



DJS/YR/YPI (2003) 1
March 2003

Experts on Youth Policy Indicators **Third and concluding meeting**

26 – 27 March 2003
European Youth Centre
Strasbourg

Final Report



TABLE OF CONTENTS

Explanatory memorandum

Introduction	3
A What is a youth policy about?	4
B Youth policy indicators	5
C Specific youth policy approaches	8
D Recommendations on the use of indicators when assessing youth policy	9
D A Aims and objectives of youth policy	
D B Recommendations on youth research	
D C Recommendations on youth policy indicators	
Annexe 1 : Materials used during the three meetings	13
Annexe 2: Introduction to the following annexes	14
Annexe 3: Issues, interpretation and implementation	15
Annexe 4: Crude indicators	21
Annexe 5: Access to Labour Market	23
Annexe 6: Access to Information	25
Annexe 7: Access to Leisure Time Opportunities	26
Annexe 8: List of participants	27

Explanatory memorandum

Introduction

The central aim of youth policy in the Council of Europe is the development and implementation of purposive and positive youth policy, which is coherent and inclusive.

Such a policy can refer to a broad understanding of member states who have agreed, at the occasion of the 6th Conference of European Ministers responsible for Youth of 7 – 9 November in Thessalonica, Greece, that despite considerable differences with regard to the socio-economic situation of young people in the world they need access to fundamental rights, to education, the labour market, health care, culture, technological innovations and the possibility to enjoy decent living conditions as a prerequisite for their active participation in society (cf. Final Declaration).

There is whole body of texts and declarations bearing witness to universal and European agreements on the content of youth policy such as the Final Texts of the five previous conferences of the Council of Europe, the United Nations First Conference of Ministers responsible for Youth held in 1998 in Lisbon, the reference to youth in the Declaration of the European Council in Laeken in 2001, the publication of the White Paper of the European Commission “A new impetus for European Youth” and the new co-operation in the youth field of the European Union.

Questions, which invite to further develop the issue are:

- Are young people, in Europe and worldwide, carrying a distinctly new set of values, attitudes and lifestyles? What social changes could predictably come about as a result of young peoples’ activity? What are the implications for the social and political institutions, as we know them?
- Are youth trends global and how do they translate locally in ‘Western’, as well as in the transition countries in Europe, in conflict areas and the developing world?
- How do social structures and institutions favour and/or obstruct young peoples’ influence? What strategies could help young people have more influence on social development – individually, as well as collectively?
- What are the indicators allowing to measure young peoples’ influence on social change? How does young peoples’ action or inaction alter the landscape of knowledge, work, leisure, community and power? (Cf. Report of the symposium “Youth Actor of Social Change”, European Youth Centre, Strasbourg, 12 – 16 December 2001, p. 7)
- What are the indicators to assess governance in the youth field? What is a youth policy, what does it aim at and how can its impact be highlighted in terms of accountability, effectiveness and coherence?

To provide answers to some of these questions and to contribute to the process of developing European standards for youth policy development the Council of Europe had invited a group of experts from various backgrounds but all with a research profile to meet and make policy recommendations to be addressed to the CDEJ and the Advisory Council.

The report and the recommendations are also submitted to the Directorate ‘Youth, Civil Society, Communication’ of the European Commission with the intention to contribute to the new co-operation in the youth field of the European Union as this has taken off following the publication of the White Paper on Youth. The group could make use of the Council of Europe’s international reviews of national youth policy 1997 – 2001 as analysed in Howard Williamson’s synthesis report “Supporting young people in Europe”, Strasbourg, 2002, and of previous reports of the youth research unit of the Directorate for Youth and Sport.

A What is a youth policy about?

One can locate the governing ideas of youth policy around the following:

- Learning
- Inclusion/ Social Cohesion
- Citizenship/ Participation
- Safety/Health/Well-being

As a result, youth policy should have the following **objectives** :

- a. To invest purposefully in young people in a coherent and mutually reinforcing way, wherever possible through an opportunity focused rather than problem oriented approach.
- b. To involve young people both in the strategic formulation of youth policies and in eliciting their views about the operational effectiveness of policy implementation.
- c. To create the conditions for learning, opportunity and experience which ensure and enable young people to develop the knowledge, skills and competencies to play a full part in both the labour market and in civil society.
- d. To establish systems for robust data collections both to demonstrate the effectiveness of youth policies and to reveal the extent to which ‘policy gaps’ exist in relation to effective service delivery to young people from certain social groups, in certain areas or in certain conditions.
- e. To display a commitment to reducing such ‘policy gaps’ where they demonstrably exist.

At European level youth ministers, as they have laid down in Thessalonica, would have to implement these objectives by taking stock of the following trends, which they believe are general to the situation of young people:

1. The experience, for young people of longer and more complex transitions to adult life (examples: extended full-time education and training and longer stay in parental home)
2. High youth unemployment and over-representation of young people in marginal and precarious employment.

