

2014

Youth Civic Engagement & Leadership

Rachel Clement, Mary Deering, Rindala
Mikhael & Carmina Villa-Garcia

4/21/2014

Contents

A Review of Literature from Academia & Practice	2
ChildFund’s Approach to Youth Development	2
Key Concepts in Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership	3
Factors Affecting Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership	7
Key Considerations for Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership	11
Medium for Intervention	12
Existing Evidence for CE&L in Youth Programming	13
Conclusion	14
Insights from Experts in the Field	19
Methodology & Process	2
Approach, Interventions and Integration	20
The Concepts of Civic Engagement and Leadership	21
Factors that Affect Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership	22
Considerations for Planning Interventions	28
Monitoring & Evaluation	29
Developing a Model on Youth Civic Engagement & Leadership	30
Youth Perspectives on Civic Engagement & Leadership	33
Key Takeaways	34
Findings from Field Research in the Philippines and Uganda	37
Methodology	2
Field Work in the Philippines	39
Field Work in Uganda	44
Recommendations for National Offices	48
Recommendations for the Philippines	48
Recommendations for Uganda	49
Fieldwork Facilitator Guide	50
General Guidelines for Activities	51
Think Tank Activities:	51
Field Activities with Local Partners	59
Field Activities with Youth	62
Appendix	67
Overview of Activities	68

A Review of Literature from Academia & Practice

ChildFund's Approach to Youth Development

Today, youth have greater access to opportunities to participate and be engaged at all levels of governance and policymaking than they did in the past. Youth in many countries are taking part in the development of national level policies, frameworks and plans of action; there is broad recognition at the international level that investing in youth and empowering them to be active and engaged participants in their communities and countries is crucial to achieving positive development outcomes. In addition, youth participation enhances skill development, confidence and competency building. ChildFund believes that when youth are equipped to fully participate in decisions that are affecting their lives through access to resources, knowledge, and opportunities for engagement, they become self-confident, strong, healthy, productive, and secure persons.

Despite this recognition that youth must be better incorporated into development programming at all levels, youth still face many challenges that hinder their involvement. ChildFund's Youth Core Program, Skilled and Involved Youth, recognizes challenges, and opportunities for intervention, in three key areas: leadership and civic engagement; employment; and sexual and reproductive health. ChildFund's theory of change for youth (ages 15-24) revolves around working directly with youth, parents, families/communities, and the broader constituency to overcome barriers in these three key domains. Civic engagement and leadership (CE&L) has been identified as one of these three key domains because civic activism is a powerful way to reach deprived, excluded, and vulnerable youth and build their skills and capacities to contribute to their communities and countries.

Within the civic engagement and leadership domain, ChildFund has identified three key pathways for how youth can effectively become change agents in their families and communities. The first pathway is youth-friendly forums. When youth have knowledge of and access to youth-friendly forums they are able to discuss and reflect on issues that are important to them. These youth-friendly spaces are an important component of giving youth a platform for learning about civic issues and engaging with their communities and other youth. The second pathway that ChildFund has identified is collective voice. ChildFund notes that an important component of youth becoming change agents is that they utilize youth-friendly spaces to come together to share experiences and viewpoints and work collaboratively to develop a goal or plan of action. The third pathway is collective action. Collective action is about youth advocating for and taking action on the goals and issues that they have identified as important. ChildFund recognizes that the collective action pathway requires that youth have the skills, knowledge, and confidence to effectively engage with governance structures, community leaders, and public authorities, such as local and central governments.

In order to support its ongoing efforts to improve and refine its youth programming, and recognizing the lack of concrete and scalable models on youth civic engagement and leadership, ChildFund initiated a multi-step process to take advantage of the existing information and expertise available on youth CE&L and conduct additional field research to develop a holistic, flexible and practice-oriented model on youth CE&L. For this purpose, a review of the considerable literature available on youth development, civic engagement and leadership was undertaken which covered more than 40 journal articles, project reports, research studies, assessments, guides, and handbooks. This report attempts to draw together some of the main insights from the readings and connect them under some key themes: Concepts, Factors, Considerations, Frameworks and Lessons Learnt.

Key Concepts in Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership

Civic Engagement

The term civic engagement (CE) does not have a standard definition; definitions of civic engagement vary over discipline, organization, country context, and person to person. In addition, the concepts associated with it are related to the interests of the definer, and the disciplines he/she is grounded in (Adler and Goggin 2005; Meinen-Dick, Di Gregorio and McCarthy, 2004); civic engagement exists in a space that brings together diverse social science disciplines such as sociology, political science and economics. Concepts related to CE include social change, community involvement, political involvement and community service (Adler and Goggin 2005). While the concepts vary across organizations, the authors of this report found it useful to highlight two main aspects of the definition: political activities and community service activities. Civic Engagement can include volunteering in a community service project, social learning, being involved in an organization working to address a social issue, voting, and joining with others to raise concerns (Mercy Corps 2012; Adler and Goggin 2005).

A general definition that might encompass different aspects of the concept is: “Civic engagement describes how an active citizen participates in the life of a community in order to improve conditions for others or to help shape the community’s future” (Adler and Goggin, 2005, 238). For example, civic engagement could be a single individual advocating for youth-friendly reproductive services at their local health clinic, or a group of youth advocating to the Board of Education in their region for comprehensive sexual education, or youth councils who interact with adults in government, or participate in trainings to act as peer mentors on the topic. This wide range of ways to engage, and the degree to which it is possible in various contexts, shows that civic engagement can encompass both traditional political engagement, such as voting or participating in politics, and social or community methods, such as volunteering. Other definitions of civic engagement, such as the ones quoted below from Adler and Goggin (2005, 238-9), were more specific to the program being implemented by the definer:

- *Civic engagement as community service:* an “individual’s duty to embrace the responsibilities of citizenship with the obligation to actively participate, alone or in concert with others, in volunteer service activities that strengthen the local community” (Diller, 21 qtd in Adler and Goggin 2005).
- *Civic engagement as political involvement:* “civic engagement differs from an individual ethic of service in that it directs individual efforts toward collective action in solving problems through our political process” (Diller, 7 qtd in Adler and Goggin 2005).
- *Civic engagement as collective action:* “the means by which an individual, through collective action, influences the larger civil society” (Van Benschoten qtd in Adler and Goggin 2005, 239).

All definitions of civic engagement involve some form of active participation going beyond civic awareness, or the understanding of civic duty (Winkler n.d.). Some of the main concepts of civic engagement are defined below:

- **Civic competencies:** the understanding of what it means to be a citizen; awareness (Winkler n.d.).
- **Citizenship:** involves a universal “compact of rights and obligations that bind citizens and states” shaped by the local circumstances and contexts. In development contexts, states are often unable to deliver on their end of the bargain and provide certain services. Mediating organizations can engage young people in roles and activities that allow them to become active citizens (Kassimir 2010).

- **Service programs:** programs that involve citizens, usually youth, in order to support national development (Israel 2011).
- **Social capital:** the shared knowledge, understandings, norms, rules, and expectations that groups of individuals bring to recurrent activities. These norms are important for people's livelihoods, development programs and economic growth (Meinzen-Dick and McCarthy 2004).
- **Participation:** the involvement of different members of society. Participation can be either direct or through intermediate institutions or representatives (Mery Corps n.d.). Additionally, participation may range from exercising full voting rights and decision-making capabilities to playing a consultative/advisory role (Camino and Zeldin 2002).
- **Collective action:** joint action by a group of people towards achieving a common goal (Meinzen-Dick, and McCarthy 2004).

Furthermore, which concepts are most relevant has evolved over time creating generational trends for civic engagement whereby each generation has been characterized by different tendencies in how and why they engage; the latest generation – the current youth generation – tends to be most interested in community engagement, volunteering, and social issues and to engage through new forms of political participation, such as participation in online and virtual communities through twitter or SMS (Finlay, Laua and Flangan n.d.).

Overall, CE can lead to a more integrated voice advocating for locally designed solutions (Winkler n.d.). Also, while some programs mentioned that through civic engagement participants were able to improve the acceptance of diversity in the communities they were working in, having diversity within the group was not a pre-requisite for civic engagement (Brammer, et al. n.d.; AED n.d.). Additionally participating in CE at a young age can clarify and strengthen civic identities and political positions thereafter as “political ideologies tend to crystalize” (Sherrod 2010). The ability of a community to advocate for and work on solutions to local problems is fundamental for a country's development; as such, enabling young people to be actively engaged in their communities becomes crucial for a country's long term development.

Youth

In order to study youth civic engagement the authors of this report sought to understand what constitutes youth. The United Nations defines youth as “the period of transition between childhood, or being dependent, and adulthood (independence), and the awareness of interdependence as members of the community,” rather than a fixed age group (UNESCO n.d. 1). Other organizations understand youth as a stage of life marked by a number of critical transitions including physiological, psychological, social and economic changes (AIYD and InterAction 2013). Although the age range for this transition period can vary, for statistical purposes and to facilitate country comparisons, the United Nations uses 15 to 24 years of age to define youth. Nonetheless, for activities at the national and local levels, youth is defined by the government or organizations, so that the youth life stage can extend beyond 24 and start at a different age. An example is the African Charter that refers to youth as any person between ages of 15 to 35 (UNESCO n.d.).

Youth Civic Engagement

The concept of civic engagement has been used primarily in the context of younger people (Adler and Goggin 2005). Few definitions separate youth and adult civic engagement especially when they incorporate both the political sphere, particularly when working with youth over 18 years of age,

and the community sphere (Adler and Goggin 2005). Generally, youth civic engagement can be understood as the process of youth being actively involved and contributing to the positive development of their own lives, families, communities, and nation (AIYD and InterAction 2013). Furthermore, when considering youth civic engagement, importance is given to creating opportunities for young people to develop a sense of competence, purpose and empowerment, referred to as an asset-based approach (AIYD and InterAction 2013). Often, social norms prevent or prohibit youth viewpoints from being taken as seriously as those of adults. Particularly for youth under the age of 18, who are still legally considered children, structures may not exist wherein they can express and advocate for their needs or improve their communities.

The international community, particularly the UN, has utilized its platform to make certain rights and responsibilities universal. Having international norms and rules, as well as mechanisms for youth engagement, allows for the worst forms of harm that can come to children to be recognized and outlawed. Mechanisms like the UN Youth Envoy and UN Youth Delegates, which will be described in further detail in a later section, provide an international space for youth engagement on such topics, even in countries where this may not be possible at a local level. For example, the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) defines childhood as under the age of 18, and takes steps towards defining what types of activities children can take part in, including child labor. The optional protocol, which 120 countries have signed on to, takes steps to define and abolish child slavery, child pornography, and child prostitution (United Nations 2000). The United Nations Commission on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which has been fundamental in recognizing women's rights as human rights, has also been important in guiding how donors engage with women and girls. CEDAW looks more explicitly at girls' rights than the CRC, but both are useful in defining children's and youth's rights and ensuring they are respected (UNICEF 2011). A key piece of CEDAW pertains to equal access to education for girls and boys (CEDAW 2012). This emphasis on girls' rights specifically, and children's rights generally, is also reflected in other international development guidance such as the Millennium Development Goals.

Youth civic engagement is central for young people's overall development, and a country's long-term development. Several theories have been put forth that connect youth civic engagement and long-term development. The theories indicate linkages between young people's level of civic engagement and their socioeconomic status and political participation.

Political Voice and Efficacy - Civic engagement and political participation are strongly connected to civic skills, political efficacy, opportunities for interaction, and social trust. "If young people are involved in civic activities in their communities, they will be more likely to be actively engaged in political life" (Mercy Corps 2012, 15). Moreover, if youth feel that their voice is heard and that their actions are able to influence the actions of adults and organizations in society, they are likely to translate this sense of efficacy to the political sphere and to participate in politics (Wilkenfeld, Lauckhardt and Tornry-Purta 2010). Political efficacy consists of information, skills, outlooks and networks which can be accessed or acquired through engagement in the community (Beaumont 2010).

Social Capital - In general, it is believed that by promoting and facilitating voice, representation and accountability, civic engagement contributes to social capital and to development efforts (Malik and Waglé 2002). In relation to youth, being engaged in the community creates social capital that can be transformed into outcomes and gains at the individual and community levels (Hastings, et al. 2011). Similarly, "if young people are civically engaged, they will be more likely to develop and exhibit forms of social capital that are conducive to the functioning of democracy, and to peaceful co-existence." (Mercy Corps 2012, 18). Social capital can include the values and attitudes associated with being a good citizen,

including social and political trust, tolerance of others, respect for pluralism and diversity, understanding of democracy, a sense of shared identity, and interpersonal trust.

Economic Engagement and Opportunities - By being civically engaged, youth gain contacts and social networks, skills such as leadership and decision-making, confidence and self-efficacy that make them more attractive candidates in the employment market. Civic engagement is often connected to employment outcomes through the development of social capital, human capital, and job-related self-efficacy (Mercy Corps 2012). Community service activities offer young people the opportunity to gain real-life capacities and knowledge that enhance their livelihood opportunities and give them skills that allow them to operate in increasingly competitive labor markets, which could contribute to decreasing youth unemployment (ICP 2010).

Conflict and Propensity towards Violence - Civic engagement is presumed to be positively associated with people's levels of political self-efficacy and likelihood to use established channels to voice grievances, and thus negatively associated with use of violence. In post-conflict contexts, structured civic engagement opportunities can help youth to see themselves as resources for positive social change, and can allow them to contribute to reconstruction. "If young people are civically engaged, they will be less likely to become involved in or support the use of violence to promote political objectives" (Mercy Corps 2012, 21). Civic engagement is one of the core themes for working with youth in conflict situations since it provides mechanisms and resources to direct their feeling of frustration and desire for change towards building their communities and promoting peace and stability (AIYD and InterAction 2013).

Leadership

Unlike civic engagement, leadership is a more concrete concept with more structured definitions. The following definition can be especially useful: Leadership is defined as a process of social influence in which one person can enlist the aid and support of others in the accomplishment of a common task (Chemers 1997). While leadership is a more structured concept, the qualities and characteristics associated with leadership vary based on context. Leadership opportunities in developed contexts can look very different from those in the developing world. This can be especially true when cultural beliefs discourage certain groups from taking on leadership roles, especially women and youth (CARE 2009). The negative perceptions towards minority groups related to who can be a leader can greatly impact programming aimed at developing leadership skills. Leadership can include effectively communicating ideas and organizing people. Being a leader or having leadership qualities is also described in tandem with being able to take action, get results, and have an impact (CARE 2009).

Youth Leadership

Youth leadership is defined by the skills acquired by youth either through trainings or adult youth partnerships. These skills can include gaining a greater appreciation for themselves and others, and a greater understanding of leadership principles (Center For Creative Leadership 2011). Youth leadership, as distinct from adult leadership, focuses on the methods by which leadership can be explored, taught or experienced. It is therefore important to not only teach leadership skills but to provide youth with opportunities to apply these skills (Redmond and Dolan 2014).

Youth leadership refers to young people leading others or getting others to work together towards a common goal or vision (Redmond and Dolan 2014). It is important to distinguish between youth development and youth leadership; youth development refers to activities that help youth become successful or deal with challenges, while youth leadership prepares young people to facilitate change (Redmond and Dolan 2014). Also, it is interesting to note that perceptions of leadership by youth vary, which can have an impact on how and why they get involved in certain activities. For example,

some youth may have negative perceptions of leadership as being too individualistic and power-centered. Other youth perceive leadership as more about service, which can help inspire them to be leaders (Ell111, Velsor 2011).

Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership

The connection between youth civic engagement and youth leadership is reflected in almost all of the literature reviewed. In fact, much of the research has shown that the two are necessarily intertwined, and that civic engagement must include a public leadership component (Adler and Goggin 2005; L. J. Hastings 2011). Specific theories, such as Youth Leadership Development (YLD) connect both civic engagement and leadership. Programs based upon YLD aim to provide young people with the ability to lead by improving leadership skills as well as supporting young people to work constructively in teams with peers, and boost youth participation and contribution in their communities. Many such programs develop these skills within projects that enable youth to enact civic service projects for the good of their community (Center For Creative Leadership 2011; Velsor 2011).

There is often no one specific factor that could be pinpointed as to why young people are or are not civically engaged or assume leadership roles; rather, engagement (or disengagement) among young people is usually the result of several factors that interact to either facilitate the involvement of youth in the community and in civic life or to impede it. While their specific characteristics and their level of importance or relevance might vary from one situation or context to the other, there are some factors which have been identified to be especially significant in either driving or restraining youth civic engagement and leadership.

Factors Affecting Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership

Perceptions of Youth

How other stakeholders perceive youth affects the expectations others have of them, the kind of roles made available to them, the responsibilities assigned to them, and as such their level of engagement.

Negative perceptions act as a restraining force that can limit the roles that young people can play in their communities (Wheeler and Roach 2005). Young people are often viewed as a problem based on the belief that they rebel against authority, are prone to conflict, risky behavior, and conformity to negative peer influences, and are immature in their ideas and values (Camino and Zeldin 2002). Positive perceptions of youth often result in more active and involved roles for youth being made available and in young people taking leading roles in their communities; young people are seen as a potential resource and are thus engaged as partners for developing solutions to the problems that face their community. Such perceptions are core tenets of the positive youth development paradigm which looks at young people as assets who should be engaged in bringing about social change and development (Camino and Zeldin 2002). In addition, the UN also recognizes the power of youth to create dialogue amongst various political, racial, and ethnic groups both within and across borders (United Nations Youth 2010).

The media can play an important role in transmitting negative perspectives of youth, and as such can be engaged to communicate more positive images (O'Donoghue and Kirschner 2003). Programs that emphasize collaboration, particularly intergenerational collaboration, as a problem-solving methodology, reported gains in perceptions of youth (O'Donoghue and Kirschner 2003) and youth perceptions of adults and existing institutions (Winkler n.d.).

