addressing [school retention](#) and [returning to education](#).

¹ 1=no significant role to 5=very important

² Department of Education and Skills (2013) *Early Leavers: What Next?*, Available at: <https://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Statistics/Early-Leavers-What-Next-.pdf>

³ Department of Education and Skills (2018) *Statistical Reports*, Available at: <https://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Statistics/Statistical-Reports/Other-Statistical-Reports.html>



NEETs: Concern about young people not in education, employment or training (NEETs) is reflected in academic literature⁴. In news media, it has tended to be picked up mostly in the context of European NEET data. While this group of young people is targeted with measures at a national level, the term NEET is less common. For instance, Ireland's national policy framework for children and young people does not reference the term NEET⁵. It is briefly mentioned in the National Youth Strategy⁶.

Migrants/ Ethnic Minorities: While some young people in Ireland, including those from migrant communities and Traveller children and young people⁷ are identified as priorities in terms of policy and provision, evidence (see below) suggests additional support may be needed.

Young people with a disability: In addition to commitments in the aforementioned National Policy Framework, Ireland's Disability Inclusion Strategy was launched in 2017⁸. While research is undertaken, there has been [some criticism](#) that children and young people with disabilities are not always included in research about them.

Other: Youth mental health is a topic of increasing importance in Ireland⁹. While it is [now falling](#), Ireland has the [fourth highest](#) rate of adolescent suicide in the EU. Despite some political [will](#), and policy developments, waiting lists for Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services [are long](#).

Ireland's policy framework for children and young people operates across Departments and agencies, and extends to statutory and non-statutory organisations that work with, and for, children and young people. As such, outcomes and goals therein address many of the at-risk groups identified in this list. That being said, Ireland's increasingly diverse ethnic profile is not yet fully addressed in national policy and provision. Some needs will be met by overlap with other groups identified here, and some services are provided at various levels by voluntary organisations. A National Youth Council report¹⁰ identified the need for appropriate supports, education, training and advocacy for ethnic minority youth. The report also identifies the need for additional research.

⁴ Kelly, E., & McGuinness, S. (2015). Impact of the Great Recession on unemployed and NEET individuals' labour market transitions in Ireland. *Economic Systems*, 39(1), 59-71.

⁵ Department of Children and Youth Affairs (2014) *Better Outcomes, Brighter Futures: The National Policy Framework for Children and Young People 2014- 2020*, Department of Children and Youth Affairs: Dublin

⁶ Department of Children and Youth Affairs (2015) *National Youth Strategy 2015-2020*, Department of Children and Youth Affairs: Dublin.

⁷ Department of Justice and Equality (2017) *National Traveller and Roma Inclusion Strategy, 2017-2021*. [online], Department of Justice and Equality: Dublin.

⁸ The Department of Justice and Equality (2017) *National Disability Inclusion Strategy, 2017-2021* [online], Department of Justice and Equality: Dublin

⁹ Dooley, B.A., Fitzgerald, A. (2012) *My World Survey: National Study of Youth Mental Health in Ireland*, Headstrong and UCD School of Psychology.

¹⁰ National Youth Council of Ireland (2017) *Make Minority a Priority: Insights from the Minority Ethnic Young People Growing up in Ireland and Recommendations for the Youth Work Sector*. [online], National Youth Council of Ireland: Dublin.



[Irish Travellers](#) are younger than the general population. According to the 2016 Census, over 73% of Travellers were aged 34 or younger. While more Travellers in Ireland are going to college, educational attainment among this group is significantly behind the general population. Travellers are also more likely to live in temporary accommodation. The aforementioned National Traveller and Roma Inclusion Strategy aims to address some of these additional needs.



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	n/a	n/a	n/a
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:			
2.1	Total number	63,177	94,835	92,264
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	3.01	4.30	4.16 ¹¹
3	Number of youth participants (less than 25 years) in active labour market programmes ¹² :			
3.1	Total number	10,343	17,062	14,384
3.2	% of the labour force (less than 25)	2.5	5.2	5.3
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	16.4	18	15.6
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (EUR)	793.58	1,148.40	1,248.80
4.2	% of GDP	0.5	0.69	0.49
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants ¹³ :	n/a	n/a	n/a
5.1	Total amount (EUR)	n/a	n/a	n/a
5.2	% of GDP	n/a	n/a	n/a
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:	n/a	n/a	n/a
6.1	Total amount (EUR)	n/a	n/a	n/a
6.2	% of GDP	n/a	n/a	n/a
6.3	% of the total expenditures on active labour market programmes	n/a	n/a	n/a

¹¹ Active population

¹² Data on participants in ALMPs between 15-29 years are not available in the Eurostat database. Instead, data on participants less than 25 years is presented

¹³ It is not possible to disaggregate this data from the Eurostat database in a reliable or robust way



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 ¹⁴	Preventive/reactive ¹⁵	Youth specific	Main source of funding ¹⁶	Linked to EU initiatives ¹⁷	Main actors of delivery ¹⁸	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	3	3	Partly	2, 3	1, 4	1, 3	Yes	Yes
Vocational guidance, career counselling	3	1	Yes	2	No	3, 7	Yes	Unknown
Training (with certificates)	3	3	Yes	1, 2, 4	6	1, 3, 7	Yes	Yes
Training (without certificates)	2	3	Yes	2	6	3, 7	Partly	Unknown
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	2	2	Partly	2	1	1, 2, 3, 4	Yes	Yes
Direct job creation	2	2	Partly	2	1	1, 2, 3	Partly	Partly
Start-up incentives, self-employment*	1	3	No	2	No	2, 4	Partly	Unknown
Other	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Comments on Table 3

(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment

Reorientation courses, preparation for training and employment are of particular importance in addressing youth unemployment in Ireland. A number of vocational education and training courses exist, with many providing allowances for participants.

¹⁴ Importance depends on the comparative scale of the programme (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

¹⁵ To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

¹⁶ EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other =5

¹⁷ Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other = 6

¹⁸ Insert; state = 1, region = 2, municipality = 3, church = 4, foundations, NGOs = 5, private sector = 6, educational institutions=7 Other, please specify=8



Information is available [here](#). One example, YouthReach is provided in detailed in this report as an example of good practice.

Many courses fall into this category, including some of the training programmes described below. They are variously funded, delivered at national and local level and targeted to different groups.

At a European funding level, [The EURES Experience Your Europe \(EYE\) programme](#) aims at helping young jobseekers to remove the barriers in finding work or training opportunities in Europe. This includes the provision of financial support towards travel to an interview, re-location, language training costs etc. There are two options promoted under the EYE programme: Your First EURES Job (aimed at jobseekers aged 18-35) and the Co-Sponsored Placement Programme (aimed at jobseekers aged 18-24).

Vocational Guidance/ Career Counselling:

There are lots of ways young people can continue in education, further training and acquire new skills. Many of The range of measure available is evidenced [here](#). In 2014, FÁS was dissolved and replaced with SOLAS, providing training to over 300,000 young people in Ireland each year. Their role includes management, co-ordination and supporting the delivering of such programmes. [Intreo centres](#) provide employment supports, including advice and assistance in relation to securing work.

Training with/without certificates

There are a range of training opportunities provided for early school leavers and young people without qualifications. Training with certification is of greater significance than training without certification.

A large number of education and training programmes are funded by SOLAS, and offered through the [Education and Training Boards \(ETBs\)](#), and various government departments and agencies.

The Vocational Training Opportunities Scheme (VTOS) provides a range of courses to unemployed people over 21.

Post leaving cert (PLC) courses are available to those who have finished your secondary education and would like to develop vocational and technological skills in order to get a job or to go into further education and training.

Further Education and Training (FET) courses support upskilling in the commercial and industrial sectors.

[Springboard](#): provides free higher education places, mostly for unemployed people, who can keep social welfare payments while participating.

[Youthreach](#) is described in detail in this report. It is funded under the European Social Fund.

Employment incentives, subsidies for employer



A number of initiatives in Ireland provide employer incentives, in the form of work placements or subsidies. Some are detailed in this report and an outline is provided here:

[JobsPlus](#) is an employer incentive which encourages employers to offer employment to jobseekers on the Live Register who have been out of work by giving employers cash incentives. Under the Youth Guarantee, from 1st January 2015, the qualifying period for employers to avail of JobsPlus for those aged under 25 has been reduced to 4 months. Young people who are eligible will be given certification that they qualify for the subsidy and can use this certification when making job applications.

Although not a direct employer incentive, [the Tús initiative](#) is a community work placement scheme providing short-term working opportunities for unemployed people that benefits the community. Placements are provided by community and voluntary organisations in both urban and rural areas. The Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection (DEASP) has overall responsibility for the scheme.

[Gateway](#) is a Local Authority Labour Activation Scheme. It is a county and city council placement scheme providing short-term working opportunities for unemployed people. It is designed to assist the personal and social development of participants with a view to bridging the gap between unemployment and re-entering the workplace.

[The Community Employment \(CE\) programme](#) is designed to help people who are long-term unemployed to get back to work by offering part-time and temporary placements in jobs based within local communities. It is administered by the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection.

[JobBridge](#) (detailed in this report) was a work experience scheme that ran for five years and was aimed at jobseekers between the age of 18-24 years old, with a small additional incentive topping up a participant's jobseeker's allowance. The scheme was discontinued in 2016 and had received some criticism for a [perceived exploitation](#) of young people.

[First Steps](#) was subsequently launched as a Youth Development Internship aimed unemployed young people aged from 18-24 who face barriers to entering employment, including lower levels of education or long-term unemployment, overseen by the Department of Employment Affairs. It closed for applications in 2016 to facilitate the introduction of the [Youth Employment Support Scheme \(YESS\)](#). This new scheme will be introduced in the second quarter of 2018 for young people aged between 18 and 24. It aims to provide a work placement where the participant has the opportunity to learn and will also receive the equivalent of the minimum wage. At the end of the programme, host organisations will be encouraged to hire satisfactory participants and will qualify for a subsidy under the JobsPlus Youth incentive.

Direct job creation



Youth [unemployment levels have fallen](#) in Ireland since the economic crisis. It has been flagged that while jobs have been created, the quality of such opportunities merits consideration, through national and regional economic development strategies. An exploratory paper on job creation and job quality prepare for the National Youth Council of Ireland in 2016 found that the alignment of unemployment and activation policies with enterprise and skills policies is a work in progress ¹⁹.

Start-up Incentives

While a small number of such schemes exist, these are not a priority and only one is aimed at young people.

The [Young Entrepreneur Scheme](#) is aimed at young people who have a business or business idea with commercial potential. The scheme provides funds and grants to winners of competitions run by Local Enterprise Offices. It is not targeted and is unlikely to benefit at-risk youth.

The [Back to Enterprise Allowance](#) is a scheme encouraging people getting social welfare payments to become self-employed. Participants can keep part of their social welfare payment for up to 2 years. In addition to income support, participants get financial support with with the costs of setting up their business.

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
Position of early school leavers and unskilled as a priority on the policy agenda.	Insufficient youth-targeted labour market policies.
Position of unemployment as a priority on the policy agenda.	Insufficient policy or practice targeted to specific at-risk groups of young people.
Flexible approach- opportunities to undertake different programmes and move among different initiatives.	Complicated landscape with multiple programmes and employer incentives operating at various levels. Continuum of service-provision needed.
Various incentives for employers connected to programmes and initiatives.	Legacy of negative perception of JobBridge as exploiting vulnerable young people.
Success of community-based schemes.	