3. High economic reliance on families and social network and support systems
4. Increasing inequalities of educational opportunity.
5. Insecurity, increasing violence suffered by youth and committed by them, fears of globalisation and the destruction of the environment; in some cases fear of armed conflict, incalculable health risks.

To understand this situation as a challenge and create a positive idea of youth policy ministers have also underlined;

1. Creativity and innovation and a tendency to understand oneself as a cultural producer, both individually and within reference groups
2. A high level of ethical standards when judging institutions both nationally and at European level indicating deep democratic convictions.
3. Active participation in community affairs, at local level and within networks and action groups
4. Open and positive attitudes to a heterogeneous Europe, standing in for cultural, ethnic and social diversity, even if intolerant social and xenophobic attitudes of some cannot be ignored. (Summary of Final Declaration).

Member states declare that these trends should be taken into account in the elaboration and implementation of youth policies and that they should secure the necessary conditions for young people and their organisations to be full partners of these policies.

B Youth policy indicators

Youth policy cannot be assessed by working with indicators alone. It is government action, based on legislation, reported to Parliament and it belongs to the public sphere. It also receives many impulses from extended interaction with civil society, namely youth organisations and networks. And it belongs to the media and the political process at large.

However, to assist the democratic process and improve good governance in the youth field a certain number of indicators, ...”stating a thing as a fact, not a conception or wish”(cf. The Concise Oxford Dictionary) can be developed both with regard to youth policy delivery, but also intended projects and programmes. Thus indicators may help with understanding the social quality of the life of young people in member countries, which then again influence the construction of youth and youth policy.

The expert group had the choice to place their understanding into the practice of working with indicators in the fields of social policy and education in OECD and the EU. Following an approach set out by OECD the group was looking for an underlying grouping of indicators such as in a life course classification like children, youth, working age etc. However, in view of the discussion about the ‘broken life-trajectories’ of many young people, the reality of parallel life-concepts and ad hoc decisions enforced by mainly economic factors, it was clear that a broader approach was needed. What remained, was a suggestion to look into all items discussed with a specific view to the categories gender, minorities and urban/rural divide.

The suggestions made by a pilot group of experts in OECD, when proposing a framework and structure for social indicators, were kept in mind:

- Promoting autonomy
- Equity (including poverty and the distribution of income)
- Healthy living (as opposed to addiction and disease)
- Social cohesion (including criminal justice)

(cf. OECD/DEELSA/ELSA (99) 11, p. 8 ff.)

The group of experts, for their field of work, suggests to understand indicators as signs or better as signals, not unlike the signals of direction of a moving vehicle, because the understanding of both policy objectives and of the central aim are themselves subject to a society in the process of change.

They propose to draw a distinction between the **indicators** of youth policy intentions and the **interpretation** of youth policy effectiveness and this in relation to the range of issues, which represent the components of youth policy (see a little later the 'package' of opportunity and experience).

Similarly to the OECD approach to social indicators and then choosing themselves an underlying group of indicators, these would have to be set out in the fields of:

- Legislation or strategic intention
- Allocation of financial resources (budget)
- The nature of interventions in areas of youth policy (either within particular Ministries or across the board of governmental organisation concerning young people)
- Mechanisms and structures for delivery (workforce scale and competence)

The youth policy interpretations would be classified in:

- Political justification (rationale; what is legal, what is legitimate, what is efficient?)
- Statistical indicators (reach)
- Qualitative illumination of the effectiveness of policy (relevance)

Trying to identify an approach, which would better describe the youth policy product (of whoever delivers it) the group of experts follows the idea of describing the youth policy process as going towards 'packages' of opportunity and experience.

These are:

- (1) Learning: (Life Long, formal and non-formal) education and training, recognition of non-formally acquired skills and competencies
- (2) Access to New Technologies
- (3) Specialist personal advice and support, career guidance
- (4) Information

- (5) Access to health services and social protection
- (6) Access to housing
- (7) Access to paid work
- (8) Mobility
- (9) Justice and youth rights (e.g. to assistance)
- (10) Opportunities to participation and active citizenship
- (11) Recreational, cultural and social
- (12) Sports and outdoor activities
- (13) Away from home, youth exchange and international experiences
- (14) Safe and secure environment

These packages correspond largely to government organisation on youth and domains administered by specific Ministries:

- Education and training
- Employment, youth employment
- Health and well-being
- Housing
- Social protection
- Family policy and child protection
- Leisure and cultural policy (sports, arts, volunteering)
- Youth justice

Cross-cutting themes are:

- Information
- Participation and active citizenship
- Power

On the question of power: this should be considered at two levels, the first one being the legal status of young people as it applies to the other cross-cutting item of participation. Can young people claim certain youth policy opportunity packages for themselves? On measures imposed on them – can they veto them? This point should also come back within ‘distinct and incorporate youth policy’. The other level of the power item concerns the budgets put at the disposal of special youth policy measures: when are they enlarged, when are they cut back? Does this mainly refer to local policies, does it intervene into ministerial domains? Are these movements co-ordinated or separate? What is the ‘hard core’ of youth policy items in budget terms – what cannot be touched and how can youth budgets be defended in legal terms?

