

2006

# Final Project Report: Plan for a Model PIMS

Christopher J. O'Leary  
*W.E. Upjohn Institute, [oleary@upjohn.org](mailto:oleary@upjohn.org)*

Lillian Vesic-Petrovic  
*W.E. Upjohn Institute*

Upjohn Institute Technical Report No. 07-021

---

## Citation

O'Leary, Christopher J., and Lillian Vesic-Petrovic. 2006. "Final Project Report: Plan for a Model PIMS." Upjohn Institute Technical Report No. 07-021. Kalamazoo, MI: W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. <https://doi.org/10.17848/tr07-021>

This title is brought to you by the Upjohn Institute. For more information, please contact [ir@upjohn.org](mailto:ir@upjohn.org).

# Final Project Report: Plan for a Model PIMS

Upjohn Institute Technical Report No. 07-021

Development of the performance information and management system (PIMS) to monitor labor market outcomes of program participants, and guide program management of active labor market programs (ALMPs)

Task 1 in Component 3: Labor Market Monitoring and Evaluation in the Employment Promotion Project for the Ministry of Labor Employment and Social Policy, Republic of Serbia

May, 2006

*Prepared for:*

National Employment Service  
Kralja Milutina 8  
11000 Belgrade  
Republic of Serbia

Svetlana Aksentijevic, Project Coordinator  
saksentijevic@rztr.co.yu

*Prepared by:*

Christopher J. O'Leary and Lillian Vesic-Petrovic  
W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
300 South Westnedge Avenue  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007, USA  
oleary@upjohn.org; petrovic@upjohn.org

## Table of Contents

### 1. Background

1.1 What is the Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS)?

1.2 Stages of the PIMS Project

1.3 Contents of this Report

### 2. Performance Indicators

3. Active Labor Market Programs in Pilot PIMS

4. Sources of Data for PIMS

5. Reporting PIMS Results: Bulletin

6. Using Results from PIMS

7. Future Use and Refinement of PIMS

## Appendices

A. Program of Study Tour to Hungary

B. Sample Design for Pilot Tests of Questionnaires

C. Brief Descriptions of ALMPs Included in PIMS

D. PIMS questionnaires

E. PIMS Training Manual

F. Blueprint for a PIMS Bulletin

## 1. Background

### 1.1 What is the Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS)?

The Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS) provides a mechanism for measuring the achievement of goals for Active Labor Market Programs (ALMPs) operated in the Republic of Serbia. The central goal for all ALMPs is—maximum employment at reasonable cost. The PIMS focuses on outcomes rather than inputs. It can be a basis for decentralized decision making in program management while preserving accountability. The PIMS can also be a basis for planning and evaluation of ALMPs. PIMS provides a consistent compilation of information about participation and labor market success resulting from ALMPs in all regions on a regular basis. It facilitates comparisons across programs and geographic labor markets.

The National Employment Service (NES) in the Republic of Serbia operates a full range of active and passive labor market programs. The model PIMS summarized in this report spans a limited range of programs. The ALMPs included in the model PIMS were chosen because they: (1) are important to the policy aims of the Ministry of Labor Employment and Social Policy (MOLESP) and the NES; (2) span the range of computational challenges for PIMS; (3) are regularly used in the project pilot sites.

The performance indicators in the PIMS rely on information combined from both administrative data systems and special supplementary sources. To minimize the administrative burden of producing PIMS reports, existing administrative data is fully utilized in PIMS. Minimal supplementary data focused on labor market outcomes is gathered by brief follow-up surveys of ALMP participants and employers. Program follow-up is conducted six months after program exit, or six months after compulsory employment retention by subsidized employers. Results of PIMS measurement will be compiled semi-annually and summarized in a PIMS Bulletin reporting on program participation and labor market success nationally and in twenty-five separate administrative regions where the NES operates programs.

### 1.2 Stages of the PIMS Project

The model PIMS for ALMPs administered by the Serbian NES was completed during a twelve month period beginning in May, 2005. The project began with a study tour of performance measurement practices used by the Hungarian National Employment Organization and ending with a final written report submitted by the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research. Following is a synopsis of the main events in the project:

#### 1.2.1 Study Tour to Hungary--May, 2005

Hosted by the Hungarian National Employment Center, a study tour about performance measurement was conducted in Hungary during May, 2005. The program for the study tour appears in Appendix A to this report. The Serbian delegation participating in the tour included:

Dejan Nikolic, NES Chief of Staff

Svetlana Aksentijevic, Head, NES Department of Analysis and Statistics

Gordana Gruborovic, Director, NES Legal Department  
Snezana Mirkovic, Director, NES Finance Department  
Milan Djuretanovic, Specialist, NES IT Department

The Hungarian program was organized and hosted by experts in the Hungarian National Employment Center:

Gyorgy Lazar, Head, Department of Analysis and Statistics  
Geza Kovacs, Head, International Department  
Ferenc Peter, Deputy Director, National Employment Center

Participants from the W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research were:

Christopher O'Leary, Senior Economist  
Lillian Vesic-Petrovic, Research Analyst

The study tour provided a strong foundation for establishing a PIMS in Serbia. A PIMS has operated continuously in Hungary for ALMPs since 1994. The study tour included examination of the following:

- Establishment of the Hungarian PI system
- Further refinement of the Hungarian PI system
- Use of results from the PI system for management of programs
- Use of results from the PI system for shaping policy
- Plans for further development of the PI system
- Efforts to harmonize the PI system with European Union standards
- Employment research based on data from the PI system
- Related projects for program evaluation
- A presentation by Ministry staff responsible for compiling PI results
- Visits to regional and local office staff compiling results

All of the Serbian delegates participating in the Hungarian study tour contributed significantly to the Serbian PIMS project. The study tour provided a firm understanding of the principles involved and the value of a PIMS system in practice. Strong working relationships were established during the study tour which benefitted later stages of the project.

#### 1.2.2 Mission to Serbia--May, 2005

Immediately following the study tour to Hungary, the Upjohn Institute project team visited Serbia with the aim of completing the following objectives:

- Establish an administrative structure for the project
- Organize a PIMS project supervisory committee
- Identify a PIMS project coordinator
- Establish a PIMS project team in Serbia
- Start work at pilot site
- Select ALMPs for the model PIMS
- Identify goals for ALMPs

Agree on common performance indicators (PI) for ALMPs  
Identify existing sources of consistent data for PIMS computation  
Identify informational gaps for PIMS computation  
Draft questionnaires follow-up surveys for ALMPs

### 1.2.3 An Administrative Structure for the Project

Overall administrative authority for the project is vested in Ms. Ljiljana Dzuver, Director of the World Bank Project Implementation Unit (PIU) in the Ministry of Labor, Employment, and Social Policy (MOLESP). Ms. Dzuver supervised the project with guidance from the project supervisory committee and the project coordinator.

The PIMS supervisory committee is:

Dragan Djukic, NES (Head of Committee)  
Dejan Nikolic, NES  
Dragan Golusin, Ministry of Labor and Social Policy

The PIMS project team:

Svetlana Aksentijevic, NES (Project Coordinator)  
Milan Djuretanovic, NES, IT Department  
Goran Mitic, Nis County NES  
Predrag Jovicevic, Nis County NES  
Zorica Gavrilov, Pancevo County NES  
Ankica Todorov, Pancevo County NES  
Momira Vlajin, Belgrade County NES

These teams were assembled during the first project mission to Serbia in May, 2005.

### 1.2.4 Pilot Tests of Follow-up Surveys

Following the May, 2005 mission to Serbia, draft questionnaires for a selected subset of programs were finalized. Pilot tests of these questionnaires were conducted in Belgrade, Pancevo, and Nis. The sampling plan for pilot testing of the questionnaires appears in Appendix B to this report.

### 1.2.5 Mission to Serbia--June, 2005

The Upjohn team of worked in Serbia during the middle of June, 2005 and accomplished the following tasks:

Reviewed pilot tests of surveys in Belgrade, Nis and Pancevo  
Revised PIMS follow-up questionnaires based on pilot tests  
Proposed a computational strategy for PIMS  
Began drafting a manual for PIMS training

### 1.2.6 PIMS Training Manual and Workshop--October, 2005

During October, 2006 the Upjohn PIMS team worked with the Serbian PIMS project team to conduct a two day workshop in Belgrade on the PIMS system. Notable contributions to preparation for the workshop were made by Svetlana Aksentiejevic and Milan Djuretanovic. The workshop was a forum of experts from throughout Serbia who reviewed PIMS concepts, data sources, and survey methods. A preliminary outline for the PIMS Bulletin was discussed, and an integrated plan was presented for managing ALMPs based on evidence about program performance from the PIMS.

Based on comments made during the Workshop, the PIMS questionnaires were revised and resubmitted. In November, 2005 a draft for the PIMS Bulletin was submitted. Based on suggestions from the project team a revised version of the PIMS Bulletin was prepared. An appendix to the PIMS Bulletin clarifying procedures for computation was then delivered.

### 1.2.7 PIMS Final Oral Report--February, 2006

On February 1, 2006 the Upjohn team including Dr. Christopher O'Leary, Dr. Randall Eberts, and Ms. Ljiljana Vesic-Petrovic presented an oral summary report on the PIMS project. The presentation was attended by:

Mr. Radovan xxxx, NES Director  
Ms. Svetlxxx xxxx, Deputy Director of the MOLSP  
Dr. Jan Rutkowski, Senior Economist, World Bank  
Ms. Ljiljana Dzuver, Director of the World Bank Project Implementation Unit

Also in attendance were several NES regional office directors including the directors of offices in Belgrade, Nis, and Pancevo.

The February presentation benefitted from the preliminary PIMS survey experience of Ms. Kosovka Ognjenovic of the Economic and Social Policy Institute (ESPI) in Belgrade. Ms. Ognjenovic provided the Upjohn team with data from surveys of program participants. Evidence from the surveys illuminated their value relative to inference from data in the public register of job seekers.

### 1.3 Contents of this Report

To provide full documentation of the project to develop a model PIMS system for Serbia this final report presents a summary of the principles, products and uses of PIMS system. It also assembles the main products produced by the project. The appendices to this report present: (A) the Hungarian study tour agenda, (B) sample design for pilot testing PIMS surveys, (C) brief descriptions of ALMPs included in PIMS, (D) PIMS questionnaires, (E) PIMS Training Manual, and (F) PIMS Bulletin.

## 2. Performance Indicators

The ALMPs operated in the Republic of Serbia include a wide range of employment programs aimed at increasing the job readiness of the unemployed and increasing job opportunities. These programs include a wide variety of skill training, subsidies for employers to hire, and help for self-employment. The goals for particular programs can differ because the target groups differ across programs. Goals may also differ because some programs aim for an intermediate objective such as acquisition of a professional credential. However, taken together, all program goals ultimately aim to foster non-subsidized employment or self-employment. Furthermore, for every program the aim is to achieve labor market success at the lowest possible cost.

The proposed PIMS is based on formulae for the following common indicators of program activity and performance:

- (a) Number of program participants
- (b) Expenditures on program participants
- (c) Cost per program participant (b/a)
- (d) Number of program participants employed
- (e) Proportion of participants employed (d/a)
- (f) Cost per participant employed (b/d)

Employment status (d) for each program participant monitored will be judged **180 days after program participation** through follow-up interviews or administrative records.

The timing of follow-up at 6 months is twice the 3 month period when follow-up on ALMPs is conducted in most other European countries and in the United States. The 6 month timing is adopted for Serbia because the labor market has adjusted to the transition very slowly. One-third of the labor force is out of work. The average duration of unemployment is 4 years.

Indicators of activity and performance will be reported by the PIMS for the entire Republic of Serbia and 25 regions (Belgrade city and 24 counties). Administrative data in the register of unemployed could also support reporting of labor market outcomes disaggregated based on participant characteristics regarding: age, sex, educational attainment, unemployment compensation recipient status, long term unemployed status, disability status, industry sector, and employer ownership status.

## 3. Active Labor Market Programs in Pilot PIMS

During project meetings at the NES head office and county NES offices in Pancevo, Nis, and the City of Belgrade the most frequently used ALMPs were identified, as well as the data systems used to support them. Based on this investigation a group of programs were selected for inclusion in the model PIMS as representative of all ALMPs. Brief descriptions of these programs are given in Appendix C. The list of programs included in the model PIMS is given below:



Additional Working Knowledge and Skills (C2)  
(Job Skill Training of the unemployed for the labor market)  
C2: Basic Computer Training  
C2: Specialized Computer Training  
C2: Foreign Language

Job Training (C5)  
(On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for specific occupations)  
C5: Personal Services, Construction, Agriculture, Bookkeeping, Accounting, Management

Programs for Self Employment (D5)  
(Self Employment Assistance)  
D5: Paid for from fund for Active Labor Programs

Self Employment through Lump Sum Support (D6)  
(Self Employment Assistance)  
D6: From unemployment compensation entitlement

Vocational Training (C1)  
(Subsidies to apprentice-volunteers, important in Pancevo)  
C1: Work experience to qualify for exams (Stipend: 6,100 CSD/month)<sup>1</sup>

Programs to Encourage New Employment (D2)  
(Hiring subsidies to employers, important in Nis)  
D2: Subsidy of payroll taxes to employers for hiring the unemployed

Regional Programs (D3)  
(Hiring subsidies to employers, important in Nis)  
D3: Subsidy to targeted regional employers for hiring (70,000 CSD)

Employment of Handicapped Persons (D4)  
(Subsidies for employment of the disabled unemployed, important in Belgrade)

D4: Subsidy is the cost to adapt workspace (currently 130,000 CSD) plus either all social insurance payroll taxes (currently 17.9%) for up to three years or 80% of the average gross wage nationwide for twelve (12) months.

#### Other Training Programs

Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1) (A2)  
A2: Active Job Seeking (delivered in local offices by NES staff)

Providing Non-financial Service for the Users (D1)  
D1: Self Employment Business Center (1 day workshop by NES staff)  
D1: Self Employment SME (two day workshop by Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises)

---

<sup>1</sup> CSD – Is the international currency code (ISO 4217) for the Serbian monetary unit called the Dinar.

#### 4. Sources of Data for PIMS

The following potential sources of useful data were identified for the PIMS:

Register of the Unemployed  
Program Participant Counts from Program Administrative Records  
Program Cost Data from Existing NES Accounting Records  
Follow-up Surveys of Participants  
Follow-up Surveys of Employers

The proposed plan for PIMS is based on the current stage of development of automated data systems maintained by the NES. Following are key elements of the plan:

- Program administrative records must be used to identify program participants and employers receiving ALMP subsidies from the NES.
- Program cost data will be estimated using the average expenditure per program participant in accounting periods aligned with program exit dates. Average program cost is expenditures divided by the number of participants during that six month period.
- Labor market success following program participation will be judged by data in the register of unemployed for all ALMPs, and also by special follow up surveys for some ALMPs.

A summary of the data sources for judging outcomes regarding labor market success follows.

