



Youth employment policies in Romania

EXCEPT working paper no. 45
July 2018

Maria-Carmen Pantea

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:

Pantea, M.-C. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Romania*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No. 45. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-414-5 (pdf)

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



Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Romania	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview	8
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions.....	13
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	15
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives	30
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion.....	32
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures	34
References	45



The key risk groups in the labour market in Romania

Table 1 “Risk group” construction¹

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Young people with outdated qualifications	1	2	2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

The main sources of reference used:

- **All young people:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015)
- **Young unemployed:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015) , ANOFM, 2016, 2017; Romanian Government (2014)
- **Early school leavers:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015); CEAE, 2016
- **Young people with low skills:** ANOFM, 2016, 2017; CEAE, 2016; Romanian Government (2017)
- **Young people with outdated qualifications:** ANOFM, 2016, 2017
- **Young people without qualifications:** ANOFM, 2016, 2017; Romanian Government (2017); Romanian Government (2014)
- **NEET:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015), ANOFM, 2016, 2017; INCSMPS, (2015); Romanian Government (2017); Romanian Government (2014)
- **Higher education graduates:** INCSMPS (2015)
- **Migrants/Ethnic minorities: ERRC (2011),**
- **Teenage/single parents:** UNICEF (2017)
- **Young people from workless families:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015)
- **Young people from remote/disadvantaged areas:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015);

¹ 1=no significant role to 5=very important



- **Young people with a disability:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015)
- **Young people leaving care:** Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly (2015); Brown (2015); UNICEF (2017)
- In-work poor: **Romanian Government (2014)**

Romania is a country where **young people** are not very high on the policy and (to some extent) on the research agenda. Important elements that help contextualize the lower potency of youth as a 'risk group' are:

- The demographic structure of today's Romania, with high EU migration of the younger population and aging of the remaining groups.
- Lower voting rates for young people and, implicitly, lower political interest
- There are high regional disparities in economic and social development: from high unemployment in the East and South-East, to high demand for labour force in the North-West and the West (Transilvania and Banat region). There is, thus, no coherent, unitary discourse on youth as a 'risk group'. Yet, elements of a neoliberal ethos are present (eg. the notion of young people having a sense of 'entitlement without responsibilities').
- In terms of the research interest, there is weak academic recognition of the area *Youth Studies*.

The Public opinion/ Media reports on **young unemployed** tend to favour a neoliberal discourse that frames unemployment as a choice. Occasionally, and with reference to very specific regions with high emigration, the absence of decent employment is considered a major cause for youth unemployment and, implicitly, for migration. Policy measures started to be generated in the last years, with amounting research on the topic (mainly quantitative) (Popovici Barbulescu, 2012; Marginean, 2014; Ricucci, 2017).

Early school leavers: 42% of Romania's 15 years old are functionally illiterate (CEAE, 2016). In 2016, the phenomenon entered the political and public agenda, especially in the context of a presidential public consultation on functional illiteracy. Yet, one year after, despite increased media attention, there is no consolidated policy response on this issue.

Young people with outdated qualifications: is rarely a topic of concern for the public opinion/ media. Yet, this is perceived as an issue for employers. In 2016, there was a major consultative process started in the context of changing the legislation on vocational education and training (VET: the upper secondary educational provisions to young people aged 15-17, leading to a Level 3 qualification). VET parallels the academic high school system that is conducive to university education. Several foreign companies (esp. German and Austrian) have been particularly influential in proposing a dual model (which involves a stronger participation of companies in the selection of pupils, curricula and practice). There is now a possibility for companies to be involved in dual schools. A new law permits partnerships between schools, companies and parents, in view of ensuring vocational education and training within a dual system. Companies provide



training (on average, 60% of time during three years) and contribute with a scholarship of 200 RON for each student. The state provides formal, school-based education and 200 RON/ month for each student. Yet, the majority of young people in VET are trained in schools that are severely underfunded, with outdated curricula and infrastructure. To a high extent, the situation of the majority of young people in VET did not receive the public and policy attention it needed.

NEET: Despite Romania having one of the highest rates of young people in NEET situation in Europe (20.9% cf. Eurostat, 2015) this attracted a very occasional media interest. ‘NEET’ is not a concept with large public recognition. A neoliberal discourse that blames young people for being in NEET situations is predominant; media has been particularly influential in maintaining this public attitude. Policies on young people in NEET situation exist only as a response to EU requirements. The research on this group follows the policy context mostly.

Higher education graduates are more present in the media discourse. The mainstream policy making is weak on issues such as over-qualification or graduates unemployment. Despite higher education becoming a middle-class norm, Romania still has a very low level of its population with higher education (19% in comparison with a 33% EU average). A major reason is the high dropout rate at lower educational levels (see issues on functional illiteracy above).

Migrants/Ethnic minorities: In Romania, migrants did not attract a level of public and policy interest similar with the one from other EU countries. The only exception were the short-lived media and policy debates on quotas. The situation of ethnic minorities distinguishes between: Roma/ Hungarians/ the other groups. Roma are more often at the center of media and research interest. EU policies prompted many interventions at national level, in regard to the Roma. The Hungarian minority is strongly involved in proposing changes, especially in regard to education.

Young people leaving care: Despite progresses made, Romania still has 20.000 children and young people living in the 180 traditional orphanages that have not been closed (UNICEF, 2017). Roma children are overrepresented in state care in Romania (ERRC, 2011). The policies for the support towards independent life are underdeveloped. The group of young people leaving care is still invisible in the mainstream media and present in scattered research. The intersectional discrimination faced by Roma children leaving care is not acknowledged (Brown et al, 2015).

In-work poor: The rate of in-work poverty refers to the situation where the work income does not allow the person and the family to escape poverty. Despite the general policy making being concerned with unemployment, there are more recent signals that employment is not a solution out of poverty. Importantly, this emerged as a policy issue in the 2014-2020 Employment Strategy. According to the 2014-2020 Employment Strategy, the main factors determining the in-work poverty can be grouped into four categories: (i) family composition, low work intensity and low wages; (ii) individual /



personal characteristics; (iii) institutional factors (duration and type of contract, minimum wage, taxation and social protection); (iv) the structure of the economy / labor market. In 2010, the in-work poverty rate registered in Romania was 17.3%, well above the EU-27 average of 8.4% (Romanian Government, 2014). Increasingly, research is aware of this particular risk group.



Youth employment policies: a general overview

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

	Indicator	Year		
		2005	2010	2015
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:	N/A	N/A	N/A
2.1	Total number	99.421	46. 109 u	32. 766 u
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)	6.8	3.5	3.1
3	Number of youth participants (up to 29 years old) in active labour market programmes:	N/A	N/A	N/A
3.1	Total number	N/A	N/A	7111
3.2	% of the labour force (15-29)	N/A	N/A	1
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)	N/A	N/A	21,7
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:			
4.1	Total amount (EUR)	N/A	34.754	30.000
4.2	% of GDP	0.107	0.027	0.019
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:	N/A	N/A	N/A
5.1	Total amount (EUR)	N/A	34.77 (e)	91.80 (e)
5.2	% of GDP	N/A	0.59	0.18 (e)
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:			
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

u= low reliability. Data cf. Eurostat

(e) = estimated

Comments on Table 2

Eurostat does not include information on youth-targeted active labour market programmes for Romania. At national level, there is no specific data for youth-targeted active labour market programmes (telephone conversations and emails at the Ministry of Work, Social Solidarity and Family and at the statistical office of the National Agency for Employment. See also Eichhorst and Rinne, 2014).

Romania has an extremely low financial allocation for active labour market measures. The maximum allocation was in 2003 (0.16 of the GDP). The allocation is on a decreasing trend ever since. For instance, in 2005, the total public spending on labour market policies was of 0.11%. In 2010, the total allocation was of 0.03. Overall, the public spending on active labour market policies in Romania registers values at less than one-tenth of the EU average spending (0.041% of GDP, as compared to the average EU27 of 0.536% in 2009). As of 2011, Romania continued to have the lowest expenditure for



ALMPs across EU countries (only 0.02% of GDP). Under these circumstances, only 3.3% of those who search for employment also participate in active labour market measures, compared to 29.3% of the EU27 average (Romanian Government, 2014 – data from 2009). The Employment Strategy 2014-2020 argues that the weak financial allocations for ALMPs is concerning and likely to disproportionately affect vulnerable groups, including young people.

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

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

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

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

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

⁶ state = 1, region = 2, municipality = 3, church = 4, foundations, NGOs = 5, private sector = 6, educational institutions=7 Other, please specify=8 If several, please list all



Comments on table 3

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

Re-orientation courses are provided in the cases of collective dismissals, part of the social responsibility programmes. Cases of collective dismissal were very rare in the recent years, because of intense restructuring of state companies during 90s and early 2000. Now, private companies use protective measures that prevent collective restructuring (e.g. externalisation of risk by temporary agency employment and other flexible work arrangements). Very few orientation courses are carried out for migrants and refugees. These are not necessarily 'youth-specific'.

Preparation for training or employment applies more to small-scale projects aimed at increasing the employability of disadvantaged young people (former youth offenders, young people leaving care, young people with disabilities). They may be informal and spontaneous in character (in the case of NGOs coaching young people in social skills), or, more structured (when delivered in institutions, such as prisons or probation offices).