Youth policy being value based, these underpinning values, principles and philosophy are:

- Human rights
- Equality of opportunity
- Multiculturalism, heterogeneity of the population
- Access and inclusion

Distinct youth policy and incorporated youth policy

Some public policy is clearly identified as being focused exclusively on young people (e.g. schooling, youth work, careers' guidance); other policy, which affects young people, is subsumed within wider youth policy (social welfare and family policy, housing). And other policy again, in between, consists of public policy frameworks with sub-sections having an approach tailored towards young people (violence prevention, criminal justice).

Universal and specialist policy

Policy approaches will inevitably be segmented and differently structured, whatever the extent of cross-sectoral and 'holistic' rhetoric. The experts' group works on the understanding of a combination; youth policy thus being a mainstream policy covering many fields of governance and, at the same time, a specific set of government actions, usually generated in dialogue with civil society, and aimed at working best with the resource young people represent for the benefit of society as a whole and for young people in the first place.

In this understanding the location of particular policies may be relatively unimportant; the question is always, whether policies reach those young people who need them and for whom they may be specifically directed. What is clear is that, for individual young people, there is a close interconnection between aspects of their lives, which are separated in policy delivery (e.g. educational participation, family circumstances, health conditions, delinquency) . Some young people seem to need more 'joined-up' policy intervention than others, as a result of their specific circumstances and behaviour (problems experienced and problems caused) and this comes in on top of policy activity, which is required for all young people.

C Specific youth policy approaches

Delivery mechanisms

The 'delivery' of youth policy may take a variety of forms – from centralised state direction to federalist sharing of competencies, from devolution to local community responsibility and from a 'government only' approach to engaging NGOs or subcontracting companies. It is quite likely to be a 'mixed market', both across and within elements of youth policy, with central government retaining control on whatever method of delivery through other bodies or civil society organism they have chosen. Different arrangements may or may not work well. This is precisely an area for developing policy assessment questions, because the delivery mechanism influences directly questions around access and inclusion.

Diversity and sophistication of interventions

Youth policy within different policy arenas may be delivered with a sophisticated array of initiatives, located in different contexts and directed at different sub-groups of young people. Alternatively, it may be a little more a 'blunt instrument' – one measure for all.

Philosophical compliance

Youth policy in particular policy arenas may comply to different degrees with the underlying principles and philosophy, which should inform its development and practice. Hence the need to establish the political rationale for specific forms of policy development and to evaluate its position on a continuum from an opportunity-focused perspective to one, which is essentially problem-oriented (e.g. combating racism and discrimination).

The assumption of universal effectiveness

The assumption is that, if policies are developed effectively to meet the needs of young people, then their needs will be met. A comprehensive and effective youth policy will keep young people 'in good shape' during their adolescence and equip them with the skills for successful 'life-management' in their young adulthood. This is clearly an utopian assumption and there will be obstructions and weaknesses in any policy designed to address those needs. It is this 'shortfall' in the effectiveness of policies, which the group refers to as 'policy gap'.

Similar assumptions concern policy aims such as full employment, quality education for all, a non-discriminatory society, European unity, a healthy environment and the 'pursuit of happiness' (US constitution). Societal conventions and agreements suggest these policy aims, not to pursue them is considered politically 'incorrect' and one can surely talk of societal progress for every inch that these concrete utopian aims are brought nearer to daily reality. However, the 'policy gap' will exist and needs description in order to assess effectiveness within realistic terms.

The 'policy gap'

As described, the 'policy gap' is the extent to which the effectiveness of youth policies deviates from the universal assumption. The reasons for this 'policy gap' may be: resource constraints, inappropriate structures, an absence of a suitably skilled workforce, a poorly designed policy, unrealistic objectives, or an absence of a sufficiently broad range of measures. This list is not exhaustive; but different reasons for the 'policy gap' may overlap. Moreover this gap may affect different sub-groups of young people to a different degree: hence there may be disproportionately negative consequences for groups such as rural young people, minorities, those who leave school prematurely or young women. The resultant policy challenge will be, how to improve the 'package of opportunity and experience' to ensure that access to it is created for such disproportionately disadvantaged groups of young people.

