Youth Organisations for Inclusion

Drivers of Inclusion and Diversity in Youth Organisations in Europe

August 2026

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

Introduction 4

Key Takeaways 5

Report Structure 6

Project Objectives 7

Policy Relevance 7

Methodology 9

Survey Design 9

Analytical Framework 9

Survey Dissemination Strategy 11

Limitations 13

Organisational Profile of Youth Organisations 14

Youth-Led and Youth-Serving Organisations 14

Legal Status and Organisational Models 15

Main Activity Areas 15

Organisational Size and Operational Scope 16

Governance and Decision-Making 17

Decision-Making Structures 17

Level of Procedural Formalisation 18

Frequency of Policy Review 19

Implications 20

Resources, capacity and operational realities 21

Funding 21

Organisational Capacity 21
Available Time 22
Main Barriers 22
Implications 23
Inclusion Readiness 24
Existing Inclusion Measures 24
Prior Experience with Disability Inclusion 24
Implications 25
Inclusion Drivers and Support Needs 26
Values-Based Motivations 26
Beneficiary and Partnership Expectations 27
Legal and Funding Incentives 27
Preferred Support Mechanisms 27
Internal Responsibility for Inclusion Processes 28
Implications 28
Cross-Sectional Analysis 29
Capacity Segmentation 29
Feasibility Risk Assessment 32
Sector Difference From Business Environments 33
Conclusions and Recommendations 35
Conclusions 35
Recommendations 36
References 39

Introduction

Young persons with disabilities in the EU face significantly higher levels of social exclusion and disadvantage than their peers without disabilities. In 2024, 29% of persons with disabilities were at risk of poverty or social exclusion, compared to 18% of persons without disabilities and the rate or early school-leaving is double for persons with disabilities. These disparities reflect systemic barriers embedded in the institutions that shape young people's lives.

Youth organisations can play a vital role in addressing both the immediate effects of social exclusion and the structural barriers that perpetuate inequalities for young persons with disabilities. They can provide opportunities for social participation, community building, and personal development while advocating for systemic change and supporting young persons with disabilities to develop skills and pathways to professional engagement.

However, across Europe, the participation of young persons with disabilities in youth organisations remains deeply constrained. This limits both their access to the opportunities provided by youth organisations and their ability to influence decisions that affect their lives and rights.

Despite growing recognition of the importance of inclusion, many youth organisations remain inaccessible to young persons with disabilities. As many youth organisations operate with limited staff and resources, there is often a gap between their willingness to be inclusive and their ability to put inclusive practices into action. Strengthening their capacity is therefore essential to remove barriers and enable the full participation of young persons with disabilities in civic and social life.

In this context, meaningful inclusion requires organisational change. Youth organisations need the policies, practices, knowledge, and skills necessary to ensure accessibility and enable young persons with disabilities to participate fully, not merely as recipients of activities and services, but as active members shaping the organisation's work.

Existing models for disability-inclusive organisational change provide a useful starting point for this work. YO-IN project partner Fundación Bequal has extensive

experience supporting businesses to strengthen accessibility and embed disability inclusion through structured organisational development processes. However, while valuable lessons can be drawn from these experiences, the context of youth organisations differs significantly from that of the private sector.

Youth organisations often operate with distinct structures, objectives, and resource constraints. Many rely on volunteers, have limited financial and human resources, and are driven primarily by social and educational missions rather than commercial objectives. As a result, the motivations, capacities, and practical realities that shape organisational change in youth organisations may differ substantially from those of businesses.

This report is the result of an investigation into these differences and their implications for disability inclusion efforts. It explores the specific barriers and opportunities faced by youth organisations and examines how existing approaches to disability inclusion can be adapted to their context. Ultimately, the report seeks to identify the resources, tools, and support mechanisms required to enable youth organisations to become more accessible, inclusive, and equipped to ensure the meaningful participation of young persons with disabilities.