¹⁹ Sweeney, J. (2016) *Job Creation and Job Quality in Ireland: an Exploration of the Policy Issues*, Dublin: National Youth Council of Ireland.



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Ireland has implemented a range of initiatives aimed at supporting young people to find work. These include internships, traineeships and employer subsidies. A contextual overview is provided here, along with some examples focused on ‘good jobs’ and their relevant policy context.

The introduction of the Youth Guarantee in 2013 aimed to provide young people with a good quality offer of employment, education or traineeship. In Ireland, the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection coordinates the implementation of the Guarantee.

Ireland has implemented a range of initiatives under the Youth Guarantee. Information is available [here](#).

JobBridge, the national internship scheme, was a strategic response to Ireland’s economic crisis. It closed for applications in August, 2017. Evaluations of the scheme provided opportunities for learning in job creation for young people. After that, First Steps was rolled out (as part of the Youth Guarantee), aimed at young people with lower levels of education. It has now closed to applications and has been replaced with the Youth Employment Support Scheme (YESS). It is targeted at young jobseekers who are long-term unemployed and aims to provide them with the opportunity to learn basic work and social skills in a supportive environment while on a work placement. More information on the range of relevant initiatives can be found [here](#).

Also rolled out under the Youth Guarantee was JobsPlus Youth, the employer incentive scheme which encourages employers to offer employment to jobseekers from the Live Register who have been out of work by providing cash incentives. The programme is profiled as a detailed example in this report, evidencing its early implementation success.

In addition, the EURES Experience Your Europe (EYE) programme aims at helping young jobseekers overcome barriers to find work in Europe, including financial support towards travel to an interview, re-location, language and training costs. It includes a co-sponsored placement programme supporting a young person to take up employment to take up a placement in another European country. This is an example of a programme aimed at good jobs for young people, with the programme of potential interest to Irish companies with branches in Europe or with a demand for a certain skillset.

The Department also hosts Jobs Fairs with the aim to bring employers and other agencies face-to-face with recruiting employers or with training agencies offering training to the unemployed.



In addition, the Back to Work Enterprise Allowance supports individual start-ups by allowing people to retain a reducing proportion of their social welfare payment over two years.

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	Evaluation	“Good practice” example ²²	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ²³	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ²⁴
1	Jobs Plus	National	C. Targeted to long-term unemployed	4	2013	The European Commission is providing co-funding to JobsPlus for participants under 25 years. The JobsPlus is supported by the European Social Fund.	JobsPlus is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF)	Policy Review - mixed results	Yes	3	2
2	Job Bridge	National	C. JobBridge targets those in receipt of jobseekers allowance and particular target groups	5	2011	JobBridge is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF) and Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection on an equal funding basis.	Yes: Youth Guarantee (First Steps) Youth Employment Initiative European Social Fund	Yes, mixed results.	No.	2	2

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

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



			of young people and those with a disability.								
3	Tús	National	C. Targeted to long-term unemployed	5	2011	The European Commission is providing co-funding to Tús for participants under 25 years. Tús is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF) and Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection on an equal funding basis.	Yes: Youth Guarantee Youth Employment Initiative European Social Fund European Commission	Yes, mixed results.	Partially	3	2

Comments on Table 5

JobsPlus

JobsPlus was selected because of its standing as a high-profile, national employer-incentive scheme with a new youth component connected to the Youth Guarantee. Early evidence indicates its success and a full evaluation is forthcoming.

JobBridge

JobBridge is selected as it was a prominent response to Ireland’s economic crisis. Despite its position in the current best practice database, evidence and evaluation indicates it was not entirely successful as a measure and therefore represents important learning.

Tús

Tús was selected as an ongoing example of a community-based initiative, with a youth strand that is co-funded by the European Commission through the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF).



Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	JobsPlus
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>JobsPlus is an employer incentive which encourages and rewards employers who employ jobseekers on the Live Register.</p> <p>Intended effects: It is intended to encourage employers and businesses to employ people who have been out of work for long periods.</p> <p>Target groups: Jobseekers on the Live Register; young jobseekers; long-term unemployed</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>In receipt of Jobseeker’s financial supports. If 25 or over, be at least 12 months on the Live Register. Or be 25 or over and least 24 months on the Live Register in the previous 30 months to qualify as an eligible employee for the higher incentive. If under 25, the qualifying period is 4 months.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p> <p>Employment incentives, subsidies for employer. The measure is tied to employability.</p> <p>Level: The programme is available nationally and administered by the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection</p> <p>Start/ end date: July, 2013- Present</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p> <p>The programme is available nationally and administered by the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection.</p> <p>The European Commission is providing co-funding to JobsPlus for participants under 25 years. JobsPlus Youth is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF).</p> <p>Employers would also be considered stakeholders/ partners in the implementation of this initiative.</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>The European Commission is providing co-funding to JobsPlus for participants under 25 years. JobsPlus Youth is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF).</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</p> <p>The overall budget for JobsPlus has increased from €1.2m in 2013 to €27.24m in 2016. For the period 2015 – 2017 the allocation from each of the ESF and YEI was €2.7m.</p>



<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled and who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Data on eligibility applications²⁵ indicates that for the first 30 months of the scheme, approximately 1,000 eligibility applications were received monthly. 2016 saw a spike in applications, with 3,000 per month by August of that year. It is worth noting that these eligibility applications have not yet resulted in new jobs, as there has not yet been a corresponding increase in payments being made for new JobsPlus employees.</p> <p>Figures on the creation of payments up to the end of 2016 indicate that 12,161 positions had been supported through the JobsPlus scheme, increasing year on year.</p> <p>In 2016, 3,775 payments were created as part of the scheme, meaning that 3,775 people availed.</p> <p>According to Eurostat, unemployment in Ireland in 2016 was at 7.9%. CSO data indicates a figure of 172,000 unemployed people in September, 2016. OECD data indicates that 55.3% of unemployed people in Ireland in 2016 were long-term unemployed.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the programme on annual basis.</p> <p>Expenditure data²⁶ provides an annual breakdown of costs from 2013 to 2016, including budget and outturn data.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="357 987 1442 1160"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> <th>Total</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Budget</td> <td>€1.2m</td> <td>€13.5m</td> <td>€25.5m</td> <td>€27.24m</td> <td>€67.44m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Outturn</td> <td>€1.04m</td> <td>€11.88m</td> <td>€22.63m</td> <td>€23.99m</td> <td>€59.54m</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>In addition, the total staff costs of the scheme during the period 2013-2016 were €2.49m.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>There are two levels of payment: €7,500 for recruiting an employee who has been unemployed for between one and two years, and €10,000 for an employee who has been unemployed for more than two years. Payments are made each month, in arrears over a two-year period.</p>		2013	2014	2015	2016	Total	Budget	€1.2m	€13.5m	€25.5m	€27.24m	€67.44m	Outturn	€1.04m	€11.88m	€22.63m	€23.99m	€59.54m
	2013	2014	2015	2016	Total														
Budget	€1.2m	€13.5m	€25.5m	€27.24m	€67.44m														
Outturn	€1.04m	€11.88m	€22.63m	€23.99m	€59.54m														
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Jobseekers on the Live Register; young jobseekers; long-term unemployed</p> <p>Is this programme especially targeted to young people or to all 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)?</p> <p>The programme is targeted to all jobseekers on the Live Register. Since January 1st, 2015 the programme was expanded to target young people under JobsPlus Youth.</p>																		

²⁵ Department of Social Protection, (2017) *JobsPlus Focused Policy Assessment*, Department of Social Protection: Dublin

²⁶ Department of Social Protection, (2017) *JobsPlus Focused Policy Assessment*, Department of Social Protection: Dublin.



<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?</p> <p>The programme is targeted to all jobseekers on the Live Register. Since January 1st, 2015 the programme was expanded to target young people under JobsPlus Youth. No evidence could be found of youth involvement in the design of JobsPlus Youth at the time of preparation of this report.</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>Is the programme 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>It forms part of the Youth Guarantee, which aims to ensure that young people under the age of 25 receive a good quality offer of employment, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within four months of entering the labour market. The European Commission is co-funding for some elements of the Youth Guarantee plan through the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF).</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this programme available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>A Focused Policy Assessment²⁷ was undertaken by the Department of Social Protection in 2017. It will be followed by a counterfactual evaluation incorporating econometric modelling to assess the measure of impact of the programme on labour market outcomes for participants.</p> <p>If evaluations of this programme 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>A Focused Policy Assessment was undertaken by the Department of Social Protection in 2017. It reviewed the operation of the scheme from July 2013 to the end of 2016, exploring scheme outputs and activities, results and impacts. The forthcoming counterfactual evaluation will assess the extent to which participation in the programme resulted in improved employment outcomes relative to remaining on the Live Register. It will cover deadweight and displacement. For example, it may be able to ascertain the extent to which the scheme contributed to deadweight by constructing control and treatment groups to estimate how jobseekers on JobsPlus would have gained employment in the absence of the programme. Through undertaking a survey of employers and exploring sectoral recruitment data, the research team expects to provide indicative data on displacement.</p>

²⁷ Department of Social Protection, (2017) *JobsPlus Focused Policy Assessment*, Department of Social Protection: Dublin.



<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>The key findings are summarised in the Focused Policy Assessment. The report found that more than 12,000 people gained employment through the programme by the end of 2016, with over 8,000 employers benefitting from grants. The numbers were favourably compared with 1,454 employers supported in 2011 by the schemes it replaced. It was also found that 87% of employees who participated on JobsPlus remain off the Live Register between 30 and 36 months after their commencement date on the scheme.</p>
	<p>Does this programme 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>According the Focused Policy Assessment, the programme has been broadly successful in terms of uptake and output. However, it was found that older workers, particularly those over the age of 50 were underrepresented on the scheme, making up just 10% of JobsPlus participants. This is despite the estimation that over 40% of long-term unemployed people are in this age bracket.</p> <p>In addition, the numbers gaining employment represent a small fraction of long-term unemployed in Ireland (see 2016 breakdown under achieved results) so it's likely that the programme works best alongside a suite of targeted measures.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>The scheme is not aimed exclusively at young people, although has new criteria for young people under JobsPlus Youth. It is also not intended to resolve all of the main causes of unemployment and social exclusion but rather to encourage employers to employ people who have been out of work for long periods. It exist alongside a suite of other services for the unemployed, and other services for young people.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>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>The programme has demonstrated growth and success in targeting a population. The expansion of the programme to include a dedicated youth strand speaks to some appreciation of the importance of young people as a target group on the policy agenda. However, there is room for growth, given the number of long-term unemployed in Ireland.</p>