Register of the Unemployed

Training for Active Job Seeking (A2/AJS/1)  
Non-financial Services for the Users (D1/NES)  
Non-financial Service for the Users (D1/ASME)

Register of the Unemployed and Participant Surveys

Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers (C1)  
Additional Working Knowledge and Skills (C2)  
Programs for Self Employment (D5)  
Self Employment with Lump Sum Support (D6)

Register of the Unemployed and Employer Surveys

On-the-Job Training (C5)  
Programs to Encourage New Employment (D2)  
Regional Programs (D3)  
Employment of Handicapped Persons (D4)

## 5. Reporting Results: PIMS Bulletin

The PIMS Bulletin is a semi-annual summary of results from the Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS) for persons who ended participation in active labor market programs (ALMPs) in the prior six month period. PIMS Bulletins report on program exits through the middle of the calendar year on June 30, and through the end of the calendar year on December 31.

A summary table lists the core PIMS measures for eleven ALMPs. This is followed by a series of eleven tables each presenting PIMS results for a separate ALMP in all 25 NES regions in the Republic of Serbia. The eleven tables are presented in three groups. Tables 2 through 4 give results based only on existing administrative data stored in the register of job seekers (REGISTER), Tables 5 through 8 list results based on REGISTER and surveys of ALMP participants, and Tables 9 through 12 present results based on REGISTER and employer surveys. Four additional tables also report on activity in the 25 regions with republic wide totals. These tables numbered 13 through 16 report on the size distribution and ownership category of employers hiring recent ALMP participants.

### *Summary of Republic-wide Results*

The first table in the PIMS Bulletin reports summary results for the entire Republic of Serbia on core PIMS measures for eleven ALMPs. Results are listed for the following variables:

Participants

Costs

Cost per participant

Number of participants leaving the register of unemployed

Percent of participants leaving the register of unemployed

Cost per participant leaving the register of unemployed

These results are measured consistently across the Republic of Serbia. Counts of participants leaving programs 6 months earlier are based on standard NES records. Cost data is based on standard financial reports produced by each region monthly for each ALMP. Rules for leaving the register are applied uniformly. Leaving the register is counted as a positive outcome when a participant is removed because they or their employer reports that employment was started or resumed, or the registrant did not report for job search for three sequential months and was automatically removed from the register.

### *Programs Monitored with Register Data*

Tables 2, 3 and 4 summarize performance results for ALMPs which have a relatively high number of participants and low costs to administer. No special surveys of either participants or employers are used to monitor effectiveness of these ALMPs. Results in these tables are based entirely on administrative data available in the REGISTER.

These tables repeat columns 1 through 6 for the core PIMS measures as presented in Table 1, with the Republic wide results repeated in the bottom row of each table. In these tables, column 7 lists the regional target rate for leaving the register, column 8 an indicator of whether the regional target percentage was reached, and column 9 the regional unemployment rate.

### *Target Rate of Employment*

The target rate of employment in a particular region for a particular ALMP may be set by negotiation between the NES and the regional administration for NES. The target should depend on the ratio of regional to national unemployment rates, and the composition of program participants in terms of factors like educational attainment, duration of unemployment, and proportion who are significantly disabled in a way affecting the ability to work. A formal statistical adjustment methodology can be adopted, or an alternate procedure could be put in place. Targets can be set by negotiation, or by a simple algorithm based on the ratio of regional to national unemployment rates. Since this version of the PIMS Bulletin does not include formal statistical adjustment methods for comparison of performance across areas, all the Bulletin tables presenting regional results also list the regional unemployment rate as a basis for comparison. More about this point appears in section 6 of this report on using results from PIMS.

### *Programs Monitored with Participant Surveys*

Tables 5 through 8 report on ALMPs monitored using both REGISTER data and participant follow up surveys. Like for the tables reviewed above, the standard REGISTER results are presented in columns 1 through 6 for tables in this section. Columns 7 to 11 present PIMS measurements under the heading "Common Survey Data." These results are based on participant surveys and are similar across the four ALMPs monitored by participant surveys. The next group of columns presents special results specific to the survey for that program. In each of these tables the right most column presents the regional unemployment rate to provide an objective basis for contrasting performance results across regions.

### *Programs Monitored with Employer Surveys*

Four ALMPs in the model PIMS are monitored using both REGISTER data and employer follow up surveys. For these programs ALMP financing is directed to employers, and the PIMS surveys of employers ask questions regarding the success of participants in these programs. Standard REGISTER based results are presented in columns 1 through 6 for tables in this section. Columns 7 to 16 present PIMS measurements under the heading "Common Survey Data." These results are based on employer surveys and are identical across the four ALMPs monitored by employer surveys. The right most column in each table reports the regional unemployment rate.

The remaining tables in the Bulletin report on the employer size of survey respondents as measured by their number of employees, and the ownership category for employers. Measures of any secondary employment effects due to hiring by persons receiving self-employment assistance are also reported.

## 6. Using Results from PIMS

The use of the performance indicators for employment programs management should be governed by:

### *Five Principles for Performance Management*

- (1) To preserve decentralized decision making about allocation of funds to various programs and service providers at the regional level.
- (2) To promote superior performance by regions, local offices, and service providers through positive incentives.
- (3) To help identify and correct poor performance through technical assistance and/or sanctions.
- (4) To contribute performance information to the funding allocation process, thereby orienting organizational behavior toward successful program outcomes.
- (5) To ensure compliance with legal requirements of programs.

Following is an outline for a possible evaluation and planning process for ALMPs that could be adopted in Serbia.<sup>2</sup> The suggested management system calls for establishment of Master Plans by national and regional NES offices which set rules for regular procedures in program administration. Once Master Plans are established they remain relatively unchanged from year to year. The annual cycle mainly involves Annual Plans and Semi-annual Reports prepared by the national and regional NES offices.

### *Annual Planning Cycle*

- (1) Goals for ALMPs are clearly stated in the National Employment Strategy, and are announced to the regions in Guidelines for Preparing a Regional Employment Strategy.
- (2) Regional Employment Strategy is prepared following guidelines issued by the NES.
- (3) Based on the PIMS for the prior year, NES prepares an Annual National Employment Plan. This Plan announces likely funding levels to the regions for active labor programs and sets preliminary targets for performance based on past performance and labor market conditions. A five or ten percent budget reserve is held for incentive grants to high performing areas. Preliminary performance targets are a basis for negotiating final targets with the regions.
- (4) Annual Regional Employment Plans are prepared each year by regions. These report final negotiated targets for PIMS in the coming year, and requests for funding including a plan for budget allocation among the several active labor market programs.

---

<sup>2</sup>The procedure suggested here is adapted from O'Leary (1995).

(5) Based on annual plans submitted by all regions, the NES submits a funding request for active labor market programs through the MOLESP and the Finance Ministry to the Parliament. Based on the final budget granted by Parliament, financial allocations to regions are set based on a formula, plus incentive rewards based on performance in the prior year.

(6) Regions set final plans based on budget received. Tenders are announced for third party providers of active labor market programs. Contracts with service providers are performance based. Eligible service provider lists are maintained reporting prior placement rates by service providers.

(7) Regions submit PIMS reports to NES quarterly.

(8) PIMS bulletin is produced for half year, and full year results.

#### *Allocation of funds across active labor market programs*

Budget allocation for ALMPs from the national to the regional NES offices may be accomplished by a formula which depends on regional values of a variety of factors such as: the regional share of registered unemployed, the regional share of long term unemployed, and the regional share of school leavers. The NES would assign each factor a weight in the budget allocation formula, such that the weights sum to one. In a decentralized management system, managers of regional NES offices would then decide on allocation of the budget across ALMPs administered within the region.

The budget allocation formula may be enriched by adding a summary measure of program performance to variables such as those suggested above. The performance factor should be assigned a weight no greater than 10 percent. Such an addition will give importance to the PIMS. Even if only 5 percent of the budget allocation depends on a measure of program performance, a great positive incentive for efficiency will be created.

To ensure stability in the planning process, the regional budget allocation in each year should be based on the previous year's allocation, and should not be less than 90 percent of the previous year's budget allocation. The selected algorithm would be used to distribute only the remainder of the fund.

#### *Setting ALMP Performance Targets for Regional NES Offices*

For each ALMP the performance target may be uniform across all regions, or the target may vary across regions. A uniform target could be based on the national average outcome in the previous year, or an increase over the previous year performance. For each program, setting different targets for each region permit recognition of the differing labor market conditions across regions. Factors in addition to labor market conditions are also relevant to properly setting targets.

Performance targets may be set either subjectively or objectively. Subjectively set targets are usually negotiated between the national and regional office based on the regional labor market conditions and recent levels of program performance. Improved performance is expected year to year except in conditions of rising employment.

Regional targets for performance may be set objectively, based on labor market conditions. We briefly discuss objective approaches to setting targets, but first we summarize a major risk of distorted incentives which may emerge from a PIMS.

In an effort to achieve a high level of program performance, managers and staff in regional offices may select for program participation those candidates most likely to gain reemployment after participation. Enrolling “highly able” persons will increase the reemployment rate for program participants. Many such participants are job ready even before receiving program services. Targeted enrollment of highly able persons by program administrators is said to be “cream skinning” or “skidanje kajmaka.” In such cases the social benefit of employment and training resources could be higher by assisting others who require more help gaining employment.

Well known objective methods for setting performance targets can counteract cream skinning and also adjust for local labor market conditions. A hypothetical example of one method applied to Hungary is presented in O’Leary (1995, p. 742). In that example performance targets are adjusted by one measure of labor market conditions and three measures of program participant characteristics. By this methodology, the target is lowered if unemployment in the region is above the national average. Targets are also lowered if relative to the national share of participants there are higher regional shares of low educated, or older, or recent school leavers. There have been recent improvements in this type of methodology by Eberts, Bartik and Kline (2006) who instead maintain a uniform target and adjust measured performance based on labor market conditions and client characteristics.

To avoid problems of adverse incentives, and to improve the comparability of performance across programs and regions. A methodology for adjusting performance targets or measured program performance across regional NES offices should be considered. The NES may choose to designate certain groups for special attention in reemployment services. For example there may be targeting of services to: persons with eight or fewer years of schooling, persons not eligible for unemployment compensation, the physically handicapped, or the long term unemployed. If this is done, methods for adjusting the performance targets by service to these target groups could be incorporated in the adjustment methodology. This would provide an incentive for providing service to these groups.

## 7. Future Use and Refinement of PIMS

- Register Information and/or Surveys
- PIMS Implementation in All Regions
- Nationwide Training in PIMS
- Development of Adjustment Methodology
- PIMS as a Component of Budget Allocation
- Possible Impact Evaluations

## Appendix A

### Program of Study Tour to Hungary

#### Serbian Delegation:

Dejan Nikolic, NES Chief of Staff  
Svetlana Aksentijevic, Head, NES Department of Analysis and Statistics  
Gordana Gruborovic, Director, NES Legal Department  
Snezana Mirkovic, Director, NES Finance Department  
Milan Djuretanovic, Specialist, NES IT Department

#### Hungarian National Employment Center:

Gyorgy Lazar, Head, Department of Analysis and Statistics  
Geza Kovacs, Head, International Department  
Ferenc Peter, Deputy Director, National Employment Center

#### W.E. Upjohn Institute Participants:

Christopher O'Leary, Senior Economist  
Lillian Vesic-Petrovic, Research Analyst



Day # 1 **Tuesday, 10 May 2006**

| <b>Topic</b>  | <b>Presenters</b>  | <b>Time</b>   | <b>Location</b> |
|---|--|---------------|-----------------|
| Welcome to Hungary  | Mr. Károly Pirisi<br>DG  | 9.00 – 9.15   | NEO<br>Budapest |
| The main functions and organisational structure of the PES in Hungary               | Mr. Ferenc Péter<br>Deputy DG  | 9.15 – 10.15  | NEO             |
| <b>B r e a k</b>  |  | 10.15 – 10.45 |                 |
| Establishment and development of LMP monitoring system                              | Mr. János Simkó<br>(expert) and<br>Mr. Chris O’Leary<br>(WB consultant)                                  | 10.45 – 12.00 | NEO             |
| 10 years experience with the monitoring system of ALMPs                             | Mr. György Lázár<br>(head of LMI Dept.) and<br>Ms. Éva Sziklai<br>(senior analyst)                       | 12.00 – 13.00 | NEO             |
| <b>L u n c h</b>  |  | 13.00 – 14.15 | NEO             |
| IT support to the monitoring system   | Mr. Bertalan Balogh<br>(outside expert)  | 14.15 – 15.30 | NEO             |
| <b>B r e a k</b>  |  | 15.30 – 16.00 |                 |
| EU indicators about the use of ALMPs, connected to the European Employment Strategy | Mr. György Lázár   | 16.00 – 17.00 | NEO             |
|   |  |               |                 |
| <b>Day # 2</b>  | <b>Wednesday, 11 May 2006</b>  |               |                 |
|   |  |               |                 |
| Use of results from the PI system   | Dr. Judit Székely<br>Deputy state secretary<br>(Ministry of Empl. Policy and Labour)                     | 9.00 – 10.00  | NEO             |
| The costs and cost effectiveness of the ALMPs                                       | Dr. Ildikó Varga<br>DG of Directorate for handling the Labour Market Fund<br>(Ministry of EP and Labour) | 10.00 – 11.00 | NEO             |
| <b>B r e a k</b>  |  | 11.00 – 11.30 | NEO             |

|   |  |               |                                     |
|---|--|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| The LMP database of Eurostat  | Mr. György Lázár and Ms. Éva Sziklai   | 11.30 – 12.30 | NEO                                 |
| L u n c h   |  | 12.30 – 13.30 | NEO                                 |
| Employment research and net impact analyses of ALMPs                | Mr. Gyula Nagy and Mr. Chris O’Leary   | 13.30 – 14.30 | NEO                                 |
| The possibilities for deeper analyses of the existing data bases    | Mr. Gyula Nagy and Mr. Peter Galasi (University of Economics)                                | 14.30 – 15.30 | NEO                                 |
| B r e a k   |  | 15.30 – 16.00 | NEO                                 |
| Performance management and performance indicators of PES in Hungary | Mr. György Lázár   | 16.00 – 17.00 | NEO                                 |
|   |  |               |                                     |
| <b>Day #3 Thursday, 12 May</b>                                      |  |               |                                     |
|   |  |               |                                     |
| Visit with the County Labour Centre of Komárom-Esztergom county     | CLC staff  | 9.30 – 11.00  | County Labour Centre                |
| B r e a k   |  | 11.00 – 11.30 |                                     |
| Visit with local office(s) of the county Labour Centre              |  | 11.30 – 13.00 | County Labour Centre (local office) |
| L u n c h   |  | 13.00 – 14.30 | Restaurant                          |
| The use of the results in the local and regional levels             |  | 14.30 – 16.00 | County L.C.                         |
| from 16.00 - Traveling back to Budapest                             |  |               |                                     |
|   |  |               |                                     |
| <b>Day #4 Friday, 13 May</b>  |  |               |                                     |
|   |  |               |                                     |
| Plans of further development  | Mr. Sándor Gál Director and/or Mr. Miklós Temesfalvi Dep. Director of Szabolcs-Sz.-B. County | 9.00 – 11.00  | NEO                                 |
| B r e a k   |  | 11.00- 11.15  |                                     |

|  |   |               |     |
|--|---|---------------|-----|
| The state of the art of program evaluation and performance management in Serbia-Montenegro | The delegation from Serbia-Montenegro                     | 11.15 – 12.45 | NEO |
| Panel discussion on the possible utilisation of Hungarian experiences in Serbia-Montenegro | Mr. György Lázár<br>Ms. Éva Sziklai<br>and the delegation | 12.45 – 13.30 | NEO |
|  |   |               |     |
| End of program with lunch at NEO   |   |               |     |