D Recommendations on the use of indicators when assessing youth policy

PACKAGES OF OPPORTUNITY AND EXPERIENCE

Aims of youth policy as they are laid down in the Final Texts of Youth Ministers' Conferences, the White Paper on Youth and the international reviews of national youth policy are not of binding quality in terms of international law. However, they describe reliably a set of intentions which corresponds to the 'packages

of opportunity and experience’ and thus, in a way, the youth policy product as it has emerged during the last ten years. ‘Packages of opportunity and experience’ bridge youth policy gaps, which need to be identified first. They have to be met by central government, local communities, regional units and the civil society. Reachable aims, corresponding to the packages as listed in B (1) to (14) are:

D A AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF YOUTH POLICY

- (1) The number of young people active in Life Long Learning, both in formal and non-formal education, and indiscriminate of gender, origin and social and cultural background shall increase. Qualifications acquired in structured and curriculum based non-formal education offers shall be recognised as part of Life Long Learning.
- (2) The number of young people having access to New Technologies and being trained in using them to the best of their advantage shall increase.
- (3) The proportion of young people in member countries who receive specialist personal advice and support and vocational guidance shall increase.
- (4) The number of youth information centres, youth information services in the media and youth information contact points in member countries and the proportion of young people making good use of this offer shall increase.
- (5) The number of young people decided to live a healthy lifestyle shall increase and so shall the health and social protection services providing guidance and assistance.
- (6) The proportion of local authorities, which in co-operation with central government care for creating access to suitable housing schemes for young people shall increase.
- (7) The number of young people finding access to paid work must increase.
- (8) The number of opportunities of mobility of young people in order to enlarge their intercultural and personal experiences and their professional qualifications shall increase.
- (9) The number of countries introducing a specific youth legislation and practicing a youth justice system shall increase.
- (10) The number of central and local government measures aimed at giving young people real opportunities to practice active citizenship, to participate in public life and to use freedom of speech and association shall increase.
- (11) The opportunities for young people to take part in recreational and cultural opportunities and/or to become active in social and voluntary services shall increase.
- (12) Occasions to practice sport and outdoor activities shall increase, and where they do not exist yet, be created.
- (13) Young people shall be given opportunities for stays away from home from a very young age and their proportion to

take part in international exchanges in the forms of both studies and practical experiences shall increase.

- (14) The proportion of young people who are victims of crime and violent acts and the proportion of young people who are perpetrators of violence shall decrease.

D B RECOMMENDATIONS ON YOUTH RESEARCH

- (15) Evidence based policy making is only possible if the evidence is available and accessible. European youth research, as the evidential reference for European youth policy-making, must currently work with a highly uneven and disparate information and knowledge base. Comprehensive, coherent and co-ordinated policies and action in favour of young people throughout Europe require comprehensive, coherent and co-ordinated evidence and expertise. In this respect, and to improve the quantity, quality and balance of information and knowledge about young people it is recommended to establish a comprehensive European database and a regular reporting system and to support European youth research by structured co-operation between the Council of Europe and the European Commission. The partnership agreement on youth research between the Commission and the Council of Europe represents a significant step forward.

- (16) The Cultural Convention of the Council of Europe comprises 48 signatory parties. These vary substantially in their collections of statistics on young people. It is still a long way to arrive at the comprehensive European database on young people recommended above. When using data one should not insist on absolute comparability, because this would be unrealistic. Instead, data should be used which have proven comparable in a reasonable high number of member countries. Also, the UN Human Development Index (HDI) should be used for young people as a subgroup to general population studies (Cf. International review of Lithuania, 2002)

- (17) The Council of Europe invites all European and international organisations working with youth policy indicators (EU, OECD, World Bank, UNESCO) to enter into dialogue and exchange on the feasibility of the approach suggested here, its potential for further development, its 'political wisdom' and its appropriateness in term of practical use and efficiency in knowledge production on young people in Europe and the world at large. This dialogue must include youth organisations and the civil society at large as well as the business community. A European conference of experts

on indicators and their use in European youth studies is proposed for 2004, within the partnership agreement between the European Commission and the Council of Europe on youth research.

D C RECOMMENDATIONS ON YOUTH POLICY INDICATORS

- (18) Indicators are meant to show what countries are doing for young people and how they are doing this. They need to be appropriate to describe both governmental measures and activities of civil society and the market, and moreover, the interaction between them.
- (19) Indicators have to serve political postulates of good governance such as accountability, effectiveness, coherence and transparency.
- (20) Indicators, youth policy interpretation and youth policy components are different dimensions of understanding and conceptualising youth policy. These dimensions inform each other and are a prerequisite for the construction of youth policy ‘packages of opportunity and experience’. Scope and content of these packages need to bridge the gap between intended youth policy objectives and concrete achievements.
- (21) All youth policy indicators should be broken down by gender, minority/majority status and urban/rural divide.
- (22) Indicators need to show within the mechanism of implementation and delivery of youth policy, how the arrangements within member countries promote access and inclusion or, how they fail in achieving this objective.
- (23) Any use of indicators needs to be made subject of an ‘intercultural examination’, considering the development of youth policy in a country by using knowledge related to historic understanding, religious and cultural norms and habits, effects of long lasting styles of governance of a very recent past, economic facts and figures before being used in reviewing youth policy in a country. In other words, indicators need to be attuned to situations and processes, without ever leaving the core understanding of youth policy to be democratic, value based and promoting gender equality and minority rights.
- (24) It is desirable that ongoing work on indicators in the Council of Europe should become part of the guidelines on the production of national youth policy reports and international reviews as well as of the youth policy advisory missions. Indicators should also be used within the new policy of the European Union following the publication of the White Paper “A new impetus for European youth”.