Demographic Characteristics& Socio-Economic Status

Young people from some backgrounds and who are socially and/or economically disadvantaged, tend to have low levels of civic knowledge and engagement (B. P. Wilkenfeld 2009). Characteristics highlighted in several studies which are likely to affect the level of engagement include a young person's setting (rural-urban), employment status, social class and wealth, and racial and ethnic background. (O'Donoghue and Kirschner 2003). For example, youth who are unemployed, in rural areas and are part of a minority ethnic group tend to be civically and politically disengaged. Disparities in participation and engagement resulting from these characteristics are intensified by the lack of opportunities and avenues for civic engagement in their communities (CSSP 2011). In fact, young people from backgrounds regarded as "disadvantaged" are often no less willing to be engaged than others, but tend to lack access to opportunities for engagement that fit their specific needs and circumstances. (Fox, et al. 2010)

Spaces for Engagement

Youth need to have spaces, both physical and metaphorical, which facilitate their engagement in civic and political affairs in their community. The lack of sufficient institutional mechanisms, structures, policies and societal norms for encouraging young people's involvement often limits their capacity to be civically engaged and assume leadership roles (Camino and Zeldin 2002). These spaces include actual facilities and physical infrastructure which are open and available to young people to come together. However, the presence of a physical meeting place does not ensure that young people have institutional and societal support that encourages their participation and engagement. Youth in certain settings, for example in disadvantaged urban areas, might experience "institutional discontinuity" characterized by lack of access to spaces for engagement and opportunities for participation (O'Donoghue and Kirschner 2003). Furthermore, policies and legal frameworks affecting youth can enhance or limit the roles they play. For example, legal limitations on when a young person can vote or can participate or assume decision-making roles in organizations can shape the types of engagement open to them. While formal spaces might be closed, informal spaces such as online forums might be more open. The Internet and the rise of social media have introduced and encouraged a new true youth-led and youth-decision making space (Raynes-Goldie 2008). Organizations (governmental and non-governmental) can play a key role in creating and sustaining welcoming spaces for youth civic engagement, by establishing mechanisms to involve youth within their own structures, making space for youth on their own governing bodies, and investing resources in ensuring that both physical and normative spaces for youth civic engagement are available and accessible.

The arena for active citizenship and social involvement and impact has been referred to as the "Fifth Space" that young people can occupy in addition to the more typical spaces related to family, education and livelihoods, friends, and leisure and lifestyle, and is a space that needs to be supported to be a "youth friendly, youth-led space that nurtures youth leadership" (ICP; Pravah 2010). These five spaces are interconnected to a certain extent but compete for time and resources, with the fifth space often being marginalized as less legitimate and useful for young people; however, if this fifth space is nurtured and strengthened, the competencies it builds in young people enable them to become more active in the other spaces. It can be reasoned then that building and enhancing the space for civic engagement can be a useful strategy for improving young people's participation in other spaces through the knowledge and skills they gain.

Social Environment

The social environment, especially family and peers, has a significant influence on young people's attitudes, behaviors and choices, and as such on whether they are civically engaged and what form their engagement might take. Through their interactions with family and peers, young people can

derive systems of belief and values supportive of community engagement and can become used to forming and expressing opinions on a range of social and political issues, all of which can contribute to their willingness to be civically engaged (Lenzi, et al. 2013). Social environments which are supportive of civic engagement and which present clear and positive examples of involvement in the community are conducive to youth civic engagement (B. P. Wilkenfeld 2009). However, environments that discourage community engagement or resist the participation of young people in the political life can restrict the ability of young people to be civically engaged (Finlay, Wray-lake and Flanagan 2010).

Education

The educational background of youth themselves and their parents have an effect on the level of engagement; participation usually increases with higher levels of education (Mercy Corps 2012). Educational institutions, especially schools, are key mediums for promoting civic engagement through the transmission of civic knowledge and by involving students in programs and activities that stimulate community involvement, such as service-learning projects. Education also affects the social and economic opportunities available to young people and a person's educational attainment can significantly influence his socio-economic status and employment opportunities, which are also factors that affect civic engagement. Youth with lower education and with limited financial means are less likely to participate in a range of civic activities, including voting or volunteering (Finlay, Wray-lake and Flanagan 2010).

Ownership

How youth are civically engaged can affect whether or not they are involved in their communities. Being involved in activities or structures that don't encourage youth ownership of the initiatives they participate in can demotivate young people and restrict their effective and sustained engagement. Such hierarchical structures that attempt to control young people's engagement can also prevent youth from gaining valuable skills and knowledge (O'Donoghue and Kirschner 2003). Ownership can take many forms depending on the context, but its key characteristic is ensuring that young people play leading roles and that their contributions are valued and acknowledged. Despite its importance, promoting youth ownership can be a challenge, which can involve overcoming legal barriers that might restrict the ability of young people to assume leadership and decision-making roles. For example, in some states in the US, young people under the age of 18 are prevented from formally serving on the board of directors for non-profit organizations (Camino and Zeldin 2002), which limits the opportunity to engage them as equal partners in the planning and decision-making processes.

In many cases, the most effective programs for promoting youth development have been ones in which young people take the lead in creating their own solutions and where they are involved in planning and implementing programs, all of which nurture the skills, values and experiences that can be crucial for their future growth and development. Programs that actively engage youth in meaningful roles and ensure that their opinions are valued and taken into consideration are able to sustain young people's interest, motivation and commitment to be civically engaged (Flanagan and Watts 2007). For example, in Nepal, Mercy Corps gave ownership to young people, who designed community projects and took responsibility for all aspects, including fundraising, building, and maintenance (Mercy Corps n/a). Also, the "Ending Child Marriage in Malawi" project adopted a community-based advocacy approach which specifically focused on engaging girls to define the challenges they face related to child marriage and determine their own solutions and activities for addressing them and was successful in decreasing the incidents of child marriage in Malawi and improving the well-being of girls (Girls Empowerment Network & Let Girls Lead n/a). Also, in an evaluation of the Youth Development Competencies Program (YDCP) in Russia, it was determined that the focus on youth empowerment,

especially by adopting the youth-driven model which emphasizes youth-led civic engagement and involving youth as partners, contributed significantly to the development of the YDCP participants, who displayed on average improved personal and professional competencies and skills over the Comparison Group participants of somewhere between 14% and 23%” (Social Impact 2011).

Youth-Adult Partnerships

It has been widely recognized that the involvement of both youth and adults is essential in order to achieve effective and sustained social change and development. Youth-Adult Partnerships (YA-P) draw upon the complementary perspectives and skills that adults and youth bring to the table (Camino and Zeldin 2002). Although organizations define this differently, one working definition which encompasses the ideal YA-P may be: “a) multiple youth and multiple adults deliberating and acting together, (b) in a collective [democratic] fashion (c) over a sustained period of time, (d) through shared work, (e) intended to promote social justice, strengthen an organization and/or affirmatively address a community issue” (Zeldin 2012).

By virtue of their experience and expertise, adults are often able and expected to provide support, guidance and access to networks and resources. Young people are often the ones who have the drive, a fresh perspective, and a passion and energy to push for the change that is needed. What each side has to offer would differ from one group to the other, but by capitalizing on their unique qualifications adults and youth are often able to ensure more successful projects and efforts (Fox et al. 2010). Ideally, however, these relationships and interactions do not focus on prescriptive roles or hierarchical social norms, but are about shared control and insight (Zeldin 2012). In fact, Article 12 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child is based upon the notion that children have the right to be heard on matters affecting them and for their voices to be taken seriously. In most societies, this premise is contrary to many historic notions of youth capabilities and roles, so programs must conscientiously and consistently reevaluate the degree to which these adult-youth interactions allow for co-learning, authentic youth voice, and decision making for adults and youth participants (Zeldin 2012). It may be difficult, even for those adults who agree with YA-P in theory, to hand control to youth, especially for those adults who feel like they have no voice within their society (Handy, Rodgers and Schwieterman 2011).

On the other hand, young people might hesitate to enter into such partnerships if they do not trust adults and the structures in their community. A study that took place in the slums of Nairobi worked with both in and out of school youth that had a low impression of civic engagement and did not participate; the study showed that youth were able to identify issues they would like to change, but did not actively work to change them. This lack of engagement was due to a lack of trust in adult community members, the educational system including teachers and policies, and/or the government (Winkler n.d.).

Effective and complementary youth-adult partnerships are an essential part of strong and sustained youth engagement and can help alleviate several of the challenges that undermine youth development (AIYD and InterAction 2013). Building these effective partnerships requires thoughtful consideration and planning, and is often an ongoing process of dialogue and learning (Wheeler and Roach 2005). In fact, ineffective communication has been cited as the greatest barrier to effective youth-adult relationships (Handy, Rodgers and Schwieterman 2011). Evaluations of existing programs showed that the most successful ones began with youth that were outstanding and motivated to be active, who were then trained and given access to existing research and best practices, and culminated with YA-P integration, including clear expectations for staff (Arnold 2008). As beneficial as civic engagement or leadership activities can be for youth, they often lack the skills and know-how to do

them with complete independence. In fact, intergenerational partnership is often key in enabling youth to be successful, because youth often lack all the requisite skills and know-how to carry out activities and programs (Zeldin 2012). This thinking is in line with the theory of positive youth development (PYD) which posits that youth programs and activities should cultivate “the 5 c’s”: competence, character, connection, confidence, and caring (Arnold 2008).

Access to Information

Young people should be able to access information to enhance their civic knowledge and inform their participation. Young people who are well-informed about civic engagement and political participation tend to be more interested and motivated to be civically and politically engaged (Mercy Corps 2012). There are different types of information that can promote youth engagement including issue or topic-specific information (for example on HIV/AIDS) which enables youth to act more effectively in these fields and raises their status in their communities as the ones who share this knowledge (Hart, et al. 2004); actionable information on full participation in citizenship (Education Development Center 2012); and information about effective outlets for civic participation (ICP 2010). Two main mechanisms can be used to facilitate access to information (1) working with partners and key stakeholders “where youth typically are found” such as educational institutions and (2) the use of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) and the media to communicate and disseminate information (Golombek, Ph.D (ed) 2009). ICTs are playing an increasing role in facilitating this process and in connecting young people to civic action opportunities and resources; online portals and websites – such as YouthActionNet – open opportunities for young people all over the world to share information, exchange resources and develop their awareness and drive to promote social change in their communities and in the world (Golombek, Ph.D (ed) 2009). However, these technologies tools, and information are not readily or equally available to a large number of youth who remain on the sidelines unaware of the opportunities available for participation and development. For example, in the Philippines around 5.5 million young people ages 15 to 24 don’t have access to formal or informal educational institutions, where this knowledge and infrastructure is available which makes promoting their participation very difficult (Golombek, Ph.D (ed) 2009). In these cases, young people need to be reached through other stakeholders they are likely to be involved in such as their places of employment, religious institutions and gathering places in their communities such as internet cafes.

Key Considerations for Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership

Gender

Gender stereotypes and societal norms can increase risky behaviors (for example unsafe health practices), and cut off educational and economic opportunities for both boys and girls. Recognizing that programs and policies impact girls and young women differently than boys and young men and adjusting accordingly can increase positive program outcomes (AIYD and InterAction 2013). Program activities should be sensitive to gender norms so that young people are comfortable in the program environment, but also so that the environment provides a forum for young people to understand and challenge gender and social norms. Program designers should also be cognizant of the fact that harmful traditional practices (FGM/C, early and forced marriage, domestic violence) may not openly discussed or prioritized as problems, and that changes comes slowly and only by engaging both genders (AGALI, 2014). However, there may be some issues, such as adolescent sexual reproductive health, which are more relevant to certain genders, or more appropriate to discuss with youths in gendered ways. Youth are often more open to challenging established gender norms and their example can lead to societal change (AIYD and InterAction 2013).

Medium for Intervention

In every society, there exists a constant tension between the government and civil society (Rueben 2003; Zeldin 2002). The degree to which this tension exists may vary, but can provide motivation for the government to meet the expectations of the population and for the population to advocate, monitor and hold the government accountable. While there are many factors that affect the level of civic engagement, the most common themes that emerged from the literature include: gender, country context education, wealth, and employment status. Country context includes the economic context, and the degree to which various levels of government function and are committed to meeting the needs of their citizens and the capacity on the part of the government to provide public services. In order to address these factors, the four most consistently identified mediums for intervention are listed below:

Schools

Schools are a unique medium for intervention in that they capture a large proportion of the youth demographic and can educate youth on both the processes and historical context of civic engagement. They also give access to hands-on experiential learning through mechanisms like student government (L. J. Hastings 2011; B. Wilkenfeld 2009). Once youth leave school actual opportunities for civic engagement dwindle. When youth leaders gain experience from taking on leadership roles in their community in addition to the leadership skills from school, leaderships increase in a way not seen in adulthood (L. J. Hastings 2011).

Families

Families who engage in and encourage youth participation can positively or negatively shape youth interest and preparedness in and for CE&L (Lenzi, et al. 2013). Parents and peers can facilitate preparation for civic engagement by discussing political and social issues and being models of conscientious citizens (B. Wilkenfeld 2009). In India for example, many families create an environment that is unfavorable towards civic engagement, with parents discouraging their children from being involved in the voluntary sector. In cases where the family environment is not supportive of youth CE&L, it might be necessary to work with families to build their acceptance and support of young people's engagement (Etra et al. 2010).

Communities

The context of the community matters a great deal (Sherrod 2010). Neighborhoods can facilitate civic engagement by providing positive experiences in school, community centers, and more (Wilkenfeld 2009). Community institutions should find ways to work together to promote positive youth development and recognize the great potential of youth to help transform communities (Zeldin 2002). Such encouragement can build youth's connections to their own identity, culture and community; civic participation is heavily influenced by the cultural context (Wilkenfeld 2009; Zeldin 2002). The community is regarded as a "real-life" medium for intervention that can offer a different practical experience of engagement (Hastings 2011). For example a study conducted with data from almost 3,000 fourteen-year-olds in the United States on the relationships between contexts and adolescent civic engagement found that exposure to civic learning experiences whether in schools through a civic curriculum or in their neighborhoods was related to increases in the civic outcomes (B. Wilkenfeld 2009).

Local Governments

Providing opportunity structures at the local level, including the availability of settings, roles, and people that promote engagement, is crucial for effective youth engagement in political processes, including advocacy (Watts 2007). Quality local leadership, training and supervision, and democratic input and involvement are important components of youth community engagement (Campbell-Patton and Patton). These structures and opportunities could include developing mechanisms to engage youth in the planning and decision-making process at the local government level, for example in Papua New Guinea and India, or establishing youth councils and committees, as is the case in the Gambia and Uganda (ICP 2010). The United States provides another example where young people are present on or advise state and city departments and local leaders to ensure that youth voice is heard and that the needs of young people are addressed (Camino and Zeldin 2002).

Existing Evidence for CE&L in Youth Programming

Bringing about meaningful and sustainable social change requires identifying gaps and prioritizing and coalescing around ideas to create desired change (CARE n.d.). One such social change that has gained considerable momentum recently is empowering youth to take an active role in driving development outcomes (Mercy Corps n/a). This growing consensus has led organizations to incorporate youth into the development of programs, and provide them with the necessary skills and connections to participate in civic engagement activities and take on leadership roles at the local, regional, and national levels.

Promising Practices

Promoting youth civic engagement and leadership at the programmatic level is done in a variety of ways. It is important to first recognize that context has a major impact on how youth are engaged and what entry points are used to engage them. However, despite contextual differences, the transition period between childhood and adulthood is crucial for education on civic matters and enabling youth to be active participants (Finlay, Wray-lake and Flanagan 2010). As the recognition continues to grow that youth civic engagement and leadership is an important component not just for youth development, but also development overall, many promising practices are emerging that incorporate approaches and principles researched herein.

One such promising practice is the Youth Network of Medellin in Colombia. The organization was founded in response to the stigmatization of youth in Colombia as being either victims or criminals. Some young people decided to change this perception by creating a youth network and carried out a campaign to combat the negative images of youth and promote youth rights. In this instance, youth coalesced around a common sentiment and formed an organization to drive a change they felt passionate about. The creation of the youth network in this instance provided youth with a legitimate platform to engage with decision makers in government and civil society.

Another example comes from a partnership formed by Pravah, an organization in India working on social justice issues through youth civic engagement, and Innovations in Civic Participation, a global organization focused on youth civic engagement, in India. ICP and Pravah observed youth civic participation in India and found that youth tend to occupy four spaces: family, education and livelihoods, friends, and leisure and lifestyle. They found that active civic participation was a “Fifth Space” that was more at the margins and of less interest to youth, but that it was a crucial component of developing a sense of self and effective relationships and impacting society. The ICP and Pravah partnership promotes the belief that this Fifth Space must be a youth friendly and youth-led space

where they are free to share concerns and perspectives, build skills, and engage with issues of interest (ICP; Pravah 2010)

Youth civic engagement and leadership evaluations are in their early stages, therefore best practices have been difficult to identify. However, impact evaluations on service learning programs have proven that these programs are proving to be a promising model for developing youth leadership and civic engagement (Israel 2011). Service learning programs can involve in and out of school youth at different education stages and have been proven successful in different country contexts. Examples of these successes include a mega study of Argentina's secondary school service learning program CLAYSS (Israel 2011). The study found that students who participated in service learning at a young age showed sustained enthusiasm for service learning. A study in Rwanda which utilized pre and post-surveys for participants in a service learning program for out of school youth found that by participating in community-based experiences, participants developed a stronger civic identity, with a greater sense of responsibility for others and the society itself (Israel 2011). Youth also reported that they learned practical skills. Similar impact evaluations exist for youth service learning programs in Mexico and Israel. The program in Mexico found that being involved in service learning can encourage youth to further their education, and in Israel, youth participants reported gaining a sense of belonging and opportunity (Israel 2011).

Conclusion

Identifying effective theories and best practices, while difficult, has shown that youth civic engagement and leadership is an evolving arena that contains long-lasting implications for the youth involved. Through a critical examination of existing practices both within and outside of ChildFund, researchers have classified existing concepts and theories, as well as what appear to be the most important stakeholders and considerations to utilize when working with youth on these concepts.

ChildFund, in many ways, is on the forefront of identifying an effective strategy for engaging in this space. By developing their programmatic efforts into clearly delineated life stages with clear pathways, ChildFund will not only be able to best address life stage three and youth civic engagement and leadership, but to lay the ground work and develop the soft skills necessary for these arenas in life stage two. One of the biggest challenges any organization that works within youth civic engagement and leadership will face is that of challenging perceptions of youth—both by adult stakeholders and youth themselves. ChildFund's long history of working with youth throughout the world has already cut through many of the barriers to youth access mentioned previously, such as relationships with schools, parents, village elders, and local government. In addition to these efforts, ChildFund may want to give greater attention to other methodologies such as youth-adult partnerships to create truly youth friendly forums, and to activate authentic collective voice and collective action.