Public Occupation Services (POS) are involved in the provision of information and counselling services. Beneficiaries are (young) people actively seeking employment. It is uncertain whether 'counseling' goes much beyond provision of information. Several digital systems for matching unemployed persons with the available job openings, have been piloted (e.g. cards, restricted access platforms), mostly in the frame of European Social Fund (e.g. the CHANCE 4 NEET project, The European Professional Card project). The evidence on their actual applicability is uncertain. Each POS has a public online database with the available jobs, updated regularly.

Vocational guidance and career counselling. The main setting where vocational guidance and career counselling (as a measure) occurs is within the public employment offices. However, an evaluation indicates its negative impact (INCSMP, 2015). Interviewed recipients of the vocational training measure stated that the choice of participation in a certain type of training course was overwhelmingly based on their personal decision (INCSMP, 2015). The unemployed persons are, most often, not in possession of systematic, accurate information about the labour market demands. This implies the need for more intensive information and counselling measures based on reliable sources (studies and labour forecasts) (INCSMP, 2015).

Training (with certificates): Since 2011, Romania has a National Register of Approved Vocational Training Providers, managed by the National Authority for Qualifications (NAC). Among others, the NAC is responsible for the authorization and licensing process of adult vocational training providers. The NAC is subordinated to the Ministry of Education.

Whilst many organisations/ institutions provide trainings, only some have accreditation (permission to issue certificates that are recognised by NAC). There are many accredited private training providers, subcontracted by local employment offices when needed.



Vocational schools (public) are rarely involved in the provision of training outside regular educational offer to their students. Often, this is perceived as a limitation for their development and financial sustainability.

Together with unemployment subsidies, the provision of 'vocational training measures' is one of the most prevalent (coverage & expenditure) activation measure in Romania (INCSMPS, 2015). However, an evaluation study commissioned by the Ministry of Work indicates that the unemployed people receiving a 'vocational training measure' had a *lower* probability of being employed in the immediate period following the implementation of the measure. Attendance of trainings decreased their probability of obtaining employment even by 16%, in comparison to their counterparts from the control group. A possible explanation was the provision of trainings in areas without high labour market demand (INCSMPS, 2015).

Training (without certificates): in a context of 1) high demand for qualified labour force and/ or 2) need for company-specific skills, firms rely on in-house training of their staff. Few companies offer certificates that are transferable within the industry; the largest majority offer no certificates, or certificates that are valid within a company or a consortium. This raises limitations to employers' horizontal mobility/ career advancement outside a company/ consortium.

Employment incentives, subsidies for employer

Employment incentives are one of the most relevant measures against unemployment. They still have high coverage and expenditure, despite being on a decreasing trend. For instance, in 2006, the total expenditure for 'employment incentives' was 52,10 Mil. Euro. In 2015, the expenditure was 24.65 mil, in a context of declining unemployment. There are different subsidies for employers. Of high prevalence are the subsidies for employing people older than 45 who were previously registered as unemployed. An evaluation indicates that this type of subsidy increases the chances for unemployed people older than 45 of getting a job when registering, with 44,7% (INCSMP, 2015).

In terms of *youth* labour market subsidies, the measures with the highest coverage and allocation are the subsidies for graduate recruitment (approx. 5 mil. Euro). An evaluation indicates that 24,6% of those who benefited from this measure consider they would have been unemployed, in its absence (INCSMP, 2015).

As of 2015, the expenses for '**direct job creation**' were ten times lower than in 2006. In almost ten years, they decreased ten times: from 33, 18 mil. Euro in 2006, to 3,63 mil in 2015. Since 2011, the expenditures for direct job creation did not exceed 5 mil euro/ year.

Despite a media climate of promoting entrepreneurial support measures, the related expenditures are the smallest among all activation measures (INCSMP, 2015). The highest expenditure for '**start-up incentives**' was of 1,05 mil. Euro in 2010. The amount



decreased to an expenditure of 0.04 mil. Euro in 2015. The expenditures for ‘counselling for business start-up’ are identical. They are largely supported through EU initiatives.

The expenses for ‘**out-of-work income maintenance**’ have always been the largest category of expenditure. Now, they amount to 58% of the total LMP (categories 1-9). As of 2010, the ‘out-of-work income maintenance’ measure was 90% of the total LMP (1-9).

Note:

Romania has eight *development regions* (created in 1998 in view of EU accession). These correspond to NUT-II level divisions in European Union member states, but do not actually have an administrative or legislative status. This explains why the ‘main source of funding’ is never ‘regional’.

There are also some **structural constraints that limit the possibility to have outcome indicators** after participation in a support intervention. For instance, the new Labour Code increased the probationary period to 120 days for young graduates and 90 days for unqualified workers. Under these circumstances, statistical data which would be able to capture a quality measure of youth employment, need to be taken long-term after entering a probationary period

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
Substantial progress in strengthening the Public Employment Service (Gligor, 2017)	Extremely low financial allocations for ALMP (10 times lower than the EU average)
High media visibility of training opportunities	Weak approaches that target the root causes of youth unemployment and social exclusion, in particular early school leaving and child poverty.
	Strong focus on training provision, at the expense of direct-job creation measures.
	Weak labour market forecasting
	Oversupply of trainings in areas where there is no labour market demand
	Strong focus on quantitative indicators, at the expense of concern for quality in the provision of support (Schiopoiu Burlea, 2014)
	Absence of complex measures in order to activate difficult groups that make an ‘untapped labour force’ (Gligor, 2017)
	Weak focus on young people in rural areas
	<i>The Matthew effect</i> (‘creaming’, cf. Gligor, 2007): ALMP oriented towards the more advantaged from the disadvantaged.
	Underdeveloped links between employment and integrated services. Still, strong focus on benefits.



Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 5 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group ⁷	Type ⁸	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” ⁹ example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion ¹⁰	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people ¹¹
1	Technical College ‘Independenta’ Sibiu - Dual School Marquardt, Sibiu	Local	C	3	2014-2017	National Other	No	Yes, positive	Yes	N/A	2
2	INTESPO	National	D	1	Ongoing	EU	ESF	No	No	N/A	N/A
3	Subsidies for employers within the modified Apprenticeship Act	National	B	4	Ongoing	National, with possibility of accessing structural funds	Not directly. The modified Apprenticeship Act was considered ‘satellite element’ of the Youth Guarantee architecture	No	No	1	N/A

⁷ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

⁸ (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

⁹ 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.”

¹⁰ 1 - very weak; 2 - weak; 3 - medium; 4 - strong; 5 - very strong; N/A - not applicable. Please provide a brief explanation of the ratings, incl. references if relevant.

¹¹ 1 - Significant improvement; 2 - Improvement; 3 - No change; 4 - Deterioration; 5 - Significant deterioration; N/A – not applicable. Please provide a brief explanation of the ratings, incl. references if relevant.



Comments on Table 5

Technical College 'Independenta' Sibiu -Dual School Marquardt, Sibiu

Is an example of practice identified during the fieldwork carried out within the project 'A youth-centered analysis of the changes in the nature and meaning of work', supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research and Innovation, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PNII-RU-TE-2014-4-0011. The project involved interviews/ focus groups with over 250 young people in VET, visits in over 30 VET schools and interviews with 65 teachers, school authorities and employers. Two members of a research team member (Ovidiu Oltean and Maria-Carmen Pantea) carried out a face to face interview with the company representative and a telephone interview with the school director. Interviews suggested a genuine concern with issues of social inclusion and quality employment, as young people are offered qualification and full time, stable employment with possibilities of advancement in a big company. Based on the judgement of the interviewers, a decision was made to include Technical College 'Independenta' Sibiu -Dual School Marquardt, Sibiu as an example of good practice.

INTESPO

was selected because it meets several criteria: (i) it is an ongoing intervention; (ii) it targets only young people; (iii) it searches to reach a sub- group of young people that experiences social exclusion; (iv) it is national in scale.

Subsidies for employers within the modified Apprenticeship Act

is an intervention that targets mainly young people and addresses several sub-groups of young people that may be in one of the following situations of disadvantage: Early school leavers/ Young people with low skills/ Young people with outdated qualifications/ Young people without qualifications. In Romania, the intervention has a convoluted history, which that may inform the broader European analysis of 'what works' and 'what does not work' in promoting apprenticeships. It responds to the [New Skills for New Jobs initiative](#) set up to bridge the gap between the worlds of education and work.

The labour market measures are mainly concentrated on facilitating the entry onto work. Overall, there is little focus on policies, initiatives and measures aimed at 'good jobs' for young people (well-paid, corresponding to the individual preferences of young people, with good career advancement opportunities, etc.)

The impact of policy measures on youth inclusion

Technical College 'Independenta' Sibiu -Dual School Marquardt, Sibiu: the impact on targeted young people is **very strong**, as highly disadvantaged young people receive high quality training, close mentorship, level 3 qualification, employment with possibilities of progression. Very likely, in the absence of the intervention, the young people involved would have experienced social exclusion. However, if considering a broader definition of impact, in relation to a larger population, this small scale intervention cannot be assessed as having an impact on 'youth inclusion' by large.



INTESPO: N/A as the intervention is ongoing.

Subsidies for employers within the modified Apprenticeship Act: very weak. The previous allocations led to an extremely low number of apprenticeships.

The trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people

Technical College ‘Independența’ Sibiu -Dual School Marquardt, Sibiu: Significant improvement for the young people directly involved, as they are employed/ in training with Yes the 3 years education. Yet, the effect cannot be extended to a larger group.