ANNEXE 1

MATERIALS USED DURING THE THREE MEETINGS:

- 1) "Youth Policy Macro-Indicators – A Reflection on Meta-Evaluation", Paper 7 pp. Ola STAFSENG, Department of Education, University of Oslo, Strasbourg, December 2002
- 2) 6th Conference of European Ministers responsible for Youth, Thessalonica, Greece, 7 – 9 November 2002, Report, Strasbourg, 12 December 2002, CDEJ (2003)2
- 3) Consultative Meeting on Youth Policy Indicators, Budapest, European Youth Centre, 1 – 2 July 2002, Report, Strasbourg 23 August 2002 DJS/YR/YPI(2002)1
- 4) "Youth – Actor of Social Change", Symposium, Strasbourg, European Youth Centre, Report, July 2002 DJS/Symp/YASC
- 5) "Young Voices Seminar", Council of Europe and UNICEF, 19 – 20 November 2001, Report submitted by Malcolm HILL and Beate SCHERRER, Centre for the Child and Society, University of Glasgow
- 6) "Young Voices", Opinion Survey of Children and Young people in Europe and Central Asia, UNICEF 2001
- 7) "Social Indicators: A Proposed Framework and Structure", OECD 23 September 1999, DEELSA/ELSA (99)11
- 8) "European benchmarks in education and training: follow-up to the Lisbon European Council", Brussels, 20 November 2002 COM(2002)629 final
- 9) Draft recommendation on the promotion and recognition of non-formal education/learning of young people (revised) Strasbourg, 21 January 2003 CDEJ (2003) 7
- 10) SWOT Analysis in "National Action Plan for Youth", Romania, Bucharest, revised version, 2003
- 11) "Swedish Youth 2002" – Second Year Follow-up of the National Youth Policy, Summary of Report 2002:5, The Swedish National Board for Youth Affairs, Stockholm 2002
- 12) "A new impetus for European youth" – European Commission, White Paper on Youth, European Communities 2002
- 13) "Exploring the European youth mosaic" – The social situation of young people in Europe – Lynne CHISHOLM and Sikya KOVACHEVA, Council of Europe, September 2002
- 14) "Supporting young people in Europe" – Principles, policy and practice – Howard WILLIAMSON, Council of Europe, October 2002
- 15) Specific papers and presentations:

Peter WOOTSCH : 13410s (Thirteen for Teens) Youth Conference for the candidate countries to the European Union, Budapest 18 – 21 April 2002 – questionnaire and data collection – results

Peter WOOTSCH: An interactive model of government and civil society relations in the field of youth

Howard WILLIAMSON : Youth Policy contributions – the scope – an opportunity focused understanding of youth policy – the power problem (driving forces)

Peter LAURITZEN: Youth Policy levels of action – objectives, definitions, areas, delivery.

ANNEXE 2

The following annexes are examples on the use of indicators as practised in the group of experts. They are by no means as elaborate as they should be; but they show the direction (like an indicator should) and they are complementary to one each other. Annexe 3 takes by and large the list of packages of opportunities and experience (11 items instead of 14 because some issues are also domains in that approach) and relates them to issues, interpretation and implementation (see explanatory note). Annexe 4 consists of a list of ‘crude indicators’, which are then related to a system framework, participation/access levels and differential engagement. Experts also talked of a ‘crashing the door ‘ approach, because what they wanted first, was to determine one indicator to access the item, before working on a more refined system (an example used was access to car transport as a crude indicator for poverty). Annexes 5 – 7 are lists of questions directed to issues, which is a logical step to take once the indicators are clarified.

In any case, the purpose of this exercise is not to give impressions of measurability where maybe nothing can be measured in social science terms. The aim of working with indicators is to raise the level of understanding of a problem faced, break it down into levels where solutions can be found and direct discussions and practices concerning implementation. The expert group made the experience that in the end they could even quantify more items than they had originally imagined and that this was in no way contradictory to the ‘qualifying’ school of thinking they largely came from. The system in annexe 3 can be easily modified and further developed, as the system in annexe 4 can be completely reinvented; ideally one should work with the two approaches.

ANNEXE 3

Explanatory Note:

The model being proposed is based on the inter-relationship that exists among three basic elements of a youth policy, that is, **issues, interpretation and implementation**.

The grid is intended to act as an aid for a refined evaluation / assessment of the policy in terms of coherence, collaboration among the relevant domains, and the actual implementation of the policy.