Bibliography

- Adler, Richard P., and Judy Goggin. "What Do We Mean By "Civic Engagement"?" *Journal of Transformative Education*, June 2005.
- AED. *Inspiring Citizen, Improving Communities*, Center for Enterprise and Capacity Development
- AIYD and InterAction. *Guiding Principles for International Youth Development*. Alliance for International Youth Development and InterAction, 2013.
http://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Guiding%20Principles%20for%20International%20Youth%20Development_FINAL_2013_0.pdf
- Arnold, Mary. "Youth Community Engagement: A Recipe for Success." *Journal of Community Engagement and Scholarship* (University of Alabama Press) 1, no. 1 (2008): 56-65.
- Beaumont, Elizabeth. "Political Agency and Empowerment: Pathways for Developing a Sense of Political Efficacy in Young Adults." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, by Lonnie R. Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta and Constance A. Flanagan, 525 - 558. New Jersey: Wiley and Sons, Inc., 2010.
- Brammer, Leila, et al. *Core Competencies in Civic Engagement*. The Center for Engaged Democracy Core Competencies, Engaged Democracy's Policy Papers Series.
- Camino, Linda , and Shepherd Zeldin. "From Periphery to Center: Pathways for Youth Civic Engagement in the Day-To-Day Life of Communities." *Applied Developmental Science*, 2002: 213 - 220.
- CARE. *The Power to Lead: A Leadership Model for Adolescent Girls*. 2009.
http://www.care.org/sites/default/files/documents/GE-2009-PW_Leadership.pdf
- CARE. *Theories of Change: What are they, why do we need them, and how do we develop and test them over time?* .
- CEDAW. *CEDAW Statement: Protection of Girls' Right to Education*. October 2012.
- Center For Creative Leadership. *Youth Leadership Development for Reforms A Case Study from Kenya*. 2011. <http://www.ccl.org/leadership/pdf/research/KenyaYouthLeadershipDevelopment.pdf>
- Center for the Study of Social Policy. *Results-Based Public Policy Strategies For Promoting Youth Civic Engagement* . 2011.
- Chemers, M. *An integrative theory of leadership*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997.
- CSSP. *Results-Based Public Policy Strategies For Promoting Youth Civic Engagement*. Center for the Study of Social Policy (CSSP), 2011.
- Education Development Center. *EQUIP3 Lessons Learned: Experiences in Livelihoods, Literacy and Leadership in Youth Programs in 26 Countries*. USAID, 2012.
- Etra, Alex, Kamini Prakash, Lauren A Graham, and Helene Perold. *Youth Development through Civic Engagement: Mapping Assets in South Asia*. Innovations in Civic Participation, 2010.
- Finlay, Andrea, Wray-Lake Laua , and Contance Flangan. "Civic Engagement during the transition to Adulthood: Development Opportunities and Social Policies at a Critical Juncture." *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*. Published Online: August" 13 AUG 2010

Flanagan, Constance, and Roderick J. Watts. "Pushing the Envelope On Youth Civic Engagement: A Developmental And Liberation Psychology Perspective." *Journal of Community Psychology*, 2007: 779 - 792.

Fox, Mediline, Kavitha Mediratta, Jessica Ruglis, Brett Stoudt, Seema Shah, and Michelle Fine. "Critical Youth Engagement: Participatory Action Research and Organizing." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, by Lonnie R. Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta and Constance A. Flanagan. Wiley, 2010.

Girls Empowerment Network & Let Girls Lead. *Ending Child Marriage in Malawi*. Let Girls Lead, n/a.

Golombek, Ph.D (ed), Silvia. *What Works in Youth Participation: Case Studies from Around the World*. International Youth Foundation, 2009.

http://www.iyfnet.org/sites/default/files/WW_Youth_Participation.pdf

Handy, Deborah J, Kathleen Boyce Rodgers, and Tiffany Anne Schwieterman. "Youth Asset Mapping: Showcasing Youth Empowerment and Positive Youth-Adult Partnerships." *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences* 103, no. 1 (2011).

Hart, Jason, Jesse Newman, Lisanne Ackermann, and Thomas Feeny. *Children Changing their World: Understanding and Evaluating Children's Participation in Development*. Plan, 2004.

http://toolkit.ineesite.org/toolkit/INEEcms/uploads/1033/Children_Changing_Their_World.pdf

Hastings, Lindsay J.,Leverne A. Barrett, John E. Barbuto, Jr., and Lloyd C. Bell. "Developing a Paradigm Model of Youth Leadership Development and Community Engagement: A Grounded Theory ." *Journal of Agricultural Education* 52 (2011): 19-29.

ICP. *Youth Civic Participation in Action: Meeting Community and Youth Development Needs Worldwide* . Innovations in Civic Participation, 2010.

ICP; Pravah. *Making Youth Work Visible: Impact Assessment of Youth Active Citizenship Interventions*. Innovations in Civic Participation and Pravah, 2010.

Israel, Ron. *Youth Service Programs A Study of Promising Models in International Development* Education Development Center, Inc., 2011. <http://www.equip123.net/docs/e3-YSP.pdf>

Kassimir, Ronald. "Youth Civic Engagement in the Developing World: Challenges and Opportunities." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, by Lonnie R. Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta and Constance A. Flanagan. Wiley, 2010.

Lenzi, Michela, Alessio Vieno, Massimo Santinello, Maury Nation, and Adam Voight. "The Role Played by the Family in Shaping Early and Middle Adolescent Civic Responsibility." *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 2013.

Malik, Khalid, and Swarnim Waglé. *Civic Engagement and Development: Introducing the Issues*. Adapted from a UNDP report in 2002, UNDP, 2002.

Meinzen-Dick, Ruth , Di Gregorio, Monica, and Nancy McCarthy. *Methods of Studying Collective Action in Rural Development* . International Food Policy Research Institute , CGIAR Systemwide Program on Collective Action and Property Rights, 2004.

Mercy Corps. "*Civic Engagement of Youth in the Middle East and North Africa: An Analysis of Key Drivers and Outcomes*." Mercy Corps, 2012.

http://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/mena_youth_civic_engagement_study_-_final.pdf

Mercy Corps. *Youth and Conflict: Best Practices and Lessons Learned*. n/a.
http://www.mercycorps.org/sites/default/files/youth_and_conflict_best_practices_-_hi_res_final.pdf.

Mery Corps . "Guide to Good Governance Programming." March 2011

National Democratic Institute. "Political Process Mapping: Considering the Outcomes and How They Can Be Measured." 2012.

O'Donoghue, Jennifer L., and Benjamin R. Kirschner. *Urban Youth's Civic Development Outcomes in Community-Based Youth Organizations*. International Conference on Civic Education Research, 2003.

Raynes-Goldie, Kate, and Luke Walker. "Our Space: Online Civic Engagement Tools for Youth." Edited by W. Lance Bennett. *Civic Life Online: Learning How Digital Media Can Engage Youth* (The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation), 2008: 161-188.

Redmond, Susan, and Pat Dolan. "Towards a conceptual model of youth leadership development." *Child and Family Social Work* , 2014.

Rueben, William. "The Role of Civic Engagement and Social Accountability in the Governance Equation ." *Environmentally and Socially Sustainable Network* , March 2003.

Sherrod, Lonnie R., Judith Torney-Purta, Constance A. Flanagan. "Civic Engagement during the Transition to Adulthood: Development Opportunities and Social Policies at a Critical Juncture." (Wiley) August 2010: 1-706.

Sherrod, Lonnie R. et all. "Adulthood: Development Opportunities and Social Policies at a Critical Juncture." *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*. Wiley, 2010.

Social Impact. *Program Evaluation Executive Summary: Youth Development Competencies Program*. Evaluation Report Executive Summary, IREX, 2011.

UNESCO. *What do we mean by youth*. <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/social-and-human-sciences/themes/youth/youth-definition/>.

UNICEF. "Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women: In Brief." 2011.

United Nations. *Chapter IV: Human Rights: 11 .c Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution and Child Pornography*. May 25, 2000.
https://treaties.un.org/pages/viewdetails.aspx?src=ind&mtdsg_no=iv-11-c&chapter=4&lang=en
 (accessed April 10, 2014).

United Nations Youth. "Fostering Dialogue and Mutual Understanding." August 12, 2010.
<http://www.un.org/esa/socdev/documents/youth/fact-sheets/youth-fosteringdialogue.pdf> (accessed April 10, 2014).

Velsor, Ellen Van. "Youth Leadership Summit 2011: Creating Community: Finding One Voice Reflections & Insight." Center for Creative Leadership, 2011.

Watts, Roderick and Constance Flanagan. "Pushing the Envelope On Youth Civic Engagement: A Developmental And Liberation Psychology Perspective." *Journal of Community Psychology* (Wiley Publishing) 35 (2007): 779-792.

Wheeler, Wendy , and Carla Roach. *Community-Based Youth Leadership: A Pathway to Civic Engagement*. Innovation Center for Community and Youth Development, 2005.

Wilkenfeld, Britt, James Lauckhardt, and Judith Tornry-Purta. "The Relation between Developmental Theory and Measures of Civic Engagement in Research on Adolescents." In *Handbook of Research on Civic Engagement in Youth*, by Lonnie R. Sherrod, Judith Torney-Purta and Constance A. Flanagan, 193 - 220. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons, Inc, 2010.

Wilkenfeld, Britt, Ph.D. *Does Context Matter? How family Peer, School and Neighborhood Context Relate to Adolescent Civic Engagement*. USA: The Center for Information & Research on Civic Learning & Engagement , 2009.

Winkler, Stephen. *Civic Engagement of Nairobi Slum Youth Preliminary Findings* . "The Supply.n.d.
[http://static.squarespace.com/static/52c756e1e4b02ee17f5e9e67/t/5343f970e4b0907609b2a216/1396963696552/Findings%20\(1\).pdf](http://static.squarespace.com/static/52c756e1e4b02ee17f5e9e67/t/5343f970e4b0907609b2a216/1396963696552/Findings%20(1).pdf)

Shepherd Zeldin, Linda Camino and Shepherd "From Periphery to Center: Pathways for Youth Civic Engagement in the Day-To-Day Life of Communities." *Applied Developmental Science* 6, no. 4 (2002): 213-220.

Zeldin, Shepherd, Brian D. Christens, Jane L. Powers "The Psychology and Practice of Youth-Adult Partnership: Bridging Generations for Youth Development and Community Change." *American Journal of Community Psychology* (Society for Community Research and Action 2012), October 2012. Page 385-397

Insights from Experts in the Field

Methodology & Process

As part of a three-step process to assist ChildFund's Youth Programs in the development of a holistic CE&L model for youth, the GWU Consultant group conducted key informant interviews with 22 practitioners from 13 organizations operating in the United States, Philippines and Uganda, in addition to 8 interviews with key staff and experts from within ChildFund working in Gambia, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Zambia and the Americas region. Moreover, the team had four conversations with youth leaders who have been involved in civic engagement and leadership activities for several years. The details of the people interviewed and the organizations they are involved in can be found at the end of the report. The interviews were conducted between January and March 2014.

The purpose of the interviews was to learn from the experience and expertise that practitioners in ChildFund and outside it have acquired over the years they've been involved in this domain. Separate questionnaires were developed for each category of interviewee: external, internal and youth, and were subsequently modified as needed to learn the most from the organization/interviewees' specific area of expertise. The data from the interviews were compiled and analyzed based on five main themes.

Approach, Interventions and Integration

Interviews with External Organizations

Approaches to addressing youth issues vary by organization, but there is also great variability within organizations from national office to national office. For many of the organizations interviewed, context was cited as being integral to deciding an overall approach and how to integrate youth issues into that. In regards to civic engagement and leadership more specifically, very few organizations had an overall approach for how to integrate CE&L into programming. CE&L was usually integrated into existing programs, rather than being approached in isolation.

Interviewees were asked how their organizations approach youth and most described the age range of youth they worked with and what kinds of youth issues they engaged on. Age ranges varied but were usually fairly consistent with the ChildFund definition of 15-24. Some used an age of around 18-20 years old as a cut-off: youth above that age were approached in one way, and youth below in another way. Other organizations saw the youth life stage as starting younger, at 12 years old. In regards to addressing youth, there were many common programmatic elements among those interviewed and many organizations noted that their approach to working with children and youth varied by life stage.

Youth issues are very cross-cutting. Many of the organizations interviewed highlighted the importance of integrating youth issues across programs and recognized the importance of letting youth determine what issue and program areas are of interest and importance to them. For example, one organization noted that their approach to working with youth was guided by the issues that the youth chose as being relevant to them. Another organization noted that it is important to do an issue analysis in any given context to give youth and local partners the chance to identify key issues in determining what to address.

In looking specifically at approaches to youth civic engagement and leadership, many organizations were able to highlight programmatic examples where CE&L were well integrated or a main

component even if they were lacking an overall approach to CE&L. Whether CE&L was the main objective or just part of a larger program focus varied greatly. For example, one organization highlighted a work readiness curriculum that includes a leadership component. On the other hand, other organizations noted programs focused on youth led community service projects where they learn project management skills and how to engage with adults and leaders, or work on educating youth about leadership skills and politics. One organization noted that they focus on building youth leadership skills and educating about civic engagement across their youth programs.

In order to successfully integrate civic engagement and leadership into youth programming, many organizations noted the importance of skills building and capacity building. Whether it was through specific skills trainings or curriculums focused on civic education and participation, the importance of providing youth with the skills and knowledge to effectively advocate for their issues, participate in their communities, and engage with decision-makers was a crucial component to CE&L programming.

Interviews with ChildFund National Offices

In discussing whether national offices had adopted a specific approach to youth development, most noted that their work was guided by the Theory of Change for Life Stage 3 and that they looked to the domains of change within that. In addition to the overall TOC for LS3, national office staff noted the importance of national strategies, given that programmatic interventions and issue areas in which youth are engaged vary greatly by context.

Many of the interviewees noted that their approach to youth development centered around life skills and employment training. Other areas of focus included reproductive health. Civic engagement and leadership were highlighted as being part of the overall approach by many of the interviewees, but a deliberate approach was often lacking.

When asked how CE&L fit into their overall approach, many interviewees discussed the importance of working with youth to identify issues that they were interested in and that they used this to help guide their programs. The importance of involving youth in program design and implementation, especially when it came to programs with an advocacy component, was often noted. CE&L was seen as more of a means rather than an end in and of itself. Working on civic engagement and leadership was more about skills building, learning about governance structures and processes, and networking so that youth are better equipped to take part in programs.

The Concepts of Civic Engagement and Leadership

External Interviews

Although the participants in the interviews had a difficult time defining the concepts of civic engagement and leadership, several interviewees related civic engagement with community involvement, which was described as identifying and addressing community needs. While political aspects of civic engagement did emerge in some of the interviews, for example in programs that encourage participants to interact with their governments through advocacy or voting, they were not come up frequently when defining civic engagement. Leadership emerged as individuals or groups with specific skills to bring community concerns to those with the ability to make change.

Another theme that emerged from numerous external interviews is that civic engagement and youth civic engagement are highly related to both having skills and building skills. Skills are needed in civic engagement in order to give participants the tools to engage the community and influence change. The interviewees mentioned a range of skills including communication, engagement, and critical thinking and analysis.

An additional theme that emerged from the external interviews was that civic engagement is cross-sectoral. Some of the areas that were mentioned where civic engagement interacts with other sectors include: working with schools to improve the community, addressing problems such as unemployment, work readiness, and sensitizing the community on health issues or new technology.

Furthermore, some interviewees mentioned youth-led civic engagement when talking about civic engagement; for the interviewees that mentioned youth-led civic engagement this meant putting youth at the center of development and helping youth see that they can help their communities. An important part of this theme is that youth should be present in all parts of the program including the design. However, one interviewee mentioned that it's important to keep in mind that youth don't always have all the skills or solutions to a problem and therefore, it's important to have programs that are youth-led, with adult partnerships.

Defining leadership was also difficult for the interviewees. One of the themes that emerged was that leadership was about having an individual or a small group of people guiding, or leading, or influencing a group. On the other hand, some interviewees talked about leaders being the champions of a certain group as they have skills the greater group does not. These people would have leadership skills and be better prepared to take the ideas generated in a certain space, which often includes other young people, to those who have the capacity and responsibility to respond. One interviewee talked about leadership as accountability and reporting back to those who were engaged in the initial discussions. Two main topics emerged when defining leadership: (1) leaders appear to be a small group of people within a bigger group (2) these leaders possess some skills that the rest of the group does not.

Finally, civic engagement and leadership were largely viewed as being interconnected concepts. The interviewees saw civic engagement and leadership being connected because civic engagement creates groups that need leaders. Furthermore, two interviewees highlighted that if someone is a leader he/she is likely be civically engaged. How interviewees saw the relationship between the two concepts had implications on programming as some programs focused on building leaders so they could get the community involved and others focused on training a large group of people on community engagement and having leaders emerge from these groups.

Internal Interviews

As with the external interviews, the internal interviewees had a hard time defining civic engagement or leadership. One interviewee said that civic engagement might not be the correct term for the activities ChildFund is conducting or its goals. Of those interviewees who did define youth civic engagement, their definitions were similar to those from the external interviews and included providing a space for youth to demand rights and hold duty bearers accountable. Additionally internal interviewees highlighted the importance of skills or capacity in civic engagement, stating that civic engagement is the acquisition of skills or capacity to identify a problem and engage with the community to solve the problem. When compared to the external interviews, the internal interviewees mentioned the community less in the definition of civic engagement. Instead of engagement in the community, internal interviewees extended the definition of civic engagement to engaging with important stakeholders, including the community as such a stakeholder.

Internal interviewees really focused on the youth-led part of youth civic engagement stating that civic engagement activities need to be youth-led throughout the entire process and that youth need to take on responsibility for engagement. Furthermore, internal interviewees described the leadership process as a youth-led process, describing youth leadership as youth taking personal responsibility for themselves in the areas they see as having a need.

Definitions for youth leadership were varied across internal interviewees and new components of the definition of leadership were mentioned such as personal responsibility, and self-awareness. Along with these new definitions some of the internal interviewees highlighted elements similar to external interviewees, including working with a group towards a common goal and being able to influence communities.

Finally, internal interviewees, similar to external interviewees, saw civic engagement and leadership as being interconnected. Internal interviewees saw leadership as part of civic engagement because civically engaged citizens participate in different roles including leadership. On the other hand some participants saw civic engagement as part of leadership because civic engagement is performing those leadership roles, while having the passion to engage and be active in society. Because the interviewees saw the concepts as very interwoven, they believed that both concepts could be tackled by the same activities. One participant noted that when conducting civic engagement programming, you have a goal and purpose and therefore you're using that engagement to try to influence another group of people towards the direction you want, and therefore you are using leadership skills.

Factors that Affect Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership

Successes and Areas of Opportunity - External Interviews

An area of both success and opportunity that was consistently highlighted was the degree to which youth are integrated into all stages of project development, and their level of ownership over these phases. The organizations that were able to highlight the greatest number of successes were also those who stated that they encouraged youth to self-identify the issues they wanted to work on in their programs. For example, before identifying the project's issue-based focus, one organization highlighted their use of youth insight in mapping community resources as putting youth "at the center of development." As an illustrative example, one organization noted that youth living in disaster-prone areas tended to work on Disaster Risk Reduction Management projects, and that adolescent girls tended to be more concerned than boys about adolescent pregnancy, while adolescent boys tended to have greater security concerns than their female peers. These differences, they noted, were important in program sustainability and maintaining high levels of youth engagement.