INTESPO: N/A as the intervention is ongoing.

Subsidies for employers within the modified Apprenticeship Act: N/A. The financial support for companies was significantly increased recently (2017). There is no evidence yet, on its potential influence on unemployed young people.

Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	Colegiul Tehnic ‘Independența’ Sibiu - Scoala Duala Marquardt, Sibiu Technical College ‘Independența’ Sibiu -Dual School Marquardt, Sibiu
Short description	<p><u>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</u> Provision of vocational education and training (VET) to young people, within the secondary education system, through a dual model (partnership between a public vocational school, a private company and students).</p> <p><u>Intended effects:</u> Level 3 qualification in mechanical area in automotive industry (cnc operators, tool makers, electromechanical) and employment in a company with real advancement opportunities.</p> <p><u>Target groups:</u> in the academic year 2014/15, 7 students (14-15 years old) who were enrolled in a public vocational school. They all had extremely low academic performances.</p> <p><u>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</u> certificate of 8 grades, enrolled in the vocational school (rom. <i>Scoala profesionala</i>) of Colegiul Tehnic Independența, no further selection or screening.</p> <p><u>Type of intervention:</u> job-specific training, academic recovery, gradual introduction into work, mentoring, provision of employment for all students, at the end of the VET education.</p> <p><u>Level:</u> local</p> <p><u>Start/ end date:</u> September 2014 – July 2017 (3 school years) The intervention is ongoing for other groups of young people, enrolled in each academic year.</p> <p>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</p>



	<p>There are several stakeholders involved in the formulation/ implementation of this intervention: a business association, local school authorities, a public school, students and their parents.</p> <p><u>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</u></p> <p>The Ministry of Education enables dual arrangements between technical schools and companies.</p> <p>Main institutions involved: Colegiul Tehnic Independența (public school), Marquardt Schaltsysteme Sibiu</p> <p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>(EUR. 50 000 / year) from company budget (source: interview with company representative).</p>																				
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="464 887 1385 1216"> <thead> <tr> <th>Academic year</th> <th>No. enrolled in the program</th> <th>No. who finished the program</th> <th>No. employed</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2014/2015</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> <td>6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2015/2016</td> <td>7</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2016/2017</td> <td>8</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>2017/2018</td> <td>10</td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>The costs incurred by the company:</u></p> <p>Approx 50 thousand EUR / year for the material basis (Apprentice Toolshop)</p> <p>Approx 700 EUR / pupil / year (cf. dual school coordinator from Dual School Marquardt) (source: interview with company representative).</p> <p>The costs incurred by school are the regular state allocations for secondary education.</p>	Academic year	No. enrolled in the program	No. who finished the program	No. employed	2014/2015	7	6	6	2015/2016	7			2016/2017	8			2017/2018	10		
Academic year	No. enrolled in the program	No. who finished the program	No. employed																		
2014/2015	7	6	6																		
2015/2016	7																				
2016/2017	8																				
2017/2018	10																				
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure</p> <p>The program is targeting exclusively young people.</p> <p>Eligibility criteria: enrolled in a public vocational school that signed a cooperation protocol with the company Marquardt Schaltsysteme Sibiu.</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?</p> <p>The program and the curricula are already structured and are followed accordingly. The inputs from the pupils are welcome during the implementation (cf. company representative). However, as the intervention is part of the formal education that is very structured in Romania, the capacity of young people to exert a meaningful influence over designing the programme, is reduced.</p>																				



<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship)? No</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? There are no external evaluations of the program. The intervention is on-going and several indicators of effectiveness are present (e.g. the number of VET students receiving certification, number of young people employed). Because of being part of the secondary education system, close monitoring and evaluations, based on clear indicators were possible. They are internal, produced by the implementing public school and the company. The company has an electronic system of monitoring the academic performance and absences. There are periodic evaluations of the academic and technical performance (very detailed) and a final examination.</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><u>The major indicators of success:</u> According to the data provided by the company representative, upon finishing the three years of VET, 6 of the 7 young people were certified as <i>numerical control machine operators tool makers, electromechanical</i> and were employed by the implementing company. The equipment they produced meets the high quality standards that enable their use in the automotive industry.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? This program achieves its stated goals and intended effects. Assessment of the magnitude of the effect The intervention is part of a dual model in VET, which is very new in Romania. Whilst the dual model reaches high employability, an overall major limitation is that it is very selective from the onset. The majority of schools operating in a dual model are highly competitive, with companies involved in promoting the model, in selecting and training of students. In the situation presented, however, the target group was socio-economically disadvantaged and extremely uncompetitive (e.g. functionally illiterate young people with grades of 2 on a scale 1 to 10, at the national evaluation). The intervention was small in scale (32 pupils in total) and allowed for a very close relationship with the coordination staff from the company. Both the level of professional training and mentorship were high. The company allocated a person as coordinator – Dedicated Practice Tutor („zero“ production demands, only training tasks). The replication of the intervention at larger scale involves a complex set of elements: - companies’ financial and social responsibility</p>



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - social commitment of the coordinating staff - companies' openness to the idea that it is possible to gradually train and obtain high results when working with young people that are functionally-illiterate - personal commitment from young people and their parents. <p>Coverage and take-up: It is a local, small-scale intervention.</p> <p>VET schools – in general - are not very attractive to young people. When they do not follow a dual model, the possibilities for young people to learn a trade are of mixed quality and highly dependent on the availability and commitment of local companies and school staff. Yet, the new employment possibilities in high tech companies are likely to change young people's views on VET.</p> <p>Possible barriers for participation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to information on dual VET among young people in remote rural areas • Extremely poor prior knowledge in the area of mathematics and literacy (functional illiteracy) • High levels of social and economic disadvantage for young people and their families (the largest majority from rural areas) • Weak capacity of VET schools to provide remedial education • Parental migration and the involvement of young people in family's migration projects • Administrative challenges of the public-private partnership in a context of very recent legislation • Inexistence of VET textbooks for several academic disciplines (e.g. Romanian literature, foreign languages) and outdated textbooks for technical disciplines <p>The intervention does provide quality and sustainable employment.</p> <p>A positive, unintended consequence is the capacity to challenge the mainstream view on the young people in VET.</p> <p>Main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness</p> <p>The intervention is very small in scale. Also, it can be implemented by large companies, as it involves high costs and human resources.</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?</p> <p>This measure addresses the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion among young people. It targets a high risk group: young people from rural areas, with extremely low academic standing and at risk of being unskilled unemployed.</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>This is a local, small-scale intervention. The effect is not as much a matter of magnitude, but it sends a powerful social message for Romania's public</p>



	<p>education and the companies involved in the dual system. As 42% of 15 years old in Romania are functionally illiterate (CEAE, 2016), the social significance of an intervention that prepares and introduces into high quality employment, young people that were functionally illiterate, is high.</p> <p>The main added value rests in the capacity to obtain high technical performance by gradual training and close mentorship, with extremely disadvantaged and 'hard to reach' young people.</p> <p>A possible concern is for the companies involved in the association, to start becoming very selective in students' recruitment. This has been the case with other dual schools, where companies' offer was heavily promoted and attracted high interest from young people, including many with high academic standing (15% admittance rate). Under these circumstances, young people with low school performance and socially disadvantaged, were often screened out.</p>
--	---

Name of the initiative	<p>Înregistrarea Tinerilor în Evidențele Serviciului Public de Ocupare (Registration of Youth in the Public Occupation Service Registry)</p> <p>INTESPO</p>
Short description	<p><u>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</u></p> <p>To increase the number of young people in NEET situations who register with the Public Employment Service (PES), in order to provide personalized support measures.</p> <p><u>Intended Effects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mapping of young people in NEET situations, based on 8 steps of data collection • Minimum 200,000 young potential NEETs identified • one campaign and an application dedicated to young people in NEET situations • 41 collaboration protocols establishing support teams at county level and at least 180 protocols at the local level • 7 methodologies / working procedures for administrative coordination • 42 support points and 42 local intervention and training teams • At least 42 local intervention teams equipped • At least 160,000 young people registered in the Public Employment Service database, profiled, informed about their options and monitored up to 6 months after leaving the NEET situation. <p><u>Description:</u></p> <p>This is a twofold project. First, it has a strong capacity-building component, aimed to revitalize the administrative structures able to identify and monitor the situation of young people in NEETs situation. Second, it has an</p>



<p>awareness-rising component, aimed at informing the young people in NEETs situations about the opportunities available.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- To increase the level of awareness among young people in NEET situations about the benefits of registering with the PES and their options for integration into the labour market, education, training or entrepreneurship through national information and awareness campaign.- To create a basis for the identification and monitoring of young people in NEET situations, by establishing a local support network and a mechanism that identifies 200,000 young people in NEET situations <p><u>Target groups:</u></p> <p>Inactive young people in NEET situation.</p> <p><u>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</u></p> <p>Young people aged 16-24, not registered with the Unemployment Office, with low skills and / or difficulties in social integration. The regional breakdown is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• More developed regions - 20,000 inactive young people in NEET situations, of which at least 8,000 women• Less developed regions - 180,000 inactive young people in NEET situations,, of which at least 80,000 women <p><u>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</u></p> <p>Labour market participation; Prevention of poverty through inclusive labour markets; Social inclusion and anti-discrimination; Social security systems;</p> <p><u>Level:</u></p> <p>National</p> <p><u>Start/ end date:</u></p> <p>Since August 2017 48 months</p> <p><u>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</u></p> <p>No evidence</p> <p><u>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</u></p> <p>National Agency for Employment in partnership with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Ministry of Work and Social Justice- Ministry of National Education and Scientific Research- National Payment and Social Inspection Agency <p>The project involves cooperation with other stakeholders: local authorities, trade unions, youth NGOs, community-based social workers, community mediators, Police, church etc.</p> <p><u>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</u></p>



