



# ASSESSING INSTITUTIONAL READINESS OF MEANINGFUL YOUTH ENGAGEMENT

## Introduction

An outline method for the assessment of anti-corruption authorities' institutional readiness for the 13 institutional enablers as defined in the **“Policy Guide for National Anti-Corruption Authorities on Meaningful Youth Engagement in Anti-Corruption Work”** is described below. These institutional enablers have not been discussed in detail with anti-corruption authorities nor have they been piloted. A suggested way forward, with the aim of drafting a “Toolkit” for the anti-corruption authorities to undertake both one off detailed and/or routine updates of Institutional Readiness, would require a pilot testing of these institutional enablers and a refinement of a monitoring system to define and track anti-corruption authorities Institutional Readiness. A toolkit is needed on how to undertake such an institutional readiness assessment either “in-house’ or through external support should be developed, translated into multiple languages and rolled-out globally across anti-corruption authorities. This roll-out should be undertaken in a systematic manner alongside case studies of existing youth engagement efforts allowing the learnings to be analyzed.



## 1. Diversity and inclusion

### **a) Stakeholder Analysis**

An assessment of anti-corruption authorities' capacity to undertake stakeholder analysis will reveal that an anti-corruption authorities' capacity may vary from low (where the anti-corruption authorities have little internal capacity to undertake stakeholder analyses and rarely uses them), to medium (where the anti-corruption authorities regularly undertake stakeholder analyses to help design work programme activities. A high level of internal capacity and experience relevant to meaningful youth engagement is often found when the anti-corruption authorities routinely conduct participatory youth stakeholder analysis jointly with young people, ensuring a clear understanding of the youth groups' capabilities and interests.

### **b) Participation plan**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' capacity to undertake a participation plan will reveal that the anti-corruption authorities' capacity may vary from a low capacity, where it has little internal capacity to undertake project participation plans and rarely uses them, through to the anti-corruption authorities which regularly draft participation plans in their work programming (medium capacity). A high level is when the anti-corruption authorities have the internal capacity and experience to develop inclusive participatory plans jointly with young people.

## 2. Engagement-enabling environment

### **a) Dedicated funding for youth engagement**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities institutional readiness and agility in financing and resourcing meaningful youth engagement activities is assessed as low when there is little experience in allocating budget for youth engagement; medium if an anti-corruption authority routinely allocates budget for civil society organization and citizens stakeholder participatory activities (including diverse marginalized groups) and high if the anti-corruption authority uses transparent participatory budgeting processes and has internal, flexible budget allocation and processing mechanisms for youth budgeting including interns, youth consultants and youth partners.

### **b) Formal youth engagement mechanisms**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' institutional readiness for youth mobilization is considered low when no formal internal youth engagement mechanisms exist and there is little experience in mobilizing young people for collaborative or partnering activities. Mobilizing youth only as participants for events could also be considered as a low level of readiness for meaningful youth engagement as often the empowerment of youth participants is tokenistic engagement undertaken in a classroom style "youth educational event". Similarly, when young people are invited to an event but are not provided with the opportunity to participate and share their views the engagement path is one-way and considered low. Events which are co-designed with young people who go on to play active partnering roles in the event implementation would lead to a youth engagement assessment showing a more advanced level of meaningful youth engagement readiness. Readiness would be adjudged as medium when an anti-corruption authority has generic citizens participation policies and implementing guidelines which are inclusive of youth engagement, and high when there is a specific youth engagement mandate, internal youth engagement guides and tools with staff training programs for meaningful youth engagement including how to mobilize young people effectively.

### **c) Staff capacity, and technical knowledge on meaningful youth engagement**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' capacity for meaningful youth engagement is assessed as low when anti-corruption authorities' staff have little youth partnering, mentoring, or safeguarding experience and would be unable to design a meaningful youth engagement activity without seeking outside assistance. Capacity would be medium when the anti-corruption authorities have a number of staff who have youth engagement experience and the capacity to co-design and implement with partners a meaningful youth engagement initiative. Where an anti-corruption authority has mandated staff training in meaningful youth engagement, recognized internal meaningful youth engagement specialist, and is well networked with youth who can co-design, implement and evaluate meaningful youth engagement activities, the anti-corruption authorities would be assessed as having a high staff capacity for meaningful youth engagement.

### **d) Youth safeguarding**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities institutional readiness to undertake adequate safeguarding is considered: low if no formal internal youth engagement safeguarding mechanisms exist; medium where the anti-corruption authorities have staff trained in safeguarding principles with mandatory generic stakeholder engagement procedures which, with help from an experienced civil society organization partner, can adequately be used to provide youth safeguarding including provisions for safeguarding minors and young people engagement. A high safeguarding capacity would be assessed when an anti-corruption authority has mandatory youth engagement procedures with experience in implementation through internal support counselling/safeguarding/security capacity and external experienced civil society organization partners to provide high quality youth safeguarding oversight and monitoring support.