## Appendix B

### Sample Design for Pilot Tests of Questionnaires

Table B.1 Questionnaire Pilot Test Design, Sample Sizes by Program and Region.

| Program  | Month or time since NES support ended   | Pancevo | Nis | Belgrade |
|--|---|---------|-----|----------|
| Job Skill Training of the unemployed for the labor market (C2)   | November 2004                           | 4       | 4   | 4        |
| On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for specific occupations (C5)  | May 2004                                | 4       |     | 4        |
| Self Employment Assistance (lump sum from ALMP) (D5, D6)   | November 2004                           | 4       | 4   |          |
| Subsidies to apprentice-volunteers (C1)  | November 2004                           | 8       |     |          |
| Subsidies to employers for hiring the unemployed (pays of social insurance tax) (D2) (Same questionnaire is used for D3) | 3 times length of subsidy plus 6 months |         | 4   |          |
| Subsidies to employers for hiring the unemployed (lump sum) (D3)   | November 2004                           |         | 4   |          |
| Subsidies to employers for hiring the disabled unemployed (D4)   | November 2004                           |         |     | 8        |
| Regional Total   |   | 20      | 20  | 16       |

## Appendix C

### Brief Descriptions of ALMPs Included in PIMS

Active Labor Market Programs (ALMPs)

Job Skill Training of the unemployed for the labor market (C2)

C2: Basic Computer Training

C2: Specialized Computer Training

C2: Foreign Language

On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for specific occupations (C5)

C5: Personal Services, Construction, Agriculture, Bookkeeping, Accounting, Management

Self Employment Assistance (D5, D6)

D5: From fund for Active Labor Programs

D6: From UC funds

Subsidies to apprentice-volunteers (important in Pancevo) (C1)

C1: Work experience to qualify for exams (6,100 CSD/month)

Hiring subsidies to employers (important in Nis) (D2, D3)

D3: Subsidy to county targeted employers for hiring (70,000 CSD)

D2: Subsidy of payroll taxes to employers for hiring the unemployed

Subsidies for hiring the disabled unemployed (important in Belgrade) (D4)

D4: Subsidy of social insurance taxes plus expenses for adaptation of workspace to accommodate employment of the handicapped.

Other Training Programs (A2, D1)

A2: Active Job Seeking (delivered in local offices by NES staff)

D1: Self Employment Business Center (1 day workshop by NES staff)

D1: Self Employment SME (2 day workshop by Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises)

## **Brief Descriptions of Active Labor Market Programs Included in the PIMS:**

### **Job Skill Training of the unemployed for the labor market (C2)**

Is intended for unemployed job seekers who have completed at least secondary education, courses are funded based on labor market demand for persons with specific job skills. Courses follow the standard curriculum of formal educational institutions, authorized training centers and other institutions licensed to conduct educational activities. Three different group courses are offered:

#### **Basic computer training**

Provides basic PC literacy needed for work within one's occupation, as well as additional knowledge for conducting work in other fields. The course includes 88 lessons and lasts one month, four lessons per every working day, with an examination at the end of the course.

#### **Specialized computer training**

Provides specific computer knowledge and internationally acknowledged certificates. It includes courses such as: Microsoft Certified Office Specialist, Microsoft Certified System Engineer, Microsoft Certified Database Administrator, Microsoft Certified Application Developer, Microsoft Certified Programmer, Web Design, AutoDesk, Animation, PC technical support, and Graphics workshop. Courses typically include 40 to 400 lessons and last between 15 days to 6 months, with intensive lessons every weekday. Prerequisites: secondary education, basic knowledge of Windows based personal computers, English language skills. Specific courses may have other specific prerequisites of computer knowledge.

#### **Foreign language training**

The training aims to improve a student's existing foreign language skills. Course completers achieve the internationally acknowledged *Intermediate* level language skills and higher level business language skills. Training is customized to the group enrolled, but typically includes 60 lessons provided over a period of two to three months. Language training is usually delivered by institutions of formal education licensed for conducting foreign language courses, as well as other institutions accredited and licensed for foreign language education.



### On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for a specific position (C5)

Is intended for unemployed job seekers who have completed at least 8 years of formal education, and provides on-the-job (OJT) training in practical job skills currently demanded in the local job market by a specific employer. It is implemented through existing training plans used by an employer. Typical fields of OJT are: personal services (cosmetologist, massager, hairdresser, etc.), construction trades (house painter, plasterer, installation worker, etc.), agriculture (beekeeping, snails keeping, medicinal herbs raising, etc.), and business skills (bookkeeping, accounting, management, etc). Training most often lasts up to six months. The training is continuously monitored in order to evaluate training objectives and results. During OJT participants are paid a monthly stipend equal to 30 percent of the national average wage. Participants who successfully complete training must be signed by the employer to a permanent employment contract within 15 days after training has finished. The NES also pays employer costs for providing worker's compensation insurance during the period of OJT (currently 4.3 percent of gross wages).

### Self Employment Assistance (D5, D6)

The program encourages aspiring entrepreneurs to establish shops, farms, and other enterprises to create conditions for self-employment. It is targeted to registered unemployed with an interest in and capacity for independent business management.

A lump sum is provided to help start the new enterprise. Under program D5 the lump sum is drawn from the fund for ALMPs. Under program D6 the lump sum is a cash out of existing unemployment compensation entitlement. (Program D5 is used more frequently than D6.) Program D4—job creation subsidies for disabled unemployed job seekers registered with the NES, also permits lump sum payments for self-employment.

### Subsidies to apprentice-volunteers (C1)

The program is for young unemployed persons without work experience, but having secondary education, an undergraduate degree, or an advanced university degree. A subsidy of 6,100 CSD is paid monthly directly to the unemployed person to support volunteer experience in an occupation to qualify for taking a formal certification examination. The NES financial support for persons with university degree lasts twelve months, with undergraduate degree of nine months, with secondary education of six months. These apprentice durations are prescribed by law.

### Subsidies to employers for hiring the unemployed (D3, D2)

Working with county and local government, the NES office may identify certain types of business activities to be supported through subsidies for job creation. The industries selected should have growing demand for their products or services and should be important to the regional economic development. Persons hired with NES subsidy funds should be drawn from the NES register of unemployed job seekers. In addition to helping the unemployed get jobs, the subsidies are intended to support development of key industries in the region. Hiring should be targeted to the following vulnerable groups: persons over 50 years of age, unemployment benefit users, unemployed and single parents, persons in declining occupations and long-term unemployed, refugees and displaced persons, members

of ethnic minorities having a higher rate of unemployment, and persons with disabilities. The subsidy can be paid either as a lump sum per worker hired (D3), or as a reduction in the compulsory social insurance tax (D2). The employer has an obligation to retain the subsidized worker after the NES support ends. Under the lump sum subsidy (D3) workers must be retained at least 24 months, while under the reduction of social insurance tax (D2) workers must be retained for a duration that is three times as long as the subsidy is paid. The lump sum subsidy (D3) is much more popular.

#### Subsidies for employment of the disabled unemployed (D4)

To employ handicapped persons who are on the NES unemployment register, through creation of new workplaces either in self-employment or with existing employers. For self-employment a lump sum is granted in addition to either all social insurance payroll taxes<sup>3</sup> (currently 17.9%) for up to three years, or 80% of the average gross wage nationwide for one year. In the case of hiring by an existing employer, the subsidy grants a lump sum (to include the cost of adapting the workplace to accommodate the handicapped) plus either all social insurance payroll taxes for up to three years, or 80% of the average gross wage nationwide for one year.

#### Other Training Programs:

##### Active Job Seeking (A2)

Training sessions organized by the NES and held in NES branch offices or other suitable places. Sessions provide specific knowledge and skills about job finding methods to job seekers. The training also encourages persistence and determination in job seekers. The minimum technical requirements are tables, chairs, and a marking board. A computer and projector may also be used. It is recommended that trainees be exposed to internet job search and e-mail communication.

##### Self Employment Training by NES (D1)

The program is designed and delivered by staff of the NES. The core component is a one day seminar, usually at a local NES office, designed to encourage creation of new businesses and provide counseling support to employers and jobseekers on legislative and other regulations related to business start-up (Section 54, the Regulation on Conditions), as well as education on starting a business and business management. Targeted activities include export-oriented businesses, agriculture, manufacturing and services. Participants in this seminar sometimes also receive lump sum (D5) or UC cash out (D6) assistance from the NES.

---

<sup>3</sup> Social insurance payroll tax contributions on gross wages are paid by both employer and worker equally at rates of: 11 percent to public pensions, 6.15 percent for health insurance, and 0.75 percent for unemployment insurance.

## Self Employment Training by the Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises (D1)

This program is a two day seminar on how to start and operate a small business. It is organized by the Serbian Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises. The program aims to develop capacity of future entrepreneurs through sharing information (group education) and professional assistance (individual consultations).

## Appendix D

### PIMS Questionnaires

## Final Questionnaires for a Model PIMS (Revised)

Development of the performance information and management system (PIMS) to monitor labor market outcomes of program participants, and guide program management of active labor market programs (ALMPs)

Task 1 in Component 3: Labor Market Monitoring and Evaluation in the Employment Promotion Project for the Ministry of Labor Employment and Social Policy, Republic of Serbia

November, 2005

*Prepared for:*

National Employment Service  
Kralja Milutina 8  
11000 Belgrade  
Republic of Serbia

Svetlana Aksentijevic, Project Coordinator  
saksentijevic@rztr.co.yu

*Prepared by:*

Christopher J. O'Leary and Lillian Vesic-Petrovic  
W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
300 South Westnedge Avenue  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007, USA  
oleary@upjohn.org; petrovic@upjohn.org

## **Introduction**

The model Performance Information Management System (PIMS) developed in this project covers a select subset of Active Labor Market Programs (ALMPs) operated in the Republic of Serbia. The programs for the model PIMS were chosen because: (1) they are important to the policy aims of the Ministry of Labor Employment and Social Policy (MOLESP) and the National Employment Service (NES); (2) the set of programs chosen span the range of computational challenges for PIMS; and (3) they are ALMPs regularly used in the pilot sites.

The indicators for PIMS will rely on data combined across different administrative data systems as well as results of special questionnaires administered to participants and employers six (6) months after program obligations have ended.

## **Testing and Revising Questionnaires**

In June, 2005, Pilot tests of the questionnaires were conducted by telephone, through the mail, and in person at pilot regional NES offices in Belgrade, Nis, and Pancevo. Revisions to draft surveys were made based on the pilot tests and comments from the PIMS supervisory committee.

This report presents final versions of the questionnaires based on suggestions made at the October, 2005 workshop in Belgrade. It was decided at the workshop that questionnaires will be administered either by telephone or in person. The questionnaires in this report include our suggestions for introduction and conclusion of interviews. Naturally, NES may modify the wording of these statements where appropriate.

## **Final Questionnaires for the Model PIMS**

The following pages of this report present the final questionnaires to be used in the model PIMS developed under this project. There are three (3) different questionnaires to be administered to individual job seekers participating in NES programs, and one (1) common questionnaire to be completed with information from employers who received assistance for hiring or training from the NES.

The participant surveys are:

- Job Skill Training of the unemployed for the labor market (C2)
- Self Employment Assistance (D5, D6)
- Subsidies to apprentice-volunteers (C1)

The employer survey is to be used for:

- On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for specific occupations (C5)
- Subsidies to employers for hiring the unemployed (D3, D2)
- Subsidies to employers for hiring the disabled unemployed (D4)

## Follow-Up Questionnaires for ALMPs in Serbia

## Job Skill Training of the Unemployed for the Labor Market (C2)

Hello name of participant. My name is name of interviewer. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). About six months ago you participated in Job Skill Training supported by the NES. I would like to ask you a few questions about the services you received and your employment success since. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research. Please, answer the questions **honestly**.

| Question |  | Circle   |    |
|----------|--|--|----|
| 1        | Did you get a job after training?  | Yes  | No |
| 2        | Are you presently employed?  | Yes  | No |
| 3        | Is your current job a permanent one?   | Yes  | No |
| 4        | Is your current job full-time?   | Yes  | No |
| 5        | How valuable was the training provided by NES in helping you get your current job? Please grade on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most valuable. | 1 2 3 4 5  |    |
| 6        | In which sector do you currently work: 1) state owned, 2) government agency, 3) private, 4) mixed, 5) cooperative farm                           |  |    |
| 7        | How many people now work at the place where you work? (Please circle the category of firm size).   | a) micro: 1-10<br>b) small: 11-50<br>c) medium: 51-250<br>d) large: 250+ |    |
| 8        | What is your occupation on your present job?   |  |    |
| 9        | On your present job, are you using knowledge and skills you received during the training?  | Yes  | No |
| 10       | How would you rate your training? Choose one of the following: a) extremely good; b) very good; c) good; d) bad; e) very bad                     |  |    |
| 11       | Please share any other comments or observations you have about your job training or services provided by the NES.                                |  |    |
|          |  |  |    |
| PIN      | 9591225-34567-8  |  |    |

Thank you for your cooperation.



### Self Employment Assistance (D5,D6)

Hello *name of participant*. My name is *name of interviewer*. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). Several months ago you received Self-Employment assistance from the NES. I would like to ask you a few questions about the services you received and your employment success since. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research. Please, answer the questions **honestly**.

| Question |   | Circle  |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 1.1      | Are you currently self-employed? (If No, skip to 2.1.)  | Yes   | No |
| 1.2      | Besides yourself, how many other people do you employ?  |   |    |
| 1.3      | How would you judge the future prospects for your self-employment activity? Choose one of the following: a) growing, b) stable, c) declining                        |   |    |
| 1.4      | How would you rate the self-employment assistance you received from NES? Choose one of the following: a) extremely good; b) very good; c) good; d) bad; e) very bad |   |    |
| 1.5      | Would you have started self-employment without NES help?<br>(Skip to 3.)  | Yes   | No |
| 2.1      | Are you presently employed?   | Yes   | No |
| 2.2      | Is your current job a permanent one?  | Yes   | No |
| 2.3      | Is your current job full-time?  | Yes   | No |
| 2.4      | In which sector do you currently work: 1) state owned, 2) government agency, 3) private, 4) mixed, 5) cooperative farm  |   |    |
| 2.5      | How many people now work at the place where you work? (Please circle the category of firm size).  | a) micro: 1-10<br>b) small: 11-50<br>c) medium: 51-250 d) large: 250+ |    |
| 2.6      | Does your present job involve activities similar to your subsidized self-employment activity?   | Yes   | No |
| 4.       | In the space below you may write other comments or observations about your self-employment assistance or other services of the NES.                                 |   |    |
|          |   |   |    |
| PIN      | 9591225-34567-8   |   |    |

Thank you for your cooperation.

