



**AALBORG UNIVERSITY**  
DENMARK

**Aalborg Universitet**

## **Youth employment policies in denmark**

Bredgaard, Thomas

*Publication date:*  
2018

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

*Citation for published version (APA):*

Bredgaard, T. (2018). *Youth employment policies in denmark*. (pp. 1-37).

### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



# Youth employment policies in Denmark

EXCEPT working paper no. 34  
June 2018

Thomas Bredgaard

[www.except-project.eu](http://www.except-project.eu)  
[twitter.com/except\\_eu](https://twitter.com/except_eu)  
[www.facebook.com/excepteu](https://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:**

---

Bredgaard, T. (2018). *Youth employment policies in Denmark*, EXCEPT Working Papers, WP No 34. Tallinn University, Tallinn. <http://www.except-project.eu/working-papers/>

---

© Author

ISSN 2504-7159

ISBN 978-9949-29-403-9 (pdf)

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



## Contents

The key risk groups in the labour market in Denmark .....	4
Youth employment policies: a general overview .....	6
Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions .....	10
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	11
Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives .....	25
Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion .....	26
Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures .....	27
References .....	37



## The key risk groups in the labour market in Denmark

Table 1 “Risk group” construction<sup>1</sup>

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

### Comments on Table 1

Young people in Denmark are not considered to be a risk group in general. Among young people, the key risk groups are ethnic minorities and NEET (often, the two groups overlap) (cf. below). Unemployed single parents are also considered a risk group and targeted measures are directed at increasing their economic incentives to take ordinary education and give them targeted counselling and advice.

\* NEET (academic research): Although this is considered an important topic among researchers, the research community on youth and the labour market is small and fragmented in Denmark.

\*\* Higher Education graduates (mainstream policy): In recent years, the government has implemented reforms to reduce the intake on university education programs with high subsequent unemployment rates (especially within humanities and arts).

\*\*\* Migrants/Ethnic minorities (mainstream policy): There is a political concern about the low educational attainment and higher unemployment rates of ethnic minorities. This concern has only been reinforced by the “refugee crisis” in 2014-2015 and the increasing number of young asylum seekers, including unaccompanied children.

<sup>1</sup> 1=no significant role to 5=very important



Ethnic minorities are not specifically targeted in national labour market and educational policies. The group overlap with other “risk groups” like NEETs, early school leavers, young people without qualifications or young people from workless families. There are numerous local projects by jobcenters, private providers and voluntary organisations that target young ethnic minorities, but not any specific national programs. This is probably due to the fact that Danish active labour market and education policies are general in nature (universal) and not specific (targeted) and to avoid possible claims of (positive or negative) discrimination and stigma. In the public and political discourse, young ethnic minorities are typically classified as (second-generation) descendants of parents born outside Denmark. The debate specifically focus on young ethnic minorities with parents from “third-world countries” (e.g. Africa, Asia and the Middle East).

Young migrants are a heterogeneous category that includes groups with very different needs and challenges, like refugees (e.g. unaccompanied children), students, and work migrants etc. In the public and political debate, young migrants are classified as young people migrating to Denmark for a shorter (study or work) or longer period (refugees).



## 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 <sup>2</sup>		n.a.	n.a.	6
1.1	including youth-targeted <sup>3</sup>		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.1
2	Number of participants (stock) in active labour market programmes:				
2.1	Total number		141,925	190,813	194,372
2.2	% of the labour force (15-64)		5.0	6.6	6.8
3	Number of youth participants in active labour market programmes: (less than 25 years) <sup>4</sup>				
3.1	Total number		11,226	19,387	17,444
3.2	% of the labour force (less than 25)		2.8	4.3	3.9
3.3	% of the total number of participants (stock)		7.9	10.2	9.0
4	Expenditures on active labour market programmes:				
4.1	Total amount (EUR) million		2,594	3,333	3,889
4.2	% of GDP		1.22	1.38	1.46
5.	Expenditures on all active labour market programmes for youth participants:				
5.1	Total amount (EUR)		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
5.2	% of GDP		n.a.	n.a.	n.a.
6	Expenditures on youth-targeted active labour market programmes:				
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.

### Comments on Table 2

Total number of ALMP programmes: A quick calculation of the programmes in the Eurostat database is misleading and does not correspond to national classifications. Since 2003, ALMPs in Denmark have been classified in three categories (education and training, wage subsidies and work training programs). Within each of these general categories, there are a number of specific programs. There is no central registration of the number of programs and I have therefore decided to insert “not available” (n.a.). Here is a more detailed list of national programs in Denmark:

<sup>2</sup> Programs targeted at youth

<sup>3</sup> Total number of active labour market programs, including youth targeted: Data are not available (n.a.). None of the programs in the Eurostat database are specifically targeted at young people, but there are national programs targeted at young people (see below).

<sup>4</sup> Data on participants in ALMPs between 15-29 years are not available in the Eurostat database. Instead, data on participants less than 25 years are instead.



Table 3 Detailed list of ALMP programs

Main category	Sub categories	Program
Education and training	Ordinary education	Basic adult education (AVU) Labour market education (AMU) Vocational education (EUD) Social- and health education (SOSU) Longer education (short-, medium and long-term education) Courses for persons with dyslexia Danish language training
	Other training and counselling programs	Bridge-building programs* Unspecified programs
Wage subsidies	Wage subsidies in the private sector Wage subsidies in the public sector	
Work training programs	Work training programs in the private sector Work training programs in the public sector	
Socially useful jobs		
Adult apprenticeships		
Job rotation		

Source: [www.jobindsats.dk](http://www.jobindsats.dk)

Table 4 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 <sup>5</sup>	Preventive /reactive <sup>6</sup>	Youth specific	Main source of funding <sup>7</sup>	Linked to EU initiatives <sup>8</sup>	Main actors of delivery <sup>9</sup>	Evaluation present	Youth/participant feedback used to improve the delivery
(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment	3	3	YES	2	NO	3	YES	PARTLY

<sup>5</sup> Importance depends on the comparative scale of the program (coverage & expenditure) -> Does not exist = 0; Not relevant = 1; Quite important = 2; Very important = 3

<sup>6</sup> To what extent do policies focus on preventative measures or are purely reactive to manifest problems PREVENTIVE = 1; REACTIVE = 2; BOTH=3.