Although each organization framed this slightly differently most stated that one of the strengths of collective action exercises was connecting youth with others who faced similar challenges, which they highlighted as having long-term benefits outside of specific programmatic goals. This was particularly true of organizations that worked in conflict or post conflict contexts. The intentional mixing of youth groups (depending on the context this was noted as by gender, by ethnicity, or even by sexual orientation) was a useful method for bridging peace and building understanding. One interviewee stated that, "part of civic engagement and leadership is a way of bringing everyday issues out of the individual experience and into the local, national, or international sphere and arming youth with the tools to engage at those levels."

Many mentioned the perception that youth, particularly young men, were seen as having the potential for violence and that one of the strengths of their programmatic efforts was to change community perceptions of youth and to begin intergenerational dialogue. It is worth noting, however, that none of those interviewed could cite a specific programmatic effort that was consistently utilized to establish these engagement pathways. For more information, please read the challenges section later in this paper.

Several organizations mentioned that working on soft skills such as critical thinking or relationship building, were strong areas in their youth programs. Many of these organizations did note that their current work was not within the youth CE&L space, but that these aforementioned soft skills could translate into it. This is an area of opportunity for creating a more intentional and direct approach to youth CE&L. Some programmatic examples of utilizing these soft skills included youth radio programs, theater productions such as plays or puppet shows, and even reality TV shows. As youth tend to be more engaged with technology, particularly as it relates to social media, several programs highlighted efforts that engaged youth via their mobile phones, such as SMS debates or information sharing, or on the Internet.

All organizations noted that working within the formal education system was an effective methodology to engage with youth. For more information on out of school youth, please see the section below, on challenges. How organizations worked within schools varied by context. Organizations in some contexts spoke positively of the national Department of Education to educate and empower youth, while others worked with individual schools, teachers, or student governments to integrate a curriculum to teach the basics of civic engagement and leadership.

Challenges and Threats - External Interviews

For the most part, organizations were consistently optimistic about the future for youth. Even organizations which cited external forces unique to their context, such as extremely high youth unemployment rates, in the case of Uganda, or corruption in youth political structures, in the case of the Philippines, mechanisms like the UN or social media held great potential and were a way of still working within this topic despite contextual constraints. All external organizations highlighted that they saw youth civic engagement and leadership as an area that they needed to work on improving.

All key informant interviews noted the importance of engaging with parents, village elders, and other key adult community stakeholders. Despite this, none of the organizations had a consistent system or policy in place for engaging with parents or community stakeholders, and said that even within similar contexts in the same country these approaches could vary greatly. Having a framework for understanding how to best engage with these actors that is consistently utilized was cited as a definite need.

Youth leaders are often alone in many ways: Their leadership can separate them from their peers and some interviewees worried that their engagement is not really meaningful. Of particular concern were youth who sat on adult government councils and either lacked sufficient interaction with their peers, or who sat on national youth councils in areas far from their home and separated them from the true needs of their community.

Others worried that making the distinction between youth and adult participation relegated youth activities to being dismissed by adult stakeholders. One interviewee noted that while youth are involved in activities they are not necessarily listened to. Many organizations mentioned that they tended to consistently work with the same youth on various projects, which made that group exceptionally engaged and well-versed, while simultaneously not representative of the greater youth

population in that context. Language barriers, including jargon, can lead to disengagement and misunderstandings or mistrust of those youths, as well. Many were quick to point out societal norms and power dynamics that do not allow intergenerational coordination, but all stated that sensitizing adults to taking youth point of views into consideration was crucial not only for youth CE&L but for social development in societies both in the US and in developing country contexts. Youth are often taught that their participation should be limited to listening to their elders, and thus their concerns remain unheard.

Many program officers pointed out that the youth chosen for their more successful projects tended to be wealthier and more engaged than their peers and that reaching out to more marginalized youth, particularly out of school and ethnic minority youths, remained a challenge. Both in Uganda and the Philippines, it was noted that often youth advance the interests of those who sponsor them, and not necessarily their own. Several noted that NGOs tend to go after the same communities or individuals within those communities, which leads to an elite group of recipients who do not change with time or necessarily reflect the average citizen. The most marginalized groups noted were married adolescent girls and young mothers, those living with disabilities, and in the case of the Philippines, LGBT youth.

An organization that stressed engaging with the poorest of the poor, predominantly in rural areas, emphasized that their most successful youth participants had begun as child participants. But went on to note that once youth graduated from high school (currently age 15-16 in the Philippines, though reforms are underway to extend until the age of 17-18) they become increasingly harder to reach and that their programmatic involvement dwindles or ceases altogether. They stated that they were stronger in Africa than in Asia in this area, but unfortunately researchers were unable to interview a representative from the same organization in Uganda for comparison. As Uganda considers youth as being up to age 35, however, this drastically changes the needs of 'youth' and how a program would respond to and include them.

That anything done with youth has to be fun, engaging, and challenging was consistently mentioned. This idea of reaching youth at their level was integrated into commentary on everything from recruitment to program retention and sustainability. Recruitment of a diverse group of youths to work with was an issue for almost all organizations. While some organizations struggled with finding youth to work with due to contextual constraints such as the difficulty of engaging with out of school youth, others found that youth participation waned after the initial recruitment efforts. One organization stated that they had to exclude certain youths, if they were known participants in terrorist groups, which meant that their groups were not as diverse as possible, but that there were several potential challenges and negative consequences to excluding a group of youths from a project. This same interviewee said that it was particularly true of conflict situations, where the local government or donor organization may even put restrictions on what the organization can and cannot do. Parents may also restrict or restrain youth participation if the group is perceived to put youth in a position where they are unsafe.

In terms of donor funding, something every organization noted as a challenge, some worried that there wasn't enough money to do the activities they would want to prioritize. Others worried that, while their funding levels covered their current programs, those programs might not be sustainable beyond grant timelines. Many organizations noted that they were working more on youth livelihoods interventions rather than interventions specific to youth CE&L. While they noted the connection between livelihoods and CE&L, many organizations said funding for CE&L specific work was more difficult to come by.

Honesty and transparency were cited as important to making working with youth meaningful both to the organization and youth themselves, and it was also cited as one of the hardest things to implement. Many organizations noted that they struggled to balance donor requirements, headquarter requirements, and the needs of beneficiaries, especially when it came to youth. Most organizations cited trusting youth opinions as a challenge at every level. One organization recently did an internal audit of their own practices and decided to include youth on their own Board of Directors in order to “practice what we preach and include youth at every level.”

One organization in the Philippines bemoaned that youth had robust social media discussions surrounding governmental corruption and other current events, but that these discussions did not translate into actionable civic engagement. Even in countries where there are local government structures in place to engage with youth, or for youth to act in leadership positions, corruption and other problems often prevent these programs from being effective. Interviews conducted both in Uganda and the Philippines noted that even with official youth structures in place in government, meaningful engagement remained a challenge. Simply having a framework and structures is not enough. One key informant in the Philippines stated that this youth representation at every level was intended to lead to lifelong civic engagement but that, in reality, it just introduces young people to corruption in politics at a young age, causing youth to become disillusioned and cynical about the government’s ability to help them.

Successes and Opportunities - Internal Interviews

One of the main themes that emerged from interviews was the importance of creating meaningful partnerships with youth actors. Programs that cited youth inclusion as a factor in successful programs spoke of including youth as a part of the issue identification, program design, and implementation. Those who were best able to define youth civic engagement and leadership tended to be the NOs who took a more intentional or stand-alone approach to the two areas, as opposed to NOs that mainstreamed these ideas into other areas.

One successful example of this came from a national office whose youth had identified youth alcohol abuse as an issue in their community, citing unregulated alcohol sales as the main reason. This particular group was able to collect information, present it to civic leaders, and reform the alcohol laws in their area. Another example was with livelihoods activities. While trainings on leadership were consistently praised, this national office said they were not enough. To build on this existing strength, national offices should encourage youth to and identify the types of trainings they wanted. Once the youth had identified the areas they hoped to work in, they presented it to ChildFund and then program officers and youth worked together to create relevant programs.

As contexts varied greatly by country, different mechanisms presented themselves as opportunities but in all contexts interviewees discussed building on existing structures—whether that means national youth councils or local parent organizations—as an opportunity. Programs often looked to enabling environments either at the local or national level and built up from there.

Challenges and Threats - Internal Interviews

One interviewee noted, “The demands of youth are overwhelming; there are so many needs that some remain unattended.” In addition to education, unemployment, substance abuse, harmful traditional practices such as FGM and child marriage, many other challenges were mentioned. These include: abuse and exploitation of youth, unsafe or hazardous environments, and social norms that exclude or discount youth voices. Careful planning, meaningful engagement, and a diverse funding stream were highlighted as potential solutions to several of the challenges faced.

Funding was consistently mentioned and actors said that having diverse funding sources was crucial to ensuring programmatic flexibility. Many shared the concern that as priorities change with each funding cycle, NOs must continually worry about the longevity and sustainability of activities. One national office said that unequal investment in various life stages was problematic. Human capital, in addition to financial capital, was cited as a hurdle by almost every interviewee.

Once youth are in LS3, national offices noted, it can be difficult to engage and/or maintain engagement. One national office stated that successful youth CE&L programs actually must begin earlier than LS3, in building the capacity of youth actors in LS2. Engaging with LS3 actors can also be difficult because of the negative perceptions of youth that exist, and thus addressing youth actors also needs to involve innovative ways to engage with adult gatekeepers. An additional challenge to engaging with you can be seen in country contexts where youth unemployment is a major issue and so it can be difficult to implement interventions not related to employability. In these situations, some youth such as rural youth or girls, may be left out of programmatic efforts.

Most organizations stated that they wished for better planning, particularly in areas of youth employment and employability skills, including M&E indicators and overall manuals and handbooks for this life stage. Many encouraged a community-level bottom-up approach to assess and address needs of youth with the most constructive methods possible, but said that they had not done this in their own programs as it relates to youth CE&L. Some talked about duplicated efforts by ChildFund and other organizations, and said that coordination and communication in the development community could lead to better efforts and a more efficient use of funding.

Contextual considerations were consistently mentioned: countries with existing structures or methods for youth to engage with the local or national government said corruption remained a great concern. Simply having these structures exist on paper is not enough. Even those that are semi-functional run the risk of being overtaken by a particular political party or agenda. This creates less space for real youth engagement. Others stated that there was fundamental lack of understanding on the part of youth as to what the formal political processes looked like for civic engagement, and that there needed to be further intentional efforts to educate youth both on the political and the social ways to engage and lead. Staff in other countries worried that their governments would see educational attempts as attempts to overthrow the government or incite a rebellion.

Key Stakeholders - And How to Engage with Them

Although stakeholders can vary greatly within a country context, the following is a list of the most commonly mentioned stakeholders by ChildFund staff.

Local level	National Office Level
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ChildFund National office • Community based organizations; particularly women's groups and parents' organizations; • Youth community centers; • Children's groups; • Parents; • Community leadership; and • Government departments such as local schools and school districts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ChildFund HQ • Ministries of health and education; • Regional and national youth councils; • District councils and local councils; and • Technical and educational institutions such as technical universities for vocational trainings. • Young people

- ChildFund has historically been strong at setting up children's groups, which helps strengthen youth groups
- Religious leaders
- Community officials

How does ChildFund engage with stakeholders? This also varies greatly by context but the following were consistently mentioned:

- By sitting on advisory boards of different sectoral organizations;
- Come up with joint activities with partner organizations;
- Coordination with other NGOs;
- Coordination and communication with various government departments such as the Department of Education
- Coordination with the private sector (although this varies greatly by context)

Considerations for Planning Interventions

Based on their experience working on promoting youth development generally, and youth civic engagement and leadership specifically, the interviewees underlined a number of important considerations that should be kept in mind when planning interventions. While the considerations mentioned by practitioners both internal and external to Child Fund were diverse and numerous, they mostly fit under five key themes:

Youth Sub-Groups

Throughout the discussions it became clear that young people should not be regarded or treated as a uniform and homogenous group, and that these different sub-groups of youth often have different needs which should be addressed differently and directly. What these sub-groups are and who is included in them differed, with age and life circumstances being the two most common defining characteristics. In regards to age groups, one organization generally addresses youth sub-groups of 5-year segments each, others distinguish between youth under 18 and over 18, and some highlighted other age sub-groups which they have found to be relevant. In general, programs for the older age groups tended to focus more directly on giving youth leadership roles and engaging them in activities focused on employability and civic engagement. Along the same lines, some interventions themselves are more relevant and useful for particular age groups, for example activities related to elections would focus on youth who can vote or are approaching the voting age.

On the other hand, many of the interviewees pointed to the importance of context, which defines what stage in their lives young people are in and effects young people's needs and the activities they respond to. Context, for example, is crucial when it comes to determining the challenges and opportunities that exist for rural youth versus urban youth in a given setting. Similarly, youth sub-groups could form around education, employment or family status. No matter which approach they seemed to tend towards, the majority of the organizations recognized the usefulness of both perspectives, often indicating that age groups are a useful framework for organizing and categorizing target groups, but that the specific context of the target group should also be taken into consideration to fully understand their needs.

Gender

While there is general agreement that gender needs to be taken into consideration when designing interventions with youth, few of the organizations seem to have concrete mechanisms and guidelines to address gender. Some of the approaches mentioned include actively targeting girls and increasing the presence and participation of girls in activities, adopting a gender lens when designing programs, and addressing issues of gender in activities and opening discussions on gender roles. It is generally recognized that girls and boys can have different needs, priorities and concerns, and that social norms can affect the roles that each gender can play in activities and society at large. It was also mentioned that the type of activities that appeal to girls might be different than what boys find interesting. The interviewees emphasized the importance of being aware of the social dynamics and distinctions surrounding gender in a specific context and taking them into consideration when planning interventions.

Context of the Intervention

Understanding the context is another key consideration that emerged throughout the discussions in order to determine what interventions are appropriate and feasible. The context itself involves several elements that practitioners should be aware of to assess what limitations they have to operate under and what opportunities are available to promote youth civic engagement and leadership.

- *Power dynamics and the legal framework:* involves understanding what roles and spaces the political and legal systems allow for youth. In what positions and capacities are youth allowed and encouraged to participate? What roles are restricted and what kind of implications are there for their participation in such roles? Answers to these questions and others help practitioners make an informed decision on what issues can be pursued/promoted and by whom and on whether programs should build the capacity of youth to demand change, or enable them to become more capable and engaged adults who bring about the needed change.
- *The social and cultural setting:* understanding who are the different groups within society and what are the norms, values and practices important to them, in order to determine what activities are acceptable, even appealing, and what interventions might not be tolerated or supported.
- *Location and time-specific limitations or opportunities:* involves understanding what is feasible in a specific area and period of time. In the location where the interventions will take place, what kind of infrastructure is available - is the use of ICT tools an option for example? What else is going on in the same period of the intervention and how might that affect the type of interventions which are possible and appropriate?
- *Conflict situations:* conflicts exacerbate many of the limitations which might already be present in a certain context and affect how you choose to engage youth, on what, and who is involved in the process.
- *Community concerns:* it is important to identify the issues that are most important in the community, which either unite or divide them to determine what concerns are most relevant, especially for the youth.
- *Other actors and activities:* involves determining what other interventions have been implemented and any lessons learned from them which can inform the process of planning new interventions, especially to avoid problems encountered and to fill gaps.

Youth Perspectives and Preferences

One recurring theme in the different discussions was the importance of taking into consideration the points of view of young people and their interests when designing programs to engage them. Whether by engaging them in an informal conversation or involving them in structured needs assessments, the key idea is to find out what young people want, hear their perspectives on the problems they are facing and get a sense of what they are interested in and passionate about. Interventions which are grounded in youth perspectives and take their preferences into consideration are often more likely to be more effective and sustainable.

Project Requirements and Limitations

Organizations generally plan activities as part of a broader program with a specified scale, scope, objective, budget and requirements all of which largely affect the kind of interventions possible and preferable. How much money and time is available, what type of impact is sought (immediate results or long-term impact), and what are the objectives it needs to achieve are just some of the elements that might affect the type of project and activities that are designed.

Evaluation

While the majority of the organizations recognized the need for monitoring and evaluating interventions on youth civic engagement and leadership, very few of them had concrete and well-developed M&E systems and mechanisms, or clear indicators. Two of the organizations mentioned that they are now in the process of developing their indicators and assessment tools for their work with youth. A lot of the systems or indicators that were mentioned were project-based and developed for the purposes of a specific program within a certain context, and sometimes according to the requirements of specific donors. Many of these indicators tended to focus more on activity outputs and assessing the project's performance rather than evaluating its impact (or the impact of the program.) In addition, organizations highlighted some indicators and tools that have been developed for assessing youth development in general, for example the Development Assets Profile survey.¹

In general, while most of the interviewees expressed interest in standard indicators and tools on youth CE&L, many also emphasized the relation between the objectives of the program, the resources (both financial and human) available, and the tools and indicators which would be appropriate. One organization highlighted the fact that activities related to CE&L are often woven into projects that focus on other areas, and therefore, the indicators developed to measure these interventions are not appropriate for assessing youth leadership and civic engagement. Another interviewee pointed to the importance of involving the beneficiaries themselves, the youth and community more broadly, in defining what a successful intervention would look like and developing the indicators accordingly. In short, it became clear in the majority of the discussions that monitoring and evaluation related to youth is an area which is gaining attention and momentum, but still needs to be developed significantly both in terms of identifying standard indicators and determining adaptable tools, particularly when it comes to evaluating youth civic engagement and leadership.

¹ Developed by Search Institute. Additional information can be found at: <http://www.search-institute.org/surveys/DAP>

Developing a Model on Youth Civic Engagement & Leadership

When discussing the main points to keep in mind when developing a model on youth civic engagement and leadership, interviewees highlighted key components which correspond to a certain extent to the considerations for planning interventions. The components mentioned varied from practical considerations on the process of developing and implementing the model, to programmatic elements which should guide the model rationale and content. The components suggested by both ChildFund national offices and other organizations largely fall under 8 main themes:

Diversity of Target Groups and Needs

The model should recognize that there are multiple sub-groups within youth that can be targeted to promote civic engagement and leadership, and that these sub-groups might have their unique concerns and needs and require targeted and tailored interventions. The model should make provisions to identify the different sub-groups and ensure they are directly engaged. When programs address youth in general, without delving into the specific sub-categories and their needs, they run the risk of excluding many young people who are often already disengaged. Young people who are part of marginalized groups – could include people with disabilities, minorities, girls, young parents, etc. – are often difficult to find and involve in activities, and have to be targeted and mobilized specifically and directly to ensure that their voices are heard and that they participate. Leaving these young people out limits their opportunities and the roles they can play in the future, while actively engaging them can transform their own and other's perceptions on what they can do and what roles they can play in their community.