### Subsidies to Apprentice-Volunteers (C1)

Hello *name of participant*. My name is *name of interviewer*. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). About six months ago the financial support from the NES ended for your *Volunteer-Apprenticeship*. I would like to ask you a few questions about the services you received and your employment success since. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research. Please, answer the questions **honestly**.

| Question | Circle  |    |
|----------|---|----|
|          | Yes   | No |
| 1.       | Did you take the occupational license exam?   |    |
| 2.       | Do you now have the occupational license?   |    |
| 3.       | Did you get a paying job since your volunteer job?  |    |
| 4.1      | Are you presently employed in a regular job?<br>(If No, go to 5.)   |    |
| 4.2      | Is your current job a permanent one?  |    |
| 4.3      | Is your current job full-time?  |    |
| 4.4      | In which sector do you currently work: 1) state owned, 2) government agency, 3) private, 4) mixed, 5) cooperative farm  |    |
| 4.5      | How many people now work at the place where you work? (Please circle the category of firm size).<br>a) micro: 1-10<br>b) small: 11-50<br>c) medium: 51-250 d) large: 250+ |    |
| 4.6      | What is your present occupation?  |    |
| 4.7      | Is your present occupation related to your volunteer occupation?  |    |
| 5.       | Would you have done the volunteer activity even if you were not subsidized  |    |
| 6.       | If you wish, in the space below you may write other comments or observations about your assistance or other services of the NES.  |    |
|          |   |    |
| PIN      | 9591225-34567-8   |    |

Thank you for your cooperation.

**NES Survey of Employers for Active Labor Market Programs (C5, D2, D3, D4)**

Hello *name of respondent*. My name is *name of interviewer*. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). About six months ago the compulsory retention period ended for employees for whom you received support from the NES. I would like to ask you a few questions about your organization and about the employees that NES subsidized. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research.

How many people now work at your company? (Circle one: micro: 1-10, small: 11-50, medium: 51-250, large: 250+).

What year did your enterprise start operations? (year: \_\_\_\_\_).

We have a list of your employees whose compulsory retention period ended about six (6) months ago. For each employee please tell us if they are still working at your enterprise? If yes what is their occupational title, if not their reason for job separation, and the month/year they left.

| Employee |           |                   | Occupation |        | Job Separation Information |            |
|----------|-----------|-------------------|------------|--------|----------------------------|------------|
| Name     | ID Number | Still at Employer | Title      | Code** | Reason Code*               | Month/Year |
|          |           | Yes or No         |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |

\*Reason Codes for Job Separation: (1) termination by employer due to redundancy, (2) termination by employer due to worker's poor performance or misconduct, (3) termination by employee (voluntary quit), (4) other reasons.

\*\*Filled by NES employee.

## Appendix E

### PIMS Training Manual

## PIMS Training Manual

Development of the performance information and management system (PIMS) to monitor labor market outcomes of program participants, and guide program management of active labor market programs (ALMPs)

Task 1 in Component 3: Labor Market Monitoring and Evaluation in the Employment Promotion Project for the Ministry of Labor Employment and Social Policy, Republic of Serbia

October, 2005

*Prepared for:*

National Employment Service  
Kralja Milutina 8  
11000 Belgrade  
Republic of Serbia

Svetlana Aksentijevic, Project Coordinator  
saksentijevic@rztr.co.yu

*Prepared by:*

Christopher J. O'Leary and Lillian Vesic-Petrovic  
W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
300 South Westnedge Avenue  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007, USA  
oleary@upjohn.org; petrovic@upjohn.org

## Table of Contents

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| PIMS Training Agenda .....   | 2    |
| Outline for Introductory Remarks .....                                       | 4    |
| Outline for Overview of INFOBASE .....                                       | 5    |
| Outline for Presenting Experience from Pilot Testing of Questionnaires ..... | 7    |
| Outline for Explanation and Demonstration of the PIMS for Programs .....     | 8    |
| Data Sources for PIMS Computation by Program .....                           | 9    |
| Outlines for Programs with Outcomes from INFOBASE .....                      | 10   |
| A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1) .....                            | 10   |
| D1: Non-financial Services for the Users (NES) .....                         | 11   |
| D1: Non-financial Service for the Users (ASME) .....                         | 11   |
| Outlines for Programs with Outcomes from Worker Surveys .....                | 12   |
| C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers .....                        | 12   |
| C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills .....                            | 13   |
| D5: Programs for Self Employment .....                                       | 14   |
| D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support .....                              | 14   |
| Outlines for Programs with Outcomes from Employer Surveys .....              | 15   |
| C5: On-the-Job Training .....  | 15   |
| D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment .....                               | 16   |
| D3: Regional Programs .....  | 16   |
| D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons .....                                  | 16   |
| Outline for Discussion of PIMS Bulletin .....                                | 17   |
| Outline for Discussion of Future Development of PIMS .....                   | 18   |
| List of Training Seminar Participants .....                                  | 19   |
| Questionnaires .....   | 20   |

Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS) Training  
National Employment Service  
Belgrade, Serbia

Agenda

October 13, 2005

- 9:00-9:15 Welcome. Dejan Nikolic, NES Chief of Staff.
- 9:15-10:00 Introductory remarks. Svetlana Aksentijevic, Director Department of Analysis and Statistics, NES and Christopher J. O'Leary, Senior Economist, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research
- 10:00-10:45 Overview of INFOBASE. Milan Djuretanovic, NES IT Department and Goran Mitic, NES Nis
- 10:45-11:00 Break.
- 11:00-11:15 Experience conducting surveys for Subsidies to Apprentice-Volunteers (C1) in Pancevo, Zorica Gavrilovic
- 11:15-11:30 Experience conducting surveys for Hiring Subsidies to Employers (D2, D3) in Nis, Predrag Jovicevic.
- 11:30-11:45 Experience conducting surveys for Subsidies for Employment of the Disabled Unemployed (D4) in Belgrade, Momira Vlajin.
- 11:45-12:00 Experience conducting surveys for On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for specific occupations (C5) in Belgrade, Snezana Markovic.
- 12:00-12:15 Question and Answer Period
- 12:15-13:15 Break.
- 13:15-14:30 Explanation and demonstration of the PIMS based on register data in INFOBASE  
Active Job Seeking (A2)  
Self Employment Business Center (NES) (D1)  
Self Employment Business Center (ASME) (D1)  
Christopher J. O'Leary, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, and  
Milan Djuretanovic, NES IT Department
- 14:30-14:45 Break

14:45-16:00 Explanation and demonstration of the PIMS based on participant surveys  
Subsidies to apprentice-volunteers (C1)  
Job Skill Training of the unemployed for the labor market (C2)  
Self Employment Assistance (D5, D6)  
Christopher J. O'Leary and Ljiljana Vesic-Petrovic, W.E. Upjohn Institute for  
Employment Research

16:00 Conclusion of the first day. Svetlana Aksentijevic, NES

October 14, 2005

8:30-10:30 Explanation and demonstration of PIMS based on employer surveys  
On-the-Job Training of the unemployed for specific occupations (C5)  
Subsidies to employers for hiring the unemployed (D3, D2)  
Subsidies to employers for hiring the disabled unemployed (D4)  
Ljiljana Vesic-Petrovic, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, and  
Milan Djuretanovic, NES IT Department

10:30-11:00 Break.

11:00-11:30 Discussion of PIMS Bulletin. Christopher O'Leary, and Dragan Djukic, NES

11:30-12:00 General discussion on PIMS. Svetlana Aksentijevic and Christopher O'Leary.

12:00 Concluding remarks. Dejan Nikolic



Outline for Introductory Remarks  
Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS) Training

1. What is PIMS? (O'Leary)
  - a system for measuring achievement of program goals
  - focus on outcomes rather than inputs or process
  
2. Why was the system developed? (Aksentijevic)
  - for evaluation and planning
  - better than alternative methods
  - supports decentralized decision making
  
3. How was the system developed? (O'Leary)
  - performance indicators (participants, cost, employment)
  - data sources (participant and employer surveys, INFOBASE administrative records)
  - follow-up surveys (participant surveys, employer survey)
  - role of the pilot regions (Belgrade, Nis, Pancevo)
  - review and revision
  
4. What are the parts of the system? (Aksentijevic)
  - performance indicators
  - data requirements
  - surveys
  - INFOBASE
  - standard reports
  - PIMS Bulletin
  
5. How will the system be used? (O'Leary)
  - promote superior performance
  - identify areas where performance can be improved
  - a factor in budget allocation
  - ensure compliance with contracts
  
6. What are the goals of this training seminar? (O'Leary)
  - introduce PIMS
  - overview of INFOBASE
  - review survey of workers and employers
  - discuss methods for computing PIMS measures
  - outline a periodic bulletin reporting PIMS results
  
7. What is the schedule for implementation of the system? (Aksentijevic)
  - distribution of survey materials
  - distribution of INFOBASE
  - begin surveys and reporting

## Outline for Overview of INFOBASE

Presenters: Milan Djuretanovic, NES IT Department and Goran Mitic, NES Nis

1. Origin of INFOBASE
2. Contents of INFOBASE
3. Planned schedule for updates to INFOBASE
4. NES plans for expanding INFOBASE to all regions in Serbia
5. How INFOBASE data can be accessed
6. Plan for using INFOBASE for PIMS
7. Example of PIMS computations using INFOBASE

Suggested Example: Active Job Seeking (A2)

Regions for Example: Belgrade city, Nis, and Pancevo.

Participant Dates: 1.1.2005 to 31.3.2005

Subgroups: sex, age, education, UC recipient, long term unemployed, and disabled

The next page shows a summary PIMS table for Pancevo prepared in June, 2005 based on AJS (A2) participants 6 months before.

Note: Regions should provide their best estimate of cost per participant in AJS.

| A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)  | a            | B    | c                       | d                  | e   | f                                   |
|--|--------------|------|-------------------------|--------------------|---|-------------------------------------|
| Pancevo  |              |      | (b)/(a)                 |                    | (d)/(a)                                   | (b)/(d)                             |
| Program leavers<br>29.10.2004 and 9.11.2004  | Participants | Cost | Cost Per<br>Participant | Number<br>Employed | Proportion of<br>Participants<br>Employed | Cost Per<br>Participant<br>Employed |
|  |              |      |                         |                    |   |                                     |
| Pancevo Total  | 32           | 477  | 15                      | 6                  | 18.8%                                     | 80                                  |
|  |              |      |                         |                    |   |                                     |
| Sex (females)  | 31           | 462  | 15                      | 6                  | 19.4%                                     | 77                                  |
|  |              |      |                         |                    |   |                                     |
| Age 15-24  | 3            | 45   | 15                      | 0                  | 0.0%                                      |                                     |
| Age 25-30  | 14           | 209  | 15                      | 2                  | 14.3%                                     | 104                                 |
| Age 31-45  | 14           | 209  | 15                      | 3                  | 21.4%                                     | 70                                  |
| Age 46-54  | 1            | 15   | 15                      | 1                  | 100.0%                                    | 15                                  |
| Age over 54  | 0            | 0    |                         |                    |   |                                     |
|  |              |      |                         |                    |   |                                     |
| Education less than 11<br>grades complete (I, II)                                  | 0            | 0    |                         | 0                  |   |                                     |
| 11, 12, or additional<br>schooling (III, IV, V)                                    | 22           | 328  | 15                      | 3                  | 13.6%                                     | 109                                 |
| Completed two years of<br>college (VI-1, VI-2)                                     | 8            | 119  | 15                      | 2                  | 25.0%                                     | 60                                  |
| University degree (VII-1,<br>VII-2, VIII)  | 2            | 30   | 15                      | 1                  | 50.0%                                     | 30                                  |
|  |              |      |                         |                    |   |                                     |
| Unemployment<br>compensation (UC)<br>recipients                                    | 0            | 0    |                         | 0                  |   |                                     |
| Long term unemployed<br>(registered over 2 years)                                  | 14           | 209  | 15                      | 2                  | 14.3%                                     | 104                                 |
| Disabled   | 0            | 0    |                         | 0                  |   |                                     |
|  |              |      |                         |                    |   |                                     |
| Total AJS costs 1/1/2005<br>to 31.5.2005 in Pancevo<br>(Costs for five (5) months) |              | 2386 |                         |                    |   |                                     |

## Outline for Presenting Experience from Pilot Testing of Questionnaires

Presenters: Zorica Gavrilovic, Pancevo, Subsidies to Apprentice-Volunteers (C1)  
Predrag Jovicevic, Nis, Hiring Subsidies to Employers (D2, D3)  
Momira Vlajin, Belgrade, Employment of the Disabled Unemployed (D4)  
Snezana Markovic, Belgrade, OJT of unemployed for specific jobs (C5)

Each presenter will cover the following points:

1. How many pilot test questionnaires were attempted and completed in May and August?
2. What was the response rate when sent by mail?
3. What was the response rate for telephone interviews?
4. What should be done to get a high response rate?
5. Do you believe responses to questions were truthful?
6. Do the final August versions of questionnaires require more wording changes?
7. What can you tell others to make doing the surveys easier and more reliable?
8. Should some questions be removed from the survey?
9. Should other questions be added to the survey?
10. Please share any other suggestions you have for the survey.

## Outline for Explanation and Demonstration of the PIMS for Programs

Program being evaluated.

1. What performance indicators (\*) are being introduced?

- Participants (i)
- Costs (i)
- Cost per participant (\*)
- Employment (i)
- Proportion of participants employed (\*)
- Cost per participant employed (\*)
- Other outcomes

2. Sources of PIMS data input (i).

- Data from the register of job seekers (characteristics of participants)
- Follow-up survey data
- Accounting cost data
- Program participation lists (number of participants)

3. Organization of surveys.

- Whom do we follow-up? Employers and Participants.
- Who would organize the follow-up surveys? Which department?
- What questions do the surveys ask?
- How are surveys conducted? How many call back attempts to complete surveys?
- Who (which department) does data entry of follow-up?