<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>JobBridge (The Internship Scheme)</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure: To provide work experience opportunities for unemployed people. This activation scheme provides jobseekers the opportunity to engage in the job market through internship opportunities within real workplaces. The main aim of the measure is for participants to gain quality work experience and to be provided with opportunities to develop new skills and to network. The programme aims for participants to be therefore better placed to take advantage of job opportunities as they arise.</p> <p>Intended Effects:</p> <p>The key objectives of the JobBridge scheme are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep unemployed people close to the labour market. • Provide unemployed people with the opportunity to gain quality work experience thereby increasing their employability. • Facilitate employers to contribute to the national activation agenda by providing Internships opportunities to the unemployed. <p>JobBridge provides work experience placements for interns for a 6 month or 9 month period. Its aim is to assist in breaking the cycle where jobseekers are unable to get a job without experience, either as new entrants to the labour market after education or training or as unemployed workers wishing to learn new skills. An internship ideally provides the opportunity to gain valuable experience in a working environment to those looking to explore or gain the relevant knowledge and skills required to enter into a particular career field. Interns receive an allowance per week on top of their social welfare entitlement. This will be payable for the period of the internship. The objective of the scheme is to provide work place experience in order to improve the skills, experience and employability of those involved.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>Persons unemployed for at least 3 months; young people aged 16-25 and people with a disability.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>Currently in receipt of a live claim (Jobseekers Allowance/Jobseekers Benefit/ One Parent Family Payment/ Disability Allowance /Signing for Credits) and have been in receipt of same for a total of 3 months (78 days) or more in the last 6 month.</p> <p>Casual claimants may participate in JobBridge provided that their employer is not the provider of the internship.</p> <p>Periods spent on Back to Education Allowance, VTOS, FÁS/SOLAS and Fáilte Ireland Training courses, Youthreach, FIT, Community Employment Schemes, Tús, Gateway, the Rural Social Scheme, Back to Work Scheme, Back to WorkEnterprise Allowance, Momentum Courses, Job Initiative or Job Assist will count towards meeting the eligibility of JobBridge, provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The individual has completed these programmes



<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Has a live claim• Is in receipt of Jobseekers Allowance/Jobseekers Benefit/One Parent Family Payment/Disability Allowance or signing for Social Insurance Contribution credits immediately before commencing on JobBridge. <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</p> <p>Direct job creation- Type 5 as per the intervention classification provided.</p> <p>Level:</p> <p>National.</p> <p>Start/ end date:</p> <p>The JobBridge internship scheme commenced in June 2011, <u>it was closed to new participants in late 2016 and the entire programme was closed August 2017.</u> A new Youth Employment Support Scheme (YESS) to replace the programme is to be established in 2018. First Steps, the youth-targeted variant of JobBridge closed to new participants in 2017 and will be closed entirely by April 2018.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p> <p>The supports and measures are at the disposal of case officers, designating “at risk” groups, and setting minimum service levels for individuals in these groups are all set nationally.</p> <p>JobBridge is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF).</p> <p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>JobBridge is one of a suite of labour market activation programmes managed by the Department of Social Protection under the Government’s labour market activation strategy, Pathways to Work. The first iteration of Pathways to Work was launched in 2012 and the most recent covers the period 2016-2020. One of the strategy’s objectives is to provide jobseekers with work-based placements and education and training, and to ensure employment programmes are work-focused.</p> <p>JobBridge is part of the National Employment Action Plan (NEAP) and was being used by the Department of Social Protection as a means of activating unemployed people. The scheme involves full-time six- or nine-month internships and the placements are provided voluntarily by organisations in the public, private, community and voluntary sectors (host organisations).</p> <p>The placements are advertised when a Host Organisation registered their organisation via the Jobs Ireland website, all JobBridge applications are validated by the National Contact Centre (NCC), when successfully validated the Internship goes live on Jobs Ireland website and jobseekers apply to the organisation. If selected, and if eligible, the jobseeker commences their internship, maintains their current social welfare entitlements and receive an additional weekly stipend of €52.50 payable by the Department of Social Protection [DSP]; The host organisations are not allowed to make any payment to the interns except for internship-related expenses.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</p>
--



	<p>JobBridge is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF) and Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection on an equal funding basis. For the period 2015 - 2017 the allocation from the ESF and YEI was €38.2 million in collective total.</p>																																				
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled and who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Annual average number of participants 2011-2016</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="359 577 1174 689"> <tr> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> <tr> <td>2977</td> <td>5,160</td> <td>6,058</td> <td>6,047</td> <td>4,207</td> <td>1,764</td> </tr> </table> <p>Number of Young People (under 25 years of age) 2011-2016:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="359 745 1046 857"> <tr> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> <tr> <td>815</td> <td>1342</td> <td>1503</td> <td>1,369</td> <td>926</td> <td>344</td> </tr> </table> <p>Total expenditures for the programme on annual basis</p> <p>Total expenditure on social welfare for the programme 2011- 2016 (€000):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="359 958 1137 1122"> <tr> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> <tr> <td>€7,914</td> <td>€54,739</td> <td>€67,688</td> <td>€76,030</td> <td>€63,489</td> <td>€37,793</td> </tr> </table> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>Expenditure per beneficiary not available.</p>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2977	5,160	6,058	6,047	4,207	1,764	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	815	1342	1503	1,369	926	344	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	€7,914	€54,739	€67,688	€76,030	€63,489	€37,793
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016																																
2977	5,160	6,058	6,047	4,207	1,764																																
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016																																
815	1342	1503	1,369	926	344																																
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016																																
€7,914	€54,739	€67,688	€76,030	€63,489	€37,793																																
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Is this programme especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>JobBridge is targeted to all unemployed, however, the First Steps programme was introduced to target young people through the JobBridge structure.</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>One of the specific actions outlined in the Irish Pathways to Work document to implement the EU council recommendation was to introduce to the existing JobBridge National Internship Scheme an additional 'developmental internship variant for the most disadvantaged young people' - First Steps. The target cohort for First Steps are people aged 18-24 who are signing on the live register, with low levels of education and, who may have experienced long periods of unemployment and possibly have additional barriers to employment. It is for those young people who have limited or no experience of work, in particular, those young people who would find it difficult to progress through candidate screening in a typical recruitment process.</p> <p>The First Steps initiative was introduced in February 2015 and provides for an initial 1,500 placements of 3 months with an option to extend this to 6 or 9 months. Placements are for unemployed individuals in organisations in the private, public, voluntary and community sectors.</p>																																				



	<p>First Steps is one of many youth focused actions that Ireland has committed to delivering under the Irish Youth Guarantee. Placements are for 3 months with an option to extend to 6 or 9 months and participants will receive an allowance of €52.50 per week on top of their social welfare entitlement. The Host Organisation selects the potential participant after they have been referred by their local Intreo office (Intreo is a single point of contact for all employment and income supports in Ireland). Intreo Case Officers target/recruit NEETs through a range of activities including; activated DSP clients, group information sessions, open days/open calls for under 25s and collaboration with other Case Officers, employer engagement directly and communication with ETBs, job clubs, group information sessions and other partnership companies. The delivery mechanism is fit for purpose to deliver the YEI interventions.</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 programme 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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Guarantee • Youth Employment Initiative • European Social Fund
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this programme available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>An Evaluation²⁸ of JobBridge was conducted independently by Indecon International Economic Consultants in 2013 and submitted to the Department of Social Protection.</p> <p>A Summary Report²⁹ by the National Youth Council of Ireland in 2015 of a quantitative and qualitative study exploring the views, perspectives and experiences of young people aged 18-25 years who participated in JobBridge.</p> <p>Report³⁰ of the Labour Market Council (an independent group of industry leaders and labour market experts appointed by the Minister for Social Protection to oversee the effective delivery of the Government’s Pathways to Work Strategy) was submitted: Proposal for a New Work Placement Programme Drawing on the Lessons from Job Bridge (2016).</p>

²⁸ Indecon International Economic Consultants (2013) *Indecon’s Evaluation of JobBridge: Final Evaluation Report*, Indecon: Dublin, Available: <https://m.welfare.ie/en/downloads/Indecon-Report-on-Evaluation-of-JobBridge.pdf>

²⁹ National Youth Council of Ireland (2015) *JobBridge: Stepping Stone or Dead End?*, National Youth Council of Ireland: Dublin, Available: <http://www.youth.ie/sites/youth.ie/files/NYCI-JobBridge-Summary-na.pdf>

³⁰ Labour Market Council (2016) *Proposal for a New Work Placement Programme Drawing on the Lessons from Job Bridge*, Labour Market Council: Dublin, Available: https://www.welfare.ie/en/downloads/LabourMarketCouncil/LMC_Proposal_for_New_Work_Placement_Programme.pdf



An Evaluation³¹ of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020 was undertaken to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of joint support from the ESF and the specific allocation for YEI including the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Ireland, encompassing an evaluation of JobBridge.

The Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection publishes annual reports³² providing statistical information on social welfare services.

Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?

Both Internal and External.

If evaluations of this programme 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)?

There is extensive detailed information provided in these evaluations, including evaluation and discussion of deadweight loss, substitution effect and displacement. The 2013 Indecon evaluation suggests that most of the benefits in terms of employment outcomes would have occurred in the absence of the Scheme. In other words, high levels of deadweight exist. In relation to deadweight loss, Indecon evaluation found that in the cost-benefit analysis a level of deadweight of 75.6%, as well as a job displacement level of 29.1% was found.

While host organisations must self-declare that an intern is not replacing a job vacancy, an internal audit report completed by the Department of Social Protection indicated that it was not possible for the audit team to verify whether or not an internship is displacing a potential job vacancy.

The Indecon evaluation suggests that there is evidence of some level of displacement- 3% or 220 organisations in breach of displacement control guidelines.

The National Youth Council of Ireland (NYCI) evaluation emphasised that the scheme should only be open to host organisations and sectors of the economy that demonstrate high levels of progression to employment; that the Department of Social Protection should enhance monitoring of compliance with the cooling off period after JobBridge participation to prevent job displacement.

³¹ Gauge and Department of Education and Skills (2016) *Evaluation of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020*, Available:

<http://www.esf.ie/en/ImageLibrary/Repository/Files/YEI-Evaluation.pdf>

³² Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection (2016) Annual Report: Statistical Information on Social Welfare Services, Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection: Dublin, Available: <https://www.welfare.ie/en/Pages/Annual-SWS-Statistical-Information-Report.aspx>



<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>JobBridge was reviewed by Indecon consultants in 2012. The evaluation presents a robust estimate of the labour market outcomes attributable to participation on the programme. Indecon makes a number of suggestions for changes to the scheme, including to replace JobBridge with a smaller targeted programme, appropriate to current labour market conditions, to address some of the issues raised by interns (payment and potential exploitation) and, in particular, to maximise economic benefits and reduce costs. It raises a number of recommendations around payment contributions from host organisation to minimise displacement, and increased regulations of host organisations. It also recommends that in order to minimise deadweight and displacement and cost to the public, that the internships should be limited to 6 months.</p> <p>The Labour Market Council compiled a report based on the Indecon evaluation. This report looks to develop recommendations for future iterations of a national internship programme. Accordingly it makes the following recommendations in accordance with the Indecon findings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It should be voluntary for both participants and host organisations.• The primary focus of the scheme should be to offer eligible jobseekers the opportunity to break the cycle of “no work, no experience; no experience, no work”.• The scheme should place greater emphasis on skills development for interns, drawing upon employer best practices in this domain from JobBridge• All interns should receive a payment equivalent to the net (i.e. after taking account of PSRI and other taxes) minimum wage.• Host organisations should contribute to the cost of any additional payment to participants. At the same time, hosts who hire an intern before the end of the work experience should be eligible for a rebate.• In order to minimize deadweight, displacement and the costs to the public, consideration should be given to limiting the maximum duration of work experience to six months.• Host organisations must be fully compliant with all relevant public/employers/motor liability insurance and this insurance should cover the participant for the duration of the scheme.• Host organisations must be fully compliant with all relevant health, safety and other legal requirement.• Provision should be made for sufficient no-notice random inspection visits to host organisations by Department inspectors. <p>The evaluation by NYCI produced mixed findings. It identified that securing work experience was the primary motivating factor for many participants. While a majority of participants were satisfied with their internship and just under half would recommend JobBridge to another person, and this study found that only 27% secured full time employment immediately following their internship. The analysis of the research also identified a large number of deficiencies in the scheme. These included: poorly-designed internships, inadequate mentoring, instances of unacceptable treatment of interns, lack of rights and clarity concerning terms and conditions. Other issues identified included insufficient monitoring and auditing of the scheme to prevent abuse, job displacement and inadequate income support. The findings of this report based on the experiences and views of JobBridge participants</p>
--------------------------------------	---