	<p>47.474.754,5 Euro (cf. Ministry of Work and Social Justice, 2017) This is a non-competitive ESF project.</p>
Achieved results	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people who are entitled and who actually take part)/ number of young people who have found a job. <u>The costs incurred by the company:</u> None. The project has just been approved by the Management Authority in August 2017.</p>
Targeting	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure The project targets at least 200,000 inactive young people in NEET situation. In particular, the project aims to reach young people aged 16-24, not registered with the Unemployment Office, with low skills and / or difficulties in social integration. The regional breakdown is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More developed regions - 20,000 inactive young people in NEET situations, of which at least 8,000 women • Less developed regions - 180,000 inactive young people in NEET situations,, of which at least 80,000 women
Youth involvement	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way? The information publicly available does not give any indication of involving the target group in designing the project. Alongside other stakeholders, the project aims to involve youth NGOs and volunteers, for the purpose of reaching young people in NEET situations.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship)? The project is funded through European Social Fund, Human capital operational programme (2014-2020). POCU 2014 -2020, PA 2 Specific objective 2.3.(non-competitive)</p>
Available evaluations	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? There are no (public) ex-ante evaluations.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><u>The major indicators of success:</u> N/A</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect A major strength is the capacity to (even partially) keep track of young people in NEET situations, before they become long-term unemployed. This project was designed in order to respond to administrative shortcomings related to the identification and involvement of young people in NEET situations.</p>



	<p>It is premature to advance any judgements on the quality of this intervention. Previous interviews with representatives of the Employment Agencies involved in NEET-related projects, suggest structural difficulties in reaching and involving the most disadvantaged young people, largely because of: (i) the weak proactive-ness of the public employment offices; (ii) the absence of organisational structures including young people in NEET situations; (iii) promotion campaigns taking place in large cities, among relatively advantaged groups and (iv) the weak inter-institutional cooperation. The current project does not include convincing information that the above shortcomings are anticipated/mitigated.</p> <p>Possible barriers for participation</p> <p>'NEET' is not a concept with established use in Romania. There are still some conceptual unclarities in relation to the status of long-term unemployed and the 'unregistered NEETs'. The databases available (incl. Ministry of Education) provide the possibility of identifying a group of <i>potential</i> young NEETs, but it is more difficult to screen the eligible young people with a certain level of detail. According to OP HC (2014), this generated delays and blockages in YEI interventions.¹² For this reason, the current project also uses the notion of 'potential NEETs'.</p> <p>Main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness</p> <p>The information publicly available on this project does not seem to adequately engage with the limitations previously encountered and to build on the lessons learned from earlier initiatives.</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?</p> <p>This measure aims to touch upon some causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people. Yet, this is not a project aiming toward a more structural change in relation to the <i>root</i> causes of youth unemployment and social exclusion: regional disparities, rural/ urban divides, early school dropout especially in rural areas, inefficient schooling with 42% functional illiteracy rate among the 15 years old. From this perspective, the project is rather <i>reactive</i>, than <i>proactive</i> in engaging with the incoming flux of disadvantaged young people.</p> <p>The project introduces <i>case management</i> as a working method with young people in NEET situations. This involves a process of interaction within the service network (social work, education, employment) and provision of</p>

¹²Program Operational Capital Uman (2014) *Annual and final implementation reports for the Investment for growth and jobs goal PART A.*



	<p>tailored services in collaboration with young people themselves. This may include second-chance schooling, for instance. From a more structural approach, the project will contribute to introducing case management as a method of working with young people in NEET situations, which has not been done at national scale in Romania. The case management also includes the monitoring of progress both during and after the involvement in a program or in an active measure.</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>I do not propose this project as a 'good practice' because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is undergoing - There are no (available) ex-ante evaluations able to legitimize some positive expectations related to the situation of young people (who are indirect beneficiaries) - The project has a strong focus on the administrative capacity and overlooks the power of structural constraints that frame youth unemployment/ NEET in parts of Romania, such as: unavailability of <i>quality</i> employment, hidden costs of continuing education for the young people in the rural areas, the often low quality of schooling in vocational education and training, the low salaries vs. high living costs, the increase of precarious employment and the scale of the problem for Romania.

<p>Name of the initiative</p>	<p>Initiative Regarding the Apprenticeship System in Romania</p>
<p>Short description</p>	<p><u>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</u></p> <p>To make apprenticeships attractive to employers,</p> <p><u>Intended Effects:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To provide qualifications to young people that have difficulties in adapting to the labour market • To adapt training to the actual needs of employers <p><u>Description:</u></p> <p>Employers who enter an <i>apprenticeship</i> contract will receive, upon request, an amount of 1,125 RON (250 Euro) monthly, for the entire duration of the contract. This is more than three times the previous amount.</p> <p>Depending on the skill level, the apprenticeship contracts cannot take less than:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 12 months, if apprenticeship at the workplace is organized for the acquisition of competences corresponding to a level 2 qualification; • 24 months, where apprenticeship at the workplace is organized for the acquisition of competences corresponding to a level 3 qualification;



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 36 months, where apprenticeship at the workplace is organized for the acquisition of competencies corresponding to a level 4 qualification <p>There are no employment conditionalities.</p> <p>Objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• To increase young people’s level of qualification via work placements that provide learning opportunities.• To increase employers’ openness towards hiring young people <p><u>Target groups:</u></p> <p>Young people aged 16-25 years old.</p> <p><u>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</u></p> <p>Young people aged 16-25 years old. A person can enrol in an apprenticeship, provided s/he cumulatively meets the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- is between 16 and 25 years old;- is registered at the Employment office;- is not qualified for the occupation of the apprenticeship;- meets certain qualification levels according to the provisions of the law (129/ 2000). <p><u>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</u></p> <p>Skills supply, productivity and lifelong learning</p> <p><u>Level:</u></p> <p>National</p> <p><u>Start/ end date:</u></p> <p>Since 2005, with amendments and a recent renewal.</p> <p><u>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</u></p> <p>Yes: two large-scale surveys with employers. No evidence on involving young people in the formulation/ implementation of the measure.</p> <p><u>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</u></p> <p>The Ministry of Labour is the responsible body for implementation of the measure.</p> <p><u>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</u></p> <p>The measure is funded from the unemployment insurance budget, but there is now the possibility to fund it through the European structural and investment funds.</p> <p>No evidence of any specific budgetary allocation has been identified.</p>
--	--



<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>In 2016, there were only 167 apprenticeship contracts signed in Romania (Romanian Government, 2017). In previous years, even fewer apprenticeships were registered.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Is this program 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>Young people aged 16-25 years old.</p> <p>A person can enrol in an apprenticeship, provided s/he cumulatively meets the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - is older than 16; - is registered at the Employment office; - is not qualified for the occupation of the apprenticeship; - meets certain qualification levels according to the provisions of the law (129/ 2000).
<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>The information publicly available does not give any indication of involving the young people in designing the project.</p> <p>Large scale public consultation processes based on on-line surveys were initiated by the government. In 2013, the questionnaire was filled by 5000 companies and in 2015 by 1319 companies (Ministry of Labor Family, Social Protection and Elderly, 2015). Both aimed to capture exclusively the perspectives of potential employers. The estimated impact of modifying the Apprenticeship Act is defined exclusively in relation to the labour-market and the need for skills (Romanian Government, 2017). Young people are regarded as 'labour force'.</p> <p>The Law proposal states that no consultations with the NGO sector or 'other entities involved' were carried out (Romanian Government, 2017).</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p>



	<p>In 2013, Romania committed to take measures to increase the quality, supply and attractiveness of apprenticeships (European Alliance for Apprenticeships, 2013). Later on, the modified Apprenticeship Act was considered ‘satellite element’ of the Youth Guarantee architecture (RYGIP, 2015).</p> <p>The measure is related to the flagship initiative “<i>Youth on the move</i>” which establishes lines of action for the Member States to raise the overall quality of all levels of education and training. It also responds to the overall approach ‘<i>An Agenda for New Skills and Jobs</i>’.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>There is one ex-post internal evaluation on this program (Ministry of Labour, 2015). The evaluation is mainly based on two large-scale surveys carried out in 2013 and 2015. Issues such as deadweight loss, 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) are not considered.</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>In 2013, a large-scale survey (5000 companies) was carried out exploring the training activities performed in 2013. The survey indicated that only 0.2% of the companies included, organized apprenticeship activities at the workplace in 2013. The survey was carried out in the frame of the Research and Development Sectorial Plan of the Ministry of Labour. It indicates that most companies that organized apprenticeship at the workplace were medium-</p>



sized, despite the conventional belief that big companies operating in the industrial sector are more likely to carry out apprenticeships (Ministry of Labour, 2015). Main reasons for which the companies did not organize apprenticeships programs in 2013 were: i) no need for workers trained by means of such programs (62.4% of the companies); ii) barriers in allocating workers from the production sector, to training provision (27.4%); iii) unreasonably high costs associated to vocational training programs for apprentices (20%); iv) specific bureaucracy of apprenticeship (15.8%). SMEs were particularly discouraged by the high costs of the vocational training programs for apprentices (Ministry of Labour, 2015).