4. Subgroups being examined.

- Region code
- Local office code
- Sex
- Age
- Education
- UC recipient status
- Long term unemployed status
- Disabled status

5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

| Data Sources for PIMS Computations by Program    |                      |            |                 |
|--|----------------------|------------|-----------------|
| Program  | Participant          | Cost       | Employment      |
| A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)      | Register             | Accounting | INFOBASE        |
| D1: Non-financial Services for the Users (NES)   | Register             | Accounting | INFOBASE        |
| D1: Non-financial Service for the Users (ASME)   | Register             | Accounting | INFOBASE        |
| C1: Vocational Training -- Apprentice Volunteers | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Worker Survey   |
| C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills      | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Worker Survey   |
| D5: Programs for Self Employment                 | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Worker Survey   |
| D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support        | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Worker Survey   |
| C5: On-the-Job Training                          | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Employer Survey |
| D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment         | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Employer Survey |
| D3: Regional Programs                            | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Employer Survey |
| D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons            | Program/<br>Register | Accounting | Employer Survey |

A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)

1. What performance indicators (\*) are being introduced?

Participants  
Costs  
Cost per participant (\*)  
Employment  
Proportion of participants employed (\*)  
Cost per participant employed (\*)

2. Sources of performance measurement data.

Participant identifier from participation lists  
Participant characteristics from register via INFOBASE  
Data on leaving register (proxy for employment) (INFOBASE)  
Accounting cost data (based on staff time costs for AJS seminars plus overhead)

3. Surveys.

No follow-up surveys INFOBASE is source of outcome data

4. Subgroups being examined.

Region code  
Local office code  
Sex  
Age  
Education  
UC recipient status  
Long term unemployed status  
Disabled status

5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

Results computed in INFOBASE  
Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December  
Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)

D1: Non-financial Services for the Users (NES or ASME)

1. What performance indicators (\*) are being introduced?

- Participants
- Costs
- Cost per participant (\*)
- Employment
- Proportion of participants employed (\*)
- Cost per participant employed (\*)

2. Sources of performance measurement data.

- Participant identifier from participation lists
- Participant characteristics from register via INFOBASE
- Data on leaving register (proxy for employment) (INFOBASE)
- Accounting cost data (based on staff time costs for AJS seminars plus overhead)

3. Surveys

- No follow-up surveys INFOBASE is source of outcome data

4. Subgroups being examined.

- Region code
- Local office code
- Sex
- Age
- Education
- UC recipient status
- Long term unemployed status
- Disabled status

5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

- Results computed in INFOBASE
- Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December
- Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)



C1: Vocational Training -- Apprentice Volunteers

1. What performance indicators (\*) are being introduced

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Participants (i)                        | Took occupational license exam (*)             |
| Costs (i)                               | Acquired occupational license (*)              |
| Cost per participant (*)                | Current job is permanent (*)                   |
| Employment (i)                          | Current job is full time (*)                   |
| Proportion of participants employed (*) | Occupation related to volunteer occupation (*) |
| Cost per participant employed (*)       |  |

2. Sources of performance measurement data.

Data from the register of job seekers  
Follow-up survey data (C1)  
Accounting cost data  
Program participation lists

3. Organization of surveys.

Whom do we follow-up? -- Participants  
Who would organize the follow-up survey? Which department?  
What questions do the surveys ask? – Questionnaire C1  
How are surveys conducted? -- Telephone?  
Which department key enters follow-up data? (To: INFOBASE?)

4. Subgroups being examined.

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Region code       | UC recipient                                  |
| Local office code | Long term unemployed                          |
| Sex               | Disabled                                      |
| Age               | Sector of current job: SOE, government        |
| Education         | private, co-op farm, mixed                    |
|                   | Size of employer: micro, small, medium, large |

5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

Compute results in INFOBASE?  
Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December  
Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)

## C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills (Job Skill Training)

### 1. What performance indicators (\*) are being introduced

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Participants (i)                        | Took occupational license exam (*)             |
| Costs (i)                               | Acquired occupational license (*)              |
| Cost per participant (*)                | Current job is permanent (*)                   |
| Employment (i)                          | Current job is full time (*)                   |
| Proportion of participants employed (*) | Occupation related to volunteer occupation (*) |
| Cost per participant employed (*)       |  |

### 2. Sources of performance measurement data.

Data from the register of job seekers  
Follow-up survey data (C2)  
Accounting cost data  
Program participation lists

### 3. Organization of surveys.

Whom do we follow-up? -- Participants  
Who would organize the follow-up survey? Which department?  
What questions do the surveys ask? – Questionnaire C2  
How are surveys conducted? -- Telephone?  
Which department key enters follow-up data? (To: INFOBASE?)

### 4. Subgroups being examined.

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Region code       | UC recipient                                  |
| Local office code | Long term unemployed                          |
| Sex               | Disabled                                      |
| Age               | Sector of current job: SOE, government        |
| Education         | private, co-op farm, mixed                    |
|                   | Size of employer: micro, small, medium, large |

### 5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

Compute results in INFOBASE?  
Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December  
Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)

## D5 and D6: Programs for Self Employment

### 1. What performance indicators (\*) are being introduced?

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Participants (i)                       | Still in self-employment NES supported (*)   |
| Costs (i)                              | Number of others hired (*)   |
| Cost per participant (*)               | Future growth, stable, or decline (*)  |
| Currently self-employed (i)            | Value of NES help a, b, c, d, e (*)  |
| Proportion currently self-employed (*) | Needed NES help to start yes, no (*)   |
| Cost per currently self-employed (*)   | Currently working elsewhere (i) and<br>Proportion for whom job is:<br>Permanent (i)<br>Full time (i) |

### 2. Sources of performance measurement data.

Data from the register of job seekers  
Follow-up survey data (D5, D6)  
Accounting cost data  
Program participation lists

### 3. Organization of surveys.

Whom do we follow-up? -- Participants  
Who would organize the follow-up survey? Which department?  
What questions do the surveys ask? -- Questionnaire D5, D6  
How are surveys conducted? -- Telephone?  
Which department key enters follow-up data? (To: INFOBASE?)

### 4. Subgroups being examined.

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Region code       | UC recipient  |
| Local office code | Long term unemployed  |
| Sex               | Disabled  |
| Age               | Currently working elsewhere and   |
| Education         | Sector of current job: SOE, government<br>private, co-op farm, mixed<br>Size of employer: micro, small, medium, large |

### 5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

Compute results in INFOBASE?  
Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December  
Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)

## C5: On-the-Job Training

### 1. What performance indicators are being introduced?

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Participants (i)                        | Current job uses training skill (*)              |
| Costs (i)                               | Job separation reason (1, 2, 3, 4) (percent (i)) |
| Cost per participant (*)                |  |
| Employment (i)                          |  |
| Proportion of participants employed (*) |  |
| Cost per participant employed (*)       |  |

### 2. Sources of performance measurement data.

- Data from the register of job seekers
- Follow-up survey data from employer
- Accounting cost data
- Program participation lists

### 3. Organization of surveys.

- Whom do we follow-up? -- Employers
- Who would organize the follow-up? Which department?
- What questions do the surveys ask? (Employer survey)
- How are surveys conducted? (Telephone interview)
- Who (which department) does data entry of follow-up?

### 4. Subgroups being examined.

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Region code       | UC recipient                                  |
| Local office code | Long term unemployed                          |
| Sex               | Disabled                                      |
| Age               | Size of employer: micro, small, medium, large |
| Education         |   |

### 5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

- Compute results in INFOBASE?
- Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December
- Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)

D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment (reduced payroll taxes charged employer)  
 D3: Regional Programs (lump sum subsidy to employer)  
 D4: Employment of Handicapped (lump sum plus payroll tax or wage subsidy)

1. What performance indicators are being introduced?

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Participants (i)                        | Current job related to NES support (*) |
| Costs (i)                               | Job separation reason (1, 2, 3, 4)     |
| Cost per participant (*)                |  |
| Employment (i)                          |  |
| Proportion of participants employed (*) |  |
| Cost per participant employed (*)       |  |

2. Sources of performance measurement data.

Data from the register of job seekers  
 Follow-up survey data from employers  
 Accounting cost data  
 Program participation lists

3. Organization of surveys.

Whom do we follow-up? Employers and Persons.  
 Who would organize the follow-up? Which department?  
 What questions do the surveys ask? (Employer survey)  
 How are surveys conducted? (Telephone interview)  
 Who (which department) does data entry of follow-up?

4. Subgroups being examined.

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Region code       | UC recipient                                  |
| Local office code | Long term unemployed                          |
| Sex               | Disabled                                      |
| Age               | Size of employer: micro, small, medium, large |
| Education         |   |

5. Computing, reporting and interpreting results

Compute results in INFOBASE?  
 Results compiled monthly and summarized at the end of June and December  
 Results interpreted in labor market context (local UNRATE/national UNRATE)

## Outline for Discussion of PIMS Bulletin

1. Uses of PIMS Information
2. Annual Planning Cycle
3. Budget Allocation
4. Performance Incentives
5. Adjustment Methodology
6. National Results
7. Regional Results
8. Local Results
9. PIMS Bulletin

## Outline for Discussion of Future Development of PIMS

1. Use of INFOBASE and Register Information for All Programs
2. Refinement of Questionnaires
3. Nationwide Training
4. Implementation in All Regions
5. Development of Adjustment Methodology
6. PIMS Bulletin
7. PIMS as a Component of Budget Allocation

## List of Training Seminar Participants

1. Snezana Markovic, NES Belgrade
2. Momira Vlajin, NES Belgrade
3. Zoran Milenkovic, NES Belgrade
4. Dragana Radovanovic, NES Belgrade
5. Svetlana Popovic, NES Belgrade
6. Biljana Pejic, NES Belgrade
7. Goran Mitic, NES Nis
8. Predrag Jovanovic, NES Nis
9. Ana Jovanovic, NES Nis
10. Ankica Todorov, NES Pancevo
11. Ljiljana Marinkovic-Stankov, NES Pancevo
12. Jasmina Petrovic, NES Kraljevo
13. Dragica Salamic, NES Novi Sad
14. Zeljko Radosavljevic, NES Sabac
15. Toplica Todorovic, NES
16. Miroslav Jovic, NES
17. Svetlana Aksentijevic, NES
18. Milan Djuretanovic, NES
19. Dejan Nikolic, NES
20. Nikola Bulatovic, PIUEPP



## Job Skill Training of the Unemployed for the Labor Market (C2)

Hello name of participant. My name is name of interviewer. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). About six months ago you participated in Job Skill Training supported by the NES. I would like to ask you a few questions about the services you received and your employment success since. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research. Please, answer the questions **honestly**.

| Question |  | Circle   |    |
|----------|--|--|----|
| 1        | Did you get a job after training?  | Yes  | No |
| 2        | Are you presently employed?  | Yes  | No |
| 3        | Is your current job a permanent one?   | Yes  | No |
| 4        | Is your current job full-time?   | Yes  | No |
| 5        | How valuable was the training provided by NES in helping you get your current job? Please grade on a scale of 1 to 5 with 5 being most valuable. | 1 2 3 4 5  |    |
| 6        | In which sector do you currently work: 1) state owned, 2) government agency, 3) private, 4) mixed, 5) cooperative farm                           |  |    |
| 7        | How many people now work at the place where you work? (Please circle the category of firm size).   | a) micro: 1-10<br>b) small: 11-50<br>c) medium: 51-250<br>d) large: 250+ |    |
| 8        | What is your occupation on your present job?   |  |    |
| 9        | On your present job, are you using knowledge and skills you received during the training?  | Yes  | No |
| 10       | How would you rate your training? Choose one of the following: a) extremely good; b) very good; c) good; d) bad; e) very bad                     |  |    |
| 11       | Please share any other comments or observations you have about your job training or services provided by the NES.                                |  |    |
|          |  |  |    |
| PIN      | 9591225-34567-8  |  |    |

Thank you for your cooperation.

### Self Employment Assistance (D5,D6)

Hello *name of participant*. My name is *name of interviewer*. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). Several months ago you received Self-Employment assistance from the NES. I would like to ask you a few questions about the services you received and your employment success since. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research. Please, answer the questions **honestly**.

| Question |   | Circle  |    |
|----------|---|---|----|
| 1.1      | Are you currently self-employed? (If No, skip to 2.1.)  | Yes   | No |
| 1.2      | Besides yourself, how many other people do you employ?  |   |    |
| 1.3      | How would you judge the future prospects for your self-employment activity? Choose one of the following: a) growing, b) stable, c) declining                        |   |    |
| 1.4      | How would you rate the self-employment assistance you received from NES? Choose one of the following: a) extremely good; b) very good; c) good; d) bad; e) very bad |   |    |
| 1.5      | Would you have started self-employment without NES help?<br>(Skip to 3.)  | Yes   | No |
| 2.1      | Are you presently employed?   | Yes   | No |
| 2.2      | Is your current job a permanent one?  | Yes   | No |
| 2.3      | Is your current job full-time?  | Yes   | No |
| 2.4      | In which sector do you currently work: 1) state owned, 2) government agency, 3) private, 4) mixed, 5) cooperative farm  |   |    |
| 2.5      | How many people now work at the place where you work? (Please circle the category of firm size).  | a) micro: 1-10<br>b) small: 11-50<br>c) medium: 51-250 d) large: 250+ |    |
| 2.6      | Does your present job involve activities similar to your subsidized self-employment activity?   | Yes   | No |
| 4.       | In the space below you may write other comments or observations about your self-employment assistance or other services of the NES.                                 |   |    |
|          |   |   |    |
| PIN      | 9591225-34567-8   |   |    |

Thank you for your cooperation.

### Subsidies to Apprentice-Volunteers (C1)

Hello *name of participant*. My name is *name of interviewer*. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). About six months ago the financial support from the NES ended for your *Volunteer-Apprenticeship*. I would like to ask you a few questions about the services you received and your employment success since. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research. Please, answer the questions **honestly**.

| Question | Circle  |    |
|----------|---|----|
|          | Yes   | No |
| 1.       | Did you take the occupational license exam?   |    |
| 2.       | Do you now have the occupational license?   |    |
| 3.       | Did you get a paying job since your volunteer job?  |    |
| 4.1      | Are you presently employed in a regular job?<br>(If No, go to 5.)   |    |
| 4.2      | Is your current job a permanent one?  |    |
| 4.3      | Is your current job full-time?  |    |
| 4.4      | In which sector do you currently work: 1) state owned, 2) government agency, 3) private, 4) mixed, 5) cooperative farm  |    |
| 4.5      | How many people now work at the place where you work? (Please circle the category of firm size).<br>a) micro: 1-10<br>b) small: 11-50<br>c) medium: 51-250 d) large: 250+ |    |
| 4.6      | What is your present occupation?  |    |
| 4.7      | Is your present occupation related to your volunteer occupation?  |    |
| 5.       | Would you have done the volunteer activity even if you were not subsidized  |    |
| 6.       | If you wish, in the space below you may write other comments or observations about your assistance or other services of the NES.  |    |
|          |   |    |
| PIN      | 9591225-34567-8   |    |

Thank you for your cooperation.

### NES Survey of Employers for Active Labor Market Programs (C5, D2, D3, D4)

Hello *name of respondent*. My name is *name of interviewer*. I'm calling for the National Employment Service (NES). About six months ago the compulsory retention period ended for employees for whom you received support from the NES. I would like to ask you a few questions about your organization and about the employees that NES subsidized. Our goal is to improve the training and services we are providing. Your responses are confidential and will **only** be used for research.

How many people now work at your company? (Circle one: micro: 1-10, small: 11-50, medium: 51-250, large: 250+).

What year did your enterprise start operations? (year: \_\_\_\_\_).

We have a list of your employees whose compulsory retention period ended about six (6) months ago. For each employee please tell us if they are still working at your enterprise? If yes what is their occupational title, if not their reason for job separation, and the month/year they left.

| Employee |           |                   | Occupation |        | Job Separation Information |            |
|----------|-----------|-------------------|------------|--------|----------------------------|------------|
| Name     | ID Number | Still at Employer | Title      | Code** | Reason Code*               | Month/Year |
|          |           | Yes or No         |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |
|          |           |                   |            |        |                            |            |

\*Reason Codes for Job Separation: (1) termination by employer due to redundancy, (2) termination by employer due to worker's poor performance or misconduct, (3) termination by employee (voluntary quit), (4) other reasons.

\*\*Filled by NES employee.