<sup>7</sup> EU = 1; national = 2, regional = 3, local = 4; other -5

<sup>8</sup> Youth Guarantee =1; Youth Employment Initiative =2; Framework for Quality traineeships and apprenticeship =3; Eures =4; Support to youth entrepreneurship =5; Other - 6

<sup>9</sup> 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





Vocational guidance, career counselling	3	1	YES	2	NO	3 and 7	PARTLY	PARTLY
Training (with certificates)	2	2	YES	2	NO	7	Partly	NO
Training (without certificates)	2	2	NO	2	NO	3 and 6	Partly	NO
Employment incentives, subsidies for employer	2	2	NO	2	NO	3	YES	NO
Direct job creation	2	2	Partly	2	NO	3	YES	NO
Start-up incentives, self-employment programmes	0	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.
Other	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.	N.A.

#### Comments on Table 4

ALMP towards young people in Denmark focus on labour market integration and basic education. The most important programs are those that are considered to fulfil this objective (reorientation programs and vocational guidance), especially “uddannelseshjælp” and “ungdommens uddannelsesvejledning” (see below). Important reforms have been implemented recently to promote these programs. Training with and without certificates are also important program (vocational apprenticeships and municipal employment programs) as a second option if the programs above are not successful. Employment incentives (wage subsidies) and direct job creation (socially useful jobs) are also quite important, but should mainly be used if the other options fail.

Ad 1. Reorientation courses: “Uddannelseshjælp” (2014). The program has implemented by local jobcenters from 2014 to target NEET by reducing social assistance to a level equivalent to education support (SU) and by a new obligation to join ordinary education programs (quid pro quo). The young recipients of “education support” (uddannelsesyndelse) are classified in three groups depending on their prior educational background and personal characteristics: (1) Obviously education-ready (begin on ordinary education as soon as possible), (2) Education-ready (assistance to get ready for ordinary education, e.g. courses in basic reading, writing and math, mentor-assistance) (3) Activity-ready (participate in activation programs, i.e. “Nytteindsats”, see below).



Ad 2. Vocational guidance/Career counselling: "Ungdommens uddannelsesvejledning" (UU-Centers). Municipal centres for guidance of young people in relation to education and employment. The target group is both young people in public schools as well as NEETs (18-24/30 years).

Ad 3. Training with certificates: Vocational apprenticeships in a dual training system ("Lærlinge")

Ad 4. Training without certificates: Municipal employment programs implemented "in-house" (municipal guidance and training courses for vulnerable young unemployed) or "in-company" training (work experience programs and enterprise training programs in local work places).

Ad 5. Employment incentives, subsidies for employer: Wage subsidies in the public and private sector ("Løntilskud").

Ad 6. Direct job creation: Additional and "socially useful" job in municipal institutions ("Nyttejobs").

Table 5 Strengths and weaknesses of the overall policy approach

Effectiveness of the overall policy approach towards tackling youth unemployment and social exclusion	
Strengths	Weaknesses
Early and intensive active labour market programs with both motivation and qualification effects	Lack of targeted and effective programs for NEET <sup>10</sup>
Case workers and counsellors ability to classify different target groups of young people according to specific needs	Lack of coherent approach towards ethnic minorities
A flexible and secure labour market (flexicurity) that promotes high youth employment <sup>11</sup>	

<sup>10</sup> In October 2017, the government and the opposition has agreed on a reform of the preparatory educational system for young persons below 25 years. The main objective is to target NEET (estimated about 50.000 young people) with a simpler and more integrated system of preparatory educational programs and institutions in each municipality (Forberedende Grunduddannelse, FGU).

<sup>11</sup> See: Per K. Madsen (2015): "Youth Unemployment and skills mismatch in Denmark", In-depth Analysis for the EMPL Committee ([http://vbn.aau.dk/en/publications/youth-unemployment-and-the-skills-mismatch-in-denmark\(6b2d84eb-31be-4c3b-9793-03063504901d\)/export.html](http://vbn.aau.dk/en/publications/youth-unemployment-and-the-skills-mismatch-in-denmark(6b2d84eb-31be-4c3b-9793-03063504901d)/export.html))



## Youth employment policies: focus on selected interventions

Table 6 A brief overview of selected youth employment interventions

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>12</sup>	Type <sup>13</sup>	Starting year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	“Good practice” <sup>14</sup> example	Impact of policy measures on youth inclusion <sup>15</sup>	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people <sup>16</sup>
1	Bridgebuilding to education	National	D – targeted at the NEET group (under 30 years receiving social assistance/ education benefits)	1	2013 (ongoing)	National	NO	YES, positive	Yes, already in the ML database	4	2
2	Adult apprenticeships	National program and local implementation by jobcenters	A. Targeted youth above 25 years who are long-term unemployed (+12 months) and with no formal	3	1997 (ongoing)	National	NO	YES, positive	YES (already in the ML database)	4	2

<sup>12</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group;

<sup>13</sup> (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

<sup>14</sup> 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.”

<sup>15</sup> 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.

<sup>16</sup> 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.



			qualifications								
3	Youth benefits	National program and local implementation by PES/Jobcenters	D. Targeted young people below 30 years on unemployment insurance benefits	4	1996 (ongoing)	National	NO	Yes, positive	Partially	4	2

### Comments on Table 6

I have selected these programs because they are the most important programs for young unemployed people in Denmark. They have national coverage, many participants and are important for the labour market careers of young unemployed persons. The three programs have a strong positive impact on labour market inclusion of young people.

\*Ad 1. Bridge building to education (*Brobygning til uddannelse*): Already in the ML database (see <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1080&langId=en&practiceId=56>).

