

<Job activation in the Municipality of s-Hertogenbosch-Netherlands >

**General details**

Name of contact	Yvonne Bieshaar
Organisation	City of ,s-Hertogenbosch
Address	PO Box 12345, 5200 GZ s-Hertogenbosch
Telephone no.	0031736159271
Email address	<a href="mailto:yvbi@s-hertogenbosch.nl">yvbi@s-hertogenbosch.nl</a>

**Details of activity**

<p>Background to the case study</p>	<p><b>Aims and objectives</b></p> <p>The Work en Social assistance act was introduced to the local governments on the first of January 2004. The city of ‘s-Hertogenbosch was very eager to work with this new act because it had introduced the Work First method years before. With the introduction of this act, the overruling view of the National government was reduced and the possibility to adjust our policy to what was needed on the local size increased. The city of s-Hertogenbosch has 135.000 inhabitants, a work force of 60.000 people, and 3.000 people on welfare.</p> <p>Every year we make a business plan in which our aims and objectives are described. On a yearly base we want to reduce the number of people on welfare with 3 %. Until now we reached our goal every year.</p> <p><b>Implementing organisation</b></p> <p>We started with the Work First approach in 1998 with a small number of our employers; those who were enthusiastic about the idea. After 1 year we saw that the approach was successful and appreciated by our clients, we introduced it in the whole organisation.</p> <p><b>Funding</b></p> <p>The budget on a year base is €8.000.000 for work integration and social assistance.</p>
-------------------------------------	--



	<p><b>When activity started / end date?</b> The activities started in 1998 and are still going on and increasing in intensity.</p>
Description of activity	<p><b>Outline of programme / activities and approaches used</b> Every client that comes to us with a request for social assistance immediately receives an appointment with a case-manager concerning an employment position, even before he or she could fill in the paperwork. If the client asks, he/she is diagnosed. If the client can work, he/she is immediately sent to a jobcentre to work for 20 hours a week. If the client has other problems (debts, addiction etc.) the case-manager designs a special program for 20 hours a week. This goes on until the client has found a job.</p> <p><b>Origins – how it came about – bottom up / top down, grew from previous initiative (if so what)</b> The idea was inspired by a visit to Wisconsin and introduced to a small group of employers in our organisation. The main motive to change our policy was that our former approach never solved the situation of the client, we could only stabilize it.</p> <p><b>Who was involved in the design, management and delivery of the programme</b> The counsellors, the town counsellors, the employers, representatives of the clients and the management of our organisation.</p> <p><b>Recognition – has the programme been recognised as good practice? If so, by whom?</b> Yes, it had a great influence in the Netherlands. When we started the program, we had a lot of criticism from the Ministry of social affairs. Nowadays nearly every city in the Netherlands introduced the Work First approach.</p>
Policy context within which the programme operates	<p><b>Is there an explicit relationship between policy priorities / local activities?</b> Yes, there is. It is one of the priorities of the politics in our city to let everyone participate in the labour market and bring in their talents. It's a policy of inclusion in stead of exclusion (which was more common in former years).</p> <p><b>Is the policy context supportive / prohibitive?</b> The local policy context is very supportive, also because the</p>



	<p>approach is proven to be successful.</p> <p><b>Has the policy context changed during the life of the activity</b> Yes, it changed recently with the local elections. It did not have an affect on our approach.</p> <p><b>Which came first – local activities or policy priorities (i.e. is activity leading or following policy priorities)?</b> It went on hand by hand.</p>
Geographical focus of the case study	<p><b>At what level does the programme operate?</b> On the local level.</p>
Impact	<p><b>Outputs – scale and scope of people reached through the programme</b> The programme reaches yearly 2000 persons. 1200 people flow in every year and 1400 people flow out every year.</p> <p><b>Outcomes: at local level – what difference at local level and at regional and / or national level – what difference made?</b> The difference is the the municipality is now free to change their policy on the basis of local factors.</p> <p><b>Any impact at European level?</b> The best impact on European level can be the focus on the client (and not on the laws) and a trust in the professionalism of the workers.</p>
Partners' details	<p><b>Name and briefly describe partner's contributions to programme</b> There are about 25 profit organisations that contribute to our programme. They are contracted by the local government.</p>

### Theme-Specific Questions

Who was targeted by the programme?	People in our city that are on social assistance.
Which levels of government were involved, informed or consulted?	The local and national government
Sustainability	<p><b>What achieved / how funded?</b> We achieved an decrease of the number of people on welfare every year. The National funds are more than enough sufficient to continue with the programme.</p>



Successes / lessons learned	<p><b>What contributed to the programme's success?</b> Enthusiasm, believe in the goals, an councillor with vision, good employees and management.</p> <p><b>What lessons have been learned</b> Never be satisfied, reinvent the programme every year. Listen to your clients, the politics and your employees.</p> <p><b>If they had their time again what would the do differently?</b> Introduce the work and social assistance act much earlier.</p>
-----------------------------	--