## Appendix F

### Blueprint for a PIMS Bulletin

## Blueprint for a PIMS Bulletin

Development of the performance information and management system (PIMS) to monitor labor market outcomes of program participants, and guide program management of active labor market programs (ALMPs)

Task 1 in Component 3: Labor Market Monitoring and Evaluation in the Employment Promotion Project for the Ministry of Labor Employment and Social Policy, Republic of Serbia

November, 2005

*Prepared for:*

National Employment Service  
Kralja Milutina 8  
11000 Belgrade  
Republic of Serbia

Svetlana Aksentijevic, Project Coordinator  
saksentijevic@rztr.co.yu

*Prepared by:*

Christopher J. O'Leary and Lillian Vesic-Petrovic  
W. E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research  
300 South Westnedge Avenue  
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49007, USA  
oleary@upjohn.org; petrovic@upjohn.org

| Table of Contents  | Page |
|--|------|
| Model PIMS Bulletin Cover Memo.....  | 1    |
| List of PIMS Bulletin Tables .....   | 6    |
| Table 1. Summary of PIMS Results .....   | 7    |
| <br>Bulletin Tables for Programs with Outcomes from REGISTER   |      |
| Table 2. Program A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1).....  | 8    |
| Table 3. Program D1 (NES): Non-financial Services for the Users .....  | 9    |
| Table 4. Program D1 (ASME): Non-financial Service for the Users .....  | 10   |
| <br>Bulletin Tables for Programs with Outcomes from Participant Surveys  |      |
| Table 5. Program C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers .....   | 11   |
| Table 6. Program C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills .....   | 12   |
| Table 7. Program D5: Programs for Self Employment.....   | 13   |
| Table 8. Program D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support .....   | 14   |
| <br>Bulletin Tables for Programs with Outcomes from Employer Surveys   |      |
| Table 9. Program C5: On-the-Job Training .....   | 15   |
| Table 10. Program D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment.....  | 16   |
| Table 11. Program D3: Regional Programs.....   | 17   |
| Table 12. Program D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons .....  | 18   |
| <br>Additional Tables  |      |
| Table 13. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs<br>Monitored by Participant Surveys .....      | 19   |
| Table 14. Distribution of Employer Ownership for Active Labor Programs<br>Monitored by Participant Surveys ..... | 20   |
| Table 15. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs<br>Monitored by Employer Surveys .....         | 21   |
| Table 16. Distribution of Employer Vintage for Active labor Programs<br>Monitored by Employer Surveys .....      | 22   |
| Appendix A. Table by Table Guide to Data and Computations for PIMS .....   | 23   |

NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT SERVICE  
Department of Analysis and Statistics  
Kralja Milutina 8  
11000 Belgrade  
Republic of Serbia

DATE: February 15, 2006

TO: Regional Offices of NES

SUBJECT: PIMS Report on the First Half of 2005

## OVERVIEW

This semi-annual bulletin presents results from the Performance Indicators Management System (PIMS) for persons who ended participation in active labor market programs (ALMPs) during the first half of 2005. A summary table lists the core PIMS measures for eleven ALMPs. This is followed by eleven tables reporting PIMS results for each separate ALMP. The eleven tables are presented in three groups. Tables 2 through 4 give results based only on existing administrative data stored in the register of job seekers (REGISTER), Tables 5 through 8 list results based on REGISTER and surveys of ALMP participants, and Tables 9 through 12 present results based on REGISTER and employer surveys. Some additional tables report on the size distribution and ownership category of employers hiring recent ALMP participants.

## SUMMARY OF PIMS RESULTS

A summary of results for the entire Republic of Serbia on core PIMS measures for eleven ALMPs is presented in Table 1. Results are listed for the following variables:

Participants  
Costs  
Cost per participant  
Number of participants leaving the register of unemployed  
Percent of participants leaving the register of unemployed  
Cost per participant leaving the register of unemployed

These results are measured consistently across the Republic of Serbia. Counts of program participants leaving programs 6 months earlier are based on standard NES records. Cost data is based on standard financial reports produced by each region monthly for each ALMP. Rules for leaving the register are applied uniformly. Leaving the register is counted as a positive outcome when they are removed because they or their employer reports that employment was started or resumed, or they did not report for job search after three months and were automatically removed from the register.



Once PIMS results are available to complete the tables a discussion of the results will appear in this section. The numbers presented in this draft Blueprint for a PIMS Bulletin are based only on participation in ALMPs in regions where data from the register of unemployed has been compiled in REGISTER. These regions include: Belgrade, Pancevo, Nis, and Kraljevo.

The results presented in this summary Table 1 for the whole country, provide a baseline for setting performance targets for each program in the separate regions of the country. The remaining tables in this PIMS Bulletin present performance results disaggregated to the 25 regions in Serbia excluding Kosovo. Each of the tables listing regional figures has as a final column the regional unemployment rate. Cross region comparisons of program performance should account for differences in opportunities for labor market success. The regional unemployment is a crude indicator of such differences. Deviations of regional unemployment rates from the national average unemployment rate can provide a first approximation to adjust target reemployment rates. In addition to setting target rates for reemployment (or leaving the register of unemployed) it is also possible to set target rates for cost of reemployment. This first draft PIMS bulletin proposes that at this early stage of performance monitoring, targets only be set for reemployment rates. Indeed most measures of program performance depend on the reemployment rate, so it has central importance as a measure of program performance.

#### PROGRAMS MONITORED BY DATA ONLY FROM REGISTER

Tables 2, 3 and 4 summarize performance results for ALMPs which have a relatively high number of participants and low costs to administer. No special surveys of either participants or employers are used to monitor effectiveness of these ALMPs. Results in these tables depend entirely on administrative data available in REGISTER.

These tables repeat columns 1 through 6 for the core PIMS measures as presented in Table 1, with the Republic wide results repeated in the bottom row of each table. In these tables, column 7 lists the regional target percentage for leaving the register, column 8 an indicator of whether the regional target percentage was reached, and column 9 the regional unemployment rate.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 2 for program A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1). The paragraph will summarize the dispersion around the national average for the monitored outcomes with particular focus on the percentage leaving the register and the cost per participant leaving the register.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 3 for program D1 (NES): Non-financial Services for the Users. This is a one day seminar run by the NES which summarizes skills needed for self-employment.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 4 for program D1 (ASME): Non-financial Services for the Users. This is a two day seminar run by the Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises which summarizes skills needed for self-employment.

## PROGRAMS MONITORED WITH PARTICIPANT SURVEYS

Four ALMPs are monitored in the PIMS using both REGISTER data and participant follow up surveys. Like for the tables reviewed above, the standard REGISTER results are presented in columns 1 through 6 for tables in this section. Columns 7 to 11 present PIMS measurements under the heading “Common Survey Data.” These results are based on participant surveys and are similar across the four ALMPs monitored by participant surveys.

Column 7 presents the response rate for ALMP participants, column 8 lists the percentage of respondents ever employed since program participation, column 9 lists the percentage of respondents employed on the survey date, column 10 lists the target rate of employment for the region, and column 11 is an indicator of whether or not the target rate of employment was reached or achieved. Depending on the choice of the NES, reaching the target rate of employment may be judged by either the rate ever employed since program participation (column 8), or the rate of employment on the survey date (column 9).

The target rate of employment in a particular region for a particular ALMP may be set by negotiation between the NES and the regional administration for NES. The target should depend on the ratio of regional to national unemployment rates, and the composition of program participants in terms of factors like educational attainment, duration of unemployment, and proportion who are significantly disabled in a way affecting the ability to work. A formal statistical adjustment methodology can be adopted, or an alternate procedure could be put in place. Targets can be set by negotiation, or by a simple algorithm based on the ratio of regional to national unemployment rates.

The four tables in this section also present similar information in columns 12, 13, and 14. The outcomes in these columns are based on completed survey responses for former program participants who are currently working for someone else. In sequential order, the outcomes summarized are: the percent employed in a permanent job, the percent employed in a full time job, and the percent for whom the current occupation is related to the ALMP experience supported by the NES. The last column in each table in this section reports the regional unemployment rate.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 5, program C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers. In addition to the columns described above for the tables based on participant surveys, this table also reports in column 15 on the percent of participants who took the occupational license exam and in column 16 on the percent of participants who passed the occupational license exam.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 6, program C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills. The first thirteen columns in this table are similar to Table 5, while column 14 reports on the percent of employed respondents working in the same occupation as the training skills.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 7, program D5: Programs

for Self Employment, a lump sum payment from the budget for ALMPs. Columns 1 through 7 are identical to the other tables based on participant response. Column 8 reports on the percent of respondents currently self-employed, while column 8 reports the percentage either self-employed or working for someone else. The target employment percentage is in column 10, while an indicator of meeting the target employment rate is in column 11. Columns 12, 13, and 14 report on characteristics of jobs for those currently working for someone else. Among those working for someone else, the three columns list respectively: the percent in permanent jobs, the percent in full time jobs, and the percent employed in jobs related to their self-employment experience supported by the NES.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 8, program D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support. The columns of this table are identical to those in Table 7. The paragraph in the Bulletin will include a contrast of this program for self-employment based on a lump sum cash out of unemployment compensation entitlement support against the self employment program D5 which is a lump sum payment from the budget for ALMPs.

#### PROGRAMS MONITORED WITH EMPLOYER SURVEYS

Four ALMPs are monitored in the PIMS using both REGISTER data and employer follow up surveys. For these programs ALMP financing is directed to employers, and the PIMS surveys of employers ask questions regarding the success of participants in these programs. Like for Tables 2 through 8 reviewed above, the standard REGISTER results are presented in columns 1 through 6 for tables in this section. Columns 7 to 16 present PIMS measurements under the heading "Common Survey Data." These results are based on employer surveys and are identical across the four ALMPs monitored by employer surveys.

Column 7 presents the response rate by employers having ALMP participants completing their required employment retention period six months before the survey month, and column 8 reports the response rate for participants. To provide employed follow up employment concepts similar to those monitored by the participant surveys, column 9 reports on the percent of respondents still employed at anytime six or more months after compulsory employment ended, and column 10 reports the percentage of participants currently employed on the survey date. Column 11 lists the target rate of employment for the region, and column 12 is an indicator of whether or not the target rate of employment was reached or achieved. Depending on the choice of the NES, reaching the target rate of employment may be judged by either the rate ever employed after compulsory employment (column 9), or the rate of employment on the survey date (column 10).

The four tables in this section also present similar information in columns 13 to 16. These four columns present percentages of participants not currently employed at the time of the survey, by the reason for job separation from the employer. The (column) percentages refer to separations because of: (13) redundancy, (14) poor work or misconduct, (15) voluntary quit, or (16) other.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 9, program C5: On-the-Job Training. Table columns are as described above.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 10, program D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 11, program D3: Regional Programs.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 12, program D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons.

## ADDITIONAL TABLES

The remaining tables in this Bulletin report on the employer size of survey respondents as measured by their number of employees, and the ownership category for employers. Measures of any secondary employment effects due to hiring by persons receiving self-employment assistance are also reported.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 13, Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Participant Surveys. For the four ALMPs monitored by participant surveys, the table lists the percentages of employers across each of four employer size categories (number of employees): micro (1-10), small (11-50), medium (51-250), and large (250+). The columns are arranged so there can be easy comparison across the four ALMPs within each employer size category. Columns 17 and 18 report on secondary hiring by survey respondents who received assistance from the self-employment ALMPs, figures summarize the average number hired by respondents in the two programs.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 14, Distribution of Employer Ownership for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Participant Surveys. For the four ALMPs monitored by participant surveys, the table lists the percentages across each of five employer ownership groups: State owned enterprise, Government agency, Private enterprise, Mixed ownership, and Cooperative farm. The columns are arranged so there can be easy comparison across the four ALMPs for each form of employer ownership.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 15, Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Employer Surveys. The table is organized exactly like Table 13 for programs based on participant surveys.

The bulletin will include a paragraph commenting on results in Table 16, Distribution of Employer Vintage for Active labor Programs Monitored by Employer Surveys. Based on data from employers responding to the surveys, the table reports the mean number of years since each company or organization was established. Columns of the table permit easy comparison of firm age across the four ALMPs and regions of the Republic of Serbia.

## List of PIMS Bulletin Tables

Table 1. Summary of PIMS Results

### Tables for Programs with Outcomes from REGISTER

Table 2. Program A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)

Table 3. Program D1 (NES): Non-financial Services for the Users

Table 4. Program D1 (ASME): Non-financial Service for the Users

### Bulletin Tables for Programs with Outcomes from Participant Surveys

Table 5. Program C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers

Table 6. Program C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills

Table 7. Program D5: Programs for Self Employment

Table 8. Program D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support

### Bulletin Tables for Programs with Outcomes from Employer Surveys

Table 9. Program C5: On-the-Job Training

Table 10. Program D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment

Table 11. Program D3: Regional Programs

Table 12. Program D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons

### Additional Tables

Table 13. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Participant Surveys

Table 14. Distribution of Employer Ownership for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Participant Surveys

Table 15. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Employer Surveys

Table 16. Distribution of Employer Vintage for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Employer Surveys

**Table 1. Summary of PIMS Results**

|   | Participants | Cost | Cost Per Participant | Participants Leaving the Register | Participants Leaving the Register (%) | Cost Per Participant Leaving the Register |
|---|--------------|------|----------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| All of Serbia                                   | 1            | 2    | 3                    | 4                                 | 5                                     | 6   |
| A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)     | 725          |      |                      | 174                               | 24.00%                                |   |
| D1: Non-financial Services for the Users (NES)  | 94           |      |                      | 16                                | 17.02%                                |   |
| D1: Non-financial Service for the Users (ASME)  |              |      |                      |                                   |                                       |   |
| C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers | 276          |      |                      | 81                                | 29.35%                                |   |
| C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills     | 1369         |      |                      | 347                               | 25.35%                                |   |
| D5: Programs for Self Employment                | 369          |      |                      | 300                               | 81.30%                                |   |
| D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support       | 11           |      |                      | 10                                | 90.91%                                |   |
| C5: On-the-Job Training                         | 42           |      |                      | 7                                 | 16.67%                                |   |
| D2: Programs to Encourage New Employment        |              |      |                      |                                   |                                       |   |
| D3: Regional Programs                           |              |      |                      |                                   |                                       |   |
| D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons           |              |      |                      |                                   |                                       |   |