In 2015, another survey (1319 companies) indicated that employers in both industry and service sectors are experiencing skill shortages, and that there is demand and interest in taking up apprenticeships within the next two years. Also, the awareness amongst employers of the apprenticeship system seemed low especially among SMEs (Ministry of Labour, 2015).

The survey indicates that: i) less than a third of the companies (29%) knew the Romanian apprenticeship system; ii) SMEs have a much *lower* level of information regarding the system than large-sized companies; iii) 37% of the companies indicated their potential interested in hiring apprentices, given the high level of difficulties they face in employing skilled workers; iv) large (48%) and medium (46%) sized companies reported most difficulties in hiring skilled workers. Unlike in 2013, the interest to organize apprenticeship programs was higher for *large* companies (40%) than for SMEs (Ministry of Labour, 2015).

The key reasons why some Romanian companies were not interested in organizing apprenticeship programs in 2015, were: i) the predilection to hire already skilled workers; ii) perceived bureaucracy of apprenticeship; iii) limited time available for the apprenticeship coordinators; iv) lack of the labour force needed and the high cost of vocational training. Larger companies were more reluctant in organizing apprenticeship programs, mainly because of bureaucracy; SMEs would rather employ already skilled workers (Ministry of Labour, 2015).

The study proposed that a more flexible system that would allow the reduction of the apprenticeship period could suit better their needs and interests of SMEs (Ministry of Labour, 2015).

The 2015 evaluation indicated that the financial incentives for employers to recruit and train apprentices were unattractive (e.g. high costs for the vocational training program with an authorized training provider, the coordination effort, apprentice's salary). As a response, in August 2017, the amount of the subsidy was significantly increased to 1,125 RON (250 Euro)



	<p>monthly, for the entire duration of the contract.</p> <p>An interview with the director of an Employment Office (county level) indicates that companies' interest in apprenticeships is low because of insufficient information on the advantages. It is suggested that many companies outsource their accounting services and the personnel does not have an adequate understanding of the labour market needs. In order to address this shortcoming, a future strategy is to establish a dialogue with the management, directly. The expectations of success are, however, low.</p> <p>On the other hand, a major concern among companies is related to a potential obligation to return the entire support in the situation the apprentice leaves before the end of the programme. The concern gains potency in a context shaped by high labour force turnover and policy instability. Whilst there is, indeed, an obligation to return the subsidy, the responsibility falls on the part that caused the ending of contract (economic agent, or the apprentice).</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage?</p> <p>Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</p> <p>Until very recently (July 2017), the monthly subsidy to employers was obviously a major deterrent for employers in hiring apprentices. In the future, it is possible for more companies to start having apprentices, largely due to the high level of support. The takeover of apprentices may depend on: i) the administrative workload involved; ii) the availability of qualified staff; iii) the level of oversight exerted by state over the <i>quality</i> of apprenticeships; iv) the financial trade-off between short-term in-house training vs. at least one year apprenticeships; v) the participation of young people.</p> <p>The main weakness of this intervention comes from its exclusive focus on companies. The measure has a strong focus on simplifying the process and providing facilities <i>for</i> companies. The law stipulate the obligation for economic agents to have at least 5/1 year of professional experience¹³ in the occupation for which the apprenticeship program is organized (law 164/2017). Yet, there is no legal stipulation that the apprenticeship coordinator is exempted from some production tasks, by virtue of his/her role. The risk for the apprenticeship coordinator to take the coordination role on the top of the usual tasks is not addressed.</p> <p>The risk of misuse of apprentices as cheap labour is not addressed. There is no legal mechanism to ensure that apprentices (who can be young people at the age of 16) receive training in a manner that is adequate to their age, that</p>

¹³ depending on the size of the company: if it is a **legal entity** or a company.



	<p>the coordinator is aware of apprentices' development needs, interests and that, ultimately, the apprenticeship is a stepping stone for professional development, personal growth and decent employment.</p> <p>There is no mechanism to limit the risk of serial, short-term employment of apprentices by the same company.</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>As the school-based vocational education and training is received with some reserve by young people themselves (see the results of PASIM project), one cannot exclude a similar attitude in regard to apprenticeships. Also, due to the exclusive focus on simplifying the process for companies, the voices of young people themselves have been overlooked.</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 initiative on apprenticeships is part of a broader context of reform within Vocational education and training (VET) by large.</p> <p>42% of Romania's 15 years old are functionally illiterate (CEAE, 2016). School-based VET is being provided in upper-secondary schools. There is extreme heterogeneity in the quality of provision, with most schools being underfunded, poorly equipped and struggling to manage a cohort of young people with extremely low academic standing. There is a legal framework in place that allow for a dual system in VET, with most companies becoming very selective in students' recruitment.</p> <p>The initiative on apprenticeships is needed, but unable to respond to deep-seated problems of the educational system and the labour market.</p> <p>The availability of non-precarious employment for the target risk group is not addressed.</p> <p>As there are no employment conditionalities, there are risks for the use of apprenticeships as replacement for employment <i>per se</i>.</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>Although the increase in the financial support for companies is significant, there is no evidence yet, that this will be reflected in a significantly increased number of apprenticeships.</p>



	<p>The intervention has a strong focus on companies. Also, there is no legal stipulation that the apprenticeship coordinator is exempted from some production tasks, by virtue of his/her role.</p> <p>The risk of misuse of apprentices as cheap labour is not addressed. There is no legal mechanism to ensure that apprentices receive training in a manner that is adequate to their age, that the coordinator is aware of apprentices' development needs, interests and that, ultimately, the apprenticeship is a stepping stone for professional development, personal growth and decent employment.</p> <p>There is no mechanism to limit the risk of serial, short-term employment of apprentices by the same company.</p> <p>The intervention is not grounded in any consultation or research involving young people themselves.</p>
--	---

Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

Romania had always had an unprecedented low absorption rate in the history of the European Community (Batusaru, 2015). For instance, in the period 2007-2012, Romania absorbed about 10 % of the Structural and Cohesion Funds, the worst performance of the 27 Member States (Bostinaru 2013:7). This 'costly failure' has been attributed to the period 2005 - 2007, when 'the Romanian government simply failed in preparing the country in terms of institutional and administrative support to absorb the funds that were about to be available' (Batusaru, 2015: 22). Yet, other explanations may be related to corruption and fraud, for instance, the EU prosecutions on the use of ESF funds on social entrepreneurship (European Anti-Fraud Office, 2016). According to the ministry of European Funds (cited in [media](#)), the ESF Human Development OP was the Operational Programme with the highest problems of corruption, with instances of real fraud, without legal measures being taken by ministries (Suciu and Jifcu, 2016).

The labour market active policies in the frame of ESF have been criticised for a disproportionate concern for quantity, at the expense of quality in the provision of support: with the "rate of absorption" of the available funds being 'the main indicator that measures the efficiency of the ESF' (Burlea Schiopoiu et al, 2014: 9). A research analysis indicates that frequent changes in the rules of applying ESF at national level had the purpose of developing 'mechanisms and schemes that allow the corruption under a bureaucratic umbrella' (Burlea Schiopoiu et al, 2014: 9). It is argued that 'in the absence of a national and/or regional HRD strategy, the ESF cannot be efficiently used. Reduced transparency and lack of communication, correlated with a superficial strategy for human resources development lead to the conclusion that the challenges of the ESF in HRD in Romania do not have viable results, measurable through indicators of economic and social efficiency' (Burlea Schiopoiu et al, 2014: 9).

The EU initiatives had the role of highlighting several major administrative shortcomings of the implementation of youth labour market inclusion in Romania, such as: (1)



insufficient administrative capacity of the Public Employment Service, the major provider of services in Youth Guarantee; (2) insufficiency of information activities addressing unregistered NEETs, in particular, Roma (Euractiv 2015). In the context of the financial allocation for Youth Guarantee, Romania received *extended* country recommendations, for which, *structural* reforms were needed. One recommendation was that the country should consolidate its active labour market policies and the capacity of the Public Employment Service. As a response, a current ESF project (INTEPSO) aims at revitalizing the administrative structures able to identify and monitor the situation of young people in NEET situations.

Another major difficulty that became evident in the process of implementing Youth Guarantee in Romania was the ‘absence of a real implication of the private sector in providing apprenticeships’ (Euractiv 2015). Indeed, employers did not find the apprenticeship arrangements attractive (QURES, 2016). The system of apprenticeships is still severely underdeveloped in Romania, with only 167 apprenticeship contracts signed in the entire country in 2016 (Romanian Government, 2017). The modified Apprenticeship Act and the new Traineeship Act were considered ‘satellite elements’ of the Youth Guarantee architecture (RYGIP, 2015). The move towards changing the legislation was slow and long overdue. It was only in the summer of 2017 that a Law on Apprenticeships was adopted, with significant fiscal facilities for companies, and weaker measures of ensuring quality of provision (see Table 3.2. Initiative Regarding the Apprenticeship System in Romania).

EU has had a strong influence in designing job market measures in Romania, but still some difficulties exist in practice, as Romania has the lowest EU spending on labour market policies.

