

The French **Guarantee for Youth** (*Garantie Jeunes*): **experiencing a new approach** to help **young vulnerable people** to **gain autonomy**

Peer review, Paris 7-8 April 2016

Nicolas Farvaque



■ 1. The innovative aspects of the measure

An **experimental measure** coupling:

- **a guarantee to a first professional experience** based on a 'work-first' approach.
 - ▶ *How is this support organised in the Missions locales and how can this 'work first' approach be operationalised?*
- **a financial resource**
 - ▶ *What is the role of this allowance in the relationship between the young people and the Mission locale?*



■ 1. The innovative aspects of the measure

1) The support and follow-up organised by the Missions locales: **articulating individual and collective support**

- A **one-year contract**
- **'Cohorts'** of around 15 young people are organised each month or so.
- **Two counsellors in pair-work** for 100 young persons
- A **six-week collective support** including classical workshops and more innovative ones
- Then **an individual guidance** during all the year



■ 1. The innovative aspects of the measure

2) A support based on the work-first approach

- The **idea**: offering a plurality of professional experiences during the one-year support, that can be completed by training opportunities.
- “Work first” rather than “train first” approach
- Role of “**immersions**” (work experiences) in companies
- In practical terms, young people are given advice to find such work experiences **by themselves**.
- Missions locales are **assessed**, among other things, regarding the number of days in work spent by young people during the year



■ 1. The innovative aspects of the measure

3) The role of the monetary allowance

- A **monthly allowance** of 461 Euros that can be combined with wages up to 300€
- A **real security net** for many young people with no other right to social protection scheme
- By opposition, some young people (a minority) **not motivated** to engage in this form of support even though there is such a monetary allowance
- A **discretionary** tool, not a “right” as such (for the moment?)
- In principle, access to the YG and also possible sanctions decided by a **local committee**.
- In practice, difficulties for counsellors to be in a position to possibly **sanction** young people



■ 2. Some observations and questions for the PR

1) A measure very much appreciated by YG counsellors and young people

- The **new approach** (collective/individual) is seen as a really **positive innovation**.
- But the YG represents a **big change** for the Missions locales which have **not totally been prepared** for it:
 - New **work organisation** (pair-work, collective workshops requiring to rethink the space organisation, etc.)
 - New **recruitments**, sometimes in an important proportion (+15-20% staff)
 - In many ML, the YG has been organised in specific premises: risk of **internal 'splitting'**
 - A very important **workload** in particular concerning administrative duties (ESF requirements...)



■ 2. Some observations and questions for the PR

2) The importance of well-performing partnerships with local employers and social partners

- **Local administration** (through the “DIRECCTE”) should be an actor facilitating these partnerships
- Importance of relationships with several partners in order to **identify** young vulnerable NEETs
- The quality of the relationships between ML and local **employers** may differ from one place to another.
How to find work experiences in a sluggish labour market in which many employers say they are 'over-solicited'?



■ 2. Some observations and questions for the PR

3) How to assess the efficiency of the YG?

- Is a **12-month** accompaniment enough to help young people very distant from employment to get back to work?
- **What after the 12 months?** The young people get back to a classical 'accompaniment', with no access to the financial allowance (other temporary financial aids possible)
- Assessment should be based on “**positive outputs**” (work situation, access to training) but also on **qualitative outcomes** (barriers to employment suppressed, increase of self-confidence, etc.).



■ Questions for the PR

- **Identification.** What are the key ingredients for successful partnership in identifying NEETs?
- **Design of the support.** Is the combination of a collective and individual guidance fruitful?
- **Tools to help young people gain autonomy.** What support and services are proven more effective to improve the employability and reintegration of NEETs?
- **Monetary allowance.** What are the advantages and drawbacks of having a monetary allowance included in the design of the Youth Guarantee measure?
- **Place of training.** What should be the correct combination between work experience and training during the accompaniment of the young people?
- **Implementation of the work-first logic.** What are the best methods to involve local employers to recruit young NEETs or at least offer them short professional experiences?