Youth are Involved and Lead Efforts

An effective model would recognize youth as agents of change in their communities and would put young people “front and center” in their own development. Youth should not be passive recipients or participants in interventions, but should play leading and decision-making roles which shape the design and implementation of programs and activities. Effective approaches would make space for young people to have a “real say” in development efforts and would reinforce youth voice and youth design, with support and guidance from adults and mentors. This would require transparency in the relationship and communication to make certain that youth know their value and their role in the process. It would also necessitate a certain level of trust and the willingness of adults to make room for youth in leadership roles and accept what they express.

Engagement is Meaningful and Interesting to Youth

A successful model would build on young people's creativity, passion and capacities, and support them to ensure that youth are not merely present in activities, but are actively engaged in initiatives that are meaningful and interesting to them. What motivates young people to be and stay engaged?

- *Opportunities for self-development:* programs should have the potential to benefit the young people at the individual level by giving them the opportunity to gain new skills, access networks, travel, build relationships, be exposed to ideas and knowledge that would be useful for their future, etc.
- *Opportunity for community development:* programs should support youth to identify and address real community needs, and have the potential to change the status quo and improve the situation.

- *Tangible results:* Programs should be designed to deliver tangible – and when possible immediate – results and a felt impact on the participants themselves or their community. Young people are often fed empty promises and are increasingly frustrated by initiatives that do not yield a clear and concrete output or result. When young people don't see the results of their work for a long time, they might start to feel exploited and question the value of their participation. Concrete and tangible outcomes from an activity become a motivation that reinforces young people's belief in the program and the value of their participation in it.
- *Fun and challenging activities:* if young people don't enjoy being part of the activity, and don't feel any degree of challenge, they might lose interest. Ensuring that there are multiple levels of engagement and responsibility and that the type and intensity of engagements escalates can be helpful to keep young people interested and involved.

Developing Linkages

The model should build or reinforce linkages between CE&L programming and other objectives of youth development. CE&L should be embedded in youth programming, should build on existing structures, and address cross-cutting issues (livelihood, health, HIV/AIDS, conflict). CE&L can be integrated into or coordinated with other programs that involve youth such as workforce development, especially as these are areas where youth are already interested and motivated to be involved (there is often a tangible and immediate outcome to be gained). Especially when it comes to skills development, there are several opportunities for coordination that would decrease duplication and maximize benefit from such activities. The caveat is that there's a risk that CE&L objectives would get lost in the mix, and that other goals and results are prioritized over them. Therefore, mechanisms for tracking, assessing, reporting and communicating CE&L results should be put in place to ensure that CE&L objectives are being met even if not through stand-alone activities.

Moreover, the model should recognize and address the fact that youth is just one stage in an individual's life and should attempt to build linkages with the other stages. Children who are engaged in their communities and are used to expressing themselves, are better-prepared to assume leadership roles and be engaged as teenager and then as adults. Even within the youth group, activities need to be connected to ensure that activities build on each other and that at each age or stage, the person is being prepared to become more (or differently) engaged later.

Stakeholders and Partnerships

The model should acknowledge and determine the diversity of stakeholders in youth civic engagement and leadership, the value of their participation and avenues for collaboration. Stakeholders include: community-based organizations, non-governmental organizations, youth associations, community leaders, youth leaders, schools, government entities, and the family. Building partnerships with these stakeholders can help create a platform for youth to raise their issues, and can result in a strong support network for them. Enlisting the support of adults and developing strong youth-adult partnerships is especially important. More broadly, promoting community engagement and ownership of programs related to youth contributes to the long-term impact and sustainability.

Assessing the Context

Youth civic engagement and leadership programming occurs within a specific context that greatly influences what interventions look like and how effective they are. Therefore, a strong model would involve a thorough assessment of the political, economic, legal, social and cultural dynamics in a certain context and their effect on youth CE&L. It would include an understanding of the systems,

structures and actors that are relevant, the spaces available for engagement and the opportunities for change and improvement.

Context also entails an understanding of the issues and restrictions surrounding young people as individuals or as a group, recognizing other commitments they might have and the issues and rights most critical to their development.

Flexible, Practical and Relatable

For the model to be able to integrate these different components and function in a diversity of contexts, it has to be flexible and adaptable. Practitioners all over the world will be using it to develop approaches to engage a large and diverse youth population often at the local, regional and national levels. The model would guide the process, but would not dictate it. It would act as a framework to inform practitioners' efforts to understand civic engagement and leadership and determine what impact is sought. At the same time, the model should be practical and oriented more towards the practice of civic engagement and leadership rather than the theories behind it. It should relate to the work of practitioners on the ground and can be applied to support their everyday work.

Supportive Systems and Resources

For the model to be successfully developed and used, sufficient resources (both financial and human) need to be invested in it to build the necessary systems which are able to maintain and mainstream it in the organization. Resources should also be invested to make sure that staff at different levels have the knowledge and capacities to be able to use the model effectively.

While most of the national office staff interviewed emphasized the importance of the model being flexible, making room for innovation and local input, and clearly demonstrating the intended change and how to get there, among other points, there was no clear agreement on what format would deliver these results. The main suggestions included:

- A detailed manual, which might include a breakdown of steps that can be followed to manage the implementation of the model and training staff on its use.
- A brief toolkit, which identifies and provides guidance on understanding and using the basic components of the model. For example, tools to understand the legal framework, local capacity, and tools to build capacity on certain skills that are important – advocacy, coaching, networking, etc.
- A simple info-graphic or chart, which might be helpful to those who don't have the technical knowhow to follow a long narrative.
- A hybrid or two-piece product, which includes a full model and a training tool kit on facilitating different activities that support the components of the model.

Youth Perspectives on Civic Engagement & Leadership

Interviews were conducted with four youth who were actively involved in an organization and would consider themselves to be leaders. When asked what made them get involved in their organizations, one respondent noted that she had learned about the organization because of a friend's parent and was interested in the opportunities for youth to get involved. Another respondent noted that he had ties to the organization from an early age and that their parents were also very involved in the organization. Youth noted they generally had to go through an adult to access an organization.

The youth respondents consistently noted that their involvement in their respective organizations helped them to build leadership skills and helped make them a leader (or more of a

leader). When the respondents were asked what leadership meant to them, two respondents noted that an important aspect was facilitating and encouraging other youth to get involved to pursue some kind of goal or change. Another respondent noted that leadership was about having influence and being a role model. Another aspect of leadership that was highlighted was the importance of managing people effectively.

Respondents were asked to identify positive aspects of being a youth leader and challenges. In terms of pros, they noted the satisfaction of enabling other youth to take action and recognizing that youth can accomplish a lot when given the opportunity. Respondents also highlighted the important personal benefits such as gaining new skills, building confidence, and developing as a person. In discussing challenges, the youth most frequently noted time as being a major constraint to their involvement. It was also noted that a major challenge was keeping other youth engaged and motivated. Another challenge that was highlighted was getting adults and staff to view youth as being on the same level.

When asked to identify what they saw as key considerations when working with youth, it was highlighted that it was important that organizations engage them from the beginning and work closely with them to identify needs and interests. For youth to stay involved they need to be interested in the projects and feel ownership over them. It was also noted that youth potential should be recognized and that adults need to be really listening and incorporating what the youth say.

Key Takeaways

The key informant interviews provided a valuable opportunity for the consultants to gain a clear perspective on how youth civic engagement and leadership is understood and applied in practice, the main factors that have restrained or facilitated work with youth on CE&L and the most important considerations for developing an organizational approach, model or interventions on youth civic engagement and leadership.

First and foremost, effective and sustainable youth development in general, and youth civic engagement and leadership specifically, requires that youth be actively and meaningfully engaged at all levels and at the different stages of the process – to identify issues, design interventions and lead activities. Youth should be active participants – and not passive recipients – in their own development and in the advancement of their communities. Youth perspectives and capacities are valuable and should be harnessed to promote development. To ensure that youth are motivated to become and stay engaged, activities should be interesting to them, should offer direct and tangible benefits and should be fun.

Second, context matters – a lot! The country or local context has implications for who is considered as youth, what civic engagement and leadership mean, and what roles youth – and groups within them – are able and willing to play in their community. It also affects what limitations, opportunities or considerations are relevant.

Third, promoting youth civic engagement and leadership is not a one-person or one-organization effort; it requires involving different stakeholders – families, the community, schools, other organizations – to varying extents, whether to ensure their support for interventions or to engage them as partners.

Fourth, while it is useful and convenient to focus on specific individuals or groups that are accessible and capable of assuming leadership roles and engaging in their communities – for example, educated youth, enrolled youth, and individuals who possess some leadership qualities – it is crucial that programs also directly target individuals and groups who are marginalized (such as young people with disabilities, those in the LGBT community or from minority groups) to ensure that their voices are heard and that they have the opportunity to improve their own and their community’s situation.

Fifth and finally, youth civic engagement and leadership programs do not exist in a vacuum – they should interact, and possibly be integrated, with other objectives of youth development. Youth issues are cross-cutting and the most successful and engaging activities are often those that work across sectors and combine elements from livelihoods, education or health, to name a few, with civic engagement. Youth CE&L does not necessarily have to be a stand-alone program, but it is essential for activities to be grounded in a well-developed and cohesive approach to make sure that the goals for youth CE&L are being met and that impact is achieved. Moreover, it is important to recognize that skills that are being built are transferable and prepare young people for new or different roles. Along the same lines, coordinating across life stages can be very useful to ensure that children acquire some of the knowledge and skills that would enable them to become engaged and leaders as young people, and that youth are developing the capacities they need to become active and successful adults.

Overview of Interviewees

Organization	Name	Position
FHI360	Jennifer Hollinger & Robin Nelson	Program Managers, Civil Society & Peacebuilding Department
Education Development Center (EDC)	Sarah Nogueira Sanca	Program Manager
Mercy Corps	Matt Streng	Senior Youth Development Advisor
Plan	Laura Brazee	Youth Engagement Manager
Plan - USNO Board	Marisa Haire	Plan USNO Board member
Plan - Global Youth Steering Committee	Sara Moore	Plan Global Youth Steering Committee member
Advocates for Youth	Ariel Cerrud	Youth Activist Network Coordinator
National Democratic Institute	Brittany Danisch	Senior Program Manager for Citizen Participation programs
ChildFund - Americas	Graeme Thompson	Regional Youth Technical Advisor for the Americas region
ChildFund - Zambia	Abigail Musonda	Youth Technical Advisor
ChildFund - Gambia	Mustapha Kebbeh	Program Director
ChildFund - Sierra Leone	Yusufu Kamara	Program Director
ChildFund – Sri Lanka	Chelsea Sexton	Program Officer
ChildFund - Uganda	Moses Otai	Program Director
ChildFund - Uganda	Timothy Opobo	Manager for Child Protection
ChildFund - Uganda	Francis Alira	M&E Manager
International Republican Institute - Uganda	Joseph Munyanga / Lara Prentice + 2 staff	Program Officer / Country Director
The Kibo Foundation - Uganda	Abraham Temu + 3 staff	Co-founder
Uganda Youth Development Link - Uganda	Rogers Mutaawe	Senior Programme Manager
Save the Children - Philippines	Sheila Carreon	Project Officer
Plan International - Philippines	Eric Lazarte	Country Program Advisor for Child-friendly Governance
Philippine Center for Civic Education and Democracy (PCCED)	Reynald Trillana / Clem Capasano	Executive Director / Chairman
National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC) Youth and Students Sectoral Council	Alcariza Peregrino / Gibby Gorres	Office of the Secretary / Sectoral Representative for Youth & Students

Findings from Field Research in the Philippines and Uganda

Methodology

The GWU Consultants split into teams of two and traveled to Uganda and the Philippines for two weeks each during March of 2014 to conduct field research. The purpose of the field work was to gain a better understanding of how youth civic engagement and leadership is understood and practiced within a specific country context at the national office and local levels. The activities of the fieldwork did not aim to concretely assess ChildFund's work and programs on youth CE&L, and accordingly this report does not attempt to provide a detailed overview of the two countries' programming on youth CE&L.

The two teams facilitated workshops and conducted interviews with the ChildFund national office (NO) staff, ChildFund local partners, youth groups, local government leaders, and other organizations working on issues related to youth civic engagement and leadership in the two countries. A detailed list of the activities carried out can be found in the appendix. The activities were designed to be participatory and aimed at actively involving practitioners from the national office and local partners and youth themselves in brainstorming on key issues related to youth civic engagement and leadership. The purpose of the activities was to encourage participants to work individually and in groups to develop their ideas and share their experiences on youth leadership and engagement and included mapping exercises, group discussions, and brainstorming activities. A description of the activities, their objectives and the process to facilitate them is included in the facilitator guide.

The main findings from the field research have been compiled into thematic areas related to definitions, application, considerations and recommendations. An attempt has been made to utilize common themes and concepts throughout as appropriate, but it should be recognized that the different country contexts and use of CE&L has led to very different ways of thinking about and connecting with these terms. The two pillars of civic engagement, community engagement and political involvement, were of particular importance and have been highlighted throughout. While the line between these two pillars is not well defined the authors of this report look at community involvement as activities in which participants do not work with the government. On the other hand, in political involvement activities participants address the government, or work with the government, to improve their communities.

Fieldwork in the Philippines

When considering how to incorporate civic engagement and leadership into youth programming, it is essential to have a deep understanding of the national and local context. In the Philippines, engagement at the local governance level, known as the Barangay, is especially rich. Youth organizations have the opportunity to engage directly with the local government to express concerns and advocate for issues of interest. However, while structures exist that allow for this type of youth engagement, it is also important to note that corruption is of serious concern at every level of government in the Philippines, which can inhibit youth from effectively participating.

The history of youth CE&L in the Philippines, while rich and unique, is similar to the Ugandan context in that it begins in more recent history with a series of positive policies to promote youth inclusion in governance both through youth participation and intentional thinking around youth issues. However, in practice, many of these systems do not work as planned. Participants in the Think Tank, focus groups, and key informant interviews spoke about the potential of the Sangguniang Kabataan (SK) or youth council at the Barangay level to promote youth engagement and development. These youth councils, in theory, should receive 10% of government funds in order to address youth issues. Currently the youth councils are on hold indefinitely as many youth councils were found to be corrupt. In several cases adults were found to be manipulating youth to use funds for their own purposes instead of investing them in issues relevant to youth. Due to the status of the SK, the National Youth Parliament, which is meant to meet every two years, is also on hold. However, there are a lot of positive initiatives, which have been successful in advancing youth and their issues, many of which are recognized by the National Commission on Youth through its designation of the Ten Accomplished Youth Organizations each year.

The vast majority of youth and youth-serving groups spoke of the community pillar of civic engagement. In the Philippines, civic engagement and leadership were not typically related to individual benefits, but were viewed as a way of connecting with other youth and the community and doing activities that advanced the collective good. However, some of the youth did note that certain trainings focused on building leadership skills did help them as individuals. For example, several youth noted that they felt the trainings they participated in had been useful for building self-confidence and giving them a competitive edge in the job market.

The consultants spoke in depth with three youth groups about how they perceive the concepts of civic engagement and leadership and what types of activities and opportunities exist pertaining to these topics. When defining leadership, they highlighted it as a tool for self-development and for learning skills. It was also noted by one youth group that leadership is something that comes from the heart and that you must be very committed to others and to community issues in order to be a good leader. In terms of civic engagement, one group gave an example on how they have been involved in their community; they noted that children were ditching school to go to Internet cafes to play computer games. They identified this as a problem and raised it in an open forum to the Mayor, who subsequently

created an ordinance that students cannot enter computer shops during school hours. In addition, some of the key advocacy areas that the youth identified were Adolescent Reproductive Health (ARH) and Disaster Risk Reduction Management (DRRM).

A timeline activity was conducted with the youth groups in order to get a sense of the major milestones that exist for youth ages 15-24 in the Philippines. The major milestones identified for youth were associated with school (high school graduation, choosing college classes, starting college) and work (starting to work, starting a career). They also highlighted things like going through emotional changes, developing their identity, and their debut ages (18 for girls, 21 for boys). The major moments on the youth timeline were clustered around 15-18, and there were fewer important moments after 21 as most youth were working by that time.

In addition, a community mapping exercise was done to get the youth groups thinking about how they perceive their own communities and how that defines the activities they partake in. When mapping their community, the groups highlighted many places associated with governance such as the Barangay halls, where they held meetings and trainings, and the Municipals' halls. Other places that were highlighted as important and youth friendly were the schools and churches; in addition, they highlighted the lake in their community as a place for fun.

All of the youth said they considered themselves to be civically engaged and leaders in their community. Their interest in being civically engaged came from wanting to help others in their community (this was highlighted as being a feeling in their heart). They reach other youth by inviting them to participate at sessions (especially on ARH and DRRM). In terms of what challenges they faced when it came to being active leaders and participants in their communities, they noted that time was a major challenge to their involvement (the need to balance their youth organization commitments with family and school commitments).

How Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership is Understood

Going Beyond Advocacy

Current programmatic efforts focus on relationships between youth groups and the local government units, or Barangays. Youth often advocate to these bodies, or the local mayor, which sometimes results in change. In addition to these activities, the consultants would recommended advocacy efforts that would target the wider community, and to go beyond advocacy alone to include a wider range of activities and ways for youth to participate.

There are some obstacles to youth participation, especially when young people have to manage their limited time and juggle other responsibilities. Activities that are cognizant of these limitations could encourage greater participation, particularly by those most marginalized and potentially most time-poor. In addition, youth are not always perceived as being on a level playing field with adult decision-makers and this can impact their ability to have their ideas taken seriously.

Advocacy, especially advocating on behalf of issues important to youth, is an area of identified strength for ChildFund and local partners. However, adults need to perceive youth voices as valid even within these discussions. Adult-youth partnership activities as a part of youth CE&L programs could foster this environment. In addition, building youth capabilities to ensure they are able to proactively participate and providing youth with a platform to engage with various governance structures were both found to be important.

Factors and Considerations for the Model

A Starting Point

For youth civic engagement and leadership programs to be most effective, the ChildFund global model will need to take into account that this work cannot be done in a vacuum. As such, the model should have explicit bridges and connections between LS3 and LS2 activities. In addition, ChildFund should coordinate with government entities such as the Barangay, Department of Education as well as with local partners and other NGOs.