Table 6 Participants in ALM measures (2-7) in Romania

ALM (2-7)	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<25	20.151	22.420	25.279	23.063	19.487	18.270	11.320	8.918	10.605

Source: 2014-2020 Employment Strategy



Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

There are very few links between unemployment policies and other components of social policies. In general, the poor inter-agency communication generates some missallocations of support (overlapping of service and lack of assistance, in other cases).

Youth unemployment is acknowledged as an important issue, yet, policies on young people that are unemployed are the same with the general population.

Housing

According to the Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration (2015), in Romania the vast majority of the housing stock is privatized and most of the tenants have their own dwelling. The lack of a housing strategy able to guide housing legislation and programs has led a poor adaptation of provision to the actual needs, including unemployed (young) people. The allocation of social housing is carried out by local authorities according to several criteria of disadvantage, including, but not limited to income and long term unemployment. The Government acknowledged that although employment is important for home maintenance, additional social support measures are needed to compensate for inadequate labor income, as Romania has the largest share of the employed population in poverty in the EU (Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration, 2015).

Health

Unemployed people, in general, benefit from health insurance during the period they receive unemployment benefits. Unemployment benefits are allocated as follows:

- 6 months, for people with a minimum of one year's contribution and for graduates;
- 9 months, for persons with a contribution period of at least 5 years;
- 12 months, for people with a contribution period of more than 10 years.

Training

Unemployed people (including young people) are eligible for various trainings organised by the local unemployment office.

Reference:

Ministry of Regional Development and Public Administration (2015). *Technical Assistance Services Agreement for Strengthen the Impact Assessment Framework in Romania EIR Pilot Project Report*.

Analysis of social housing in Romania. Available at: http://sgg.gov.ro/docs/File/UPP/doc/analiza_impact/Analiza%20privind%20locuintele%20sociale%20in%20Romania.pdf



Table 7 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions related to components of social policies

No	Name	Level	Main target group ¹⁴	Starting year; end year (if not ongoing)	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	'The first rent' programme	National	C	2017 ongoing	National	No	No	No impact	NA
2	„Subsidizing employers hiring young people at risk of social marginalization"	National	D	2002 revised and launched in 2013. ongoing	National	No	Yes, mixed results	No impact	N A

Comments on Table 7

'The first rent' programme contains components of social policies. It is a work measure where people also get support for housing. It addresses two major concerns: one related to the spatial distribution of poverty and social disadvantage in Romania and the second, related to housing. The measure responds to the weak propensity towards *internal* workforce mobility, even in contexts of regional deprivation. The measure attracted very high policy expectations and benefited from intense media promotion. In a broader analysis of ALMP, the programme is able to send the message that a labour mobility measure may fail, even when the economic costs are covered, if the *social* costs for disadvantaged clients, are not adequately anticipated.

„Subsidizing employers hiring young people at risk of social marginalization" contains components of social policies. This is a work measure where disadvantaged youth also get support from a social worker and have a protected transition into employment. Beneficiaries of the measure were young people from the child protection system, young people with disabilities, young people without family or family support, young parents, former offenders. The measure was included in order to bring into the broader analysis of ALMP the idea that for very disadvantaged young persons, the evaluation of a measure needs to be related to the significance and intensity of change. The measure involves highly tailored, individualised support.

¹⁴ a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<p>Programul „Prima chirie” ’The first rent’ programme¹⁵</p>
Short description	<p><u>Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</u> To stimulate workforce mobility, considering Romania’s regional disparities in economic development and employment opportunities.</p> <p><u>Intended effects:</u> To stimulate workforce mobility and indirectly, to contribute towards reducing urban/ rural and regional disparities.</p> <p><u>Description:</u> Provide unemployed persons who start working at more than 50 km from their home with a relocation bonus, able to compensate for some of the economic costs of relocation. The bonus amounts to 75% of housing expenses (rent and utilities). Its’ upper limit is RON 900 (aprox. Euro 200). The relocation bonus is provided at request, on a monthly basis for maximum of 36 months, provided that the solicitant has a full time labour contract of at least 12 months.</p> <p><u>Objectives:</u> To decrease unemployment To provide labour force in areas with high demand</p> <p><u>Target groups:</u> Unemployed persons.</p> <p><u>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</u> Registered ‘unemployed’ persons who start working at more than 50 km from their home, with a net monthly income (individual or family) lower than RON 5,000/month (Euro 1,085).</p> <p><u>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</u> Labour market participation; Prevention of poverty through inclusive labour markets; Social security systems.</p> <p><u>Level:</u> National</p> <p><u>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</u> The programme is implemented through Employment Agencies (county level) and administered by the National Employment Authority, which is subordinated to the Ministry of Work and Social Justice.</p>

¹⁵ The program does not involve social housing.



	<p><u>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</u></p> <p>3,902,647.50 Euro (ANOFM cited in media).</p> <p><u>Start/ end date:</u></p> <p>The programme was initially adopted in January 2017 (OUG 6/2017), but, because of Government change, it was not until June 2017 that the implementation norms were issued (HG 374/2017). The programme offered the possibility of retroactive allocation of the subsidy, up to January 2017.</p> <p>The programme is ongoing.</p> <p><u>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of the measure?</u></p> <p>No evidence</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>The programme was initiated in a context loaded with high expectations (the prime minister considered it as 'extremely important'). Yet, despite the high public and political interest in the programme, there were only 15 beneficiaries registered as of August, 17th 2017, instead of 3,300 that were expected.</p> <p>The total amount actually spent was 0,03% from the entire allocation (ANOFM cited in media)¹⁶.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Is this program 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>This program was targeted to all unemployed persons.</p> <p>Yet, the expectation was that young people, especially men without dependents will be its main beneficiaries (this has been the group receiving other two labour mobility measures). As an incentive to young people, the subsidy is not cumulated with the <i>job starting bonus</i> or <i>setting-up bonus</i>, provided in the legislation. These are two labour mobility measures for</p>

¹⁶ <http://www.ziare.com/social/ajutoare/programul-prima-chirie-un-esec-doar-15-someri-au-beneficiat-de-subventii-1477231>



	<p>persons who following unemployment, obtain employment at more than 50 km from their home. They consist of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - an employment bonus equal to twice the value of the social benchmark in force (bonus not dependent on changing the domicile) - an installation premium equal to seven times the value of the social benchmark in force at the time of installation (premium dependent on changing the domicile). <p>Importantly, however, the majority of recipients of the above two mobility measures did have the same workplace even <i>before</i> the support measures entering into force.</p>
<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>There is no evidence on the inclusion of young people in designing the programme.</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>The program is not linked to an EU initiative. It is financed from the national insurance budget for unemployment</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring? None</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>Whilst an evaluation of the programme is premature, the indicators for monitoring are clear: the number of applicants (unemployed persons relocating at least 50 km away from home, with a 12 months employment contract). The only assessment comes in an interview-format from the National Employment Agency (cited in media).</p> <p>The other measures for the stimulation of labour mobility that do not contain components of social policies (<i>job starting bonus</i> or <i>setting-up bonus</i>), were</p>



	included in an ex-post external evaluation led by a research institute (INCSMPS, 2015).
Summary of evaluation results	<p>Please summarise the main results of evaluations. If there are many evaluations about the same measure, please indicate the results of these separately together with the source.</p> <p>Official sources cited in media indicate there were 15 beneficiaries registered as of August, 17th 2017, instead of 3,300 that were expected. The total amount actually spent was 0,03% from the entire allocation (ANOFM cited in media).</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? 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>Whilst the lack of information itself might not have been a problem (the programme was very much promoted in media), yet, some other barriers apply. According to a representative of the National Employment Agency (cited in media), the severely undersized number of applicants (15) can be explained by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the very complicated mechanism for obtaining subsidies - the expenses incurred by the applicants (the need for the relocated persons to cover the rent for the first and possibly for the second month, as well as a guarantee payment) - the delayed implementation of the programme (launched in January and implemented in June). <p>Other potential elements that might have played a role are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a low social trust in a governmental policy and in employment stability - the requirement for a 12 months full time employment, whilst the entry into employment is sometimes mediated by employment agencies that offer 3 months contracts. - a certain level of social resistance to internal relocation - probably, the programme might not have been able to compensate for the <i>social</i> costs of relocation, especially for the disadvantaged beneficiaries.
Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p>Does this measure address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people and target the risk groups among young people? Explain how or, instead, why not?</p> <p>This programme did not address the main causes for unemployment and social exclusion of young people. In particular, it did not address issues such</p>



	<p>as: availability of decent jobs in proximity, the high regional and rural/ urban disparities. This programme proved that at least for Romania, relocation itself is not a solution to other deep-rooted social and economic problems. On the contrary, it may be that relocation increases individuals' risks of social exclusion and marginalisation.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</p> <p>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</p> <p>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</p> <p>This is not an example of good practice because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It was implemented with administrative delays - It proved to be bureaucratically more complicated and likely to pose institutional barriers to unemployed persons - It involved some hidden costs - It was proposed in a context of low public trust in relation to governmental policies.