**Table 2. Program A2: Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)**

|    | Register Data |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       | Performance Target              |                                 | Unemployment Rate (%) |
|----|---------------|-------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
|    | Participants  | Costs | Cost per Participant | Participants Leaving Register | Participants Leaving Register (%) | Cost per Participant Leaving Register | Target for Leaving Register (%) | Met Target for Leaving Register |                       |
|    | 1             | 2     | 3                    | 4                             | 5                                 | 6                                     | 7                               | 8                               | 9                     |
| 1  | BEOGRAD       | 653   |                      | 158                           | 24.20%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 18.60                 |
| 2  | BOR           |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 23.67                 |
| 3  | VALJEVO       |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 20.77                 |
| 4  | VRANJE        |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.28                 |
| 5  | ZAJECAR       |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 29.58                 |
| 6  | ZRENJANIN     |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 35.20                 |
| 7  | JAGODINA      |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 24.15                 |
| 8  | KIKINDA       |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 30.23                 |
| 9  | KRAGUJEVAC    |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 25.91                 |
| 10 | KRALJEVO      | 12    |                      | 2                             | 16.67%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.19                 |
| 11 | KRUSEVAC      |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 26.46                 |
| 12 | LISKOVAC      |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.52                 |
| 13 | NIS           | 15    |                      | 2                             | 13.33%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 29.33                 |
| 14 | NOVI SAD      |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 26.92                 |
| 15 | PANCEVO       | 45    |                      | 12                            | 26.67%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 32.43                 |
| 16 | PIROT         |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 27.78                 |
| 17 | POZAREVAC     |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 13.34                 |
| 18 | PROKUPLJE     |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 35.12                 |
| 19 | SMEDEREVO     |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 28.51                 |
| 20 | SOMBOR        |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 36.28                 |
| 21 | S.MITROVICA   |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 36.27                 |
| 22 | SUBOTICA      |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 30.57                 |
| 23 | UZICE         |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 32.30                 |
| 24 | CACAK         |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 28.75                 |
| 25 | SABAC         |       |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.06                 |
|    | All of Serbia | 725   |                      | 174                           | 24.00%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 27.01                 |

**Table 3. Program D1 (NES): Non-financial Services for the Users**

|                | Register Data |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       | Performance Target              |                                 | Unemployment Rate (%) |
|----------------|---------------|------|----------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|
|                | Participants  | Cost | Cost per Participant | Participants Leaving Register | Participants Leaving Register (%) | Cost per Participant Leaving Register | Target for Leaving Register (%) | Met Target for Leaving Register |                       |
|                | 1             | 2    | 3                    | 4                             | 5                                 | 6                                     | 7                               | 8                               | 9                     |
| 1 BEOGRAD      | 36            |      |                      | 6                             | 16.67%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 18.60                 |
| 2 BOR          |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 23.67                 |
| 3 VALJEVO      |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 20.77                 |
| 4 VRANJE       |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.28                 |
| 5 ZAJECAR      |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 29.58                 |
| 6 ZRENJANIN    |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 35.20                 |
| 7 JAGODINA     |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 24.15                 |
| 8 KIKINDA      |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 30.23                 |
| 9 KRAGUJEVAC   |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 25.91                 |
| 10 KRALJEVO    | 43            |      |                      | 8                             | 18.60%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.19                 |
| 11 KRUSEVAC    |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 26.46                 |
| 12 LISKOVAC    |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.52                 |
| 13 NIS         | 15            |      |                      | 2                             | 13.33%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 29.33                 |
| 14 NOVI SAD    |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 26.92                 |
| 15 PANCEVO     |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 32.43                 |
| 16 PIROT       |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 27.78                 |
| 17 POZAREVAC   |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 13.34                 |
| 18 PROKUPLJE   |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 35.12                 |
| 19 SMEDEREVO   |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 28.51                 |
| 20 SOMBOR      |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 36.28                 |
| 21 S.MITROVICA |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 36.27                 |
| 22 SUBOTICA    |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 30.57                 |
| 23 UZICE       |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 32.30                 |
| 24 CACAK       |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 28.75                 |
| 25 SABAC       |               |      |                      |                               |                                   |                                       |                                 |                                 | 33.06                 |
| All of Serbia  | 94            |      |                      | 16                            | 17.02%                            |                                       |                                 |                                 | 27.01                 |























**Table 13. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Participant Surveys (%)**

| Employer Size (Number of Employees) | Micro (1 - 10) |    |    |    | Small (11 - 50) |    |    |    | Medium (51-250) |    |    |    | Large (250+) |    |    |    | Mean Number of Others Hired |    |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|----|----|----|-----------------|----|----|----|-----------------|----|----|----|--------------|----|----|----|-----------------------------|----|
|                                     | C1             | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1              | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1              | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1           | C2 | D5 | D6 | D5                          | D6 |
|                                     | 1              | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5               | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9               | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13           | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17                          | 18 |
| 1                                   | BEOGRAD        |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 2                                   | BOR            |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 3                                   | VALJEVO        |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 4                                   | VRANJE         |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 5                                   | ZAJECAR        |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 6                                   | ZRENJANIN      |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 7                                   | JAGODINA       |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 8                                   | KIKINDA        |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 9                                   | KRAGUJEVAC     |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 10                                  | KRALJEVO       |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 11                                  | KRUSEVAC       |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 12                                  | LISKOVAC       |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 13                                  | NIS            |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 14                                  | NOVI SAD       |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 15                                  | PANCEVO        |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 16                                  | PIROT          |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 17                                  | POZAREVAC      |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 18                                  | PROKUPLJE      |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 19                                  | SMEDEREVO      |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 20                                  | SOMBOR         |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 21                                  | S.MITROVICA    |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 22                                  | SUBOTICA       |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 23                                  | UZICE          |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 24                                  | CACAK          |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
| 25                                  | SABAC          |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |
|                                     | All of Serbia  |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |                 |    |    |    |              |    |    |    |                             |    |

Programs with Outcomes from Worker Surveys

- C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers
- C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills
- D5: Programs for Self Employment
- D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support

**Table 14. Distribution of Employer Ownership for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Participant Surveys (%)**

| Sector of Employer | State Owned Enterprise |    |    |    | Government Agency |    |    |    | Private Enterprise |    |    |    | Mixed |    |    |    | Cooperative Farm |    |    |    |
|--------------------|------------------------|----|----|----|-------------------|----|----|----|--------------------|----|----|----|-------|----|----|----|------------------|----|----|----|
|                    | C1                     | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1                | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1                 | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1    | C2 | D5 | D6 | C1               | C2 | D5 | D6 |
|                    | 1                      | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5                 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9                  | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13    | 14 | 15 | 16 | 17               | 18 | 19 | 20 |
| 1                  | BEOGRAD                |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 2                  | BOR                    |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 3                  | VALJEVO                |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 4                  | VRANJE                 |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 5                  | ZAJECAR                |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 6                  | ZRENJANIN              |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 7                  | JAGODINA               |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 8                  | KIKINDA                |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 9                  | KRAGUJEVAC             |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 10                 | KRALJEVO               |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 11                 | KRUSEVAC               |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 12                 | LISKOVAC               |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 13                 | NIS                    |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 14                 | NOVI SAD               |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 15                 | PANCEVO                |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 16                 | PIROT                  |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 17                 | POZAREVAC              |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 18                 | PROKUPLJE              |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 19                 | SMEDEREVO              |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 20                 | SOMBOR                 |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 21                 | S.MITROVICA            |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 22                 | SUBOTICA               |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 23                 | UZICE                  |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 24                 | CACAK                  |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
| 25                 | SABAC                  |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |
|                    | All of Serbia          |    |    |    |                   |    |    |    |                    |    |    |    |       |    |    |    |                  |    |    |    |

Programs with Outcomes from Worker Surveys

C1: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers

C2: Additional Working Knowledge and Skills

D5: Programs for Self Employment

D6: Self Employment with Lump Sum Support

**Table 15. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Employer Surveys (%)**

| Employer Size<br>(Number of Employees) | Micro<br>(1 - 10) |         |         |         | Small<br>(11 - 50) |         |         |         | Medium<br>(51-250) |          |          |          | Large<br>(250+) |          |          |          |
|--|-------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------|---------|---------|---------|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|
|  | C5<br>1           | D2<br>2 | D3<br>3 | D4<br>4 | C5<br>5            | D2<br>6 | D3<br>7 | D4<br>8 | C5<br>9            | D2<br>10 | D3<br>11 | D4<br>12 | C5<br>13        | D2<br>14 | D3<br>15 | D4<br>16 |
| 1                                      | BEOGRAD           |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 2                                      | BOR               |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 3                                      | VALJEVO           |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 4                                      | VRANJE            |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 5                                      | ZAJECAR           |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 6                                      | ZRENJANIN         |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 7                                      | JAGODINA          |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 8                                      | KIKINDA           |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 9                                      | KRAGUJEVAC        |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 10                                     | KRALJEVO          |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 11                                     | KRUSEVAC          |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 12                                     | LISKOVAC          |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 13                                     | NIS               |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 14                                     | NOVI SAD          |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 15                                     | PANCEVO           |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 16                                     | PIROT             |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 17                                     | POZAREVAC         |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 18                                     | PROKUPLJE         |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 19                                     | SMEDEREVO         |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 20                                     | SOMBOR            |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 21                                     | S.MITROVICA       |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 22                                     | SUBOTICA          |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 23                                     | UZICE             |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 24                                     | CACAK             |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
| 25                                     | SABAC             |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |
|  | All of Serbia     |         |         |         |                    |         |         |         |                    |          |          |          |                 |          |          |          |

Programs with Outcomes from Employer Surveys

- C5. On-the-Job Training
- D2. Programs to Encourage New Employment
- D3. Regional Programs
- D4. Employment of Handicapped Persons

**Table 16. Distribution of Employer Vintage for Active Labor Programs Monitored by Employer Surveys (%)**

| Region         | Employer Vintage<br>(Mean number of years since company established) |    |    |    | Unemployment<br>Rate |
|----------------|--|----|----|----|----------------------|
|                | C5   | D2 | D3 | D4 |                      |
|                | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5                    |
| 1 BEOGRAD      |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 2 BOR          |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 3 VALJEVO      |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 4 VRANJE       |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 5 ZAJECAR      |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 6 ZRENJANIN    |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 7 JAGODINA     |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 8 KIKINDA      |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 9 KRAGUJEVAC   |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 10 KRALJEVO    |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 11 KRUSEVAC    |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 12 LISKOVAC    |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 13 NIS         |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 14 NOVI SAD    |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 15 PANCEVO     |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 16 PIROT       |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 17 POZAREVAC   |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 18 PROKUPLJE   |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 19 SMEDEREVO   |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 20 SOMBOR      |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 21 S.MITROVICA |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 22 SUBOTICA    |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 23 UZICE       |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 24 CACAK       |  |    |    |    |                      |
| 25 SABAC       |  |    |    |    |                      |
| All of Serbia  |  |    |    |    |                      |

Programs with Outcomes from Employer Surveys

- C5. On-the-Job Training
- D2. Programs to Encourage New Employment
- D3. Regional Programs
- D4. Employment of Handicapped Persons

## Appendix A.

### Table by Table Guide to Data and Computations for PIMS

#### Table 1. Summary of PIMS Results

Table 1 presents a summary of activity on ALMPs throughout the Republic of Serbia in the period covered by the report. The period for this prototype Bulletin is January 1 to June 30, 2005.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

#### Table 2. Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1)

Table 2 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Training for Active Job Seeking (AJS/1).” It is a seminar provided by the regional NES offices to a large number of participants each month. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, plus performance targets for each region on leaving the register and an indicator of whether the target was reached. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Target for leaving register (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in Column (5). These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters.

Targets are set before the program year.

Column (8) Met target for leaving register: This column records yes if the value in Column (7) equals or exceeds the value in Column (5) and no otherwise.

Column (9) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 3. Non-financial Services for the Users (NES)

Table 3 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Non-financial services for the users (NES).” It is a one day seminar provided by the regional NES offices to persons interested in undertaking self-employment. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, plus performance targets for each region on leaving the register and an indicator of whether the target was reached. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Target for leaving register (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in Column (5). These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters.

Targets are set before the program year.

Column (8) Met target for leaving register: This column records yes if the value in Column (7) equals or exceeds the value in Column (5) and no otherwise.

Column (9) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 4. Non-financial Service for the Users (ASME)

Table 4 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Non-financial services for the users (ASME).” It is a two day seminar provided by the Agency for Small and Medium Enterprises (ASME) to persons interested in undertaking self-employment. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, plus performance targets for each region on leaving the

register and an indicator of whether the target was reached. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Target for leaving register (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in Column (5). These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters.

Targets are set before the program year.

Column (8) Met target for leaving register: This column records yes if the value in Column (5) equals or exceeds the value in Column (7) and no otherwise.

Column (9) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

#### Table 5. Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers

Table 5 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers.” It provides stipends to support apprentice volunteer activity for persons completing formal education in an occupation requiring apprenticeship experience to qualify for a license examination. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of participants. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).



Column (7) Survey Response Rate (%): Among all the participants selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error) the percentage the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Ever employed since volunteer (%): Among respondents the percentage holding a job at any time since leaving the program—the proportion answering yes to survey question number 3.

Column (9) Employed on survey data (%): Among respondents the percentage holding a job on the survey date—the proportion answering yes to survey question number 4.1.

Column (10) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (11) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (10) and no otherwise.

Column (12) Permanent Job (%): Among respondents the percentage in a permanent job on the survey date—the percentage answering yes to survey question number 4.2.

Column (13) Full Time Job (%): Among respondents the percentage in a full-time job on the survey date—the percentage answering yes to survey question number 4.3.

Column (14) Occupation Related to Volunteer Activity (%): Among currently employed respondents the percentage whose job is related to the subsidized volunteer activity—the percentage of those employed on the survey date (4.1 is yes) answering yes to survey question number 4.7.

Column (15) Took License Exam (%): Among respondents the percentage answering yes to survey question number 1.

Column (16) Passed License Exam (%): Among respondents the percentage answering yes to survey question number 2.

Column (17) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

#### Table 6. Additional Working Knowledge and Skills (Training)

Table 6 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills.” It is job skill training for the unemployed to do certain occupations. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of participants. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line

for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Survey Response Rate (%): Among all the participants selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error) the percentage the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Ever employed since training (%): Among respondents the percentage holding a job at any time since leaving the program—the proportion answering yes to survey question number 1.

Column (9) Employed on survey data (%): Among respondents the percentage holding a job on the survey date—the proportion answering yes to survey question number 2.

Column (10) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (11) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (10) and no otherwise.

Column (12) Permanent Job (%): Among respondents the percentage in a permanent job on the survey date—the percentage answering yes to survey question number 3.

Column (13) Full Time Job (%): Among respondents the percentage in a full-time job on the survey date—the percentage answering yes to survey question number 4.

Column (14) Occupation Related to Training Activity (%): Among currently employed respondents the percentage whose job is related to the subsidized training activity—the percentage of those employed on the survey date (2 is yes) answering yes to survey question number 9.

Column (15) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 7. Programs for Self Employment

Table 7 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Programs for Self Employment.” It is lump sum cash assistance from the ALMP fund to begin self-employment. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of participants. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into

labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

- Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.
- Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.
- Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)
- Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.
- Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).
- Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).
- Column (7) Survey Response Rate (%): Among all the participants selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error) the percentage the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.
- Column (8) Self-Employed (%): Among respondents the percentage currently engaged in self-employment activity--the proportion answering yes to survey question number 1.
- Column (9) Employed or Self-Employed (%): Among respondents the either self-employed (answer yes to question 1) or holding a job on the survey date (answer yes to question 2.1).
- Column (10) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.
- Column (11) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (10) and no otherwise.
- Column (12) Permanent Job (%): Among respondents who are presently employed for someone else (answer yes to question 2.1) the percentage in a permanent job on the survey date (answering yes to survey question number 2.2).
- Column (13) Full Time Job (%): Among respondents who are presently employed for someone else (answer yes to question 2.1) the percentage in a full time job on the survey date (answering yes to survey question number 2.3).
- Column (14) Occupation Related to Self Employment Skills (%): Among survey respondents who are presently employed for someone else (answer yes to question 2.1) the percentage whose job is related to the subsidized training activity (answering yes to survey question number 2.6).
- Column (15) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 8. Self Employment with Lump Sum Support

Table 8 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support.” It is a lump sum cash payment based in remaining UI entitlement to begin self-employment. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the

whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of participants. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Cost: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Survey Response Rate (%): Among all the participants selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error) the percentage the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Self-Employed (%): Among respondents the percentage currently engaged in self-employment activity--the proportion answering yes to survey question number 1.