As an illustrative case study in ChildFund's work, the ChildFund Philippines NO seems primed to capitalize on these connections. Staff spoke of regular meetings and workshops among staff and local partners, and a desire to align programmatic efforts with ChildFund objectives. They have recently undergone a review and training on Life Stage Two, and spoke highly of the effort, trainings, and manuals. They identified that adolescent sexual and reproductive health (ARH) and disaster risk reduction (DRR) programs were already strong areas where youth were acting in leadership and advocacy roles.

The Philippines has formal structures in place within which youth can and are encouraged to engage, such as the Barangay, and there are established methods for engagement within those structures. Although the degree to which this forum is responsible for acting on the advocacy efforts of youth varies by area, this was consistently highlighted as a consideration any program would need to take into account.

Despite these areas of strength, NO staff and partners also identified areas where improvement was necessary. An overarching need to engage with the main actors who promote and inhibit youth CE&L was identified, and parents in particular were highlighted as an area where a more formalized methodology for engagement could be created and utilized for greater results. Current activities focused on engaging youth leaders tend to reach already empowered youth to the exclusion of more marginalized youth. Outreach mechanisms for youth activities tend to focus on those that are already active. Although religion and the church were both identified as important in local communities, they can also exclude LGBTQ youth and indigenous populations and hinder reproductive health conversations.

It was recommended that activities relating to CE&L be identified by the youth themselves as being important. This was especially highlighted when it came to discussions on advocacy issues, where the youth needed to be identifying what issues they were interested in advocating for both for program

success and longevity. Many participants identified the importance of technical assistance and the need for a technical expert on CE&L issues. It was suggested that CE&L guidance be incorporated into materials on LS3 in a format that was consistent to what they are used to. Having guideposts and modules for CE&L were highlighted as most useful. And finally, when asked about the format of the model, several participants suggested that a checklist of key issues and activities would be helpful.

Important Entry Points within LS3

The majority of youth interviewed and engaged in ChildFund activities tended to be under the age of 18. In the Philippines, secondary school ends when youth are approximately 16 years of age. Afterwards, many youth do go on to college, which is two years of additional education. However, college can be costly which might drive young people to attend vocational school or begin to work directly. These laws and milestones create unique opportunities and challenges within LS3 for the Philippines NO to utilize as entry points.

As late adolescence and early adulthood are such crucial times in one's life, and the needs of youth can vary greatly from year to year, there were several distinct milestones mentioned where further work needs to be done to respond to the needs and interests of youth participants. Youth noted that there is an important "adjustment period" between high school and college, and that youth participation in ChildFund activities tends to wane or end after college matriculation commences. Local partner staff had historically provided scholarships for youth to attend college, but currently had made changes to encourage youth to attend vocational school by incentivizing them with scholarships. Those who wished to attend more traditional post secondary institutions were still encouraged to do so but were not provided with scholarship funding. Youth and local partners expressed frustration in not being able to meet the needs of their youth.

Both youth and adults noted that being able to work and the right to vote, were major moments for youth who turn 18. Youth identified ages 21-24 as being an important time for them to mature and become more independent. Youth, local staff, and the NO all cited that it was difficult to retain and engage youth after they graduated from high school. Youth CE&L activities that addressed and responded to challenges related to time limits and stress which youth face at this point in their lives might be able to retain youth throughout the college experience, and utilize those leaders as a method for engaging younger actors and training second liners which will be mentioned in a later section.

"Elite" Youth

The idea of an "elite group" of youth (youth who are involved in many activities and who are consistently identified by groups like ChildFund as activists and as leaders) came up frequently. These youth tended to be engaged in several activities (i.e. DRRM and ARH), which overextended their capacity and denied other potential youth access to the programs. It was noted that there needed to be more of a focus on reaching out to youth beyond this elite group. This idea resonated in the youth interviews: Many of the youth have been ChildFund sponsor children and involved in the children's organizations which was how they became involved with the youth organizations. Even those who had

not been sponsor children often had a sibling or relative who had been, which was then cited as their reason for participation.

Second Liners

While it is programmatically and socially useful to involve these active and engaged youth, it was identified as a problem that there was not enough of a focus on what was termed as “second-liners,” or successors once those youth were no longer active. As traditionally ChildFund and local partners pull from the “elite” group of youth, recruiting younger youth to continue programming is problematic and affects program sustainability. The importance of outreach to marginalized groups and allowing for youth-led discussions around recruitment and issue identification is discussed in the recommendations section.

Adult-Youth Partnerships

Participants were mostly divided based on programmatic and geographic focus areas, which allowed for more streamlined discussions around common work. Some of the key themes that emerged from these discussions were the importance of families, schools, and peers and key entry points for engaging with youth. While families in particular were identified as a key entry point, there were no consistent examples about how they were being engaged in a meaningful way. The importance of adult-youth dialogue was reinforced throughout, and is discussed in the recommendations section.

Fieldwork in Uganda

How Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership is Understood

Defining Civic Engagement

The national context, including the country's history, power structure, and legislation has shaped the definition of civic engagement in Uganda. Current or recently implemented legislation has also had a great impact on the country. Most of the definitions provided by participants and interviewees focused on the community pillar of civic engagement. Definitions highlighted being involved or engaged in the community, working on specific issues of concern, and acquiring and sharing information as the defining characteristic of engagement. These definitions were elicited during the think tank, youth focus groups, and participatory activities with local partners and interviews with practitioners from other organizations.

While definitions varied, there were general similarities that participants chose to highlight in their understanding of civic engagement. Most of those asked highlighted the community aspects of civic engagement, including terms such as: decision making, education, awareness-raising, and the community acting together on common issues. Participants highlighted communities working together to identify and respond to issues such as health and sanitation, and to educate and sensitize others to the programmatic response to a certain issue. Once members of the community were educated, other definitions stated, they exercise their skills in creating further awareness and share in the experience of decision-making on issues that affect them.

When prompted to discuss the political pillar, participants mentioned that they did not necessarily consider it a part of civic engagement. Furthermore, they stated that it could be dangerous to engage in such activities, as the government has incarcerated those they view as political dissidents in the past. While political participation is an important issue given the large number of people under the age of 30 in Uganda, it's also a very sensitive one and carries the danger of ending up in jail. Both the government and the community often look at a strong and empowered group of youth suspiciously. Political actors would not hesitate to engage the youth during elections to take advantage of their numbers and their votes, but rarely engage youth in defining campaign issues, or sustain this engagement afterwards.

Historical context

Uganda's history has shaped the space for youth civic engagement and leadership. Through interviews and participatory focus groups some historical events were highlighted that have significantly contributed to opening the space for youth civic engagement and participation in politics. These include: the end of the reign of terror in 1979, and the end of the liberation war in 1986 followed by the passage of a constitution that included provisions to set aside seats for youth parliamentarians. These events created a space for citizen participation, and set up some of the structures of a democratic system that is still developing. Furthermore, the creation of local government associations, allowed for more participation and local engagement. Moreover, the quota for women in the Parliament and work on

women's empowerment under the third Millennium Development Goal assisted in elevating women representation and presence in public bodies.

Progress on engagement and participation has been made since Uganda's independence; nonetheless, participants in interviews and the think tank noted that there were several programs and pieces of legislation that could open the civic engagement space even further. However, these were only on paper, and their implementation was faulty at best. These include the establishment of national and local youth councils, which aimed to promote the visibility of youth as potential players, but in practice youth were not allowed to take leadership roles in planning and implementation. The 1996 Constitution and the National Youth Policy in 1998 enhanced the status of youth within the legal framework by recognizing their rights, prioritizing their issues, and making space for them to be represented in governance bodies such as the Parliament. Nonetheless, the youth that participated in these frameworks were often manipulated into promoting party agendas. Some programs do exist to promote skill building, such as Skilling Uganda and the Youth Fund whose aim is to provide young people with the skills and resources they need for leadership. The participants noted that these types of programs were underfunded, given the need, and gaining access involved a lengthy bureaucratic process.

Moreover, historical events have had an adverse effect on youth development and engagement. During periods of political instability and conflict, such as the reign of terror (1971 – 1979) and the liberation war (1979 – 1986), young people have been at the center of the conflict both as perpetrators and victims. Many young people lost their lives, or were born and raised in refugee camps, and others still were left uneducated and with limited prospects for employment and advancement. In recent years, participation in politics, and especially in opposition groups, resulted in young people being imprisoned, which demotivate young people from expressing their opinions and taking part in collective action. Other events that were viewed by some participants as an obstacle to civic engagement were the HIV epidemic, and recent legislation (i.e. anti-homosexual, and anti- prostitution laws). Moreover, youth often become parents or heads of households at a young age that might restrict their ability to be engaged.

Political Process

The political process in Uganda appears to be complex and to some extent discouraging to civic engagement. While participants in the think tank were able to identify the different levels of government that exist in the country, they had trouble identifying how the power flowed from the president to the sub-county level and the roles that each level of government played. While youth representatives were present at every level of government, participants of both the think tank and interviews noted that while representation was on paper, it didn't represent youth issues. Youth haven't been able to translate that participation into meaningful achievement for young people and have limited capacity to tease out the issues that are important to young people and translate them into action. Often, parties manipulate youth representatives in order to get youth to support the party's agenda. Finally, young people are seen as leaders of tomorrow and their participation is more of a listening post than really involving them in all aspects. This attitude of "sit and learn so you can lead later" demotivates young people since they don't feel their participation has value.

Youth subgroups have even more trouble being heard. Young women, for example, are at a great disadvantage as they are often not represented. Without representation their issues aren't given a voice, nor is there a space to express these issues. It was noted that in 112 districts in Uganda, there was only one female chairperson. Young parents and youth with disabilities are other sub-groups whose concerns are often not heard and who are usually not engaged and are thus left out both physically and in discussions.

Factors and Considerations for the Model

National office and Local Partners

While Uganda is not a LS3 priority country, ChildFund has been engaging in some areas of this life stage, mostly working with youth on sexual and reproductive health and employability. When discussing milestones in the youth life stage most of the programs mentioned were related to employment and sexual and reproductive health. Activities related to leadership and advocacy appeared to be irregular and not a major part of programming.

Furthermore, understanding civic engagement and leadership proved difficult to participants of the local partner workshop, youth focus groups and that think tank. While the participants marked milestones before the age of 18 when discussing civic engagement they found it difficult to grasp how this would apply to youth under 18. Additionally, participants noted that young people under 18 might not have the capabilities to be leaders or be civically engaged.

Finally, definitions of youth leadership and civic engagement used by both ChildFund and Local Partner Staff were not always youth-friendly or often reflected an uncertainty regarding the ability of youth to assume leadership roles. In fact, one participant spoke fearfully of handing over too much power to youth and said, "youth are more aggressive when they demand their rights." An imbalanced power dynamic can be harmful both to youth who hope to better themselves and their communities, but also to facilitating a program with true youth voices. According to one interviewee: "Youth don't take into account that there are processes that have to be worked through to realize those rights [...] challenge of youth understanding what civic engagement is and how to go about it for their own good." This paternalistic view resonated throughout various interactions in the country and underscores the need for meaningful adult-youth partnerships not only to empower youth to enact change, but to change the perception of youth on the part of adults.

Desire to Engage

Despite the difficulties of being civically engaged in Uganda, including the lack of incentives for youth participation, youth seemed interested in learning and sharing their knowledge with the community. This was especially true when the knowledge pertained to capacity building and skills-acquisition or activities that can lead to income generation. Furthermore, participants noted that despite the aforementioned challenges, youth continued to be involved with the Youth Councils and the Youth Fund. This demonstrated to researchers and the community a commitment to being engaged.

Importance of Partnerships

Partnerships such as those with other NGOs, adults and youth, and local and national governments will be key as ChildFund Uganda increases their youth civic engagement presence. Governmental relationships can decrease the danger associated with civic engagement programs. By having a good relationship with the government, ChildFund will be able to leverage the existing government programs and legislation to strengthen their civic engagement activities.

Partnerships with other NGOs will also be crucial for civic engagement programming. While ChildFund's work with civic engagement and leadership is relatively new in the country, there are several NGOs that have been working in this area for years. Partnering with these organizations would allow the NO to learn from other NGO's experiences, and to work in parallel to their programming in order not to duplicate efforts.

Human and Financial Resources

The availability of resources both human and financial should be considered when designing and implementing a civic engagement and leadership program. It is important to know what resources the community and the NO has, and what will be needed. Diverse funding mechanisms were highlighted as important for the longevity of programmatic efforts. Depending solely on grants, many feared, would not be sufficient in breadth or length for successful implementation. Working with a number of youth in different areas was discussed as a goal, and without sufficient funding this becomes impossible.

Likewise, knowing the current capacity of human resources in the community, and being able to supplement these with trainings, is important in civic engagement programing. Lack of skills, specifically skills related to time management, leadership, and management; along with low levels of education among youth and lack of access to information might need to be addressed in order to implement a successful civic engagement and leadership program.

Gender

While many participants emphasized that programs do not discriminate between girls and boys, many participants mentioned that there might be social and cultural limitations to what role each gender could play. During the youth focus groups, while girls did work within groups and would even come up to present the group's work or conclusions, they hesitated to express their own opinion on different matters, especially those related to their own participation and what would encourage or hinder the involvement of girls. In fact, none of the girls spoke up in the open-ended group discussions, even when questions specifically related to them.

Recommendations for National Offices

How to Best Implement and Understand Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership

Overarching Recommendations

In both Uganda and the Philippines, researchers found great similarities in programmatic needs despite the very different social, economic, and political climates. Unique differences and challenges are noted in the sections specific to each country context later in this report. The overarching recommendations for both contexts include: increasing adult-youth partnerships, allowing for greater youth inclusion at all stages of project design and implementation, and the need for training on LS3 and youth CE&L. Although the outcomes played out differently, researchers consistently heard about adults and youth who were not working as equals to solve problems, and of adults proposing solutions as opposed to youth themselves leading the change. While these are both difficult social norms to overcome, researchers recommend an intentional and systematic approach to training staff and local partners in how to listen to and hear youth voices, and how to elicit the best responses from youth to make them comfortable in those interactions as well.

Recommendations for the Philippines

Greater Youth Voices for More and More Authentic Participation

As the NO, local partners, and involved youth consistently identified a need for engaging the next level of youth, and stated that the “elite” youth tended to leave out a certain portion of the youth population, the consultants recommend that youth are allowed to identify issues that are important to them, and that future programmatic efforts have a greater level of youth leadership and involvement at all stages. The consultants believe that this will lead to youth who both want to participate and want to identify their own issues to engage, and will also create a more inclusive structure to remove the “elite youth only” participation.

By allowing youth to identify the issues that they care most about and want to change in their communities, there is also a greater chance that the involvement in the group will have lifelong outcomes for those involved. Seeing youth involved who are passionate about what they are doing, but are not necessarily “elite” youth, will also lead to a changed perception of ChildFund programs, and creates greater potential for wider participation. Increased adult-youth partnerships were also highlighted as an area of potential growth, both for an increased number of youth who were able to participate, and to enrich the existing activities and efforts. While current efforts within formal education were consistently seen as strong, both youth and adults saw a need to reach out to out-of-school youth, including those who had already graduated secondary school, as a mechanism for increasing participation.

Recommendations for Uganda

Common Definitions and Current Points of Entry

Based on the conversations with youth themselves and with practitioners from within and outside ChildFund, there are some key areas where ChildFund national office and local partners can focus on, including defining civic engagement and leadership, engaging youth in different spaces, and increasing engagement among marginalized groups.

The first step would be to develop a strong understanding of civic engagement and leadership, among the national office and the local partner staff, and what it means for youth in Uganda. This would involve working with local partners to develop an approach on youth civic engagement and leadership. This approach should include a vision for civic engagement and leadership in Uganda and programs that lead to this outcome. The programs should take advantage of activities that are already being implemented which are related to or promote youth CE&L. Also, ChildFund should work to engage young people more actively and purposefully in developing the approach and activities on youth civic engagement and leadership, from issue identification to implementation.

Furthermore, ChildFund should utilize already existing points of entry where youth already gather with one another, such as secondary schools. Engaging with youth in different spaces where they are already present and feel comfortable has many benefits, especially in an area where security is a concern for youth. Places which have the potential to be dangerous for youth and which might expose them to bad habits (i.e. the market or video halls for example) can also be specifically targeted to transform them into safe spaces and places where young people can be engaged. However, engagement should also focus on youth groups that are not well represented and marginalized, such as girls, the disabled, and indigenous minorities.

Fieldwork Facilitator Guide

General Guidelines for Activities

Before engaging with each group please remind them that:

1. Written and oral reports and other written material coming out of this project will present only aggregate data and information. Your responses will be kept confidential and your name will not be cited;
2. There are no right or wrong answers;
3. In some cases, the appropriate response may reflect the participant's opinion or impression;
4. The interview is being recorded (pictures, notes, etc.) to ensure accuracy of your responses; and
5. You are free to leave at any time or decline to answer questions that make you feel uncomfortable.

The agenda will be posted at all times on a wall visible to all participants, and both facilitator's emails as well as Danielle's will be displayed should anyone have questions after the activities.

Each facilitator will take turns running the activities outlined in the agenda and facilitator guide. When one person is not facilitating, they will be taking notes and helping out as needed. This will allow both parties to have maximum efficiency in all activities.

Think Tank Activities:

Activity: The Bowl Game

Objective: Icebreaker

Time: 30 mins

Materials: Bowl, lots of paper (cut into small pieces), and pens.

Procedure:

1. Have the players write down a famous person. This person can be a cartoon, real, or a myth; just as long as everyone in the room will be familiar with who they are.
2. Fold the pieces up and put them into the bowl.
3. Divide into two teams.
4. *Round 1:* Each team member has one minute to describe as many pieces of paper from the bowl as possible without saying the word on the paper. Each team gets one pass per turn and after that it is minus one point for every pass.
5. *Round 2:* Each team member has one minute to describe as many pieces of paper from the bowl as possible USING ONLY ONE WORD. You cannot say the word on the piece of paper.
6. *Round 3:* Each team member has one minute to act out as many pieces of paper from the bowl as possible. They are not allowed to speak or make any noises.
7. Whoever has the most points when the terms in the bowl run out wins.

Facilitator Hint: This game is easy to play but sometimes hard to explain. Have the slips of paper prepared ahead of time and then briefly state something along the lines of: "This is a guessing game that gets harder with each round. There are three rounds: in the first you can describe some thing, in the second you can only say one word, and in the third you have to act it out. For example, if your famous person is Mickey Mouse, in round one you can say, "He has big ears, he's a rodent, he's Walt's friend, his

wife is Minney.” In the second round you can say only, “ears,” and in the third you can simply act like a mouse or motion big ears on top of your head. Then let the participants write down their famous people and begin the fun!