\*\*Ad 2. Adult apprenticeship (*Voksenlærlingeordningen*): Already in the ML database (see <http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=1080&langId=en&practiceId=32>). See Deloitte evaluation referenced in the ML database.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<b>Ungeydelse (Youth unemployment benefits, YUB)</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The primary aim of the measure is to motivate young unemployed recipients on unemployment insurance benefits (UIB) without vocational qualifications to find a job or start an ordinary education.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>The amount of UIB declines by 50 percent for young people within the target group, who have been unemployed for more than 26 weeks. The daily allowance falls from DKR 849 to DKR 425 (114 Euro to 57 Euro a day).</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b></p> <p>Targeted young people below 30 years on unemployment insurance benefits</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p>



	<p>Currently, young recipients of UIB and SA below 30 years have a “right and responsibility” to participate in early activation programs before 13 weeks (compare to before 6 months for recipients above 30 years).</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>Employment incentives, subsidies for employer The type of measure is, therefore, an economic incentive (cf. category 4 in table 5 above) but an incentive for the young person on UIB.</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>National program and local implementation by PES/Jobcenters</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p> <p>The youth unemployment benefits were introduced in 1996 when youth unemployment was high and potential disincentive problems where much more likely than today. At the time, the max UIB period was 5 years compared to 2 years today and the unemployment rate was 8.2% (228.000 persons) compared to 3.4% in 2016 (92.000 persons).</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Stakeholders are not involved in the implementation, but have a general consultative role in central and regional labour market boards.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>The youth unemployment benefit is still in operation and implemented by the local jobcenters and the unemployment insurance funds. The role of the unemployment insurance funds is payment of UIB, while the jobcenters is responsible for activation and sanctions.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>There is not a specific budget for the youth benefit. In fact, it is supposed to lead to saving on the national budget.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>When YUB was introduced in 1996, the target group was about 20,000 young people (around 7,000 in the unemployment insurance system and 12-13,000 in municipalities). Three years later in 1999, the target group had fallen to around 10,000 individuals. The Ministry of Labour found an even more impressive decline in the target group of UIB recipients from 9.000 persons in 1996 to 1.300 persons in 1999. This indicates that the business cycle had improved, but also that the YUB was effective.</p> <p>ANY EVIDENCE OF THE INFLUENCE OF YUB? See below.</p>



	<p>The YUB became an exemplary case of the “motivational effect” (or threat effect) of activation, and was subsequently applied to other target groups (see Rosholm and Svarer, 2008).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>Data on budget and expenditures is not available. There are no budget and expenditure. As I explain below, benefits are cut by 50 % for the young people falling within the target group of the program. There are no services or activities besides from the benefit cut.</p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>Initially, YUB targeted young recipients of UIB below 25 years without vocational qualifications. After 6 months of unemployment, the young persons had a “right and obligation” to participate in education and training for min. 18 months. The income benefits depended on the type of education. Education outside the ordinary education system meant a 50% reduction of UIB. Participants in education within the ordinary education system got a benefit equivalent to the State Educational Grant (SU).</p> <p>Due to the success of the YUB, the target group was expanded in the following years. First, reduced benefits were extended to cover UIB recipients with vocational training (1999) and recipients in the age group between 25-29 years. Second, the idea of reducing benefits was extended to cover young recipients of social assistance in the early 2000s. Like with UIB, the YUB first covered young recipients on social assistance below 25 years and subsequently (in 2014) also recipients between 25-29 years.</p> <p>YUB are combined with earlier and more intensive ALMPs for the target group of young unemployed people. The activation approach was implemented for young recipients of SA before the activation of recipients of UIB. In 1990, a “youth allowance” was introduced to recipients of SA under the age of 20 years and subsequently expanded to recipients below 25 years. The youth allowance introduced the obligation to participate in activation programs as a quid pro quo for social assistance (see Bredgaard &amp; Jørgensen, 2000). Currently, young recipients of UIB and SA below 30 years have a “right and responsibility” to participate in early activation programs before 13 weeks (compare to before 6 months for recipients above 30 years).</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p>



	<p>Only young people, Currently, young recipients of UIB and SA below 30 years have a “right and responsibility” to participate in early activation programs before 13 weeks (compare to before 6 months for recipients above 30 years).</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No).</b></p> <p>NO, not in the YUB as such, but there is a more general involvement of young people in activation programs. Young people have influence on the formulation of their “job plan” (contract).</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>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)?</b></p> <p>No direct links, but the activation regime for young people in Denmark is in accordance with the EU youth guarantees.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>The initial evaluations done by the Ministry of Employment and the Social Research Institute documented a dramatic decline in youth unemployment in the late 1990s and a major decline in the target group of young recipients of UIB. The decline in the target groups was partly related to a general decline in open unemployment in the late 1990s, but also to the introduction of the YUB (see Nord-Larsen, 1997; Jensen et. al, 1999).</p> <p>Evaluations are ex-post. The YUB attracted substantial interest outside Denmark and considered “best practices” by the European Commission.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>Both, internal and external.</p> <p><b>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)?</b></p>



	<p>Evaluations documented a dramatic decline in youth unemployment in the late 1990s and a major decline in the target group of young recipients of UIB. The decline in the target groups was partly related to a general decline in open unemployment in the late 1990s, but also to the introduction of the YUB (see Nord-Larsen, 1997; Jensen et. al, 1999). The YUB attracted substantial interest outside Denmark and considered “best practices” by the European Commission.</p>
Summary of evaluation results	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>The evaluations of the YUB found that the program was effective in bringing down open youth unemployment (see Nord-Larsen, 1997; Jensen et. al 1999; Bredgaard &amp; Jørgensen, 2000).</p> <p>Jensen et.al (1999) found that the programme significantly raised transition rates from unemployment to schooling. The transition from unemployment to employment was found to be somewhat weaker. The fall in youth unemployment since the mid-1990s was not simply a consequence of youth unemployment being more cyclically sensitive than general unemployment, but also an effect of the special combination of benefits, incentives and sanctions in the youth benefit programme.</p> <p>Nord-Larsen (1997) concluded that the YUB motivated a number of young people to move from unemployment and into employment or education even before the sanctions of the programme were effected (motivation effect).</p> <p>Bredgaard and Jørgensen (2000) came to a similar conclusion, but also argued that the YUB was not as effective towards “vulnerable” young people with other problems than unemployment.</p>
In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects</b></p> <p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The effectiveness of the original YUB is high and undisputed, especially towards the original target group of young recipients on UIB.</p> <p><b>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.)?</b></p> <p>Problems with benefiting from the program among vulnerable young people with other problems than unemployment, e.g. social, personal, health problems.</p>