Column (9) Employed or Self-Employed (%): Among respondents the either self-employed (answer yes to question 1) or holding a job on the survey date (answer yes to question 2.1).

Column (10) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (11) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (10) and no otherwise.

Column (12) Permanent Job (%): Among respondents who are presently employed for someone else (answer yes to question 2.1) the percentage in a permanent job on the survey date (answering yes to survey question number 2.2).

Column (13) Full Time Job (%): Among respondents who are presently employed for someone else (answer yes to question 2.1) the percentage in a full time job on the survey date (answering yes to survey question number 2.3).

Column (14) Occupation Related to Self Employment Skills (%): Among survey respondents who are presently employed for someone else (answer yes to question 2.1) the percentage whose job is related to the subsidized training activity (answering yes to survey question number 2.6).

Column (15) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 9. On-the-Job Training

Table 9 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “On-the-Job Training.” It is cash assistance to employers to provide on-the-job training (OJT) to unemployed job seekers who have completed at least 8 years of formal education. OJT is provided in practical job skills currently demanded in the local job market by a specific employer. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of employers. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Costs: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Response by Employers (%): Among all the employers selected to be interviewed, the percentage the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Response for Participants (%): Among all the participants at employers selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error), the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (9) Employed after Retention Period (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who worked some time after the subsidized employer’s compulsory retention period. That is, there is no date in the job/separation Month/Year filed, or the job separation date reported is after the date when the employer’s compulsory retention period ended.

Column (10) Employed on Survey Date (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who are still working for the subsidized employer. That is, the date in the job/separation Month/Year is empty.

Column (11) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (12) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (11) and no otherwise.

Column (13) Percent Terminated for Redundancy: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (1) termination by employer due to

redundancy.

Column (14) Percent Terminated for Poor Perform/Misconduct: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (2) poor performance or misconduct.

Column (15) Percent Terminated for Voluntary Quit: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (3) termination by employee (voluntary quit).

Column (16) Percent Terminated for Other: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (4) other reasons.

Column (17) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

#### Table 10. Programs to Encourage New Employment

Table 10 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Programs to Encourage New Employment.”

It provides a reduction of social insurance tax for workers hired from the public register of unemployed job seekers. Workers for whom a tax reduction is granted must be retained for a duration that is three times as long as the subsidy is paid. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of employers. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Costs: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Response by Employers (%): Among all the employers selected to be interviewed, the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Response for Participants (%): Among all the participants at employers selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error), the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (9) Employed after Retention Period (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8))

the percentage who worked some time after the subsidized employer's compulsory retention period. That is, there is no date in the job/separation Month/Year filed, or the job separation date reported is after the date when the employer's compulsory retention period ended.

Column (10) Employed on Survey Date (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who are still working for the subsidized employer. That is, the date in the job/separation Month/Year is empty.

Column (11) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (12) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (11) and no otherwise.

Column (13) Percent Terminated for Redundancy: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (1) termination by employer due to redundancy.

Column (14) Percent Terminated for Poor Perform/Misconduct: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (2) poor performance or misconduct.

Column (15) Percent Terminated for Voluntary Quit: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (3) termination by employee (voluntary quit).

Column (16) Percent Terminated for Other: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (4) other reasons.

Column (17) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

#### Table 11. Regional Programs

Table 11 presents a summary of activity on ALMP "Regional Programs." It provides a lump sum subsidy to the wages paid workers hired from the public register of unemployed job seekers.

Such worker must be retained at least 24 months after being hired. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of employers. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Costs: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative

report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Response by Employers (%): Among all the employers selected to be interviewed, the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Response for Participants (%): Among all the participants at employers selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error), the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (9) Employed after Retention Period (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who worked some time after the subsidized employer's compulsory retention period. That is, there is no date in the job/separation Month/Year filed, or the job separation date reported is after the date when the employer's compulsory retention period ended.

Column (10) Employed on Survey Date (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who are still working for the subsidized employer. That is, the date in the job/separation Month/Year is empty.

Column (11) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (12) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (11) and no otherwise.

Column (13) Percent Terminated for Redundancy: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (1) termination by employer due to redundancy.

Column (14) Percent Terminated for Poor Perform/Misconduct: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (2) poor performance or misconduct.

Column (15) Percent Terminated for Voluntary Quit: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (3) termination by employee (voluntary quit).

Column (16) Percent Terminated for Other: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (4) other reasons.

Column (17) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 12. Program D4: Employment of Handicapped Persons



Table 12 presents a summary of activity on ALMP “Employment of Handicapped Persons.” To employ handicapped persons who are on the NES unemployment register, through creation of new workplaces either in self-employment or with existing employers. For self-employment a lump sum is granted in addition to either all social insurance payroll taxes<sup>a</sup> (currently 17.9%) for up to three years, or 80% of the average gross wage nationwide for one year. In the case of hiring by an existing employer, the subsidy grants a lump sum (to include the cost of adapting the workplace to accommodate the handicapped) plus either all social insurance payroll taxes for up to three years, or 80% of the average gross wage nationwide for one year. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. Data summarizes participation, cost, and leaving the register from existing administrative records of the NES, and evidence from special surveys of employers. Data from the surveys are used to assess achievement of performance targets. Certain other performance data related to this particular program are also presented. To put the performance measures into labor market context regional unemployment rates are also listed.

Column (1) Participants: a count of all persons ending program participation in the period.

Column (2) Costs: total expenditures made during the period as reported in the standard line for that program in NES accounting reports totaled across all months in the period.

Column (3) Cost per participant: Column (2) divided by Column (1)

Column (4) Participants leaving the register: Among those identified in Column (1) as participants, the number leaving the register of unemployed either because of an affirmative report of employment or for failure to report for active job search at the regional NES office within the preceding three months.

Column (5) Participants leaving the register (%): Column (4) as a percentage of Column (1).

Column (6) Cost per participant leaving the register: Column (2) divided by Column (4).

Column (7) Response by Employers (%): Among all the employers selected to be interviewed, the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (8) Response for Participants (%): Among all the participants at employers selected to be interviewed (this should include all persons leaving the program in the relevant period or a random sample adequate to estimate response within an acceptable margin of error), the percentage for whom the interview was completed. Knowledge of the response rate informs about the reliability of the results reported.

Column (9) Employed after Retention Period (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who worked some time after the subsidized employer’s compulsory retention period. That is, there is no date in the job/separation Month/Year filed, or the job separation date reported is after the date when the employer’s compulsory retention period ended.

Column (10) Employed on Survey Date (%): Among respondents (basis for column (8)) the percentage who are still working for the subsidized employer. That is, the date in the job/separation Month/Year is empty.

Column (11) Target employment (%): The regional target for the performance indicator

---

<sup>a</sup> Social insurance payroll tax contributions on gross wages are paid by both employer and worker equally at rates of: 11 percent to public pensions, 6.15 percent for health insurance, and 0.75 percent for unemployment insurance.

summarized in column (9) as negotiated by the region. These targets are set either objectively by a statistical adjustment methodology or subjectively by negotiation between the region and the NES headquarters. Targets are set before the program year.

Column (12) Met target employment: This column records yes if the value in Column (9) equals or exceeds the target value shown in Column (11) and no otherwise.

Column (13) Percent Terminated for Redundancy: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (1) termination by employer due to redundancy.

Column (14) Percent Terminated for Poor Perform/Misconduct: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (2) poor performance or misconduct.

Column (15) Percent Terminated for Voluntary Quit: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (3) termination by employee (voluntary quit).

Column (16) Percent Terminated for Other: Based on the survey of employers, among all those terminated, the percentage with reason code (4) other reasons.

Column (17) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.

Table 13. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Participant Surveys

Table 13 summarizes the distribution of enterprise size as measured by the number of employees working at enterprises hiring ALMP participants. The table summarizes the size results for hiring from four ALMPs monitored by individual participant surveys: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers, Additional Working Knowledge and Skills, Programs for Self Employment, and Self Employment with Lump Sum Support. To facilitate examination of the employer size pattern of hiring ALMP participants the percentages for all four programs are presented side by side for each size category. The four number of employee size categories are micro (1-10), small (11-50), medium (51-250), and large (250+). This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row. For the two self-employment programs evidence on secondary employment effects is also presented. The last two columns report the “mean number of other persons hired” in the two programs.

Column (1): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in micro (1-10) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 4.5.

Column (2): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in micro (1-10) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 7.

Column (3): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in micro (1-10) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 2.5.

Column (4): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in micro (1-10) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 2.5.

Column (5): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in small (11-50) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (b) to question 4.5.

Column (6): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in small (11-50) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (b) to question 7.

Column (7): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in small (11-50) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (b) to question 2.5.

Column (8): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in small (11-50) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (b) to question 2.5.

Column (9): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in medium (51-250) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 4.5.

Column (10): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in medium (51-250) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 7.

Column (11): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in medium (51-250) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 2.5.

Column (12): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in medium (51-250) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 2.5.

Column (13): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in large (250+) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 4.5.

Column (14): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in large (250+) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 7.

Column (15): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in large (250+) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 2.5.

Column (16): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in large (250+) employee size enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 2.5.

Column (17): Among participants in “Programs for Self Employment” the sum of the value of responses to question 1.2 divided by the sum of those still self employed (yes to question 1.1).

Column (18): Among participants in “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support” the sum of the value of responses to question 1.2 divided by the sum of those still self employed (yes to question 1.1).

Table 14. Distribution of Employer Ownership for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Participant Surveys

For ALMPs monitored by participant surveys, Table 14 summarizes the distribution of ALMP participants hired by enterprises with various ownership arrangements. The table summarizes the results for hiring from four ALMPs monitored by individual participant surveys: Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers, Additional Working Knowledge and Skills, Programs for Self Employment, and Self Employment with Lump Sum Support. To facilitate examination of ownership structure on hiring of ALMP participants the percentages for all four programs are presented side by side for each employer category. The five employer ownership categories are: (1) state owned, (2) government agency, (3) private, (4) mixed, (5) cooperative farm. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row.

Column (1): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in state owned enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 4.4.

Column (2): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in state owned enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 6.

Column (3): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in state owned enterprise , the percentage answering (a) to question 2.4.

Column (4): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in state owned enterprises, the percentage answering (a) to question 2.4.

Column (5): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in government agencies, the percentage answering (b) to question 4.4.

Column (6): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in government agencies, the percentage answering (b) to question 6.

Column (7): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in government agencies, the percentage answering (b) to question 2.4.

Column (8): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in government agencies, the percentage answering (b) to question 2.4.

Column (9): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in private enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 4.4.

Column (10): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in private enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 6.

Column (11): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in private enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 2.4.

Column (12): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in private enterprises, the percentage answering (c) to question 2.4.

Column (13): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in mixed enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 4.4.

Column (14): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in mixed enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 6.

Column (15): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in mixed enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 2.4.

Column (16): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in mixed enterprises, the percentage answering (d) to question 2.4.

Column (17): Of all the people employed after “Vocational Training – Apprentice Volunteers,” the percentage working in cooperative farms, the percentage answering (d) to question 4.4.

Column (18): Of all the people employed after “Additional Working Knowledge and Skills,” the percentage working in cooperative farms, the percentage answering (d) to question 6.

Column (19): Of all the people employed after “Programs for Self Employment,” the percentage working in cooperative farms, the percentage answering (d) to question 2.4.

Column (20): Of all the people employed after “Self Employment with Lump Sum Support,” the percentage working in cooperative farms, the percentage answering (d) to question 2.4.

Table 15. Distribution of Employer Size for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Employer Surveys

Table 15 summarizes the distribution of enterprise size as measured by the number of employees working at enterprises hiring ALMP participants. The table summarizes the size results for hiring from four ALMPs monitored by employer surveys: On-the-Job Training, Programs to Encourage New Employment, Regional Programs, Employment of Handicapped Persons. To facilitate examination of hiring ALMP participants by employer size, the percentages for all four programs are presented side by side for each size category. The four number of employee size categories are micro (1-10), small (11-50), medium (51-250), and large (250+). This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row.

Column (1): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “On-the-Job Training,” the percentage which are micro (1-10) employee size enterprises.

Column (2): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Programs to Encourage New Employment,” the percentage which are micro (1-10) employee size enterprises.

Column (3): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Regional Programs,” the percentage which are micro (1-10) employee size enterprises.

Column (4): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Employment of Handicapped Persons,” the percentage which are micro (1-10) employee size enterprises.

Column (5): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “On-the-Job Training,” the percentage which are small (11-50) employee size enterprises.

Column (6): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Programs to Encourage New Employment,” the percentage which are small (11-50) employee size enterprises.

Column (7): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Regional Programs,” the

percentage which are small (11-50) employee size enterprises.

Column (8): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Employment of Handicapped Persons,” the percentage which are small (11-50) employee size enterprises.

Column (9): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “On-the-Job Training,” the percentage which are medium (51-250) employee size enterprises.

Column (10): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Programs to Encourage New Employment,” the percentage which are medium (51-250) employee size enterprises.

Column (11): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Regional Programs,” the percentage which are medium (51-250) employee size enterprises.

Column (12): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Employment of Handicapped Persons,” the percentage which are medium (51-250) employee size enterprises.

Column (13): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “On-the-Job Training,” the percentage which are large (250+) employee size enterprises.

Column (14): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Programs to Encourage New Employment,” the percentage which are large (250+) employee size enterprises.

Column (15): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Regional Programs,” the percentage which are large (250+) employee size enterprises.

Column (16): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Employment of Handicapped Persons,” the percentage which are large (250+) employee size enterprises.

Table 16. Distribution of Employer Vintage for Active Labor Programs  
Monitored by Employer Surveys

Table 16 summarizes the distribution of enterprise vintage as measured by employers responding to surveys following involvement in four ALMPs monitored by employer surveys: On-the-Job Training, Programs to Encourage New Employment, Regional Programs, Employment of Handicapped Persons. The mean number of years since the responding enterprises were established is tabulated for each program. This table presents results for each of 25 regions in the Republic of Serbia with totals for the whole Republic listed in the bottom row.

Column (1): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “On-the-Job Training,” the mean number of years since the enterprise was established.

Column (2): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Programs to Encourage New Employment,” the mean number of years since the enterprise was established.

Column (3): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Regional Programs,” the mean number of years since the enterprise was established.

Column (4): Of all the employers responding to the survey on “Employment of Handicapped Persons,” the mean number of years since the enterprise was established.

Column (5) Unemployment Rate (%): The regional unemployment rate as measured by official statistics used by the NES for policy making. The estimate for the entire Republic is listed in the bottom row.