	<p>indicate that the scheme requires significant reform to enhance the experience of participants, improve quality and increase progression into secure and sustainable employment.</p> <p>An Evaluation³³ of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020 assesses the JobBridge programme as job-focussed, situated within the socio economic context of those who would be deemed relatively close to the labour market as it is targeted at enabling participants to gain experience between study and the beginning of their working lives. It finds JobBridge to be effectively positioned in the employment pathway for sustainable integration into the labour market for that element of the NEETS's cohort who are relatively close to the labour market.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this programme achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>The programme meets its formal objective of supporting the unemployed- the evidence indicates that JobBridge has been very effective in increasing the employment outcomes of the jobseekers, however information is lacking on issues such as the motivation of participants, treatment of interns by host organisations, mentoring, monitoring by the Department of Social Protection and the costs of participation. Having said this, the evaluations suggest that JobBridge has been successful for all cohorts of unemployed jobseekers, although the degree of success varies, in line with the intern's age, previous occupation, previous duration of unemployment and whether the internship was in the private, public or community/voluntary sector.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>Employment Outcomes: The Indecon evaluation found positive employment benefits for participants in the months after internships were completed. A survey of participants indicated that on the day of completion of internships, 36.3% of participants were in employment, this increases in the months after internships are completed with 61.4% of those surveyed indicating that they were in employment 5 months after completing their internships. Employment rates were less for those with longer period of prior unemployment. Overall, JobBridge has a positive impact of about 32% on participants' likelihood of finding a job. An employment impact of this magnitude is relatively large compared to those reported in other evaluations of similar work experience schemes in other countries.</p> <p>Satisfaction with JobBridge: The Indecon evaluation found that among interns, there was broad agreement that the internship provided them with new job skills and an opportunity to gain quality work experience. However, there was dissatisfaction with the value of the top-up payment. Host organisations reported high levels of satisfaction with all aspects of the scheme. The NYCI evaluation found that while 68% of young people agreed the internship was valuable, 44% felt that the internship was used solely for free labour, and there was a 100% dissatisfaction rate of those who felt compelled to partake in the programme.</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>

³³ Gauge and Department of Education and Skills (2016) *Evaluation of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020*, Available: <http://www.esf.ie/en/ImageLibrary/Repository/Files/YEI-Evaluation.pdf>



	<p>The fact that JobBridge internships are not entirely self-selected, and that receipt of social welfare payments is contingent on participation in the scheme is a central issue of the internship scheme-compelling participants to undertake an internship does not support long term integration into employment in the labour market, and potentially undermines the effectiveness of the programme. The evidence of dissatisfaction in young participants who felt compelled to partake emphasises the issues with this conditionality and for long-term effectiveness of the programme.</p> <p>The issues around perceived exploitation, lack of income support and monitoring and evaluation are also central issues that impact coverage- particularly for the youth cohort.</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>JobBridge acts as both a recruitment aid and an internship programme but it appears more geared towards employer incentive. Because it operates in the open labour market it is more open to displacement of entry level jobs and mistreatment of interns than other Irish ALMPs. This capacity for exploitation by employers and the lack of income support is the main flaw of the intervention.</p> <p>The high risk of exploitation of interns, and the structure whereby participants do not receive a wage but a top up payment provided by the state without employer contribution is insufficient remuneration and a disincentive for engagement from young people, but certainly an incentive for employers for subsidised hiring for low-wage jobs and displacement of regular jobs.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>The introduction of the variant of First Steps made some reasonable adjustments such as reducing it to a four day week and forging closer relationships between the Intreo Case Officer, participant and host company based around the monitoring of a progression plan for the participant that targeted young people better. However, it generally seems to be a programme for young people with higher education or skills and labour force readiness seeking to get a foothold into the labour market rather than target risk groups among young people or addressing the features of social exclusion.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example</p>	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</p> <p>The value of JobBridge is demonstrated in its success in terms of boosting the employment prospects of interns and of employment outcomes.</p> <p>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>JobBridge was introduced when unemployment was still rising, but since job growth has started to define the labour market in Ireland much more in recent years, the current structure of JobBridge is potentially diminishing the creation of entry levels jobs which many young people depend on to get on the jobs ladder in a challenging labour market. The state provision of top-up payments for internship participation without any employer contributions creates a costly intervention structure, but more importantly, opportunity for exploitation by host organisations. For replication, in order to minimise deadweight, displacement and the costs to the public, consideration should be given to</p>



	limiting the maximum duration of work experience to six months, and to ensure participant buy-in and fair treatment, minimum wage should be provided with employer contribution.
--	--

Name of the initiative	Tús – Community Workplace Initiative (Tús roughly translates to “start” in English from the Irish language)
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>The initiative aims to provide short-term quality and suitable working opportunities for people who are unemployed while at the same time carrying out beneficial work within communities. All the work carried out by participants in the Tús scheme is community-based.</p> <p>Intended Effects:</p> <p>Tús provides opportunities for people who are unemployed to break the cycle of joblessness and helps to improve a person’s work readiness and support them in returning to the labour market. Participants work 19½ hours per week for 52 weeks, with work placements intended as a valuable route for participants to gain or update experience of the workplace, to learn new skills and to return to the routine of work.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>Long-term unemployment; specifically those who have been unemployed and on benefits for at least 12 months.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>A person who has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Been continuously unemployed for at least 12 months and “signing on³⁴” on a full-time basis, and - In receipt of a jobseeker’s payment from the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection for at least 12 months, and - Currently in receipt of Jobseeker’s Allowance. <p>Or</p> <p>Persons in receipt of Jobseekers Transitional Payment and who are fully unemployed – (no qualifying period applies in this case)</p> <p>Or</p> <p>A refugee aged 18 years or older, authenticated by the Department of Justice & Law Reform and getting Jobseekers Allowance payment (no qualifying period applies).</p> <p>Time spent on the JobPath programme can count towards the qualifying time for Tús providing the person is currently receiving Jobseekers Allowance. Also, time spent in prison in this State may count</p>

³⁴ “Signing On” in Ireland is when you apply for a jobseeker’s entitlement and declare that you are available for work, fit for work, genuinely seeking work and unable to find work.



towards the qualifying time for Tús providing the person is currently receiving Jobseekers Allowance. Persons falling within the eligibility criteria can be randomly selected for participation.

Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):

Direct Job Creation - Type 5 as per the intervention classification provided.

Level:

National programme implemented at a local and community level.

Start/ end date:

Tús was launched December 2010, commenced in 2011 and is ongoing.

Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?

The Tús initiative is managed by local development companies and Údarás na Gaeltachta (regional state agency responsible for the economic, social and cultural development of Irish-speaking regions of Ireland) for the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection (DEASP), which has overall responsibility for the scheme. The work placements are proposed and provided by community and voluntary organisations. Organisations with a proposed work placement register with the local development company or Údarás na Gaeltachta in their area for consideration.

How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?

The initiative is delivered and managed at the local level through the network of local development companies (sometimes referred to as Partnership or Leader companies). Údarás na Gaeltachta delivers and manages the initiative in Gaeltacht areas (Irish language speaking areas of Ireland). These companies are collectively known as the Implementing Bodies. Each Implementing Body has been awarded a specific quota of Tús placements at both supervisory and participant level, based on the distribution of the Live Register.

The Local Development Company profiles and matches participants with suitable work placements identified in co-operations with community, voluntary and not-for-profit organisations providing services in the area. The participant becomes the employee of the Local Development Company.

The Implementing Bodies manage the day-to-day implementation of Tús and the supervision of participants on behalf of the Department. They are also responsible for advertising and promoting the initiative and identifying suitable work placements and community groups in their respective geographical locations. Implementing Bodies are responsible for evaluating and selecting organisations which wish to provide work opportunities.

Policy and general operational responsibility rests with the Tús Unit within the Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection (DEASP). Pobal - a non-profit organisation that supports local agencies and communities on behalf of the Irish Government- was engaged to manage and oversee the delivery of SICAP nationally on behalf of DEASP.

Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:

The European Commission is providing co-funding to Tús for participants under 25 years. Tús is jointly backed by the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) and the European Social Fund (ESF) and Department



	<p>of Employment Affairs and Social Protection on an equal funding basis. For the period 2015 - 2017 the allocation from each of the ESF and YEI was €11.8 million (€23.6 million total).</p>																																				
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled and who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Annual average number of participants 2011-2016 (€000):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 539 1166 651"> <thead> <tr> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2,077</td> <td>4,530</td> <td>6,999</td> <td>7,877</td> <td>7818</td> <td>7140</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Number of Young People (under 25 years of age) 2011-2016:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 707 1038 819"> <thead> <tr> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>N/A</td> <td>569</td> <td>510</td> <td>1117</td> <td>1223</td> <td>1050</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Total expenditures for the programme on annual basis.</p> <p>Exact figures are difficult to capture due to the varied nature of delivery, provider, materials, funding and cost channelling.</p> <p>Total expenditure on social welfare for the programme 2011- 2016 (€000):</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="352 1010 1098 1167"> <thead> <tr> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> <th>2014</th> <th>2015</th> <th>2016</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>€11,761</td> <td>€67,055</td> <td>€92,060</td> <td>€116,052</td> <td>€124,576</td> <td>€118,604</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>Average annual cost per participant in 2016: €15,373</p> <p>There are numerous components of the average annual cost per participant including weekly payments to participants, supervisor costs, materials and training costs.</p> <p>To provide further context, separate to the weekly payments to participants for taking part in Tús, the minimum weekly payment to participants as part of their Jobseeker’s Allowance payment (part of their eligibility) in 2016 was: €210.50</p> <p>This equates to an annualised cost of €10,946 (approx.) per beneficiary. In addition, participants may also be recipients of other allowances.</p>	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2,077	4,530	6,999	7,877	7818	7140	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	N/A	569	510	1117	1223	1050	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	€11,761	€67,055	€92,060	€116,052	€124,576	€118,604
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016																																
2,077	4,530	6,999	7,877	7818	7140																																
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016																																
N/A	569	510	1117	1223	1050																																
2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016																																
€11,761	€67,055	€92,060	€116,052	€124,576	€118,604																																
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Tús is targeted at people of all ages who are out of work and on jobseekers’ payments for a year or more. Eligibility (as outlined above) is confined to those on the Live Register for at least 12 months and in receipt of Jobseeker’s Allowance. These provisions are to ensure a targeted approach to those who are long-term unemployed. Persons falling within the eligibility criteria can be randomly selected for participation or can seek out to participate in the programme.</p> <p>Is this programme especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>Tús is targeted at long term unemployment rather than young people specifically.</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>Yes. The European Commission provides co-funding to Tús for participants under 25 years due to the prevalence of young people who fall into the target group for this measure, it is also backed by the Youth Employment Initiative. This specific funding within Tús for young people results in an allocated number of Tús placements being reserved for young people.</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>Partly. All the work carried out by participants in the Tús scheme is community-based, and therefore the allocation is based on the numbers of eligible unemployed people in each local development company or Údarás na Gaeltachta (Irish language speaking) area. The demographics of each area inform the types of projects as well as the allocation dispersion.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the programme linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>Yes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Youth Guarantee • Youth Employment Initiative • European Social Fund • European Commission
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this programme available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>A 2017 Review³⁵ of Social Protection Employment Supports Expenditure encompasses a review of Tús, conducted by the Irish Government Economic & Evaluation Service in the Department of Public Expenditure and Reform.</p> <p>A Review³⁶ of Department of Social Protection Employment Support Schemes was conducted by the Department of Social Protection in 2012 and included an evaluation of Tús, as well as an accompanying high level issues paper³⁷ emanating from A Review of Department of Social Protection Employment Support Schemes.</p>