Name of the initiative	<p>”Subvenționarea angajatorilor care încadrează în muncă tineri cu risc de marginalizare socială”</p> <p>"Subsidizing employers hiring young people at risk of social marginalization"</p>
Short description	<p><u>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</u></p> <p>To support the labour market integration of young people at risk of social marginalization.</p> <p><u>Intended Effects:</u></p> <p>Participants will remain in employment</p> <p>Employers will be sensitised to the needs and capacities of young people at risk of social marginalization</p> <p><u>Description:</u></p> <p>The measure consists of subsidy provided to employers hiring young people at risk of social marginalization (referred to as 'insertion employers'). There is also a set of accompanying measures involved in this employment relationship.</p> <p>Thus, a 'solidarity contract' is signed between the young person and a local employment office, which provides the following services:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) information and professional counselling; b) mediation of work;



	<p>c) placement in employment with an employer whose job offer has been selected as appropriate</p> <p>The duration of the solidarity contract is maximum 3 years and minimum 1 year and cannot exceed the date the young person reaches the age of 26. For each young person employed under a 'solidarity contract', the insertion employers receive until the expiry of the solidarity contract, a monthly amount equal to the basic salary set at the time of employment, but not more than twice the value of the social reference indicator (500 RON, aprox. 110 Euro). If the employment contract is extended beyond three years, there is also some financial support provided to the employer (half of the amount of the unemployment benefit) for two years.</p> <p><u>Target groups:</u></p> <p>Young people at risk of social marginalization, aged 16-26</p> <p><u>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</u></p> <p>Young people at risk of social marginalization, aged 16-26, who are registered as unemployed, and meet one of the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) come from the child protection systemb) have a disabilityc) have no family or the family cannot provide maintenance (i.e. the family benefits from certain social assistance measuresd) have dependent childrene) has executed one or more custodial sentencesf) is the victim human trafficking. <p><u>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP & which elements of social policy):</u></p> <p>Labour market participation; Prevention of poverty through inclusive labour markets; Social inclusion and anti-discrimination; Social security systems;</p> <p><u>Level:</u></p> <p>National</p> <p><u>Start/ end date:</u></p> <p>Ongoing since 2002 (Law 76/2002)</p> <p><u>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</u></p> <p>No evidence</p> <p><u>How/ through which institutions is this measure implemented?</u></p> <p>The programme is implemented through Employment Agencies (county level) and administered by the National Employment Authority, which is subordinated to the Ministry of Work and Social Justice.</p>
--	---



	<p><u>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</u></p> <p>Budget from the insurance budget for unemployment</p> <p>The budget for 2015 was 29,6 mil. RON (aprox. 6,4 mil Euro)</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p>Number of young people covered (entire running period) (data on number of people <u>who are entitled</u> and <u>who actually take part</u>)/ number of young people who have found a job.</p> <p>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</p> <p>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</p> <p>The external evaluation (INCSMPS, 2015) did not provide evidence on the actual number of beneficiaries. The statistical evidence available on the National Employment Agency is scattered and does not allow for the assessment of results over the entire timeframe.</p> <p>According to the available data, in the first and the second semester of 2017, a total of 224 solidarity contracts were signed. The planned number for entire 2017 was 718. For 2017, the entire measure has an allocation of 7.9 mil. RON (aprox. 1,7 mil Euro). It represents 2.97% from all ALM measures (cf. ANOFM, 2017).</p> <p>In 2016, the entire programme led to the employment of 297 young people, representing 43.7% of the total planned. 278 young people were employed through the mediation measure (47,11% compared to the programmed rate) and 19 young people were employed by the information and professional counselling measure (21,11% compared to the programmed rate) (cf. ANOFM, 2016).</p> <p>Of the 297 people employed, about one third came from the child protection system (33.7%), 8.8% were young people with disabilities, 35.7% were young without family or their family could not afford them maintenance, 20.05% young people with dependent children, 1% young people who executed custodial sentence and 1 young person - 0.3% - victim of trafficking in human beings (cf. ANOFM, 2016).</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p>Which are the target groups of this measure?</p> <p>Is this program 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>This program is especially targeted to young people at risk of social marginalization, aged 16-26, who are registered as unemployed, and meet one of the following criteria:</p> <p>a) come from the child protection system</p>



	<p>b) have a disability c) have no family or the family cannot provide maintenance (i.e. the family benefits from certain social assistance measures) d) have dependent children e) has executed one or more custodial sentences f) is the victim human trafficking.</p> <p>The profile of the persons benefited from the measure is: male, rural, under 25, secondary or vocational education, part of the unskilled or long-term unemployed (INCSMPS, 2015).</p>
<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No). Please describe if Yes/Partly</p> <p>No specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or in other way were identified.</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p>Is the program linked to an EU initiative (like Youth Guarantee, Youth Employment Initiative, Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship; EURES Job; Support to youth entrepreneurship). If yes, to which one?</p> <p>The programme is not linked to an EU initiative. The measure is supported by the insurance budget for unemployment.</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</p> <p>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</p> <p>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided (please, consider, do they include only basic information or more information, including evaluation of deadweight loss (hiring to subsidized jobs of individuals who would have found regular employment nevertheless); substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified are displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries); displacement effect (rises in public sector spending drive down or even eliminate private sector spending)?</p> <p>There is an ex-post external evaluation of this program, carried out by a scientific institute, based on a "counterfactual" type of assesment (INCSMPS, 2015).</p> <p>There was a qvasi-experimental design based on randomization. As previous assessments had a 50% non-response rate, a reserve list was used. The evaluation does not mention the non-response rate for this selected measure. Limitations given by the possible high non-response rate are not addressed with the necessary level of detail. It is not clear, for</p>



	<p>instance, whether the profile of the young people that did not respond is significantly different from the one of the respondents. There are several methodological shortcomings, given by the profile of those targeted by the measure. The evaluation acknowledges the following limitations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equivalent pairs for the control group were identified only at distance, as all persons with the characteristics of the target group who contacted the Employment office, were included in the intervention. • Because of a small number of observations generated by the specific target group (number not stated), the effectiveness of the measure can be assessed mostly at the individual level. • The evaluation was not able to identify the impact of subsidy measures on employment for structural reasons, such as the lack of jobs (INCSMPS, 2015: 63). <p>There is no information on any substitution effect (original regular workers possibly better paid and qualified, being displaced with participants in the intervention possibly with lower salaries). Yet, a condition was for the vacancy to be declared at the Unemployment office.</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>According to an external evaluation (INCSMPS, 2015) 61,8% of respondents consider they would not have found a workplace in the absence of this support measure. The average employment rate for the target group surveyed was 41.1%, while the average employment rate for the control group was 68.8%. The difference of 27,7% was attributed to the emasure alone (INCSMPS, 2015).</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</p> <p>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</p> <p>Coverage and take-up: are there problems concerning coverage? Possible barriers for participation (lack of information, complexity of system, conditionality, degree of attractiveness for young people, etc.)?</p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</p> <p>According to the monitoring information available, this program only partially achieves its stated goals and intended effects.</p> <p>The external evaluation of the measure concluded that the only evaluation of the effect can be made at the individual level. Because of inherent limitations involved in the measurements of impact for this group, assertion on societal and economic impact cannot be made (INCSMPS, 2015).</p>



	<p>A possible barrier in the implementation may not be related to young people themselves, but to the difficult cooperation between different institutional actors involved (e.g. Employment Offices, economic agents committed to act as ‘insertion employers’, foster care institutions, probation offices, social work etc). The recruitment and involvement of young people at risk of social marginalization involves a high level of informality, street work and outreach. Most institutions (including social work), however, are more reactive than proactive in reaching ‘the hard to reach’. Major barriers for participation are present for young people in the rural areas and for those weakly connected to institutions/ organisations. The application process involves a high level of support from administrative staff.</p> <p>There are several hidden costs associated to job fairs organised for marginalized groups in the main cities, whilst potential beneficiaries live in small towns or in isolated rural communities.</p> <p>Some risks of repeated fixed-term employment (and thus, increased precariousness) are present by this type of measure, especially when training is absent.</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>This initiative has the potential of addressing employers’ reluctance in hiring members of some highly disadvantaged groups (e.g. youth offenders or young people that experienced human trafficking). However, the actual number of young people experiencing these situations and who benefit from the measure is extremely low (around 7 each year).</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>This is an intervention that addresses a highly heterogeneous disadvantaged group and involves highly tailored, individualised support. Its replication is, thus, highly dependent on the particularities of young people and the institutions involved (including social workers).</p> <p>In the last years, the number of young people entering employment via this measure is around 50% of the one planned.</p> <p>This is a work-first type of intervention that links marginalised young people with potential employers. It does not address issues of employment <i>quality</i> and has rather weak support measures <i>during</i> employment (for employers, co-workers and young persons). Interviews with NGO staff involved in mediating access to employment of highly disadvantaged groups suggest that: 1) employers need preparation and a high degree of tolerance to work-related adaptation challenges faced by highly disadvantaged young people;</p>



	<p>2) the need for preparing the team of co-workers is often overlooked. The supportive ethos is not automatically transferred from employers to workers;</p> <p>3) to a certain extent, the initiative has a built in assumption that the challenges of labour market inclusion of a disadvantaged group end once a 'solidarity contract' is signed. The social work structures in place after entering employment are often weak.</p>
--	---