Domains are those government and non-government institutions which are largely responsible for the conservation of a cross-sectoral ‘youth’ strand in all policies.

Issues may be described as those areas and / or settings of opportunity and experience which contribute towards young people’s personal, social and political education.

The interpretation given to the overall strategy to be adopted may be supported by a set of three universal concepts that can be used for each of the eleven ‘issues’ listed. ‘Participation’, ‘Equity’ and ‘Cohesion’ are the underlying concepts for a solid, co-ordinated and coherent policy, where competent influence, fairness, consistency and conformity prevail.

In the **implementation** process, the actual delivery of ‘goods’ needs careful consideration. Therefore, the process is being presented in a three-dimensional strand, namely, **objectives, method** and **indicators**. While the objectives and indicators require concurrent development, the method and the indicators, in turn, may, to some extent be pre-empted. So that, the model includes a few examples of what one may aim to achieve. The last three columns of the grid, with the exception of the first issue (Learning), have been left blank for consideration by the youth policy developers.

ISSUES (Themes)	DOMAINS (Administration)	INTERPRETATION (Concepts)	IMPLEMENTATION (Process)		
			OBJECTIVES *	METHOD	INDICATORS *
1. LEARNING: (Lifelong; formal and non-formal) Education and Training	1. Education and training 2. Employment 3. Health and well-being 4. Leisure and cultural policy 5. Youth Justice 6. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion	* to be defined and developed (in conjunction with indicators) in a participatory process involving all stakeholders/beneficiaries at a national level.	Such as: 1. Financial and Human Resources 2. Structures 3. Legislation 4. Research (qualitative and quantitative)	* to be defined and level Such as: 1. Attendance 2. Enrolment rate 3. Success rate 4. On-going evaluation results
2. Access to new technologies	1. Education and training 2. Employment 3. Leisure and cultural policy	Participation Equity Cohesion		

3. Specialist personal advice and support	1. Education and training 2. Employment 3. Health and well-being 4. Housing 5. Social Protection 6. Family policy and child protection 7. Leisure and cultural policy 8. Youth Justice 9. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion		
4. Information	1. Education and training 2. Employment 3. Health and well-being 4. Housing 5. Social Protection 6. Family policy and child protection 7. Leisure and cultural policy 8. Youth Justice 9. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion		

5. Access to health and social protection	1. Education and training 2. Health and well-being 3. Social Protection 4. Family policy and child protection 5. Leisure and cultural policy	Participation Equity Cohesion		
6. Access to housing	1. Housing 2. Social Protection 3. Family policy and child protection	Participation Equity Cohesion		
7. Opportunities for participation and active citizenship	1. Education and training 2. Leisure and cultural policy 3. Employment 4. Health and well-being 5. Social Protection 6. Family policy and child protection 7. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion		

8. Recreational, cultural and social opportunities	1. Leisure and cultural policy 2. Education and training 3. Family policy and child protection 4. Health and well-being 5. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion		
9. Sports and outdoor activities	1. Education and training 2. Health and well-being 3. Leisure and cultural policy 4. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion		
10. Away from home, youth exchange and international experiences	1. Education and training 2. Employment 3. Social protection 4. Leisure and cultural policy	Participation Equity Cohesion		

11. Safe and secure environment	1. Education and training 2. Family protection and child protection 3. Leisure and cultural policy 4. Youth Justice 5. Environment	Participation Equity Cohesion		
---------------------------------	---	--	---------------------------------	--	--

ANNEXE 4

CRUDE INDICATORS

Youth Policy Indicators – a basis for dialogue “Crashing the door”

System framework 1	Participation/access levels 2	Differential engagement 3
Learning, Training and Employment System/structure for vocational training and labour market entry	% achieving a recognised (academic or vocational) qualification <u>beyond</u> compulsory schooling (PISA) (OECD) (Eurobarometer)	% drop-out before end of compulsory schooling proportion of youth unemployment to all unemployment % who get jobs after training
Opportunities for recognised achievement	Systems for the <u>recognition</u> of out-of-school “skills”	
Access to new technologies	A) % of households with anybody aged 30 or under with a computer B) %of schools/youth centres	% of teenagers who have never used a computer (public locations) with computers and internet access
Careers special advice and guidance	A) system of specialist service B) ratio of specialist professionals to young people (caseload levels)	
Personal information advice and support	System for making such provision % of young people using the system	(shops, media, technology, youth card etc) – complex -
Advice and access to health, <u>housing</u> and social protection	Access within x weeks to appropriate services Eg mental health, drugs treatment	Mortality rate? Teenage mothers
	STIS Hostels/emergency accommodation Housing programmes	Homelessness
	Benefits	Prospects
Opportunities for participation and citizenship	Youth councils/structures Curriculum content? (informal education)	Voting patterns
Recreational and social opportunities (activities) sports events and outdoor experiences	Infrastructure of clubs, organisations	
Away from home, youth exchange and international experiences	Framework of provision – by whom?	% of young people who have never been “away from home”
Local mobility (transport) is there a system to support and establish access to services and opportunities (connections)		