	<p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The effectiveness of the idea of benefit reductions without any supplementary assistance, however, is challenged when confronted with vulnerable young people with other problems than unemployment, e.g. social, personal, health problems.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>If the main cause of unemployment within the target group of the measure is economic disincentives to take up jobs or education, then benefit reductions have a documented “motivation effect” in the Danish case. Targeting of the program is of crucial importance, since it is more effective for the most resourceful young unemployed.</p> <p>Recently, the obligation to enrol in an ordinary education program has been extended to the majority of young persons on social assistance. To be effective towards the more vulnerable groups of young people, the educational system and institutions also have to adapt and become more inclusive. Recently, the government has concluded an agreement with this ambition. A new preparatory and flexible youth education program will be implemented by the state and different educational institutions will be merged into one in each municipality to make the choice simpler for the target group. The new system targets the approximately 50.000 young persons without employment and not in training or education (NEET).</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as ‘good practice’ example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention. Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>The original YUB is a “best practice” and was celebrated as such by the Danish government and EU institutions at that time.</p> <p>The main success factor was the “motivation effect” (or threat effect) that pushed young unemployed into ordinary education and jobs.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>The program is mainly relevant in countries with high (generous) income replacement in which potential disincentives problems may occur. To be successful benefit reductions should be combined with early and intensive activation programs to assist those that cannot find jobs on their own. To function properly, there need to be alternative “exit routes” to</p>



	unemployment, i.e. either a labour market with demand for youth labour and/or an education system with affordable and relevant education possibilities.
--	---

Name of the initiative	<b>“Brobygning til uddannelse” (Bridge building to education)</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>This objective of the program is to prepare young unemployed people to begin and complete a vocational education by upgrading their skills and qualifications and by motivating the young people towards education</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>Building Bridge to Education takes place at vocational schools and consists of a fixed schedule with various short internships at vocational schools and enterprises. Furthermore, the young persons participates in courses to upgrade their basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic. Each young person has the right to a mentor. The mentor will support the young person until the person is assigned to an ordinary internship as part of ordinary education. This allows the mentor to help the young person to handle obstacles, which may occur during the process. The programs also aims at providing the young people with clarity about their goals regarding future education so they can become ready to continue in an ordinary education after finishing the building bridge to education programme. The short internships within vocational schools help this process along. Hereby the young people try different vocational education directions, which help them reach a greater feeling of clarity regarding their future choice of education. The length of the programme differs depending on the needs of the young person, but is on average 15 weeks.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b></p> <p>The target group is NEET group, unskilled young unemployed persons based on the assumption that unskilled young people face the largest risk of unemployment and unstable employment</p> <p>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</p> <p>Under 30 years receiving social assistance/education benefits</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>(Re-)orientation courses, preparation for training or employment</p> <p>The young people try different vocational education directions, which help them reach a greater feeling of clarity regarding their future choice</p>



	<p>of education. The length of the programme differs depending on the needs of the young person, but is on average 15 weeks.</p> <p><b>Level:</b> National</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> The program began as a pilot program in 2013 and is ongoing. The project was managed by the Danish Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment and implemented through the 12 projects at vocational schools across the country (44 Partner schools and 52 employment centres). Funding was provided to each education institution. Further initiatives will be put forward in 2016 to support more local PES offices and partner schools to develop and use building bridge to education programmes to young unemployed people.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> The project was managed by the Danish Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment. Various of the partner schools and employment centres (PES offices) have implemented the building bridge to education programme as an activation measure to young unemployed people.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> Funding was provided to each education institution</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>During the pilot period 2013-2014, 2837 young people participated in the program. Data on the number of participants after the pilot period and expenditure data are not available.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b> The specific target group is young people under 30 years receiving education benefits, and who are expected to be able to begin an ordinary education within a year and complete the education. Caseworkers in the local jobcenters do this assessment.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b> Especially to young people.</p>



<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No).</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>No</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>A final evaluation of the building bridge to education programme is available on the homepage: brobygningtiluddannelse.dk. It was commissioned by the Danish Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment (STAR) and conducted by a research centre for youth research (Center for Ungdomsforskning). Ex-post evaluations.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>External.</p> <p><b>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)?</b></p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>The evaluation shows positive results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The project almost doubles the share of young people commencing on a basic ordinary programme at a vocational school 26 weeks after enrolment in the programme.</li> <li>• The project doubles the probability for the young people to complete the first part of the vocational education.</li> <li>• 12 percent of the young people who participate in the program commenced an ordinary education programme 80 weeks after they began their participation. In comparison, only 8 percent of young</li> </ul>



	<p>people in a control group similar to the participants in the program commence an ordinary education programme at the same point in time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Satisfaction surveys show that 80% of young people think that the initiative has helped them to move towards completing an education and 85% of participants feel that the mentor is important to help them to address their challenges.</li> </ul>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>Yes, as the project almost doubles the share of young people commencing on a basic ordinary programme at a vocational school 26 weeks after enrolment in the programme and it doubles the probability for the young people to complete the first part of the vocational education.</p> <p><b>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.)?</b></p> <p>The program takes place at ordinary vocational institutions, which ensures a continuous focus on education and motivates the participants to be among “ordinary” students. Mentors from the vocational education institutions are key to maintaining the young person’s engagement in the programme. The mentor also supports the young person when commencing the ordinary vocational education. The program is individually tailored to each young person.</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The main challenge in Building Bridge to Education is to minimize the drop-out rate. There is a need to help create ownership and ensure motivation towards education. The individual needs and challenges of the participants have to be addressed in the design of the programme.</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Yes, the program assist in making transitions from unemployment to education and promotes the completion of ordinary education courses, which in the long run is positively associated to employment.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as ‘good practice’ example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b></p>