References

- Advisory Services Agreement on Strengthening the Regulatory Impact Assessment Framework in Romania. Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Protection and the Elderly (2015) *RIA Pilot Project Report: Assessment of the Apprenticeship System in Romania*. URL: http://sgg.gov.ro/docs/File/UPP/doc/analiza_impact/RIA%20Pilot%20Project%20Report%20-%20Apprenticeship%20System%20in%20Romania.docx [last accessed September 13, 2017].
- ANOFM (2016) *Notă privind stadiul realizării Programului național de ocupare pentru tinerii cu risc de marginalizare socială pentru anul 2016, respectiv Trimestrul IV 2016* <http://www.anofm.ro/files/Raport%20marginalizare%202016%20.pdf> [last accessed September 11, 2017].
- ANOFM (2017) *Notă privind stadiul realizării Programului național de ocupare pentru tinerii cu risc de marginalizare socială pentru Trimestrul II 2017, respectiv Semestrul I 2017* URL: <http://www.anofm.ro/files/Raport%20marginalizare%20%20SEM%20I%20%202017%20.pdf> [last accessed September 11, 2017].
- Batusaru, C. et al. (2015) '7 Years of European Funding in Romania - Between Success and Failure' A.I. Cuza University. EURINT Proceedings. URL: http://cse.uaic.ro/eurint/proceedings/index_htm_files/EURINT2015_BAT.pdf [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Bostinaru, V. (2013), "Ultimii pasi – absorbtia fondurilor si de coeziune 2007-2013", p.7, available at: <http://victorbostinaru.ro/resurse/UltimiiPasi-AbsorbtiaFondurilorEuropene-VictorBostinaruMEP.pdf> [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Brown, P. et al. (2015) *Rights, responsibilities and redress? Research on policy and practice for Roma inclusion in ten Member States Final report*. University of Salford and University of York. URL: http://www.salford.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0009/1155789/Roma-MATRIX-Final-Report.pdf [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Burlea Șchiopoiu A., et al. (2014) 'The Challenges of the European Social Fund for Corporate Governance in Romania', Proceedings of The 10th European Conference on Management Leadership and Governance ECMLG 2014, VERN' University of Applied Sciences, Zagreb, Republic of Croatia 13 14 November 2014, Academic Conferences and Publishing International Limited, pp. 9-17.
- CEAE (2016) Scăderea analfabetismului funcțional - o posibilă prioritate strategică în educație.



- Cedefop (2013) 'Romania: Changes in legislation to encourage employers to engage in apprenticeship', URL: <http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/news-and-press/news/romania-changes-legislation-encourage-employers-engage-apprenticeship>
- Eichhorst, W. & Rinne, U. (2014) 'Promoting youth employment through activation strategies', Working Paper No. 163 2014. Geneva: ILO. URL: http://legacy.iza.org/en/webcontent/publications/reports/report_pdfs/iza_report_65.pdf [last accessed 12 Sept 2017].
- ERRC (2011) *Condamnați pe viață: Copiii romi din România aflați în grija statului* Budapest. URL: <http://www.errc.org/article/condamnați-pe-viață-copiii-romi-din-românia-aflați-în-grija-statului/3944>. [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Euractiv (2015) 'Guvernul va infiinta o agentie pentru antreprenoriat care sa gestioneze fondurile destinate tinerilor, inclusiv "Garantia pentru tineret" a Uniunii Europene' URL : http://arhiva.euractiv.ro/uniunea-europeana/articles %7CdisplayArticle/articleID_27048/EXCLUSIV-Guvernul-va-infiinta-o-agentie-pentru-antreprenoriat-care-sa-gestioneze-fondurile-destinate-tinerilor-inclusiv-Garantia-pentru-tineret-a-Uniunii-Europene.html [last accessed September 13, 2017].
- European Anti-Fraud Office (2016) 'Press release No 4/2016 22 February 2016 Romanian Members of Parliament prosecuted following OLAF investigation'. URL [file:///C:/Users/Mia/Desktop/22022016_romanian_mps_prosecuted_en%20\(1\).pdf](file:///C:/Users/Mia/Desktop/22022016_romanian_mps_prosecuted_en%20(1).pdf) [last accessed September 13, 2017].
- European Alliance for Apprenticeships (2013) Member States – Planned Reforms/Initiatives URL: http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/education_culture/repository/education/policy/vocational-policy/doc/alliance/ms/ro_en.pdf [last accessed 12 Sept 2017].
- Gligor, I. (2017) 'Country Report 2017 ROMANIA' URL: https://ec.europa.eu/romania/sites/romania/files/conferinta_de_lansare_a_raporului_de_tara_-_semestru_european_2017_-_ioana_gligor.pdf
- Institutul Național de Cercetare Științifică în domeniul Muncii și Protecției Sociale (INCSMPS) (2015) *Evaluarea efectelor măsurilor active asupra reducerii șomajului și creșterii ocupării*. Bucharest. URL: http://www.mmuncii.ro/j33/images/Documente/ProiectePrograme /Eval_Ef_Mas_Active.pdf [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Kyloh, R. (2011) *Labour reforms in Romania, in The global crisis: causes, responses and challenges* Geneva: International Labour Office.



- NEETs. *Raport de evaluare 2015*. Bucharest. URL: [http://www.fonduri-ue.ro/images/files/programe/CU/POCU-2014/14.07/Raport_final_Evaluarea_interventiilor_POCU_in_domeniul_ocupării_forței_de_muncă._Evaluarea_contribuției_POCU_la_creșterea_ocupării_în_rîndul_tinerilor_NEETs._Raport_de_evaluare_2015.pdf](http://www.fonduri-ue.ro/images/files/programe/CU/POCU-2014/14.07/Raport_final_Evaluarea_interventiilor_POCU_in_domeniul_ocuparii_forței_de_muncă._Evaluarea_contribuției_POCU_la_creșterea_ocupării_în_rîndul_tinerilor_NEETs._Raport_de_evaluare_2015.pdf) [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Marginean, S. (2014) 'Youth Unemployment in Romania: Post-crisis Challenges' in *Procedia Economics and Finance* 16: 613 – 620.
- Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Protection and the Elderly (2015) *RIA Pilot Project Report: Assessment of the Apprenticeship System in Romania*. URL: http://sgg.gov.ro/docs/File/UPP/doc/analiza_impact/RIA%20Pilot%20Project%20Report%20-%20Apprenticeship%20System%20in%20Romania.docx
- Ministry of Labour, Family, Social Protection and the Elderly (2015) *National Strategy on Social Inclusion and Poverty Reduction 2015-2020* URL: http://www.mmuncii.ro/j33/images/Documente/Familie/2016/StrategyVol1EN_web.pdf
- Ministry of Labour Family, Social Protection and the Elderly (2015) *Raport al Notei de Fundamentare: Analiză Privind Sistemul de Ucenicie în România* URL: http://www.mmuncii.ro/j33/images/Documente/ProiectePrograme_/Final_SN_Apprenticeship_RO.pdf
- Ministry of Work and Soical Justice (Romania) (2017) 'Peste 47 de milioane de euro, fonduri europene, pentru sprijinirea tinerilor inactivi să intre pe piața muncii, 11 august 2017' URL: <http://www.mmuncii.ro/j33/index.php/ro/comunicare/comunicate-de-presa/4930-cp-fonduri-europene-sprrijinire-tineri-inactivi-11082017> [last accessed September 7, 2017].
- National Agency for Employment (NAE) (2014) *Romania country fiche*, URL: file:///C:/Users/Mia/Desktop/Country%20fiche_RO.pdf [last accessed September 8, 2017].
- Popovici Barbulescu, A. (2012) *Emerging Markets Queries in Finance and Business Youth Unemployment in Romania and Measures to Combat It* in *Procedia Economics and Finance* 3: 1196–1201.
- QURES (2016) *Evaluarea intervențiilor POCU în domeniul ocupării forței de muncă. Evaluarea contribuției POCU la creșterea ocupării în rândul tinerilor*
- Ricucci, R. (2017) *The New Southern European Diaspora: Youth, Unemployment, and Migration*. Lanham: Lexington Books
- Romanian Government (2014), *Strategia Națională pentru Ocuparea Forței de Muncă 2014-2020* [National Strategy for Employment]. URL



http://www.mmuncii.ro/j33/images/Documente/Munca/2014-DOES/2014-01-31_Anexa1_Strategia_de_Ocupare.pdf [last accessed October 15, 2017].

Romanian Government (2017) *Expunere de motive pentru modificarea Legii nr. 279/2005 privind ucenicia la locul de muncă și a Legii nr. 335/2013 privind efectuarea stagiului pentru absolvenții de învățământ superior*. URL <http://sgg.gov.ro/new/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/EM-.pdf> [last accessed September 13, 2017].

Romanian Youth Guarantee Implementation Plan (RYGIP) 2014 – 2015 URL: ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=12896& [last accessed September 12, 2017]

Suciu, D. & Jifcu, I. (2016) 'Ministrul Fondurilor Europene, Cristian Ghinea: Pe POSDRU au fost și fraude reale, iar corecțiile se apropie de jumătate de miliard de euro' at URL: <http://www.mediafax.ro/economic/ministrul-fondurilor-europene-cristian-ghinea-pe-posdru-au-fost-si-fraude-reale-iar-corectiile-se-apropie-de-jumatate-de-miliard-de-euro-15661569> [last accessed 22.09.2017].

UNICEF (2017) *20.000 de copii in orfelinatele din Romania. Stam mai bine ca media regiunii* <http://www.ziare.com/1-iunie/copii/unicef-20-000-de-copii-in-orfelinatele-din-romania-stam-mai-bine-ca-media-regiunii-1467943> [last accessed September 13, 2017].