

## NARRATIVE AND QUALITATIVE ASSESMENT OF THE REPORT

### Short description (extracts of the Executive summary)

This report provides a compilation of knowledge gained from evaluators of these projects. The report includes a preliminary meta-analysis of project evaluations. The report is also based on a survey, where evaluators answered questions about their work, the projects and how they conduct their evaluations. On this basis Theme Group Youth makes the following conclusions and proposals.

This report actually contains two overviews, which both are qualitative overviews of a number of evaluations carried out at different time periods.

A survey questionnaire has been carried out to shed light on the evaluators' assessments of youth project work and the structure of the evaluation work. The report includes a preliminary meta-analysis of project evaluations.

### On the results

- Labour market projects for young people often have a large 'toolbox' available, offering many different kinds of initiative and support. This reflects the varied needs found among the young participants. The report includes an overview of the various methodologies and approaches used.
- The evaluators indicate that there are positive project outputs, concerning the number of young people that went to education, training or employment and the level of satisfaction among both participants and staff.
- On-going evaluation is the most common means applied for evaluation.
- Despite positive indications concerning project outputs, it is difficult to extract general knowledge about the impacts of the various methodologies in youth projects. The evaluation reports presented up until now generally lack supporting data for such knowledge.

### Recommendations:

- The knowledge resulting from evaluations and activities should become a more self-evident component in the development of a knowledge-based labour market policy.
- The evaluations often lack descriptions of methodologies and their impacts. The knowledge produced through evaluations should be comparable. It would consequently be desirable to offer projects and evaluators certain concrete tools for follow-up and evaluation.
- Evaluation reports should be communicated and compiled systematically, and should be easily accessible and searchable for different stakeholders.

## GLOBAL EVALUATION

The report focuses rather on the evaluations themselves, than on the results of the labour market projects and includes two separate studies: a systematic review of many evaluations and a survey using a questionnaire applied to evaluators. The methodology is interesting and can inspire similar approaches in cases when there is extensive evidence in evaluations about a specific subject (labour market projects for young people being such a subject with many available evaluations).

However, the report is not very systematic in analysing the evaluations with a clear enough aim. While it is clear that a lot of evidence exists on the variety of methods used for the labour market integration of young people, the report fails to conclude on the most impactful tools or in the limits of existent reports to tackle the assessment of the impact of employment projects (although some general remarks are included).

## CHECKLIST OF THE METHODOLOGY OF THE REPORT

Criteria	Score	Justification of the score	Description
<b>General score</b>	<b>17,5</b>		
<b>Description of the intervention</b>	<b>3,5</b>		
Organisation implementing the intervention, the "owner" of the intervention	0	yes	this is a systematic review of many evaluations where the number is given only approximately: "So far in Sweden around two hundred projects for young people have been initiated or concluded. Many are run by municipal authorities, though aim to improve cooperation between the various public stakeholders."
country	1	yes	Sweden
location	1	yes	Sweden
timeline, dates of different phases and actions	0	no	actions specified very broadly: Young people not in employment, education or training (NEETs) have been a priority of the European Social Fund (ESF) in Sweden during the period 2007 to 2013. So far in Sweden around two hundred projects for young people have been initiated or concluded. Many are run by municipal authorities, though aim to improve cooperation between the various public stakeholders.
cost/budget	0	no	ESF financed actions
implementation status	0	no	not specified
policy context such as adoption of a new development plan, end of an earlier/old development plan	0,5	yes	the need for evidence based policy, the need to support youth transition to labor market
socio-economic context such as high unemployment or school dropout rate	0	not described	
Political context such as change of government	0	not described	
institutional such as institutional setup and/or change, reform	0	not described	
international factors, such as integration into an international organisation	1	yes	ESF, cofinanced
<b>Description of the (intended) beneficiaries and activities of the intervention</b>	<b>1</b>		
beneficiaries by type (ie, institutions/organisations; communities; individuals...)	1	yes	young people
by administrative-geographic location(s) (ie, urban, rural, particular neighbourhoods, town/cties, sub-regions...)	0		
by social background (ie NEET, with fewer opportunities, ...)	0		

Criteria	Score	Justification of the score	Description
total number and percentage reached (as appropriate to the purpose of the evaluation)	0		
description of activities of the intervention	0		
description of the intervention's intended results	0		
Identification of the key stakeholders, their specific contributions and roles (financial or otherwise)	0		
<b>Description of the evaluation report</b>	<b>10</b>		
full reference	1	yes	Evaluation of Labor Market Prjects for Youtng People. What evaluations and evaluators say about youth projects co-financed by the European Social Fund; <a href="https://www.mucf.se/publikationer/evaluation-labour-market-projects-young-people">https://www.mucf.se/publikationer/evaluation-labour-market-projects-young-people</a>
Institution which commissioned the report	1	yes	Ungdomsstyrelsen
institution(s), which carried out the evaluation	0	no	a multitude of organisations
type of the institution(s) which carried out the evaluation	1	of the report, not of original evaluations	national authority
authors of the report	0	no	no authors given
type of evaluation	1	yes	ongoing, formative
goal of evaluation	1	yes	
Presentation of intervention logic, a theory of change, a logic model, social mechanisms in the report = the "theory/conceptual section"	0	no	
presentation of evaluation questions in the report	1	yes	On the basis of Theme Group Youth's mandate, would it be productive to conduct a meta-analysis of evaluations using a large number of project evaluations as an information base, and if so what questions could possibly be answered?

Criteria	Score	Justification of the score	Description
description of a selection of research design, methods and data, explanation why and how they are suitable for the evaluation's purpose, objectives and scope	1	yes	a survey among companies which have conducted evaluations fo projects cofunded from ESF starting from the 2007 round
Methodological, epistemological approach used in the evaluation report	1	yes	a survey of evaluators
research design	1	yes	
data	1	yes	
Description of the level of participation of key stakeholders in the conduct of the evaluation	0	not relevant	
Description of ethical safeguards for participants appropriate for the issues described (respect for dignity and diversity, right to self-determination, fair representation, compliance with codes for vulnerable groups, confidentiality, and avoidance of harm)	0	not relevant	
Description of limitations, biases and constraints arising from the design, data, analysis methods and ethics of research	0	not reported and discussed	
<b>Description of substantive findings presented in the report</b>	<b>0</b>		
Identification of the causal factors (contextual, organisational, managerial, etc.) influencing achievement, partial achievement or non-achievement of intended results of the intervention	0		
presence and quality of cost-benefit analysis (how costs compare to similar interventions or standards, most efficient way to get expected results)-if not feasible, an explanation is provided	0		
idenification/presentation and analysis of unexpected/unintended effects (positive and negative)	0		
<b>Description of recommendations</b>	<b>1</b>		

Criteria	Score	Justification of the score	Description
The relationship between recommendations and the findings and/or conclusions	1	a wide range of recommendations on how to use evaluations in policymaking	
Identification of a) target group and b) action for that target group for each recommendation (or clearly clustered group of recommendations)	0		
<b>Description of structure</b>	<b>2</b>		
Executive summary	1		
Structure of the report	1		