	<p>The bridge building to education program promotes the transition from unemployment and no education to education and employment for vulnerable young people.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice? Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>Pilot evaluations were positive, but scaling up is always challenging. Now the program has inspired the nation-wide reform of the preparatory education program, which is implemented in the coming years.</p>
--	---

Name of the initiative	<b>“Voksenlærlingeordning” (Adult Apprenticeships)</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The Adult Apprenticeships scheme enables people over the age of 25 to be employed in a company as an adult trainee and alternating with vocational college. The scheme leads to a vocational qualification. The employing company can receive a subsidy equivalent to about 20% of the trainee’s salary, thus adding an extra incentive for prospective employers to take on an adult trainee. The scheme is attractive to potential adult trainees due to the chance for the unskilled person to gain vocational qualifications whilst receiving remuneration equivalent to that of unskilled employees. These apprenticeships also aim to ensure that unemployed people over the age of 25 have the chance of obtaining the necessary qualifications and a more stable position in relation to the labour market</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>Adult apprenticeships are regulated through the Law on active employment services, which includes requirements to work types covered according to needs and conditions to be met for subsidy eligibility. There must be a need for labour for the type of work in question at the time the agreement is entered. At least once a year the Employment Region draws up a list of job types eligible for subsidies under the scheme.</p> <p>The trainee receives a salary during the work training as agreed in the contract. This should be at least as high as of the lowest wage of an unskilled worker in that sector. If no wage agreement exists, the salary must be equivalent to that for work of a similar nature. The adult apprentice receives a salary subsidy during the whole apprenticeship period, i.e. both during training with an employer and while at college. The work training subsidy is paid via the jobcentre, while the subsidy during school education periods comes from the Ministry of Education.</p>



	<p>The jobcentre decides whether an adult apprenticeship contract can be entered. It is also the jobcentre that administrates the employer subsidies.</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b> Targeted youth above 25 years who are long-term unemployed (+12 months) and with no formal qualifications</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b> Above 25 years who are long-term unemployed (+12 months) and with no formal qualifications? The apprentice must be a person over the age of 25 without a vocational qualification or other work related qualification comparable to or higher than the level and duration of a vocational qualification, unless the person has not used the qualification over the last 5 years. Participants can be both unemployed or in employment.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b> Training (with or without certificates)</p> <p><b>Level:</b> National program and local implementation by jobcenters</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b> Adult apprenticeships have been in operation since 1997 and the program is ongoing.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b> National program and local implementation by jobcenters. They are administered by the local jobcenters under the supervision of the Ministry of Employment.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>There are not any recent data on the number of participants in the adult apprenticeships scheme. Since the introduction of the program in 1997 and until 2011, almost 50.000 persons have participated in the program. From 2007, a decline in participation was recorded. Around 2.000 persons began in the program in 2011. About half of the participants come from employment, while the other half come from unemployment.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p>



	<p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p>
Targeting	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b>          The apprentice must be a person over the age of 25 without a vocational qualification or other work related qualification comparable to or higher than the level and duration of a vocational qualification, unless the person has not used the qualification over the last 5 years. Participants can be both unemployed or in employment.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b>          No</p> <p><b>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)?</b>          No</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No).</b></p> <p>No</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Adult Apprenticeships are in line with the European Employment Strategy and in particular with strategies for improving the qualifications of those without vocational qualifications, thus reducing the risk of long-term unemployment.</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>Deloitte (a private consultancy company) did an evaluation of the adult apprenticeship program commissioned by the Danish Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment (STAR) in 2013 (Deloitte, 2013).</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>External.</p> <p><b>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</b></p>





	<p><b>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)?</b></p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>The Deloitte evaluation from September 2013 showed several positive effects of the scheme. After one year, 70% of the apprentices were in employment compared to 58% in the control group, i.e. a 12% positive employment effect. For adult apprentices coming from unemployment on social security, 62% of the adult apprentice group were in employment compared to 37% in the control group. This showed a positive employment effect of 25%. The evaluation indicated though, that the positive effect fell over time, but even four years after the completion of the program, the effect was still positive at 15%. Interviews with apprentices showed that the apprenticeship had improved their employment possibilities, both short term and long term. 76% were either in full agreement or partly in agreement that they were in a better position jobwise after completing the adult apprenticeship.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The adult apprenticeship program is successful and have positive education and employment outcomes.</p> <p><b>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.)?</b></p> <p>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention? There are some implementation challenges worth noting: (1) Jobcentres have to work in close cooperation with vocational schools and union and professional organizations to make the program work. (2) There may also be a trade-off between the number of adult apprenticeships and the availability of apprenticeship for young people. However, the Deloitte evaluation did not find any of this type of substitution effects.</p>



Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>Yes, the program provides vocational qualification for adult unemployed and provides them with a second chance for a labour market career.</p>
Interventions assessed as 'good practice' example	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main "success factors" of this intervention.</b></p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>The success factors for the effective formulation and implementation of the Adult Apprenticeships scheme include: (1) The minimum salary levels stipulated in the scheme ensure that the adult apprentices receive a reasonable income on which to live. (2) Subsidies to employers can be an extra incentive for taking on an adult apprentice. Employers can reap the benefits of adult apprentices who are motivated, often have previous work experience, and have a stable attitude to their work.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p> <p>None.</p>

## Diffusion of EU youth employment initiatives

In general, EU employment and social policies are not particularly important in the Danish context. According to the self-perception of Danish policy- and decision makers, the causality is more likely to be the opposite, so that Danish labour market policies have inspired the formulation of EU policies (e.g. the Danish flexicurity approach or active labour market policies) (cf. Jørgensen & Madsen, 2007).

In relation to youth unemployment policies, Danish legislation and policies were implemented before the different EU policies and schemes. There is a de facto "youth guarantee" in Denmark so that young unemployed have to participate in early activation programs and interviews. This dates back to the mid-1990s and was recently further strengthened by a reform for young people on social assistance (2014).

In relation to traineeships and apprenticeships, Denmark also has a long tradition of a relatively smooth transition from school to work, which is enabled by both the dual training system and the widespread use of traineeships including in further education, and the work experience which many young people gain from combining study and part-time employment.