## **3. Intergenerational collaboration (or partnerships)**

### **a) Anti-corruption authorities-youth meaningful youth engagement collaboration/partnership plan**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities institutional readiness for intergenerational collaborations and partnerships is low when an anti-corruption authorities and youth have little experience co-designing youth engagement activities; a medium assessment would require anti-corruption authorities to have partnered or collaborated with youth from the early stage of a project initiative or knowledge activity with co-design continuing through to implementation of youth engagement following meaningful youth engagement principles. A high level of intergenerational engagement is assessed when anti-corruption authorities and youth regularly partner in co-design implementation of meaningful youth engagement and have established monitoring and evaluation systems evaluating and reporting shared-value partnership results.

## 4. Quality youth participation

### **a) Mobilized volunteers, interns, partners, leaders in anti-corruption work**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' readiness to mobilize young people is low when anti-corruption authorities' teams do not have available in-house youth resources or regular youth partners for co-designing activities. A medium readiness level is achieved when the anti-corruption authorities have internal short-term interns or volunteers or mechanisms for collaboration and partnership on an outsourcing basis with youth. When an anti-corruption authority has available, for anti-corruption authorities staff engagement, a team of youth through a dedicated experienced long term (more than six months) internship program, youth-hub or similar, including a network of routine youth partners, who have anti-corruption knowledge and an adequate level of familiarity of the anti-corruption authorities' objectives, the institutional readiness of anti-corruption authorities for youth participation is assessed as high.

### **b) Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' readiness to mobilize young people**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' institutional readiness with structures and processes for meaningful youth engagement is low if there is no "go-to" youth advisory board or youth partner mechanism established in an anti-corruption authorities; a medium assessment occurs if an anti-corruption authorities has a youth consultative group and mechanisms for mobilizing local youth and these youth periodically observe and review anti-corruption authorities institutional youth engagement mechanisms. A high assessment requires an anti-corruption authority to have active youth consultative groups with active, mandatory, well used pathways for regular and continuous meaningful youth engagement activities with participatory monitoring and evaluation in place reviewing the institutional structures and processes for quality youth participation.

### **c) Provide youth-friendly materials, capacity support**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' institutional readiness to provide youth friendly support youth is low if an anti-corruption authority has no dedicated training materials or capacity building programs targeting potential youth partners; the level of readiness rises to medium if the anti-corruption authorities have anti-corruption publications which target young people and training programs to roll-out capacity building initiatives. A high level of capacity support can be assessed when anti-corruption authorities have co-designed with young people anti-corruption training material, and training programs targeting young people include both adults and young people as facilitators and/or trainers. These programs shall target marginalized young people as participants and monitor the impact (change in knowledge and behavior) of training on youth participants.

## 5. Youth empowerment

### **a) Providing opportunities for young people to build their capacity while performing tasks supporting anti-corruption activities.**

Anti-corruption authorities' institutional readiness is low when an anti-corruption authority has no anti-corruption youth training programs, and medium when youth empowerment and training follows meaningful youth engagement principles with experiential training of youth linked to anti-corruption. A high level of institutional readiness in youth capacity building is recognized when youth are trained, mentored, and empowered to partner in anti-corruption authorities' activities supporting an inclusive approach, mobilizing, and providing opportunities for anti-corruption learning opportunities with grassroots local youth.

### **b) Creating mentorship opportunities for young interns and volunteers**

Institutional readiness for youth mentorships in an anti-corruption authority is considered low when the agency only offers short term (less than two months) intern programmes providing research opportunities with predetermined ToR for young interns. Internship and volunteer programs linked to anti-corruption authorities operations which provide hands-on experiential training for interns under close supervision and mentoring by anti-corruption authorities staff is assessed as a medium level of opportunities; whilst the anti-corruption authorities can achieve a high assessment by offering long term (> 6 months) internships with young people strategically and intentionally mobilized to support meaningful youth engagement across its operations. Dedicated training and mentoring and reverse-mentoring feature as part of the career development and meaningful youth engagement expansion objectives.

### **c) Ensure adult stakeholders have the skills to constructively engage with young people**

Assessment of anti-corruption authorities' capacity and staff skill to effectively engage with young people is low when officers have no access to meaningful youth engagement training opportunities. It rises to medium when practical meaningful youth engagement is a mandatory training requirement within the anti-corruption authorities and may be assessed as high when the agency provides a structured meaningful youth engagement skills capacity building programme for staff which includes joint training and project interventions working with external partners and youth organization that support meaningful youth engagement implementation and reverse-mentoring feedback mechanisms.