Special Provision							
Youth Justice responsibility Distinctive system? Age of criminal	Custody rates within that system						
Military/Community Service?							
Family Policy Parenting and public care strategies	% of teenagers in public care						
Child prosecution learning in care							
entitlement/ <u>Law</u> veto, choice enshrined	Legislative rights <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="padding: 5px;">YES</th> <th style="padding: 5px;">NO</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 5px;">?</td> <td style="padding: 5px;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	YES	NO	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
YES	NO						
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						
?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						

A process for consultation

Key challenges
Issues
Problems

Framework for Youth Policy
What do they do?

Indicators Test ...

Policy gap?

Mechanisms for resolution:
data needs
infrastructure (delivery and implementation)
workforce development (training)

Resource and political implications?

Change and development

ANNEXE 5

ACCESS TO LABOUR MARKET

All info by gender /minorities/rural-urban

What key skills, minimum qualifications do you consider necessary for young people to access the labour market?

How many young people have achieved this?

What vocational training opportunities are there?

In a “real” working environment
In schools/institutions

Any special measures to increase the percentage of young people with minimum skills/qualifications?

Starting points:

Level of youth unemployment: detailed data

Age
Average duration
Revolving

Counselling information/services at local level

What unemployment schemes are available and who runs them? Regional availability?

Are there active labour market measures for youth policy?

How many young people migrate for work?

Internally
Abroad

Any research on the percentage of young people entering the labour market after unemployment schemes?

Effectiveness of vocational training. Percentage of young people getting a job?

Are there apprenticeship schemes? Percentage of young people getting a job?

How is information on job opportunities disseminated?

How are these services used by young people?
What are the results of using them?

Are there laws and programmes targetting young people with special needs?

Are there anti-discrimination measures for young women and minorities?

Are unemployment schemes voluntary or compulsory?

Which are the target groups/criteria for voluntary/compulsory schemes?

Are there self-employment schemes or initiatives for and by young people?

Are they supported by governments?

Are there recognised NFE programmes? How efficient are they?

ANNEXE 6

ACCESS TO INFORMATION

Gender, minorities, rural-urban

What are the basic information outlets?

What kind of information is available?

Is it “youth-friendly”? (language format)

Is there a youth information policy or strategy?

(structures, tools, data on internet access- private/public) – e-info

face to face

basic info outlets

yp participation in deciding

content

E-literacy and E-illiteracy:

Young people’s capacity to retrieve relevant information – education for it?

What informal information systems exist (SMS, chats, ...): figures?

What NFE programmes contribute to youth information (eg peer education)?

Do young people feel “informed”?

Are there targetted information measures for specific groups of young people?

What role do youth NGOs play in distributing information to young people?

Percentage of young people using information services/visiting centres/websites....?

What kind of information do they seek?

Budget allocated to youth information?

Is there a cost to young people?

Where?

How much?

For what?

ANNEXE 7

ACCESS TO LEISURE-TIME OPPORTUNITIES

Gender, minorities, rural-urban

Are the government and local authorities offering:

- Safe spaces (youth centres, sports facilities, ...)?
- Programmes (social, cultural activities, NFE, voluntary service, civic ...)?
- Access, mobility?

Are they free of charge?

Percentage of young people participating in them

Is the govt/local authority facilitating young people's access to "commercial" leisure-time opportunities?

Are NGOs and young people involved in the conception and delivery of the services and how is it organised?

What long-term opportunities do NGOs offer?

What additional policies are connected to young people's leisure-time environment?:

- Safety negotiations
- Transport
- Drug and STD prevention

How is the quality of long-term programmes/facilities controlled? Measuring output
Eg professionalisation of youth workers
Participation/steering of young people

How is education integrated in leisure-time activities?

How much leisure time do young people have?

- School- youths
- Working youths (part/full time)
- Unemployed
- Volunteers
- Family responsibilities

ANNEXE 8

EXPERTS ON YOUTH POLICY INDICATORS

Meetings

1-2 July 2002

European Youth Centre Budapest

17-18 December 2002

26 – 27 March 2003

European Youth Centre Strasbourg

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

AUSTRIA – AUTRICHE

Ms Sylvia TRNKA

Coordinator of the European Observatory on the
Social Situation, Demography and Family