Depending on the amount of time available after participants have arrived, the facilitators will continue with as many rounds as possible and stop by 10 am.

Activity: Introductions, Expectations and Agenda

Objective: Clarify participant objectives and go over agenda/consultant objectives

Time: 30 minutes

Materials: Large sticky note with agenda already written up, blank sticky and markers

Procedure:

1. Have each person introduce her/his name, role in the national office and one thing they expect/want to get out of the think tank.
2. Write these expectations on a piece of paper (flip chart) you have up on the wall.
3. After everyone’s expectations have been added, clarify that we might not be able to cover all the points there, but that we hope through the think tank and the rest of our visit here, we will be able to address many of them. We also are always available outside the think tank and by email later on and would love to discuss some points further.
4. Briefly outline the model development process and the general plan and purpose for the fieldwork, highlighting the role that they are playing in this process, and the value this project will have for the NO.
5. Tape the day’s agenda (written out on a piece of paper) on the wall next to the expectations and go through it, highlighting any parts that correspond with their expectations.
6. Tape a blank flip chart paper next to the agenda and encourage participants to write down any lingering questions they have from a session on this paper and facilitators will try to address these questions if possible by the end of the think tank.

Activity: Concept Mapping

Objective: Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.

Time: 1 hr

Materials: Post it notes, tape, markers

Procedure:

1. The facilitator will ask the participants to get together in groups of 2 or 3 and will distribute sheets of paper and tape to each. Each group gets 5 papers in one color for CE and 5 papers in another color for leadership.
2. The facilitator will ask the participants to write or draw the words that they see as key in youth civic engagement and leadership.
3. The facilitator will write two concepts and put them up on the wall, “civic engagement” taped on one side and “Leadership” taped to the other.
4. The facilitator will ask each group to present the key concepts they have identified by placing them on the wall under the appropriate concept and explaining their reasoning for choosing it and placing it on the wall. After they present their concepts, the facilitator asks participants if any concepts could be relevant for both and could be placed in the middle under both.
5. After all the groups have passed and the key concepts have been identified, the facilitator will

divide the participants into two large groups, one focusing on adults and the other on youth. Each group should consider these concepts from the perspective assigned to it in order to define what civic engagement and leadership means/looks like to them.

6. Each group presents the definitions they have reached and participants discuss these definitions and the similarities and differences between adult and youth CE&L.
7. Through these discussions, participants form a common definition of youth civic engagement and leadership. The facilitator writes the definition on a piece of paper on the wall which will stay up through the entire Think Tank.
8. Prepare in advance a graph/table of the TOC with a focus on LS3 and facilitate a discussion on how the participants see these concepts fitting into it.

Facilitator Hint: For a more robust discussion, the facilitator should attempt to draw out some key concepts if they are not explicitly stated by the participants including: Collective Voice, Collective Action, and Youth-Friendly forums.

Based on cultural context, you may need to adjust steps 1-4. In contexts where individual participation is more difficult to elicit, you may have more success in asking groups to first define civic engagement and leadership separately and then discussing the important components therein. For more social contexts, it may be more appropriate for the steps above to remain unchanged.

Activity: Lifeline Exercise

Objective: Identify the most important milestones along the youth lifeline (15-24) in promoting their development, especially related to civic engagement and leadership, and what ChildFund/local partner is currently doing in those spheres.

Time: 1.5 hours

Materials: Flip chart paper, sticky notes, beans, markers.

Procedure:

1. Split into small groups of 2-3 and give each group a pile of beans and several pieces of sticky notes.
2. Ask each group to make a line by putting one sticky note on the left that signifies 15 and another on the right that signifies 24. Each group has the option of modifying the start and end point for the lifeline if they believe the transitions from childhood to the youth stage and then to adulthood occur at other ages in their country/community.
3. The groups will then discuss what they feel are the most important milestones for youth development in between these ages and write them on the sticky notes along with the age at which they occur, and place them on the lifeline. Facilitator should clarify that there does not need to be a milestone for every age.
4. Once the milestones have been identified, the groups will then use the beans to quantify their importance (more beans = more important.) Facilitator should clarify that milestone could be either positively or negatively important/relevant in a young person's life.
5. After all groups are finished with their milestones and quantifications, the facilitator will tell all groups to stop working.
6. The facilitator will then ask each group to report out and will tell all of the other groups to not change their timelines based on what other groups report.
7. Facilitator will "interview the beans" and ask each group why they chose those milestones and

why they quantified them the way they did. The facilitator will also ask what activities/programs they are implementing that correspond to these milestones.

8. As the facilitator is interviewing, the note-taker (other facilitator) will populate a main lifeline (created on the wall for everyone to see) with the age and milestone above the line and the corresponding program/activity below the timeline.
9. After all the milestones and activities from the group are on the lifeline, the facilitator will put up a flip chart paper with a table summarizing the TOC, with a focus on LS3, and facilitate a discussion on how LS3 and its outcomes fit in this timeline. The facilitator will also ask the participants to consider if the milestones identified and the activities currently being implemented are getting/will get us to the LS3 outcome; if not, then the participants are encouraged to take a look at the timeline and identify some of the gaps and missed opportunities.

Facilitator Hint: Depending on the group dynamic, the facilitator might want to first put up all the milestones on the main timeline (by increasing age) including the importance levels assigned to them (write the number of beans assigned next to the milestone) and discuss them as a big group (especially the milestones which ranked the highest). Then, facilitators could introduce LS3 and ask all participants to think about activities they work on to promote the 3 domains. The activities mentioned by the participants would be placed above the timeline and discussed to identify where domains are being effectively promoted and any gaps or missed opportunities in programming. Facilitators could use different colors for each domain, or use strings to signify age ranges at which one activity occurs to better visually illustrate activities and any gaps, depending on the focus of the activity and the amount of time available.

Activity: Timeline

Objective: Determine what historical events, policies or practices contribute to the country context that help or hinder civic engagement and leadership programs.

Time: 1 hour

Materials: markers, paper, yarn.

Procedure:

1. The facilitator will tape a piece of yarn on the wall, signifying the timeline with Independence on the far left as a starting point and the “present” on the far right as the end point.
2. The facilitator will then distribute sheets of paper and tape to the participants, and ask them to write down 3 events that they believe have shaped the county’s current youth civic engagement and leadership landscape.
3. Participants will then go up, and place their events/policies/practices on the timeline.
4. Participants will then be given the opportunity to add events until they believe the timeline is complete.
5. The facilitators will then organize a group discussion on how they believe that these events/policies/practices shaped the county’s current youth civic engagement and leadership.

Facilitator Hints:

Once this activity is complete leave the final charts up, they will be referenced again.

The list below is not intended to be comprehensive, but it may assist in filling in the blanks with a more reticent crowd. If it isn’t controversial starting point, may want to start the yarn timeline with

independence as a frame of reference.

Philippines:

2013 - Earthquake Bohol and Typhoon Yolanda

2012 - Responsible Planned Parenthood Act made law (after 14 years-guarantees universal access to contraception, family planning, sex ed and maternal care.)

2012 - Typhoon Bopha

1999 - The Palawan Conservation Corps

1997 - Financial Crisis in Asia

1995 - National Youth Commission established (gov't agency to address youth issues). Body convenes National Youth Parliament every 2 years

1991 - Local Government Code attempted to establish more accountability into LGUs

1986 - Marcos Regime (turning point in youth civic engagement/democracy in Philippines) Ended

1973 - Signing of the Constitution of the Philippines. Established Local Government Units (LGUs) that "enjoy local autonomy" with "general presidential oversight."

1946 - Independence from the United States (may want to avoid too much discussion here)

1898 - Independence from Spain

Uganda:

2011 - The National Employment Policy for Uganda lists youth employment as a policy priority action area.

2010 - Africa youth forum hosted in Uganda

2010 - Prohibition of Female Genital Mutilation Act

2009 - The Prevention of Trafficking in Persons Act

2005 - Constitutional Amendments (multi-party)

2001 - Youth policy

1997 - The Local government Act (later amended in 1999)

1997 - The Children Act consolidated the law relating to children, their rights, protections and provisions.

1995 - Constitution

1994 - Uganda Local Governments Association formed

1993 - National Youth Council

1986 - Political party restriction

1962 - Independence

Activity: Political Process Mapping

Objective: Map the political system and the decision-making structures to form an understanding of how power flows in the country in order to determine where there are entry points for youth engagement.

Time: 1 hour

Materials: papers, pens, flip chart papers, markers.

Procedure:

1. Divide the participants into groups of two.
2. Tell each group they have 2 minutes to think of two decision-making bodies or positions in the country's political system and write them down on a piece of paper.
3. After the two minutes are over, they should turn to the group next to them and swap papers. Each group (of 4 now) gets another four minutes to come up with another two bodies/positions. If the groups had written the same/similar answers, then they should think of additional answers so that they have a total of 6 distinct bodies/positions on their paper.
4. This process continues (each time adding 2 bodies/positions and an additional 2 minutes to their time) until all participants are part of one big group.
5. The group will introduce the bodies/positions they have identified starting with the most senior/centralized (probably president, Cabinet...) flowing down to the most decentralized and local bodies/positions and will start writing the bodies/positions on a flip chart paper put up in advance, starting at the top of the paper; relations between two actors of equal power will be indicated by a straight line connecting them; in cases of unequal power/authority, the direction of the flow of power will be indicated by an arrow extending from the more powerful body/position to the less powerful one.
6. As each body/position is called, the group discusses where it should be on the map and how it relates to other entities which are on it.
7. After all bodies/positions initially identified are on the map, the facilitator asks the group if there are other entities which should be up there; if yes, where?

8. Once the map is complete, the participants discuss what bodies/positions are most relevant for youth and most directly affect them; how youth engage/can/should engage with this system and its actors. Is there official or unofficial space where they may engage with different entities?

Facilitator Hint: The size of the initial groups, the number of bodies/positions and amount of time per round should be determined depending on the number of participants in the think tank.

Activity: Stakeholder Analysis

Objective: To identify existing stakeholders (actors and institutions) and how they are valued by participants.

Time: 1 hour

Materials: Balloons, tape, markers

Procedure:

1. Distribute 5 balloons to each person.
2. Ask each person to write down a stakeholder (actors and institutions) on each piece of paper. They may not have 10 stakeholders, this is ok, just encourage them to create as many as possible.
3. Once they are done writing down their stakeholders tell them that for each stakeholder, they should blow up a balloon to the level of power they feel this stakeholder has.
4. One at a time, each individual will go up to tape their balloons to the wall, explaining their reasoning to the group for choosing the stakeholder and amount of power they assigned it; each new person will look at the other balloons up there, and can decide to place her/his chosen stakeholder next to another one they believe is similar or place them elsewhere.
5. Once all the stakeholders/balloons are up, the facilitators will encourage the participants to reflect on their choice of stakeholder and degree of power they assigned it and to what degree their choices were similar or different.
6. Facilitators will coordinate a discussion around the extent to which ChildFund's programs engage with these stakeholders. If they do, how and what can be improved? If they don't, why not?

Facilitator Hints:

For example, for the same stakeholder one person might blow their balloon up to the highest amount possible and the other may blow up a very small balloon. This is ok. There is right or wrong answer, but encourage them to explain their rationale for the size of their balloon.

Once this activity is complete leave the final charts up, they will be utilized again.

Depending on the size of the group we have, the facilitator could divide participants into group of 2 or 4 instead of each working on their stakeholders alone.

Activity: Force Field Analysis of CE&L Context

Objective: The major elements and forces would be identified through the mapping, timeline and stakeholder analysis previously. Here, we graphically illustrate which ones are driving forces and which are restraining forces.

Time: 1 hour

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers, sticky notes.

Procedure:

1. Put up a flip chart paper on the wall and write “Youth are agents of change in their families and communities” on the top center.
2. Draw a line in the middle dividing the paper into two columns, “Driving Forces” on the left and “Restraining Forces” on the right.
3. The facilitator asks the group to report out on the Stakeholders (actors and institutions), events, policies and practices which have been identified through the previous 2 activities. The facilitator writes down the group answers on sticky notes.
4. As the facilitator writes down each answer on a sticky note, she should also discuss with the participants where the sticky notes should be placed on the Force Field diagram.
 - Some might be easily placed on one side or the other.
 - Some might be seen as relevant under both and placed twice, with some details/examples on them to explain how.
 - Some might be determined to be as not as relevant or the group would be uncertain where to place them and would be placed outside the diagram.

Facilitator Hint: keep the final flip chart on the wall, to be used as a reference on the 2nd day.

If the participants don’t seem to actively participating in smaller groups, facilitator should divide them into two large groups, one working on the restraining forces and the other on the driving forces.

Activity: Force Field Analysis of NO Capacities for CE&L

Objective: Here, the analysis is on the NO level; what are forces that are either supporting (driving) CE&L projects or restraining their effectiveness? Elements might correspond with the previous analysis, but others might be introduced (administration, structure, human and material resources).

Time: 1 hour

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers, sticky notes.

Procedure:

1. Put up a flip chart paper on the wall and write Youth Civic Engagement and Leadership on the top center.
2. Draw a line in the middle dividing the paper into two columns, “Driving Forces” on the left and “Restraining Forces” on the right.
3. Explain that we are now going to consider some of the forces specifically affecting the NO’s work with youth, that is the forces that are either supporting (driving) CE&L projects or restraining their effectiveness.
4. With the group, look at the Force Field analysis on the CE&L context to determine which forces are still relevant, and any additional forces (administration, logistics, structure, human and material resources) which are important. Write the agreed on forces on sticky notes.

5. With the group, discuss where the sticky notes should be placed on the Force Field diagram.
 - Some might be easily placed on one side or the other.
 - Some might be seen as relevant under both and placed twice, with some details/examples on them to explain how.
 - Some might be determined to be as not as relevant or the group would be uncertain where to place them and would be placed outside the diagram.

Facilitator Hint: Refer to the page created on the prior day.

If the participants don't seem to be actively participating in smaller groups, facilitator should divide them into two large groups, one working on the restraining forces and the other on the driving forces.

Activity: Model Brainstorming – Content and Format Considerations

Objective: Brainstorming activity to discuss programmatic needs and corresponding considerations for the content of the model.

Time: 1 hour

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers.

Procedure:

1. Facilitator explains that this will be a group discussion to think through the components of the model.
2. Facilitators ask the following main questions:
 - What are some of the main considerations we have identified when planning interventions on youth CE&L?
 - What components are crucial for a future youth civic engagement and leadership model?
 - What are the tools/models that participants use when doing their work; provide specific details when possible: what do they look like, how many pages, what was most useful in them, what was the least useful. If the tools are available around the room/office, ask participants to refer to them.
 - What format (graph, guide, booklet...) should the model be in to make it most useful?

Facilitator Hint: have some examples to suggest of possible tools in case participants can't think of many. Look beforehand at what resources are present in the NO and point some of them out.

Activity: Wrap Up

Objective: It is important that participants leave the day feeling that they have gained something. Recap on what the group has done in the past two days, highlighting the participant's achievements.

Time: 1.5 hrs

Materials: Certificates

Procedure:

1. Go over defined concepts, structures, stakeholders, and gaps in current activities/areas identified that NOs wish to improve upon, etc. Refer to the maps/papers which are still available around the room.
2. Facilitators will thank the NO for their contribution to our understanding of what needs to be

included in a model. Any additional questions will be answered at this time.

3. Certificates of completion (already prepared for each participant) are randomly distributed to the participants. In her/his turn, each person will choose an interesting/funny moment or description they remember from the person whose certificate they got and describe it to the group. Once the person has been identified, she/he steps forward to take the certificate, and then proceeds to describe the next person, and so on.

Field Activities with Local Partners

Activity: Concept Mapping

Objective: Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.

Time: 1 hr

Materials: Post it notes, tape, markers

Procedure:

1. The facilitator will ask the participants to get together in groups of 2 or 3 and will distribute sheets of paper and tape to each. Each group gets 5 papers in one color for CE and 5 papers in another color for leadership.
2. The facilitator will ask the participants to write or draw the words that they see as key in youth civic engagement and leadership.
3. The facilitator will write two concepts and put them up on the wall, “civic engagement” taped on one side and “Leadership” taped to the other.
4. The facilitator will ask each group to present the key concepts they have identified by placing them on the wall under the appropriate concept and explaining their reasoning for choosing it and placing it on the wall. After they present their concepts, the facilitator asks participants if any concepts could be relevant for both and could be placed in the middle under both.
5. After all the groups have passed and the key concepts have been identified, the facilitator will divide the participants into two large groups, one focusing on adults and the other on youth. Each group should consider these concepts from the perspective assigned to it in order to define what civic engagement and leadership means/looks like to them.
6. Each group presents the definitions they have reached and participants discuss these definitions and the similarities and differences between adult and youth CE&L.
7. Through these discussions, participants form a common definition of youth civic engagement and leadership. The facilitator writes the definition on a piece of paper on the wall which will stay up through the entire Think Tank.
8. Prepare in advance a graph/table of the TOC with a focus on LS3 and facilitate a discussion on how the participants see these concepts fitting into it.

Facilitator Hint: For a more robust discussion, the facilitator should attempt to draw out some key concepts, if the participants do not explicitly state them. These may include: Collective Voice, Collective Action, and Youth-Friendly forums.

Based on cultural context, you may need to adjust steps 1-4. In contexts where individual participation is more difficult to elicit, you may have more success in asking groups to first define civic engagement and leadership separately and then discussing the important components therein. For more social contexts, it may be more appropriate for the steps above to remain unchanged.

Activity: Lifeline Exercise

Objective: Identify the most important milestones along the youth lifeline (15-24) in promoting their development, especially related to civic engagement and leadership, and what ChildFund/local partner is currently doing in those spheres.

Time: 1.5 hours

Materials: Flip chart paper, sticky notes, beans, markers.

Procedure:

1. Split into small groups of 2-3 and give each group a pile of beans and several pieces of sticky notes.
2. Ask each group to make a line by putting one sticky note on the left that signifies 15 and another on the right that signifies 24. Each group has the option of modifying the start and end point for the lifeline if they believe the transitions from childhood to the youth stage and then to adulthood occurs at other ages in their country/community.
3. The groups will then discuss what they feel are the most important milestones for youth development in between these ages and write them on the sticky notes along with the age at which they occur, and place them on the lifeline. Facilitator should clarify that there does not need to be a milestone for every age.
4. Once the milestones have been identified, the groups will then use the beans to quantify their importance (more beans = more important.) Facilitator should clarify that milestone could be either positively or negatively important/relevant in a young person's life.
5. After all groups are finished with their milestones and quantifications, the facilitator will tell all groups to stop working.
6. The facilitator will then ask each group to report out and will tell all of the other groups to not change their timelines based on what other groups report.
7. Facilitator will "interview the beans" and ask each group why they chose those milestones and why they quantified them the way they did. The facilitator will also ask what activities/programs they are implementing that correspond to these milestones.
8. As the facilitator is interviewing, the note-taker (other facilitator) will populate a main lifeline (created on the wall for everyone to see) with the age and milestone above the line and the corresponding program/activity below the timeline.
9. After all the milestones and activities from the group are on the lifeline, the facilitator will put up a flip chart paper with a table summarizing the TOC, with a focus on LS3, and facilitate a discussion on how LS3 and its outcomes fit in this timeline. The facilitator will also ask the participants to consider if the milestones identified and the activities currently being implemented are getting/will get us to the LS3 outcome; if not, then the participants are encouraged to take a look at the timeline and identify some of the gaps and missed opportunities.