Danish policies are not a direct effect of EU policies, but show a high level of conformity with EU initiatives (see also Madsen, 2015).



## Consistency of the policies for youth inclusion

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

No	Name	Level	Main target group <sup>17</sup>	Starting year; end year	Funding source	Part of EU initiatives	Evaluation	Impact of the policy measures	Trends in the way selected policy measures influence unemployed young people
1	Socially useful jobs ( <i>nytteindsats</i> )	National legislation and municipal implementation	B + D. Universal program for recipients of social assistance, but especially targeted young recipients of social assistance with other problems than unemployment	2014 (ongoing)	National	NO	Yes, mixed	3	2
2	Resource trajectories ( <i>ressourceforløb</i> )	National legislation and municipal implementation	B + D. Universal program, but especially relevant for young potential clients of disability benefits (below 40 years)	2013 (ongoing)	National	NO	Yes, mixed results	2-3	2-3

### Comments on Table 7

The two programs (socially useful jobs and resource trajectories) were selected because they are the most important employment and social programs for young people with problems besides unemployment (classified as not job ready by “activation-ready”, meaning that they have to participate in some type of employment or educational program to be eligible for income support).

Not suitable example for this part: “socially useful jobs”. The “jobs” are additional municipal jobs which are defined a “socially useful” but the municipalities are not supposed to substitute existing jobs. This is a labour market policy measure where the implementation is not being done in cooperation of different sectors, usually it is coordinated by national unemployment office. No, implementation is done by jobcenters

<sup>17</sup> a. targeted youth, b. universal, c. targeted risk group, d. targeted to youth risk group



and municipal workplaces in cooperation. I think it is a good example of an employment program with a social purpose.

### Detailed description and evaluation of the selected measures

Name of the initiative	<b>Socially useful jobs (nytteindsats)</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The primary aim of the socially useful jobs (SUJ) is to demonstrate the “work requirement” of employment policies, i.e. to send the signal to the target groups that those who can work have to work for their benefit, and vice versa, that those who do not want to work lose their right to benefits. The program intends to motivate the participants to find ordinary jobs or begin an ordinary education.</p> <p>The “jobs” are additional municipal jobs which are defined a “socially useful” by the municipalities are not supposed to substitute existing jobs. There is by implication a high degree of municipal variation in the type of jobs and tasks defined as “socially useful jobs” (e.g. maintenance work, cleaning, painting in public buildings and facilities). The duration of the program for each participants is max 13 weeks.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>Participants exit unemployment and enter jobs and education faster than the control group</p> <p><b>Target groups:</b></p> <p>Universal program for recipients of social assistance, but especially targeted young recipients of social assistance with other problems than unemployment</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>Socially useful jobs are targeted the following groups of young people: (1) The obviously education-ready (while they wait to begin on an ordinary education and if they cannot find a job), (2) the job-ready (if they have not found a job after three months), (3) other individuals that are education-ready (but often they need other more intensive and supporting measures</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>Temporary direct job creation (max 13 weeks per participant).</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>National legislation and municipal implementation</p> <p><b>Start/ end date:</b></p>



	<p>The program was introduced in 2014 with a reform of the social assistance system and the introduction of “education benefits” instead of social assistance for young unemployed.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>Yes, partly. When socially useful jobs are created in the municipality, the trade unions representative or other employee representative should be informed.</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>National legislation and municipal implementation</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b> N.A.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>In 2016, about 15.000 individuals participate in socially useful jobs, the majority coming from social assistance or education benefits.</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available</b></p> <p>The majority of participants are below 30 years, but there are no data available on the age profile of participants. There are no data on budget or expenditures either.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p> <p>Socially useful jobs are a universal and mandatory program for persons on social assistance and unemployment benefits, but it is specifically targeted young persons.</p> <p>The jobcenters classify persons on social assistance into three categories: (1) job-ready (ready to find ordinary employment within three months), (2) activity-ready (ready to participate in activation programs) and (3) education-ready (ready to participate in education programs).</p> <p>Socially useful jobs are targeted the following groups of young people: (1) The obviously education-ready (while they wait to begin on an ordinary education and if they cannot find a job), (2) the job-ready (if they have not found a job after three months), (3) other individuals that are education-ready (but often they need other more intensive and supporting measures).</p>



<p>Youth involvement</p>	<p><b>Are there specific activities planned in the programme to include targeted youth actively in designing the programme or other way (Yes/Partly/No).</b></p> <p>NO</p>
<p>Links to EU initiatives</p>	<p><b>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)?</b></p> <p>NO</p>
<p>Available evaluations</p>	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>The program is quite new, so there are only few evaluations conducted internally by the Ministry of Employment. Mid-term evaluations.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>There are only few evaluations conducted internally by the Ministry of Employment.</p> <p><b>If evaluations of this program are available how detailed is the information provided?</b></p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>In 2015, The Ministry of Employment conducted an outcome evaluation of SUJ's for young persons (assessed as obviously education-ready). The evaluation found the intended effect, i.e. that participants exit unemployment and enter jobs and education faster than the control group. The effect is somewhat higher for young men than for young women and higher for ethnic Danes compared to young persons with a non-western background (Ministry of Employment, 2015).</p> <p>The Ministry of Employment also commissioned a private consultancy firm (called "Damvad") to do a qualitative evaluation of the SUJ's (Damvad, 2015). The objective of the study was to examine how municipalities implement the program and their experiences. The evaluation included a case study in 8 municipalities, and surveys of jobcentre managers and participants. The evaluation found that the programs worked well and was implemented in accordance with the political intentions.</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects?</b></p> <p>The program seems to work according to the political intentions and promote transitions from unemployment to employment and education.</p>