³⁵ Irish Government Economic & Evaluation Service (2017) *Review of Social Protection Employment Supports Expenditure*, Department of Public Expenditure and Reform: Dublin, available: <http://www.per.gov.ie/wp-content/uploads/employment-supports.pdf>

³⁶ Department of Social Protection (2012) *A Review of Department of Social Protection Employment Support Schemes*, Department of Social Protection: Dublin, Available: <https://www.welfare.ie/en/downloads/Review%20of%20Employment%20Support%20Schemes.pdf>

³⁷ Department of Social Protection (2012) *High Level Issues Paper emanating from a Review of Department of Social Protection Employment Support Schemes*, Department of Social Protection: Dublin, Available: <https://www.welfare.ie/en/pressoffice/pdf/High%20Level%20Issues%20Paper%20-%20Employment%20Support%20Schemes.pdf>



<p>A Report³⁸ on Local Youth Employment Strategies Ireland by the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) through the Local Economic and Employment Development (LEED) Programme in 2014 evaluated the landscape of youth employment and policy in Ireland, including Tús.</p> <p>In March 2017, An Analysis³⁹ of the Community Employment Programme from 2015 was published alongside a series of reforms (Department of Social Protection, 2015), and encompasses a review of Tús.</p> <p>An Evaluation⁴⁰ of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020 was undertaken to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of joint support from the ESF and the specific allocation for YEI including the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Ireland, encompassing an evaluation of Tús.</p> <p>The Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection publishes annual reports⁴¹ providing statistical information on social welfare services.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>The evaluations are internal and external.</p> <p>If evaluations of this programme 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>The evaluations available are not solely dedicated to Tús which limits the level of analysis. These evaluations highlight that the nature of the Tús programme does not prohibit employment; the</p>
--

³⁸ Local Economic and Employment Development Programme of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (2014) *Local Youth Employment Strategies Ireland*, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Available:

https://www.pobal.ie/Publications/Documents/OECD%20LEED_Youth_Local_Strategies_Ireland.pdf

³⁹ Department of Social Protection (2017) *An Analysis of the Community Employment Programme, December 2015*, Department of Social Protection: Dublin, Available:

<https://www.welfare.ie/en/downloads/PTW-ReviewOfCE-December2015-incl-exec-summary.pdf>

⁴⁰ Gauge and Department of Education and Skills (2016) *Evaluation of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020*, Available:

<http://www.esf.ie/en/ImageLibrary/Repository/Files/YEI-Evaluation.pdf>

⁴¹ Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection (2016) Annual Report: Statistical Information on Social Welfare Services, Department of Employment Affairs and Social Protection: Dublin, Available: <https://www.welfare.ie/en/Pages/Annual-SWS-Statistical-Information-Report.aspx>



	<p>programme is designed to support simultaneous job-seeking, employment and allows for termination of participation if offered alternative commercial employment or training.</p> <p>No evidence of deadweight loss of this scheme nor substitution effect is available, however, the 2017 Department of Public Expenditure and Reform Review highlighted that as deadweight is likely to increase in improving Irish economy, increased targeting of Tús may be required to counteract this inefficiency, e.g. by targeting those with longer periods of unemployment.</p> <p>In terms of displacement the 2016 Gauge and Department of Education and Skills evaluation results suggested that the Tús initiative was not displacing activities for other groups.</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>Evidence from the Gauge and Department of Education and Skills evaluation emerged that the most important needs of the long-term unemployed are met through the scheme; Tús providers highlighted that participation on the programme impacted positively on the motivation and confidence of participants offering them opportunities to experience different work environments and provide them with employment related experience to re-enter the labour market. The most significant element of the Youth Guarantee that the Tús programme has been effective in delivering was identified as ‘Employment’, by a significant margin. Once recruited, support needs of NEET participants are being met through; mentoring, placements and short-term work opportunities, skills audit, training (IT, H&S), ongoing communication with the participant and host organisations and cross referral to other programmes.</p> <p>The Department of Social Protection Analysis of the Community Employment Programme found that the number of people on Tús and other labour activation programmes has fallen by over 25 per cent (24,000 people) in the three years prior in Ireland. Consistently this review of Tús highlights that the applied restriction of a 12 month minimum on the live register for eligibility, as well as a 12 month limit for participation in the programme is too limiting and negatively impacts on participation and outcomes. This report suggests that schemes such as Tús have a role to play as an ‘intermediate’ step in progressing people who are very distant from the labour market closer to it, albeit it not directly into employment but to another scheme which may, at its conclusion, result in a job outcome. There are limited statistics on the correlation between Tús participation and job outcomes.</p> <p>The main recommendations from the review of Department of Social Protection Employment Support Schemes in respect of Tús are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a greater focus on ensuring job-search and progression planning for participants well in advance of their scheduled exit from Tús. • Procedures should be developed to allow for speedy referral of people to alternative supports for progression to employment for those referred under Tús who do not receive placement. • It is essential that the proposed tracking system for the scheme should be fully implemented as soon as possible. • As has been recommended for similar schemes, as case management evolves for those with shorter unemployment durations but at high risk of becoming long-term, eligibility for Tús could be extended to this group under limited circumstances.



	<p>The 2017 Review of Social Protection Employment Supports Expenditure emphasises that given the continuing labour market improvements in Ireland, it is reasonable to expect that expenditure on Tús should decline significantly in the short to medium term, and that further analysis should be undertaken to determine the capacity requirements for activation and case management. In terms of changes over the period, the number of 18-24 year olds on Tús increased by 3 percentage points over the period, despite being more broadly targeted to include persons over 25 with longer periods of time on the Live Register. The increased number of younger people likely reflects the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in 2014.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this programme achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Yes. The Tús programme is appropriately targeted at interventions for long-term unemployed people in disadvantaged communities to enable them to break the cycle of joblessness, helping them to improve their work readiness and support them in accessing the labour market, which is consistent with the intended purpose of the programme.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>It is difficult to fully assess the magnitude of the effect of this programme due to limited data on employment outcomes post-participation.</p> <p>The delivery of Tús has been highly effective in exceeding its expected full year intake, this has been achieved as a result of a uniquely targeted approach on young unemployed people and the benefit of an experienced delivery team across the state due to the previous delivery of the programme and a high level of community engagement.</p> <p>The Department of Social Protection analysis of the Community Employment Programme checked Tús 'leavers' against a Department extract of data, 44% of those who completed in 2013 were not on the Live Register or in receipt of One Parent Family Payment in May 2015, and of those who finished Tús in 2014, 35% were not on the Live Register in May 2015. It is also notable from this review that 6% of Tús programme leavers proceed on to other activation activities and programmes.</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>As there are only limited places available on the scheme, not all eligible unemployed people are contacted. The places on the scheme are allocated based on the numbers of eligible unemployed people in each local development company or Údarás na Gaeltachta area- which may prevent buy-in for young people in less targeted areas. Since May 2015, some Tús places (maximum 20% of places) can now be filled through self-referral by potential participants, which mitigates some of the potential issues with coverage but still represents a small proportion of overall places.</p> <p>The 12 month maximum timeframe of the programme is certainly a barrier to participation as is the 12 month minimum on Jobseekers Allowance for eligibility.</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>Tús does not adequately provide for exit/progression planning. At present there is no provision for the arrangement of an exit plan for participants before the end of their period on the scheme.</p>



	<p>Outcomes for Tús “leavers” would improve if there were a greater focus on ensuring job-search and progression planning well in advance of their exit from the programme.</p> <p>The random selection process for Tús has resulted in a wide geographical spread, making it more difficult to create cohesion between participants and to instil long-term community benefits. Furthermore, the stringent eligibility criteria and 12 month maximum to partake in the programme are certainly barriers to participation. The programme could have factored in a placement scheme of longer than 12 months to build resilience and a more sustainable integration into the labour market.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>The increased number of younger people taking part in the programme likely reflects the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in 2014, which aims to provide young people under the age of 25 with a good quality offer of employment, continued education, an apprenticeship or a traineeship within a short time of becoming unemployed. In this regard, 1,000 Tús places were provided under the Guarantee.</p> <p>The programme does not necessarily aim to address the root causes of social exclusion for risk groups amongst young people who are unemployed. Employment growth of 2.3 per cent (48,000 jobs) is projected for 2018 in Ireland, and the stability of the labour market will continue to influence future supply and demand for activation programmes such as Tús. Evidence suggests that the cohorts requiring the most assistance, in terms of numbers and distance from the labour market, are people on the Live Register for more than 3 years and people with disabilities- particularly young people who meet these criteria. This measure is effective in addressing the importance of short term opportunities for skill development, workforce exposure, community integration and personal opportunity as an intermediate step or “bridging” from long-term unemployment to future employment.</p> <p>It is evident that the random selection does not adequately address risk groups among young people, and there is certainly scope for a youth specific version of the programme to be launched. A two strand approach (activation and social inclusion) would be beneficial to the programme, and to ensure a more sustainable inclusion of risk groups amongst young people and the long-term unemployed in 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>While some measures are designed to activate the recently unemployed, Ireland’s circumstances require engagement with the large number of young people who are already unemployed for longer periods, and Tús activates this cohort through a structured engagement process and with strategic matching of the skill set of the individual to the community organisation. The introduction of self-selection also gives people the choice to refer themselves to the programme rather than a perceived sense of forced participation.</p> <p>The other main success factor is that the programme is simultaneous a vehicle to stimulate local contribution and beneficial work to be undertaken in the community.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p>



<p>Tús is aimed at re-engaging long term unemployed individuals with the labour market and improving work readiness. While direct outcomes of participation in the programme are difficult to capture, the increased motivation and self-esteem demonstrated by Tús participants and the progression into the labour market or other employment programmes outlines how central employment opportunities provided by ALMPs of this type are in moving the hard to reach cohort of long term unemployed into, or closer to the labour market.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p>

Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

The ways in which the EU initiatives have been implemented through policy and practice vary and at times create a complex, somewhat unwieldy landscape of service provision- but have also resulted in some broadly successful measures. It is clear to see the impact of the Youth Guarantee through the existence of dedicated, targeted programmes for young people aimed at increasing employment and social inclusion.

In terms of waves or political shifts, the impact of the economic crisis in Ireland provided some momentum for initiatives targeted at young people, aimed at reducing the high levels of youth unemployment. The JobBridge National Internship Scheme was subject to considerable criticism before being ultimately discontinued in 2016.



Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

ALMP measures are linked to other components of social policies. Two examples are presented in the tables below.

