

Table 2 – Control sample, absolute and % values with respect to the control population.

| LMP                           | Certification |        |      |        |            |        | Error by LMP |
|-------------------------------|---------------|--------|------|--------|------------|--------|--------------|
|                               | BAS           |        | SPE  |        | TOT by LMP |        |              |
|                               | A.V.          | % pop. | A.V. | % pop. | A.V.       | % pop. |              |
| No                            | 160           | 30.6   | 224  | 30.3   | 384        | 30.4   | 4.2          |
| Yes                           | 46            | 36.8   | 61   | 33.9   | 107        | 35.1   | 7.6          |
| <b>TOT by certification</b>   | 206           | 31.8   | 285  | 31.0   | 491        | 31.3   | 3.7          |
| <b>Error by certification</b> | 5.6           |        | 4.8  |        | 3.7        |        |              |

Table 2 describes the counterfactual sample. The restrained absolute error reveals the quite good quality of the sample, whose design resembles that of the main sample, hence maintaining the highest homogeneity on the observables.

#### 4. GROSS IMPACT EVALUATION

The gross impact of VT policies is evaluated on the working conditions of trained students in the medium term, i.e. about 12 months later the end of the course (October 2012).

In fact, the labour market transitions of individuals, who were not employed at enrolment, measure the gross impact of training, with no care of the counterfactual situation.

#### 4.1 A macro approach: Gross placement indicators

Placement outcomes are evaluated by three nested indicators, each representing a specific situation within the labour market. Figure 1 defines the indicators. The employment rate is the fraction of trained students who are employed (including redundancy funds), hence experiencing a “strong” position within the labour market. The insertion rate includes the wider subset of trained students who cover a weaker position, e.g. *stage* and on-the-job training. Finally, the success rate incorporates individuals who are still within the educational system. Investigating placement indicators by citizenship (Table 3), it emerges that EU foreigners perform the best, recording an high employment rate with respect to Italian and non-EU citizens.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{Employment rate} &= \frac{\text{Trained \& Employed (incl. redundancy funds)}}{\text{Total trained}} \\
 \text{Insertion rate} &= \frac{\text{Trained with working activity (employed + training/stage)}}{\text{Total trained}} \\
 \text{Success rate} &= \frac{\text{Trained with working activity + Students}}{\text{Total trained}}
 \end{aligned}$$

Figure 1 – Placement indicators: Definition.