<p>the quality of the intervention?</p>	<p><b>Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b> Evaluations results are so far only available for the target groups that the program was most likely to affect in a positive direction (young unemployed that are obviously education-ready, i.e. probably the most resourceful and “strongest” part of the target group). It remains to be seen if the program also have positive effects for the other target groups. There are risks of “lock-in” effects if the target group does not have relevant exit routes from unemployment.</p> <p><b>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.)?</b></p> <p>When the program was launched, there were concerns about possible substitution effects in terms of replacing ordinary municipal jobs. However, it seem that the regulations set up to avoid substitution are working (e.g. a duty to consult with the social partners in regional labour market boards, and inform workplace representatives of the trade unions).</p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>None,</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>The program does not intend to address the main causes of youth unemployment, but intends to install a “work ethic” in participants and promote a faster transition to ordinary jobs or education.</p> <p>The program does not officially intend to promote new skills and competencies of participants.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as ‘good practice’ example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b></p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>The program can be considered a “good practice” for the following reasons: (1) the program seem to promote a faster exit from unemployment towards education and jobs for persons that are assessed as “obviously education-ready”, (2) socially useful jobs are carried out in public building and facilities, which would otherwise not have happened, (3) the program sends a signal to young people that they have to work for their benefits.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p>



	However, the number of evaluations of the program are currently limited and have been commissioned by the Ministry of Employment rather than conducted by independent researchers.
--	--

Name of the initiative	<b>Resource trajectories program (ressourceforløb)</b>
Short description	<p><b>(Primary/Main) aim of the measure:</b></p> <p>The objective of the Resource Trajectory Program (RTP) is to develop the working ability and employability of persons in risk of entering permanent disability benefits. The program is a new combination of individual rehabilitation and employment services.</p> <p><b>Intended effects:</b></p> <p>The duration of the program is from 1 year to 5 years. The intention is to provide integrated municipal services through cross-sectoral interventions where the employment system cooperates with social services, education institutions, the health system etc. The program is supposed to combine active interventions like employment programs, educational support, psychological support, treatment for abuse problems, mentor support, physical training etc. To coordinate the activities each participant is assigned a coordinating caseworker.</p> <p>During the program, the participants receive a benefit called “resource benefits” which are equivalent to social assistance and the education benefit, but lower than disability benefits.</p> <p>Target groups:</p> <p><b>Eligibility criteria for beneficiaries:</b></p> <p>RTP targets individuals with complex and multiple barriers besides from unemployment. The most important target group is persons below 40 years of age, which after the reform of the disability pension system in 2013 are no longer entitled to disability pension.</p> <p><b>Type of intervention (which type of ALMP &amp; which elements of social policy):</b></p> <p>Rehabilitation and activation program The program is a new combination of individual rehabilitation and employment services. The program is supposed to combine active interventions like employment programs, educational support, psychological support, treatment for abuse problems, mentor support, physical training etc.</p> <p><b>Level:</b></p> <p>National legislation and municipal implementation. Start/ end date:</p>





	<p>The program began in 2013 with the implementation of the reform of disability pension and the flexible jobs scheme.</p> <p><b>Are stakeholders involved in the formulation/implementation of this measure?</b></p> <p>No</p> <p><b>How/through which institutions is this measure implemented?</b></p> <p>National legislation regulates the framework of the program, but leaves room for municipal implementation and caseworker discretion.</p> <p><b>Budget (EUR, thousand) and source:</b></p> <p>The public expenditures on “resource benefits” is currently about 2.5 b. DKR (330 m. Euro) annually.</p>
<p>Achieved results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>The number of participants has increased steadily since 2014. In 2016, around 22.000 individuals participating in the program (equivalent to 17.000 full-time individuals).</p> <p>6 months after the program, the majority of participants have entered into disability pension (45%), flexible jobs (16%), resource benefits (8%) or social assistance (6%). Only 3% are in ordinary employment and 1% in education.</p> <p>The program also aims at promoting progression in the social and personal well-being of the individual as well as improving the employability of participants. A user survey among participants in the program found that about 50 percent of the participants have become more confident about their future on the labour market and about 30 percent have become better at handling their health challenges (Mploy and Epinion survey quoted in KL, 2016a).</p> <p><b>Total expenditures for the program on annual basis.</b></p> <p><b>Total expenditure per beneficiary? If not available, other expenditure data what is available.</b></p> <p>The public expenditures on “resource benefits” is currently about 2.5 b. DKR (330 m. Euro) annually.</p>
<p>Targeting</p>	<p><b>Which are the target groups of this measure?</b></p> <p>The program is targeted at every unemployed person with complex and multiple barriers besides unemployment.</p> <p><b>Is this program especially targeted to young people or to all unemployed?</b></p>



	<p>No.</p> <p><b>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)?</b></p> <p>Among this group there are many younger persons (below 40 years) since they are not eligible to disability pension after the 2013 reform. The rationale behind targeting younger individuals was a political ambition to improve the employability and working ability of young persons with multiple problems rather than placing them on permanent public income support. On average, each participant in the target group have been on public income support for 9 ½ years.</p>
Youth involvement	<p><b>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</b></p> <p>Yes, partly. Eligibility and decision in the program is decided in municipal “rehabilitation teams” where representatives of employment services, social services, the health sector etc. are present. During these meeting, the individual participant is invited to participate and have a say in decision-making.</p>
Links to EU initiatives	<p><b>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)?</b></p> <p>NO</p>
Available evaluations	<p><b>Are there evaluations on this program available? (Add Sources)? If yes, are the evaluations: ex-ante; mid-term, ex-post and/or permanent monitoring?</b></p> <p>The Ministry of Employment have commissioned different evaluations of the disability pension and flexible jobs reform, but there are not yet any independent academic research on the reform. The available evaluations are nonetheless of high quality and the findings are reliable. (<a href="#">link to evaluations in Danish</a>). So far, there are no outcome evaluations of the reform and the resource trajectories.</p> <p><b>Are they internal (by the agency implementing it) or external (e.g. by scientific institutes)?</b></p> <p>They are internal.</p> <p><b>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</b></p>