The YouthReach programme is an education programme aimed at early school leavers, with a view to improving social development, education and training, autonomy and progression to further training or the labour market.

SICAP (Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme) aims to tackle poverty, social exclusion and long-term unemployment through local engagement and partnership between disadvantaged individuals, community organisations and public sector agencies.

Other initiatives target young people through community, social enterprise and youth work.

The Garda Youth Diversion Projects⁴² are community based and supported youth development projects which seek to divert young people from becoming involved (or further involved) in anti-social or criminal behaviour. They are part supported by the Irish Government and the European Social Fund as part of the Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning.

Ireland also has Youth Cafés⁴³, supported by the Department of Children and Youth Affairs.

Special Projects for Youth (SPY)⁴⁴ aim to facilitate the personal and social potential of young people.

More information on additional youth activities supporting self-efficacy, social inclusion and progression towards employment can be found in the OECD Report on Youth Employment Strategies.

YouthReach

YouthReach was selected as an evidence-based good example of a programme specifically targeting young people.

⁴² <http://www.iyjs.ie/en/IYJS/Pages/WP08000062>

⁴³ <http://childrensdatabase.ie/viewdoc.asp?Docid=4017&CatID=11&mn=&StartDate=01+January+2016>

⁴⁴ <http://www.youthworkireland.ie/what-we-do/spy>



SICAP

SICAP was selected as a programme provided at a community level with a social inclusion focus, co-funded by the European Social Fund. SICAP is an example of good practice and therefore presents an opportunity for learning.

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group ⁴⁵	Starting year; end year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures ⁴⁶	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ⁴⁷
1	Youth Reach	National	Targeted at those from 15 to 20 who left school early	1988	SOLAS- the State organisation responsible for implementing the Further Education and Training (FET) Strategy	Not directly but in line with Youth Guarantee	Yes, positive	4	2
2	Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme (SICAP)	National	Target groups: - Young unemployed people living in disadvantaged areas - NEETs - People living in disadvantaged communities - Disadvantaged Children and Families - Lone Parents - New Communities (including Refugees/Asylum Seekers)	2015	National: The Department of Rural and Community Development EU: SICAP receives co-funding from the European Social Fund (ESF), including a special allocation under the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI)	Youth Employment Initiative In line with Youth Guarantee	Yes, positive	4	2

⁴⁵ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group

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

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



			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - People with Disabilities - Roma - The Unemployed (including those not on the Live Register) - Low Income Workers/Hou sehold - Travellers (an Irish indigenou ethnic group) 						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Youthreach
Short description	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>Youthreach seeks to enable young early school leavers to return to education in a non-threatening learner-centred environment. The objectives for its participants, termed learners, are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • personal and social development and increased self-esteem; • second-chance education and introductory-level training; • the promotion of independence, personal autonomy, active citizenship, and a pattern of lifelong learning; • progression to further education, training opportunities or the labour market; and • the promotion of social inclusion. <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>Young people reintegrate into education and progress to further education or training. Accreditation can be attained (FETAC levels 3 and 4 minor and major awards–on the Irish Framework) facilitating progression to further education and training.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p>Young people not in education, employment or training; Young people (aged 15 to 20 years).</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>Beneficiarises must be between 15 and 20 and have left mainstream school early.</p> <p>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy): It is a training measure with certification, and so tackles early school leaving and youth unemployment.</p> <p>Level: National Programme with local implementation.</p> <p>Start/ end date: 1988 - present</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure? The programme is managed and delivered by Education and Training Boards (ETBs) and Community Training Centres.</p>



	<p>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</p> <p>The programme is overseen by the Department of Education and skills, and managed and delivered by Education and Training Boards (ETBs) and Community Training Centres.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source: Unknown</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled and who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>The programme is offered in 106 Youthreach Centres offering 35-40 places, and 35 Community Training Centres offering 55 places. There are over 6,500 places available nationally. It is estimated that 9.7% of the population aged 18-24 were early school leavers in 2012, around 34,000 young people.</p> <p>Number who find a job:</p> <p>This number is not readily available. In fact, the purpose of the programme is linked to outcomes other than employment, including progression to further education. Various evaluation studies outline different learner destinations post-programme. An Evaluation⁴⁸ undertaken by the Education and Skills Inspectorate (2010) found that while 15% were employed post-programme, 46% of participants continued their learning in the Centre, 4% continued their learning elsewhere and 6% went on to further education. The remainder fell into the Other category.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the programme on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>A figure was estimated in 2008 as part of a value for money study⁴⁹ undertaken by the then Department of Education and Science. Although now dated, the study estimated the cost of core tuition per student as €7,841, compared with €4,940 at post-primary level.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Young people (aged 15 to 20 years).</p> <p>The programme is targeted at early school leavers. In addition, it is noted that exceptions to the eligibility criteria may be made in some cases, for example lone parents.</p> <p>Is this programme especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>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)?</p> <p>N/A</p>
<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No).</p> <p>No evidence was found of the involvement of young people in the design of the programme at the time of preparation of this report. However, learner data was captured in the programme evaluations, potentially contributing to programme design and development.</p>

⁴⁸ Education and Skills Inspectorate (2010) *An Evaluation of Youthreach*, Department of Education and Skills: Dublin.

⁴⁹ Department of Education and Science (2008) *Value for Money Review of Youthreach and Senior Traveller Training Centre Programmes* [online], Department of Education and Science: Dublin



<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>Is the programme linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship).</p> <p>It is not directly linked but is in line with EU Employment Guidelines, 2020 targets, and the EU Youth Guarantee with emphasis on support for young people through education and employment, and on early intervention.</p> <p>The project is co-funded by the Irish Government and the European Union under the European Social Fund.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this programme available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>If evaluations of this programme 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An Evaluation⁵⁰ was undertaken by the Education and Skills Inspectorate in 2010. The Inspectorate is a division responsible for the evaluation of schools and centres for education. This could be viewed as an internal evaluation. The study covers management, planning, learning and outcomes quality. It does not explore substitution or displacement. 2. A measure study⁵¹ of early school leavers was undertaken by the Department of Education and Science to examine labour market inequalities. This is not an internal evaluation but was part of the implementation of Measure 33a: Technical Assistance – Equality Studies Unit. The ESU is mandated to examine labour market inequalities and their implication for labour market policy. The study found that a substantial minority of participants were members of the Traveller community, young people with a disability and young people with parents holding refugee status, evidence of a growing diversity of the composition of participants. 3. A report was also undertaken by the National Educational Psychology Service (NEPS)⁵² focusing on the difficulties experienced by learners across a range of domains. The study did not cover displacement or substitution.

⁵⁰ Education and Skills Inspectorate (2010) *An Evaluation of Youthreach*, Department of Education and Skills: Dublin

⁵¹ WRC Social and Economic Consultants (n.d.) *Measure Study of Early School Leavers - Youthreach and Travellers* [online], Equality Studies Unit: Dublin, available: <http://www.esf.ie/en/ImageLibrary/Repository/Info-and-Pub/Early-School-Leavers-Youthreach-and-Travellers-EHRDOP-Measure-11B-Wider-Equality-Study-PDF.pdf>

⁵² National Educational Psychological Service (2017) *A Profile of Learners in Youthreach* [online], National Educational Psychological Service: Dublin, available: <http://www.youthreach.ie/wp-content/uploads/A-profile-of-learners-in-Youthreach-NEPS-research-study-report-Mar-2017-1.pdf>



	<p>4. A value for money study⁵³ was undertaken by the Department of Education and Science in 2008. It could be considered internal. It covered the annual cost per learner on the programme. It did not test for displacement of substitution.</p> <p>A Tender specification and call for proposals was issued SOLAS with a view to having an independent evaluation undertaken. It is due for completion in 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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The evaluation undertaken by the Education and Skills Inspectorate in 2010 covered management, planning, learning and outcomes quality. The report highlights features of good practice and positive aspects of the Youthreach centres, including the focus on holistic development, the range of supports offered to learners and the culture of planning that exists in Youthreach centres. In addition, the study makes recommendations aimed at existing challenges in the programme. This includes programme development, teaching methodologies and learner assessment. The report identifies that in some cases, external assistance may effect change. 2. A measure study of early school leavers undertaken by the Department of Education and Science found that a substantial minority of participants were members of the Traveller community, young people with a disability and young people with parents holding refugee status, evidence of a growing diversity of the composition of participants. It found that considerable effort had been made to respond to the range of personal and social difficulties presented by participants. It was also found that it may not be possible to possible for Youthreach to retain some participants due to multiple and severe disadvantage and the absence of relevant resources within the programme. 3. The report undertaken by the National Educational Psychology Service (NEPS) focusing on the difficulties experienced by learners across a range of domains. The findings compare with international literature, evidencing that the population is vulnerable, disadvantaged and at risk of not completing second level education and therefore facing reduced opportunities in later life. Many experienced multiple adverse events growing up. The report highlights a need for dedicated, resourced education and training intervention that has the capacity to provide effective approaches and which can retain students for long enough to achieve the types of personal and social development, literacy and numeracy competencies and accreditation that will significantly increase life chances. 4. The value for money study found that the programme addresses learners needs in an out of school, non-threatening learning environment. It found that the programme was more costly in terms of core tuition per student. However, when output was included, Youthreach compared favourably with post-primary. The report identified the need for additional places, with the potential participant base greater than the number of places offered. <p>Sources are already provided, as per <i>Available Evaluations</i></p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the</p>	<p>Does this programme achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p>

⁵³ Department of Education and Science (2008) *Value for Money Review of Youthreach and Senior Traveller Training Centre Programmes* [online], Department of Education and Science: Dublin



<p>quality of the intervention?</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>Yes, the programme contributes to improved educational outcomes in young people, in addition to improved self-efficacy and confidence. Outcomes extend beyond direct employment, to progression to further education. The programme plays an important role by providing an alternative to the formal education system.</p> <p>It appears that the programme could be extended to serve a larger portion of the eligible population.</p> <p>The programme has challenges retaining participants in some areas, in part due to the complex needs of these students and absence of relevant resources in the programme.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>The measure is not intended to address all the ‘main causes’ of unemployment and social exclusion. It is very effective at providing a non-traditional learning environment to a cohort of early school leavers who might otherwise be left behind. In upskilling the cohort of participants, they are better prepared to continue in education.</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>The main success of Youthreach is its effectiveness in recruiting its target group, and the non-threatening learning environment that addresses the holistic development of the individual learner.</p>

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme (SICAP)</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</p> <p>The SICAP project aims to tackle poverty, social exclusion and long term unemployment in Ireland through local engagement, regional and national engagement and partnerships between disadvantaged individuals, community organisations and public sector agencies. SICAP’s vision is to improve the life chances and opportunities of those who are marginalised in society, living in poverty or in unemployment through community development approaches and targeted supports delivered at the local level.</p> <p>Intended effects:</p> <p>SICAP’s intended effect is to empower communities to work collaboratively with relevant stakeholders using a broad range of supports and interventions facilitated through the programme, providing opportunities for those who are marginalised in society, living in poverty or in unemployment through community development approaches and targeted supports delivered at the local level.</p>



The Programme has three goals that focus on community development, education and training, and employment. They are:

- To support and resource disadvantaged communities and marginalised target groups to engage with relevant local and national stakeholders in identifying and addressing social exclusion and equality issues;
- To support individuals and marginalised target groups experiencing educational disadvantage so they can participate fully, engage with and progress through life-long learning opportunities through the use of community development approaches;
- To engage with marginalised target groups/individuals and residents of disadvantaged communities who are unemployed but who do not fall within mainstream employment service provision. To help move them closer to the labour market and improve work readiness. To support access to employment and self-employment and to create social enterprise opportunities.