Gonzagagasse 19/8

A – 1010 WIEN

Tel: 41 1 535 14 54

Fax: 43 1 535 14 55

E-mail: sylvia.trnka@oif.ac.at

BELGIUM - BELGIQUE

Ms Anna SELLBERG

Policy Officer Youth Policy in Europe
European Youth Forum

Rue Joseph II 120

B – 1000 Bruxelles

Tel: 32 2 286 94 25

Mob : 32 476 92 49 17

Fax: 32 2 230 21 23

E-mail: anna.sellberg@youthforum.org

Ms Roisin Mc CABE

Rue Joseph II Straat 120

B – 1000 Bruxelles

Tel: 32 2 230 64 90

Fax: 32 2 230 21 23

E-mail: roisin.mccabe@youthforum.org

FRANCE

Mr Jean-Charles LAGREE
IRESCO – ULISS
59-61, rue Pouchet
F – 75849 PARIS CEDEX 17
Tel : 33(0)1 40 25 12 28
Fax : 33(0) 1 40 25 10 14
E-mail : lagree@ext.jussieu.fr

GERMANY – ALLEMAGNE

Mr Andreas WALTHER
IRIS e.V.
Fuerststrasse 3
D – 72072 TUEBINGEN
Tel: +49 7071 7952060
Fax: +49 7071 7952077
E-mail: andreas.walther@iris-egris.de

HUNGARY - HONGRIE

Mr Péter WOOTSCH
Szinyei Merse Pál utca u. 1
H – 1063 BUDAPEST
Tel: +36 1 372 06 62
Fax: +36 1 372 06 51
E-mail: wootsch@sziget.hu

IRELAND - IRLANDE

Mr James DOORLEY
National Youth Council of Ireland
3 Montague Street
Dublin 2
IRELAND
Tel: 353 462 4216
Fax: 353 147 84122
E-mail: doorley007@yahoo.com

LITHUANIA - LITHUANIE

Ms Vaida JASIUKAITYTE
Civil servant, Researcher
State Council for Youth Affairs
Via Buffalmecco 6A/A9
Piane di Mugnone
I – 50014 Fiesede (FI)
Tel :+39 340 980 25 12
Fax : +
E-mail : vaida.jasiukaityte@vjrt.lt

MALTA – MALTE

Dr Anthony AZZOPARDI
Youth Studies Programme
University of Malta
MSIDA MSD 06
Malta
Tel/Fax: + 356 32 90 29 18
E-mail: anthony.e.azzopardi@um.edu.mt

NORWAY - NORVEGE

Mr Ola STAFSENG
Department of Education
University of Oslo
PO Box 1092 Blindern
N – 0317 OSLO
Tel: +47 22858153
Fax: +47 22854250
E-mail: ola.stafseng@ped.uio.no

SLOVENIA - SLOVENIE

Ms Tanja RENER
Faculty of Social Sciences
Centre for Social Psychology-Youth Studies
P.O. Box 47/Kardeljeva ploščad 5
SLO – 61109 LJUBLJANA
Tel: 386 1 2518813
E-mail: tanja.rener@guest.arnes.si

SWEDEN - SUEDE

Mr Lars HARTVIGSON
PRONI
Strömsburgs Gard
S – 533 OP JÖNKÖPING
Fax: 46 36 186300
E-mail: lars.hartvigson@telia.com

UNITED KINGDOM - ROYAUME-UNI

Mr Howard WILLIAMSON
Cardiff University
Glamorgan Building
King Edward VII Avenue
Cardiff CF 10 3WT
Wales
Tel: +44 29 20 875 238
Fax: +44 29 20 874 175
E-mail: williamsonhj@cardiff.ac.uk

Ms Bryony HOSKINS
CRICT – Brunel University
32 Reading Rd, Wokingham,
Berks, RG41 1EH
United Kingdom
Tel: 44 1189791015
E-mail: BryonyHoskins@hotmail.com

EUROPEAN AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

Ms Sabine DETZEL
UNESCO, Section for Youth
7, Place de Fontenoy
F – 75352 PARIS 07 SP
Rel : 33 1 45 68 14 60
Fax : 33 1 45 68 57 90
E-mail: s.detz@unesco.org

Ms Maria Helena HENRIQUES-MUELLER
UNESCO
7, Place de Fontenoy
F – 75732 PARIS CEDEX 15
Fax : 01 45 67 16 90
E-mail:
mh.henriques-mueller@unesco.org

Mr Hans-Joachim SCHILD

European Commission

Rue de la Loi, 200

B – 1049 Brussels

E-mail : Hans-Joachim.SCHILD@cec.eu.int

Directorate of Youth and Sport

European Youth Centre

30, rue Pierre de Coubertin

F – 67075 STRASBOURG CEDEX

Tel: +33 (0)3 88 41 23 00

Fax: +33 (0)3 88 41 27 77

<http://www.coe.int/youth>

Mr Peter LAURITZEN

Head of Department

Tel: + 33 (0)3 88 41 22 93

E-mail: peter.lauritzen@coe.int

Ms Vincenza QUATTRONE-BUTLER

Administrative Assistant

Tel : +33 (0)3 88 41 22 94

E-mail : vincenza.quattrone@coe.int