

SUPPORTING LONG-TERM UNEMPLOYED IN RURAL AREAS

## Life changing – Life shaping programme

## HUNGARY

The practice was part of the public authorities' effort to tackle labour market problems in rural areas. The practice focused on supporting long-term unemployed in regions with a high level of unemployment. It can be seen as an economic development programme initiated by the local community and supported by the government. The programme design was significantly influenced by two previously successful horticultural programmes. The evaluation of the practice revealed that the good coordination among PES, local authorities and local stakeholders was crucial to obtain positive results.

| Name of the PES   | Baranya Megyel Kormanynivatal Munkaugyl Kozpont<br>Baranya County Government Office, Public Employment Centre  |
|---|--|
| When was the practice<br>implemented?   | 2009 – 2012  |
| Which organisation was involved<br>in its implementation?                     | The practice was managed by the partner consortium which approved the preselected participants, developed the training programme tailored to the needs of participants and locality, provided one or two years of subsidised employment, and ensured mentoring support to the participants during and after the completion of the practice.  |
| Which social groups were targeted by the practice?                            | Long-term unemployed   |
| What were the practice's main objectives?                                     | The main aim of the practice was to support access to employment for the long-term unemployed in the South Trans-Danubian region - a rural area with low socio-economic indicators. The practice provided training and work experience.  |
| What activities were carried out?   | The Life changing – Life shaping practice offered participants 8-9 months of tailored training; approximately 1 000 hours were provided, of which 200 hours were general classroom training and 800 hours were practical training. The theoretical training and the work experience were intentionally organised to minimise commuting requirements for participants. Programmes were designed to comply with the needs of the agriculture sector. After completing their training, the participants had an opportunity to acquire work experience (one to two years) either at the local council or with a local farmer/producer. In addition, the practice had a mentoring and personal development component. The practice took into account the characteristics (local challenges) and opportunities offered by the local community (local resources) during both the training and work experience. In addition, the practice provided three years employment (wage subsidy) for eight young graduates with an agriculture-related degree. |
| What resources and<br>other relevant organisational<br>aspects were involved? | The practice was coordinated by the regional PES and managed by a consortium of 16 municipalities, 15 farmers, 5 cooperatives and 1 professional agricultural institute. The practice was implemented in 33 localities   |
| Source(s) of funding  | National budget (tax revenue)<br>European Social Fund  |
| What were the<br>outputs of the practice:<br>people reached and products?     | <b>People reached:</b><br>The total number of participants, who participated in training and subsidised employment paths,<br>was 214.  |
|   | Products:  |

N/A

| What outcomes have<br>been identified?              | <ul> <li>81% of all participants (173 people) completed the whole programme (classroom and on-the-job training).</li> <li>95% of participants reported that the practice helped them to find employment in the long run.</li> <li>Only 15% of all participants (i.e. 32 out of the 214) dropped out of the programme (either during the 8 month training period or subsidised employment), either due to illness or finding a job.</li> <li>About 15% of those who completed the practice (26 people out of 173) found permanent employment following the practice and about the same 15% of participants (26 people out of 173) entered some form of subsidised employment (mainly public works).</li> </ul>   |
|---|---|
| What are the lessons learnt<br>and success factors? | <ul> <li>The evaluation, based on case studies, provided qualitative information and necessary evidence. These were the major findings:</li> <li>1) The local council has a significant role in improving the employment situation and the quality of life in a particular locality.</li> <li>2) The cooperation between PES, local municipalities and other organisations were important elements of this practice.</li> <li>3) The main measures used by local municipalities are mainly related to public works and subsidies.</li> <li>4) The training sessions were adapted to the target groups and focused on hands-on experience and practice, as theoretical trainings were not easily accessible for them.</li> <li>5) One of the most important achievements of the practice was the capability of local governments to continue the subsidised agricultural practice and set up their own production. The production was linked to the local economic development strategy.</li> <li>6) There is a need for better knowledge of the local economy as well as the market production based on the local community's interests and territorial resources.</li> </ul> |
| More information<br>on the practice                 | http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/empl_portal/weesp/HU-4.pdf  |



Name: PES Mutual Learning Support Team

Email: pes@icfi.com