Target groups:

- Young unemployed people living in disadvantaged areas
- NEETs
- People living in disadvantaged communities
- Disadvantaged Children and Families
- Lone Parents
- New Communities (including Refugees/Asylum Seekers)
- People with Disabilities
- Roma
- The Unemployed (including those not on the Live Register)
- Low Income Workers/Household
- Travellers (an Irish indigenous ethnic group)

Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:

The target groups listed above that fit into the 3 goals of the programme form the basis for eligibility- all beneficiaries must belong to a target group. There is varying eligibility and categorisation for each target group- for example, ethnic identification, geographical zoning for disadvantaged communities, age etc.

With regards to youth participants, In 2017, the European Social Fund funds all young SICAP participants (aged 15-24) who meet ESF audit compliance criteria.

Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):

SICAP provides courses for training and employment (intervention 1) but also provides education support and vocational guidance (intervention 2) as well as training (intervention 3).

Level:

National, implemented at the local level.

Start/ end date:



Commenced April 2015. The duration of each SICAP contract is for a maximum of 33 months: 1st April 2015 to 31st December 2017, however the programme is ongoing with the next contract commenced in January 2018.

Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?

SICAP is overseen and managed by the [Local Community Development Committee \(LCDC\)](#) in each local authority area (with some local authorities having more than one LCDC) to bring about a more co-ordinated approach to local and community development and coordinate funding. Members are from local authorities, elected members and officials, state and non-state agencies, community and voluntary organisations, and other civil society representatives such as business, farming etc.

LCDCs hold the contract with Programme Implementers (PIs) and are the key decision-makers at local level. They have responsibility for monitoring how well the programme is performing, if targets are being met and verifying financial management. They also ensure that the actions and annual plans in SICAP will meet the priorities for the area and link in with local economic and community planning. Each LCDC agrees annual targets for their area based on local needs to ensure the Programme achieves its goals.

SICAP is delivered by Programme Implementers (PIs) who are engaged by the LCDC in each area. The Programme Implementers design and, once it is approved by the LCDC, implement the annual plan in their area and report directly to the relevant LCDC on actions, targets and financial reporting. Programme Implementers are required to adopt an area-based approach to tackling disadvantage. They are expected to use Pobal Maps and the Pobal HP Deprivation Index to identify the greatest concentrations of disadvantage in their respective “lot”. This provision allows PIs to target specific geographical areas with high levels of poverty, hardship and social exclusion, as well as working with issue-based target groups. Each PI has a target for the percentage of their caseload which must reside in disadvantaged areas. Local Community Development Committees, in conjunction with the contracted PIs, are required to empower communities to work collaboratively with relevant stakeholders using a broad range of supports and interventions facilitated via the programme funds.

How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?

SICAP is delivered on the ground by 45 Programme Implementers (PIs) in 51 contract areas (lots) across the country. Programme Implementers are primarily Local Development Companies - not-for-profit companies limited by guarantee which ideally provides a bottom-up approach. They design and implement an Annual Plan and report directly to their Local Community Development Committee.

LCDCs undertake the role of the Contracting Authority to manage and administer SICAP at a local level and direct funding to the PIs. As the Contracting Authority, the LCDC is the key decision maker at a local level and has responsibility for monitoring PIs’ compliance in respect of financial management and performance monitoring. The LCDC also has responsibility for decision-making at a local level in respect of the annual performance review and the annual planning process.

The structure and role of the LCDCs was an important factor in the implementation strategy for the Youth Employment Initiative. Reflecting a diverse and representative mix of the local areas



	<p>the LCDCs comprise on average, representation comes from the Community & Voluntary sector (24%), Local Government (21%) and State Agencies (17%). The LCDC structure allows for a coordinated approach to meet objectives of SICAP.</p> <p>The Department engaged Pobal (a non-profit organisation that supports local agencies and communities on behalf of the Irish Government) to work on its behalf to manage and oversee the delivery of SICAP nationally, including in respect of co-funding under the European Social Fund (ESF). Pobal has responsibility for managing the IRIS system (reporting/ record keeping system for the programme), updating programme documentation, liaising with the main stakeholders, carrying out capacity building and supporting events with the implementers and LCDCs, and providing a technical review on the annual plans and the mid-year and end of year finance and monitoring reports.</p> <p>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</p> <p>SICAP had a 2017 annual budget of €37.5 million. The Department of Rural and Community Development is the national funder of SICAP as of July 2017, and was formerly funded by the Department of Housing, Planning, Community and Local Government. SICAP receives co-funding from the European Social Fund (ESF), including a special allocation under the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) specifically to young SICAP participants who are not in employment, education or training (NEETs). Under the Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL 2014 – 2020), the European Social Fund matched Irish Government funding in SICAP for young people aged 15-24, contributing a total of €19 million in co-financing to support individual SICAP participants aged between 15-24 years over the lifetime of the programme (The duration of each SICAP contract is for a maximum of 33 months: 1st April 2015 to 31st December 2017).</p> <p>The Department of Education and Skills has primary responsibility for the European Social Fund (ESF) in Ireland and hosts a dedicated ESF Managing Authority, ESF Audit Authority and ESF Certifying Authority, which liaise with the European Commission in respect of the fund. Responsibility for managing ESF co-funding to SICAP rests with the Department.</p>								
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled and who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Data is only currently available from programme commencement to mid-year 2017 (see below). It is important to note that the SICAP programme is not a direct job creation measure, and the scope and programme delivery is extremely varied, making it difficult to capture the number of young people entitled and covered.</p> <p>Number of young people (aged 15-24) in receipt of a SICAP, ESF and YEI educational support (Goal 2 of the programme)</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="395 1646 1209 1816"> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>4,038</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016</td> <td>4,517</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017 (mid-year)</td> <td>1,820</td> </tr> </table> <p>Number of young people (aged 15-24) who have progressed along the education continuum after registering with SICAP</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="395 1910 1209 1955"> <tr> <td>2015</td> <td>737</td> </tr> </table>	2015	4,038	2016	4,517	2017 (mid-year)	1,820	2015	737
2015	4,038								
2016	4,517								
2017 (mid-year)	1,820								
2015	737								



2016	961
2017 (mid-year)	343

Number of young people (aged 15-24) in receipt of a SICAP, ESF and YEI employment support (Goal 3 of the programme)

2015	2,975
2016	4,051
2017 (mid-year)	1,936

Number of young people (aged 15-24) progressing to part-time or full-time employment up to 6 months after receiving a Goal 3 employment support

2015	352
2016	565
2017 (mid-year)	248

Total expenditures for the programme on annual basis.

2015: €26,080,250.55

2016: €35,697,265.56

2017 budget: €37,441,235.81 and expenditure at mid-year: €13,981,460.58

Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.

Expenditure per beneficiary not available, see table below to demonstrate the expenditure for the three goals of the programme.

	Goal One Expenditure	Goal Two Expenditure	Goal Three Expenditure	Monitoring Expenditure	Actions Expenditure	Admin Expenditure
2015	€5,964,805	€6,620,674	€6,996,169	€240,964	€19,822,614	€6,257,635
2016	€8,201,366	€9,114,177	€9,542,816	€360,036	€27,218,396	€8,478,868
2017 (mid-year)	€3,203,458	€3,486,046	€3,655,585	€97,971	€10,443,062	€3,538,398

An evaluation conducted by The Economic and Social Research Institute in 2016 provided the average cost per place, expenditure to population share and estimated ratio of training cost to lot budget:

Average Cost per Place	Expenditure to Population Share
-------------------------------	--



	230.45	1.25	0.
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Young unemployed people living in disadvantaged areas - NEETs - People living in disadvantaged communities - Disadvantaged Children and Families - Lone Parents - New Communities (including Refugees/Asylum Seekers) - People with Disabilities - Roma - The Unemployed (including those not on the Live Register) - Low Income Workers/Household - Travellers (an Irish indigenous ethnic group) <p>Is this programme especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</p> <p>SICAP is focused on unemployed people who experience disadvantage and social exclusion and who are of working age (15- 65 years) for individual caseload work.</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>Yes. Young people aged 15-24, who are Not in Employment, Education or Training (NEETs) are a dedicated target group under SICAP. The Youth Employment Initiative special allocation to SICAP, for example, is dedicated solely to those young people defined nationally as NEETs and aged 15-24. Remaining European Social Fund co-funding is available to all eligible SICAP participants aged between 15-24 years.</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 programme linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>Yes, as described above the programme is linked to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Youth Employment Initiative - Youth Guarantee - European Social Fund 		
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this programme available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p>		



	<p>There are mid-year and end of year reports⁵⁴ and programme requirements published by Pobal, available from 2015 - mid-year 2017 (end of year report for 2017 not yet published).</p> <p>A major report⁵⁵ on the Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme (SICAP), conducted on behalf of Pobal by independent consultancy group Crowe Horwath in 2017. Pobal conducted two surveys, one directed at programme implementers (PIs) and Local Community Development Committees (LDCCs), and one at a wider range of stakeholders. The results of the surveys were analysed on a thematic basis to inform the report made by Crowe Horwath.</p> <p>An Exploration⁵⁶ of (Area-based) Social Inclusion and Community Development Training Programmes in Ireland by The Economic and Social Research Institute in 2016 was funded by Pobal as part of the Research Programme on Community Development and Social Inclusion.</p> <p>A study⁵⁷ was undertaken by Pobal in 2017: Kickboxing, kindness and going the extra mile: good practice for working with NEETS under SICAP was jointly funded by the Department of Rural and Community Development and the European Social Fund in Ireland. This research aimed to uncover current good practice in Ireland in relation to the engagement of and service delivery to young people aged 15-24, who are not in employment, education or training (NEETs). The need for this research was identified by the Department of Rural and Community Development and Pobal.</p> <p>An Evaluation⁵⁸ of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-</p>
--	--

⁵⁴ Pobal *Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme (SICAP) Mid Year and End of Year Reports* Available:

<https://www.pobal.ie/publications/documents/sicap%20end%20of%20year%20report%202015%20final.pdf>

<https://www.pobal.ie/Publications/Documents/SICAP%202016%20End%20of%20Year%20Report%20-%20Full%20Version.pdf>

<https://www.pobal.ie/Publications/Documents/SICAP%202017%20Mid%20Year%20Report.pdf>

<https://www.pobal.ie/Publications/Documents/SICAP%20Programme%20Requirements%202016.pdf>

⁵⁵ Crowe Horwath (2017) *Final report: Key Themes Arising from the Consultation Process with SICAP Stakeholders to Inform the Development of SICAP 2018-2022*, Available:

<http://www.crowehorwath.ie/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/Crowe-Horwath-final-report-to-Pobal-SICAP-consultation.pdf>

⁵⁶ The Economic and Social Research Institute (2016) *An Exploration of (Area-based) Social Inclusion and Community Development Training Programmes in Ireland*, The Economic and Social Research Institute: Dublin, Available: <https://www.esri.ie/pubs/RS54.pdf>

⁵⁷ Gardner, C., Dermody, A., O'Donoghue, R., Davis, S., Isard, P., Aylward, Y. (2017) *Kickboxing, kindness and going the extra mile: good practice for working with NEETS under SICAP*, Pobal: DUBLIN, Available:

<https://www.pobal.ie/Publications/Documents/Good%20practice%20for%20working%20with%20NEETS%20under%20SICAP%20-%20Summary%20Report.pdf>

⁵⁸ Gauge and Department of Education and Skills (2016) *Evaluation of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020*, Available:

<http://www.esf.ie/en/ImageLibrary/Repository/Files/YEI-Evaluation.pdf>



	<p>2020 was undertaken to assess the effectiveness, efficiency and impact of joint support from the ESF and the specific allocation for YEI including the implementation of the Youth Guarantee in Ireland, encompassing an evaluation of SICAP. This evaluation consulted with the SICAP measure manager, funding liaison and programme directorate staff in Pobal and the 48 Intermediate Bodies.</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>Both internal and external.</p> <p>If evaluations of this programme 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>With respect to the evaluation of community-level impacts, in contrast to programmes targeted at individuals, the objectives of community development initiatives are often wide ranging and without clearly defined targets; which limits the analysis of direct outcomes of SICAP.</p> <p>No evaluation of substitution effect of deadweight loss was available, The Evaluation of the operation of the Youth Employment Initiative (YEI) element of the European Social Fund (ESF) Programme for Employability, Inclusion and Learning (PEIL) 2014-2020 found that while the SICAP programme was not displacing interventions for other age groups, the short time scale for delivery of the programme (April to December) was deemed to have potentially displaced young people to private sector activation programmes and the need for more intense predevelopment support for groups of young people was cited.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>The Gauge and Department of Education and Skills evaluation found that while SICAP is a national programme, it has sufficient flexibility to be tailored locally to best meet the needs of disadvantaged areas and target groups. This study found that SICAP is appropriately targeted at NEETS who are disadvantaged and face barriers to employment. Their needs are addressed through the preparing for work supports which provide critical learning opportunities to overcome barriers to employment while the training in growth sectors enables participants to develop sustainable employment skills.</p> <p>The 2016 Economic and Social Research Institute report found that the vast majority of the funding, approximately 85 per cent, was directed towards community-based initiatives. The remainder of spending was directed at individual-level training programmes aimed at improving the outcomes of participants across a range of goals. The data indicates that that there are significant differences across the PIs in terms of the concentration of training places across goals, with no clear discernible pattern emerging with respect to social and economic deprivation levels. Training resources are generally focused towards geographical areas with the highest levels of deprivation. However, there is evidence of an inverse relationship between area deprivation and average cost per place, indicating a higher level of resources per participant in less deprived areas.</p>



	<p>The Crowe Horwath research suggests that SICAP endeavours to afford sufficient local flexibility to Programme Implementers to be able to respond to local priorities, however as a pre-designed programme with prescribed targets, it is limited in terms of ensuring the programme meets its objectives and is locally responsive. The structure has positioned local groups solely as sub-contractors to the State and not as partners in programme development and delivery. The next iteration of SICAP is recommended to have the capacity to allow for increased local autonomy and flexibility in the implementation of the programme.</p> <p>The 2017 study by Gardner et al. found that, overall, young people regarded SICAP services as having met their needs. The programme was found to exemplify good practice across all stages of service delivery, and it was found that the programme has an impact on progression to education or employment. A flexible, individualised approach was considered key by service providers, who were able to name a large number of specific approaches and ways of working that together represent good practice in working with NEETs in Ireland.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this programme achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Yes. Activities under the SICAP programme can be aligned under the following three goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - social inclusion and capacity building, - lifelong learning and - employment. <p>The fact that the scope of the programme is so broad, and the goals are multifaceted, makes it difficult to fully capture both direct and spill-over effects. The selection of target groups to benefit from SICAP has been broadly informed by the current socio-economic context, which helps safeguard the programme in ensuring it reaches the disadvantaged groups it is aimed at. The ethos of community engagement and partnership is strongly embedded within the SICAP programme and provides an access point for the hard to reach target groups which would not be available through mainstream statutory provision, which is the overarching purpose of the programme. Whilst SICAP interventions are aimed to those with barriers to labour market progression, evidence from the evaluations has emerged that the integrated work placement and continued education approach embedded within the programme is delivering enhanced employability skills. These skills build participants' capacity to sustain in the labour market, and are highly when linked with other interventions on the YEI pathway, build participants' capacity to sustain in the labour market.</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>2016 statistics demonstrate that the total number of disadvantaged individuals (15 years upwards) engaged under SICAP on a one-to-one basis was 47,511 individuals. In addition, some 3,076 local community groups were supported. An increased focus of the programme on providing supports to social enterprises was evident in the target for the number of social enterprises assisted under SICAP being exceeded by 50%. The annual statistics on the number of young people (aged 15-24) who have progressed along the education continuum after registering with SICAP (961 in 2016) as well as the number of young people (aged 15-24) progressing to part-time or full-time employment up to 6 months after receiving a Goal 3 employment support (565</p>



in 2016) indicate the value of these interventions. While in 2015 the overall number of individuals progressing to employment was 24% below the target, in 2016 the target was exceeded by 38%, and for young people it changed from 68% of the target achievement to 117%. The two more challenging targets involved progression of individuals and young people to self-employment. While the level of attainment improved between 2015 and 2016, progression to self-employment- especially for young people- remains a challenge for the programme.

Evidence did emerge that SICAP is delivering an increased net impact when compared against the impact of previous funding arrangements. The role of YEI funding mechanisms was deemed highly important - YEI involvement has allowed for an increased focus on the particular target group of young unemployed people. This is considered important in the light of national funding reductions for social inclusion programmes as YEI funding was seen to augment the funding which is available for work with disadvantaged young people.

Of note, extra work does not have any more value currently- in many instances, more work is being done with individuals that does not end up being captured, as once there are two interventions, the target is deemed to have been met. Within SICAP, there is often nowhere to capture in detail the intensity of the work being undertaken and the impact and effects. The research concludes that while SICAP training programmes could be subject to rigorous evaluation, the more disadvantaged nature of the client base implies that costlier mixed-method approaches are required. Developing a complete evaluation framework is also made more difficult by the fact that, as discussed earlier, the objectives of community development initiatives are often wide ranging and do not have clearly defined targets.

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.)?

Due to its concentration in disadvantaged areas and the inclusion of specific target groups, SICAP may be more exposed to a range of barriers to inclusion, such as stigmatisation, low self-esteem, household joblessness, early school leaving, low educational attainment and substance misuse. The existence of these barriers constitute a central rationale for SICAP, which offers easier access to more intensive provision compared to the alternatives available from mainstream agencies.

The increased allocation of resources per participant in less deprived areas suggests that resources may be too thinly spread across more deprived populations and there may be grounds for some further reallocation of funds towards the most deprived areas.

The dispersed populations in rural areas, with challenges such as infrastructure deficits and lack of public transport as issues particular to some LCDC areas, with others facing specific issues relating to urban areas, such as particular difficulty in accessing housing. There is a need for local flexibility and input to the identification of target groups for SICAP to ensure locally responsive coverage and buy-in from stakeholders and participants.

In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?

Current targets and measurement methods are not an incentive to work with the most disadvantaged and complex cases. Therefore, the individual targets need to be calculated at more



	<p>realistic levels that reflect the complexities of the challenges faced by many of the eligible participants.</p> <p>It is clear from the research that there are significant differences across the PIs in terms of the concentration of training places across the different goals, with no clear discernible pattern emerging with respect to social and economic deprivation levels. Current SICAP guidelines suggest that spending should be equally distributed across the three goals, with minor flexibility provided on this point. This seems to run contrary to one of the underlying principles of community development: that resources are allocated according to need. A more practical approach to oversight, one that enables community organisations to concentrate their activities around the specific problems that is responsive to the local landscape is required - a one-size-fits-all approach does not work for all the communities and target groups. Local identification of needs and solutions, albeit in a national framework, is necessary to facilitate local motivation and innovation. If needs and solutions are externally-identified, local participation, commitment and buy-in suffers.</p> <p>Areas of work that need to be further legitimised include early intervention and preventative programmes, community education and non-caseload work with young people.</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>SICAP is appropriately targeted at NEETS who are disadvantaged and face barriers to employment. Their needs are primarily addressed through the preparing for work supports which provide critical learning opportunities to overcome barriers to employment while the training in growth sectors enables participants to develop sustainable employment skills. The ready for work supports provide participants with real employment and/or training opportunities. Many PIs emphasised the importance of a holistic approach in providing supports to NEETs, for example, improving life skills and decision-making skills and addressing ‘soft’ barriers to progression, such as low self-esteem, lack of self-awareness, lack of clarity about values and difficulty with goal setting. PIs reported that mentoring and guidance were an important method of delivery. Training courses provided for NEETs by the majority of PIs aimed to address basic skills gaps and equip beneficiaries with mandatory training required to enter employment in sectors, such as construction, retail and hospitality.</p> <p>Practical issues, such as a lack of transport or a lack of life skills and confidence affected young people/ NEETs even more than other groups. Locally, the programme implementers channel a lot of time and resources into, and highlighted the importance of, building relationships, of solid engagement routines and the value of long-term initiatives for their success in responding to these challenges. Programme Implementers also emphasised the importance of building strong relationships with young people, which often required developing long-term initiatives spanning over a number of years and reaching out to young people at risk before they become NEETs.</p> <p>The inclusion of the SICAP programme within the YEI is geared to ensure that those most disadvantaged and marginalised can benefit from customised support to meet their needs to build their employability to offset poverty and social exclusion. However, participants in the SICAP programme expressed the desire to see a clear definition in relation to SICAP, the terminology</p>



	<p>used within it (for example, what “social inclusion” and “community development” mean in the context of this particular programme), its particular and individual role and intended impact, and how this programme fits within the wider landscape of statutory and voluntary agencies and supports.</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>Particularly in the context of young people, the following have been identified as success factors of the programme:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Engaging young people <p>The importance of understanding the local community, harnessing the resources available and being part of it and being out in the community, as a means to engaging young people, especially those with the most needs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Understanding the interests of the young people targeted by the service. • Providing short or sample courses based on young people’s interests. • Ensuring that short sample courses provide meaningful opportunities and clear pathways into other SICAP supports. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2) Working effectively with young people <p>SICAP utilises effective measures to work with young people:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing ongoing support to address barriers • Setting achievable goals • Addressing external factors such as mental health • Flexibility in the structure and follow up with young people • Ensuring young people are aware of the workplace focus and relevance of programmes- providing real work scenarios and creating an environment that is different from school and supports workplace readiness. <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>SICAP has a clear strategic fit as a targeted programme to meet those most at risk of sustained long term unemployment and the implementation strategy delivered by local stakeholders has helped to ensure strong progress against targets. The fact that SICAP adopts a holistic approach to promoting social inclusion and reducing poverty by recognising that patterns of disadvantage may be present within particular groups and also on a spatial basis is one of the main success factors of this intervention. The Programme targets both communities of need (area-based) and individuals of need (issue-based).</p> <p>Good practice was identified across all stages of service delivery from initial advertising of the programme and engagement of young people, through delivery of supports to young people and follow-up post referral. Good practice was also identified in relation to interagency partnership and collaboration, and internal organisational development. The outcomes for young people who progressed to employment or education demonstrated that young people viewed the programme as having an impact on their progression, as the vast majority stated that their progression was due, entirely or to a significant degree, to SICAP supports.</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p>