Facilitator Hint: Depending on the group dynamic, the facilitator might want to first put up all the milestones on the main timeline (by increasing age) including the importance levels assigned to them (write the number of beans assigned next to the milestone) and discuss them as a big group (especially the milestones which ranked the highest). Then, facilitators could introduce LS3 and ask all participants to think about activities they work on to promote the 3 domains. The activities mentioned by the participants would be placed above the timeline and discussed to identify where domains are being effectively promoted and any gaps or missed opportunities in programming. Facilitators could use different colors for each domain, or use strings to signify age ranges at which

one activity occurs to better visually illustrate activities and any gaps, depending on the focus of the activity and the amount of time available.

Activity: Community Ecosystem Mapping

Objective: To map the key elements of the community and analyze the role each plays, and to understand youth's own perspectives on power and decision-making within the community, and within that, their role inside those spaces (if any).

Time: 1.5 hours

Materials: Big pieces of paper, markers, post it notes.

Procedure:

1. Divide into 3 or 4 groups depending on the number of participants.
2. For about 45 minutes, each group takes a big piece of paper and draws a map of their community identifying elements such as community limits (geographically), landmarks, major places/institutions where decisions are made, places where youth can make decisions about their lives, gathering places for youth, places where youth feel unwelcome, dangerous places in the community, etc.
3. Once the map is drawn, groups then mark these locations according to their role/significance.
4. Groups present their maps.
5. Group discussion.

Facilitator Hint: Groups may try to get too precise with maps, encourage them to make the map inclusive of the youth areas to engage in their community or take on leadership roles--street names and an exact map is not necessary here!

To facilitate the process of marking the maps and introducing the maps, facilitators can distribute written instructions on what participants should generally report on, such as:

- Places/institutions where decisions are made
- Places where youth can make decisions about their lives
- Gathering places for youth
- Places where youth feel unwelcome
- Dangerous places in the community
- Other places/institutions that are important to youth.

Activity: Force Field Analysis of CE&L Context

Objective: The major elements and forces would be identified through the mapping, timeline and stakeholder analysis previously. Here, we graphically illustrate which ones are driving forces and which are restraining forces.

Time: 1 hour

Materials: Flip chart paper, markers, sticky notes.

Procedure:

5. Put up a flip chart paper on the wall and write "Youth are agents of change in their families and communities" on the top center.
6. Draw a line in the middle dividing the paper into two columns, "Driving Forces" on the left and "Restraining Forces" on the right.

7. The facilitator asks the group to report out on the Stakeholders (actors and institutions), events, policies and practices which have been identified through the previous 2 activities. The facilitator writes down the group answers on sticky notes.
8. As the facilitator writes down each answer on a sticky note, she should also discuss with the participants where the sticky notes should be placed on the Force Field diagram.
 - Some might be easily placed on one side or the other.
 - Some might be seen as relevant under both and placed twice, with some details/examples on them to explain how.
 - Some might be determined to be as not as relevant or the group would be uncertain where to place them and would be placed outside the diagram.

Facilitator Hint: If the participants don't seem to actively participating in smaller groups, facilitator should divide them into two large groups, one working on the restraining forces and the other on the driving forces.

As appropriate, the facilitators might also integrate into the activity discussions of driving and restraining forces for youth programming.

Field Activities with Youth

Activity: Introductions

Objective: Introduce participants and an overview of the day.

Time: 30 minutes

Materials: None

Procedure:

1. Consultants introduce themselves, the purpose of the day, and thank participants for attending.
2. Ask youth to introduce themselves to the group.
3. Let youth know that their identities will be kept confidential and that they do not have to participate. Consultants should be sure to say: If there is anything I can do to make this a more comfortable experience, please let me know, either now, at any point during the day, or privately. Ask them if they have any questions.

Activity: The Bowl Game

Objective: Icebreaker

Time: 30 mins

Materials: Bowl, lots of paper (cut into small pieces), and pens.

Procedure:

1. Have the players write down a famous person. This person can be a cartoon, real, or a myth; just as long as everyone in the room will be familiar with who they are.
2. Fold the pieces up and put them into the bowl.
3. Divide into two teams.
4. *Round 1:* Each team member has one minute to describe as many pieces of paper from the bowl

as possible without saying the word on the paper. Each team gets one pass per turn and after that it is minus one point for every pass.

5. *Round 2:* Each team member has one minute to describe as many pieces of paper from the bowl as possible USING ONLY ONE WORD. You cannot say the word on the piece of paper.
6. *Round 3:* Each team member has one minute to act out as many pieces of paper from the bowl as possible. They are not allowed to speak or make any noises.
7. Whoever has the most points when the terms in the bowl run out wins.

Facilitator Hint: This game is easy to play but sometimes hard to explain. Have the slips of paper prepared ahead of time and then briefly state something along the lines of: “This is a guessing game that gets harder with each round. There are three rounds: in the first you can describe some thing, in the second you can only say one word, and in the third you have to act it out. For example, if your famous person is Mickey Mouse, in round one you can say, “He has big ears, he’s a rodent, he’s Walt’s friend, his wife is Minney.” In the second round you can say only, “ears,” and in the third you can simply act like a mouse or motion big ears on top of your head. Then let the participants write down their famous people and begin the fun!

Depending on the amount of time available after participants have arrived, the facilitators will continue with as many rounds as possible and stop by 10:30 am.

Activity: Concept Mapping

Objective: Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.

Time: 1 hr

Materials: Post it notes, tape, markers

Procedure:

1. The facilitator will ask the participants to get together in groups of 2 or 3 and will distribute sheets of paper and tape to each. Each group gets 5 papers in one color for CE and 5 papers in another color for leadership.
2. The facilitator will ask the participants to write or draw the words that they see as key in youth civic engagement and leadership.
3. The facilitator will write two concepts and put them up on the wall, “civic engagement” taped on one side and “Leadership” taped to the other.
4. The facilitator will ask each group to present the key concepts they have identified by placing them on the wall under the appropriate concept and explaining their reasoning for choosing it and placing it on the wall. After they present their concepts, the facilitator asks participants if any concepts could be relevant for both and could be placed in the middle under both.
5. After all the groups have passed and the key concepts have been identified, the facilitator will divide the participants into two large groups, one focusing on adults and the other on youth. Each group should consider these concepts from the perspective assigned to it in order to define what civic engagement and leadership means/looks like to them.
6. Each group presents the definitions they have reached and participants discuss these definitions and the similarities and differences between adult and youth CE&L.
7. Through these discussions, participants form a common definition of youth civic engagement and leadership. The facilitator writes the definition on a piece of paper on the wall which will stay up through the entire Think Tank.
8. Prepare in advance a graph/table of the TOC with a focus on LS3 and facilitate a discussion on how the participants see these concepts fitting into it.

Facilitator Hints: If youth seem unfamiliar with the term “civic engagement”, provide alternatives. This should be a robust discussion, but if you need any follow-up questions to keep the conversation going, consider:

- 1) What opportunities do youth have to come together?
- 2) How are young people working together for the collective good?
- 3) In what ways do young people interact with important people in the community?
- 4) Think about what type of change you would like to see for young people?

Based on cultural context, you may need to adjust steps 1-4. In contexts where individual participation is more difficult to elicit, you may have more success in asking groups to first define civic engagement and leadership separately and then discussing the important components therein. For more social contexts, it may be more appropriate for the steps above to remain unchanged.

Activity: Group Discussion

Objective: Now that the concepts of civic engagement and leadership have been thoroughly discussed, the group discussion will allow youth participants to begin thinking about their own experiences with CE&L.

Time: 45 minutes

Material: None

Procedure:

1. Facilitators divide participants into groups (depending on the number of participants).
2. Facilitators distribute a sheet of paper to each group with 5 key questions that the groups will attempt to answer or add some bullet points for. Illustrative key questions:
 - What are some challenges/barriers to youth civic engagement and leadership?
 - What are some opportunities and factors that facilitate youth civic engagement and leadership?
 - Give some examples on how young people are civically engaged in your community.
 - Give some examples of leaders in your community.
 - What are some skills young people need to be civically engaged and to be leaders?
3. Facilitators will coordinate an open discussion with all groups about the ideas they discussed separately. Follow up questions are added as needed from the following list:
 - a. Would you consider yourself “civically engaged”?If yes....
 - i. In what way(s) are you “civically engaged?”
 - ii. How did you become “civically engaged?”
 - iii. Who helps you to be “civically engaged?”
 - iv. Who makes it hard for you to be “civically engaged?”
 - v. Would you like to be more “civically engaged?”
 - vi. What would make you want to be more “civically engaged?”
- b. Do you feel civic engagement is different for boys/men? Why and how?
- c. Do you feel civic engagement is different for girls/women? Why and how?

- d. Think of other young people in the community who are not “civically engaged” ...
 - i. What would make them want to be “civically engaged?”
 - ii. Who could help them to be “civically engaged?”
 - iii. Who would make it hard for them to be “civically engaged?”
- e. What are the root causes of disengagement or engagement?
- f. What skills and experiences do you feel youth need to be civically engaged?
- g. What would make you excited about participating in programs on civic engagement?
- h. How can aid agencies or NGOs help you address the issues that matter most to you?

Facilitator Hints: Be sure to connect this discussion back to the concept mapping and incorporate any other important concepts into this discussion.

Depending on the size and make up of the group we have, the facilitator will divide participants into group of: girls under 18, boys under 18 and a mixed group 18 and above.

Activity: Community Ecosystem Mapping

Objective: To map the key elements of the community. This exercise will also serve to analyze the role each plays.

Time: 1.5 hours

Materials: Big pieces of paper, markers, post it notes.

Procedure:

1. Divide into 3 or 4 groups depending on the number of participants.
2. For about 45 minutes, each group takes a big piece of paper and draws a map of their community identifying elements such as community limits (geographically), landmarks, major places/institutions where decisions are made, places where youth can make decisions about their lives, gathering places for youth, places where youth feel unwelcome, dangerous places in the community, etc.
3. Once the map is drawn, groups then mark these locations according to their role/significance.
4. Groups present their maps.
5. Group discussion.

Facilitator Hint: Groups may try to get too precise with maps, encourage them to make the map inclusive of the youth areas to engage in their community or take on leadership roles--street names and an exact map is not necessary here!

To facilitate the process of marking the maps and introducing the maps, facilitators can distribute written instructions on what participants should generally report on, such as:

- Places/institutions where decisions are made
- Places where youth can make decisions about their lives
- Gathering places for youth
- Places where youth feel unwelcome
- Dangerous places in the community
- Other places/institutions that are important to youth.

Activity: Lifeline Exercise

Objective: Identify the most important milestones along the youth lifeline (15-24) in promoting their development, especially related to civic engagement and leadership, and what ChildFund/local partner is currently doing in those spheres.

Time: 1.5 hours

Materials: Flip chart paper, sticky notes, beans, markers.

Procedure:

1. Split into small groups of 2-3 and give each group a pile of beans and several pieces of sticky notes.
2. Ask each group to make a line by putting one sticky note on the left that signifies 15 and another on the right that signifies 24.
3. The groups will then discuss what they feel are the most important milestones for youth development in between these ages and write them on the sticky notes along with the age at which they occur, and place them on the lifeline.
4. Once the milestones have been identified, the groups will then use the beans to quantify their importance (more beans = more important.)
5. After all groups are finished with their milestones and quantifications, the facilitator will tell all groups to stop working.
6. The facilitator will then ask each group to report out and will tell all of the other groups to not change their timelines based on what other groups report.
7. Facilitator will “interview the beans” and ask each group why they chose those milestones and why they quantified them the way they did. The facilitator will also ask what activities/programs they have been part of that correspond to these milestones.
8. As the facilitator is interviewing, the note-taker (other facilitator) will populate a main timeline (created on the wall for everyone to see) with the age and milestone above the line and the corresponding program/activity below the timeline.
9. After all the milestones and activities from the group are on the lifeline, the facilitator will coordinate an open discussion on the lifeline.

Appendix

Overview of Activities

Philippines (March 10 – 21)

Activity	Objective
Day 1	
Meeting with Mark Anthony R. Dasco, ChildFund Philippines Program Director	Ensure that the next two weeks would align with the national office and the consultant's objectives, and to gain insight into the overall structure and opportunities seen by the national office for youth civic engagement and leadership.
Day 2 – 3 Think Tank with 18 practitioners from the NO and local partners	
Bowl Activity	Icebreaker
Introductions & Expectations	Clarify participant objectives and go over agenda/consultant objectives.
Concept Mapping	Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.
Timeline	Determine what historical events, policies or practices contribute to the country context that help or hinder civic engagement and leadership programs.
Political Process Mapping	Map the political system and the decision-making structures to form an understanding of how power flows in the country in order to determine where there are entry points for youth engagement.
Stakeholder Analysis	Identifying existing stakeholders (actors and institutions) and how they are valued by participants.
Force Field CE&L Context	Analyzing forces that are either supporting (driving) or restraining the effectiveness of youth engagement and leadership in general.
Force Field Analysis NO Capacities for CE&L	Analyzing forces that are either supporting (driving) or restraining the effectiveness of ChildFund's work on CE&L projects specifically.
Model Brainstorming	Brainstorming on programmatic needs and corresponding considerations for the model.
Presentation of Findings	Share some of the key takeaways from the literature review and interviews conducted so far.
Wrap up	Recap on what the group has done in the past two days, the main takeaways, and distribution of certificates.
Day 4	
Five focus group discussions with NO and local partners staff	Gain more in-depth information on how youth CE&L fits into the participants' work, what they see as key opportunities, challenges and main considerations for incorporating CE&L into their programs.
Interview with former CF sponsor child, Perseus Cordova	Discuss his experiences, what made him want to be a leader and challenges faced by youth leaders.

Day 5	
Interviews with 4 external organizations	Discuss civic engagement & leadership broadly in the Philippines context as well as in regards to their work specifically, and ways in which ChildFund and local partners could feed into existing structures to strengthen youth civic engagement and leadership in the country.
Day 6 – 7: Group Activities with 3 youth groups (22 young people) and some parents	
Concept Mapping	Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.
Lifeline	Identifying the most important milestones along the youth lifeline in promoting their development, and what ChildFund/local partner are currently doing in those spheres, and where some gaps in programing exist.
Community Mapping	Map the key elements of the community and analyze the role each plays, and understand youth's own perspectives on power and decision-making within the community, and within that, their role inside those spaces (if any).
Group Discussion	Learn about youth's own experience in civic engagement and leadership and the different activities they have been part of.
Days 8 – 10: Information Synthesis and Debrief to NO	

Uganda (March 3 – 14)

Activity	Objective
Day 1	
Meeting with Busia Area Manager and Raising Voices project officer	Discuss the plan for the next three days and the logistical arrangements for the field visit.
Day 2: Busia Workshop	
Bowl Activity	Icebreaker
Introductions & Expectations	Clarify participant objectives and go over agenda/consultant objectives.
Concept Mapping	Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.
Lifeline	Identifying the most important milestones along the youth lifeline in promoting their development, and what ChildFund/local partner are currently doing in those spheres, and where some gaps in programming exist.
Community Mapping	Map the key elements of the community and analyze the role each plays, and understand youth's own perspectives on power and decision-making within the community, and within that, their role inside those spaces (if any).
Force Field Analysis	Analyzing forces that are either supporting (driving) or restraining the effectiveness of youth engagement and leadership in general and programming specifically
Recap and Conclusions	Go over the main takeaways from the day.
Day 3 – 4: Group Activities with 3 youth groups (60 young people)	
Concept Mapping	Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.
Group Discussion	Identifying some of the challenges/ barriers and opportunities for youth as well as the youth's experiences with civic engagement and leadership in their community.
Community Mapping	Map the key elements of the community and analyze the role each plays, and understand youth's own perspectives on power and decision-making within the community, and within that, their role inside those spaces (if any).
Day 5	
Interview with ChildFund Programme Director, Moses Otai	Learn about ChildFund's work with youth in Uganda and his experience with some key challenges, opportunities and considerations that he believes are relevant when engaging young people.

Day 6 – 7: Think Tank with 9 practitioners from the NO and local partners	
Bowl Activity	Icebreaker
Introductions & Expectations	Clarify participant objectives and go over agenda/consultant objectives.
Concept Mapping	Define Civic Engagement and Leadership, develop a list of key concepts and an understanding of their complexity and interrelation.
Lifeline	Identifying the most important milestones along the youth lifeline in promoting their development, and what ChildFund/local partner are currently doing in those spheres, and where some gaps in programing exist.
Timeline	Determine what historical events, policies or practices contribute to the country context that help or hinder civic engagement and leadership programs.
Political Process Mapping	Map the political system and the decision-making structures to form an understanding of how power flows in the country in order to determine where there are entry points for youth engagement.
Stakeholder Analysis	Identifying existing stakeholders (actors and institutions) and how they are valued by participants.
Force Field CE&L Context	Analyzing forces that are either supporting (driving) or restraining the effectiveness of youth engagement and leadership in general.
Force Field Analysis NO Capacities for CE&L	Analyzing forces that are either supporting (driving) or restraining the effectiveness of ChildFund’s work on CE&L projects specifically.
Model Brainstorming	Brainstorming on programmatic needs and corresponding considerations for the model.
Presentation of Findings	Share some of the key takeaways from the literature review and interviews conducted so far.
Wrap up	Recap on what the group has done in the past two days, the main takeaways, and distribution of certificates.
Day 8 – 9: Interviews	
Interviews with two National Office Staff	Discuss ChildFund’s work with youth in general and on civic engagement and leadership specifically, and their perspectives on the main challenges and factors that facilitate youth CE&L in Uganda.
Interviews with 3 external organizations	Discuss their work with youth and their input on the country context and some of the main challenges and opportunities for youth engagement and leadership in Uganda.
Day 10	
Debrief	Debrief Mr. Otai about the fieldwork in the past two weeks and share the general outline of the activities conducted.