	<p><b>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)?</b></p> <p>Mploy (a private consultancy company) did a user survey of participants in resource trajectories. The evaluation found that 43 % of participants were satisfied, while 33 % were not satisfied. The remaining 24 % reply “neither satisfied nor dissatisfied” or did not reply. In 2013, Mploy also did a very early study of the first experiences of implementation of resource trajectories for the Ministry of Employment.</p> <p>The Social Science Research Institute (Socialforskningsinstituttet) in 2015 examined the implementation and organisation of resource trajectories through case studies in four municipalities. The case studies found among other things that participants were particularly satisfied with the assistance of mentors and new coordinating caseworkers. The respondents in the municipalities also stressed that cross-sectorial cooperation, motivation and empowerment of participants remained challenging (see below).</p>
<p>Summary of evaluation results</p>	<p><b>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.</b></p> <p>The Danish Social Research Institute have done a qualitative evaluation of the RTP about two years after the introduction of the program (Mehlsen et. al, 2015). The data were interviews with participants in four municipalities and register analysis. The evaluation found that the majority of the participants were satisfied with the new program and especially with their new right to assistance from mentors and coordinating caseworkers. The Local Government Association (Kommunernes Landsforening – KL) have also conducted various analysis of the resource trajectory program. KL generally finds that the reform of the disability pension system works in accordance with the political intention to award fewer disability pensions and instead create more flexible jobs and resource trajectories. A register analysis and survey amoobcenters from 2016 done by KL, however, also found implementation issues, like challenges in working across systems and boundaries, local variations in implementation and reluctance of employers to recruit persons with complex barriers to labour market integration (KL, 2016b).</p>
<p>In your view: How would you assess the</p>	<p><b>Does this program achieve its stated goals and intended effects? Assessment of the magnitude of the effect?</b></p> <p>The program assists in achieving the formal objective, which is to reduce the number disability pensions, and also partly in achieving the specific</p>



<p>quality of the intervention?</p>	<p>program objective, which is to improve the employability and working ability of the participants. The outcomes in terms of ordinary employment and education are indeed very small, which is somewhat to be expected, since the target group is very “weak”. A more realistic outcome is transition into “flexible jobs” (which is a specific type of subsidised employment, where job tasks and working hours are adapted to the individual participant).</p> <p><b>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.)?</b></p> <p><b>In your opinion which are the main weaknesses of this intervention in terms of: adequacy; coverage; take-up; effectiveness of this intervention?</b></p> <p>The outcomes in terms of ordinary employment and education are indeed very small, which is somewhat to be expected, since the target group is very “weak”. A more realistic outcome is transition into “flexible jobs” (which is a specific type of subsidised employment, where job tasks and working hours are adapted to the individual participant).</p>
<p>Related to the causes of unemployment and target risk groups</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p> <p>The program intends to address the main and complex barriers of employment among participants. The complexity of the intervention and the long duration of the program goes to show how complex it is to address unemployment among this group of potential recipients of disability pension.</p>
<p>Interventions assessed as ‘good practice’ example</p>	<p><b>Explain shortly which the reasons are and what are the main “success factors” of this intervention.</b></p> <p>It is in my opinion too early to describe this program as “good practice”. More systematic and independent evaluations are needed to assess the implementation and outcomes of the resource trajectories program. The program has the potential to become “good practice” in terms of finding viable alternatives to disability pension for young persons with multiple and complex barriers to labour market integration.</p> <p><b>Give a reason why you value it as a good practice?</b></p> <p>Too early to say that it is a good practice.</p> <p><b>Or alternatively, what do you see as main reasons hindering the potential for replication in other contexts?</b></p>



	Too early to say.
--	-------------------



## References

Bredgaard, T. & H. Jørgensen (2000): Was the problem solved? Danish youth unemployment policies in the 1990s, Aalborg University: CARMA research paper.

Center for Ungdomsforskning (2016): "Hvad virker? Ledige unges vej til uddannelse og arbejde – Evaluering af Brobygning til Uddannelse" [Evaluation of project "Bridgebuilding to Education"].

Damvad (2015): Kvalitativ evaluering af nytteindsats, evaluation commissioned by the Agency for Labour Market and Recruitment (STAR) [A qualitative evaluation of socially useful jobs].

Deloitte (2013): Evaluering af voksenlærlingeordningen – Effekter, anvendelse og incitamenter [Evaluation of the Adult Apprenticeship Scheme].

Jensen, P., Svarer Nielsen, M. & Rosholm, M. (1999): "*The Effects of Benefits, Incentives, and Sanctions on Youth Unemployment*", Centre for Labour Market and Social Research (CLS), Working Paper 99: 005, Aarhus University.

Jørgensen, H. & P. K. Madsen (2007): *Flexicurity and beyond – Finding a New Agenda for the European Social Model*, Copenhagen: DJØF Publishing.

KL (2016a): Fra førtidspension til ressourceforløb, KL Indblik, The Danish Local government Association [From disability pension to resource trajectories].

KL (2016b): Jobcentrenes erfaringer med ressourceforløb, Danish Local government Association (KL) [The experiences of jobcenters with resource trajectories].

Madsen, P. K. (2015): Youth Unemployment and the Skills Mismatch in Denmark, In-depth analysis for the EMPL Committee. [http://vbn.aau.dk/files/227968848/PK\\_Madsen\\_Youth\\_unemployment\\_and\\_skills\\_mismatch\\_in\\_Denmark.pdf](http://vbn.aau.dk/files/227968848/PK_Madsen_Youth_unemployment_and_skills_mismatch_in_Denmark.pdf)

Ministry of Employment (2015): Effekten af nytteindsatsen for unge i kontanthjælpssystemet, Beskæftigelsesministeriet [Evaluation of the effects of socially useful jobs for young recipients of social assistance].

Mehlsen, L., H. Holt, H. B. Bach & C. Thörnfeldt (2015): Ressourceforløb – Koordinerende sagsbehandlere og borgernes erfaringer, Copenhagen: Social Science Research Centre [Resource trajectories – Experiences of caseworkers and citizens].

Nord-Larsen, Mogens: "*Ungeindsatsen start*", SFI report, Copenhagen, 1997 [The Danish National Institute for Social Research: The Start of the Youth Unemployment Programme].

Rosholm, M. & M. Svarer (2008): The threat effect of active labour market programs, *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, June 2008.