Key Takeaways

- Disability inclusion in youth organisations is primarily driven by organisational values, staff initiative, and the needs of beneficiaries.
- The main barriers to inclusion are structural. Youth organisations are generally motivated to become more inclusive but face significant resource constraints.
- Levels of inclusion maturity vary considerably across the sector, ranging from organisations with little or no prior experience to those where disability inclusion is already embedded across multiple dimensions.
- The findings support the development of a tiered, modular, and capacity-sensitive Quality Label, providing organisations with progressive pathways towards inclusion according to level of experience, resources, and organisational readiness.

Report Structure

This report presents the findings of the Youth Organisations for Inclusion Survey, conducted as part of the YO-IN project. It aims to provide an evidence base for the development of a Quality Label, certification pathways, and supporting materials by examining the current capacities, structures, practices, and needs of youth organisations in relation to disability inclusion.

The report begins by introducing the YO-IN project and the broader policy context that underpins it, including the rights-based approach to disability inclusion established by the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) and relevant European policy frameworks. It then outlines the survey methodology, including the survey design, dissemination strategy, and analytical framework.

The main body of the report follows the structure of the survey itself. It analyses the profile of participating organisations, their governance and decision-making arrangements, available resources and operational capacity, existing approaches to disability inclusion, and the drivers, barriers, and support needs that influence their engagement with inclusion work. Throughout this analysis, particular attention is paid to the characteristics that distinguish youth organisations from business environments. Understanding these differences is essential to ensuring that any future methodology is both relevant and feasible within the youth sector.

The report subsequently brings these findings together through a cross-sectional analysis, exploring how organisational capacity, levels of formalisation, available time, and inclusion readiness interact across the sample. This analysis identifies both opportunities and potential implementation risks, helping to clarify the forms of support that organisations are likely to require in order to undertake meaningful organisational change.

Finally, the report concludes with a series of recommendations for the design and implementation of the YO-IN Quality Label methodology, meant to guide and recognise youth organisation’s disability inclusion efforts. These recommendations address the structure and requirements of the proposed inclusion label, the implementation process that will accompany it, and other practical considerations necessary to ensure that the methodology is accessible, proportionate, and capable

of supporting youth organisations with different levels of capacity and experience in disability inclusion.

Project Objectives

The YO-IN project supports youth organisations to become more accessible, inclusive, and participatory, enabling young persons with disabilities to fully engage in, contribute to, and benefit from all that youth organisations have to offer. To achieve this aim, YO-IN is guided by the following objectives:

1. develop a European recognition mechanism for inclusive youth organisations;
2. provide practical tools and resources to support organisational transformation;
3. strengthen the capacities of youth workers and managers;
4. promote European networking and exchange of good practices between youth and disability sectors.

The project's central output is a European Quality Label for Inclusive Youth Organisations, which functions simultaneously as a recognition mechanism and a capacity-building framework, encouraging long-term organisational change rather than one-off training interventions.

Policy Relevance

The YO-IN project sits at the intersection of several key European policy priorities, responding to growing recognition that the inclusion of young persons with disabilities requires not only supportive policies but also capable and accessible organisations able to put those policies into practice. While significant progress has been made in recent years in integrating disability and youth policy agendas, barriers to participation remain widespread across the youth sector. YO-IN addresses this implementation gap by focusing on youth organisations themselves as drivers of change. Through the development of a European Quality Label, Disability Inclusion Plans, training programmes, and practical support tools, the project translates high-level commitments on inclusion, participation, and accessibility into concrete organisational practices that can be adopted by youth organisations across Europe.

The project is particularly relevant within the framework of Erasmus+, which identifies inclusion and diversity as a cross-cutting priority and emphasises the need to strengthen organisational capacity to reach and support participants with fewer opportunities, including persons with disabilities. YO-IN contributes directly to this objective by helping youth organisations improve their accessibility, governance, decision-making processes, and programme design, thereby increasing their ability to engage young persons with disabilities meaningfully and sustainably. Rather than focusing solely on individual projects or activities, YO-IN promotes organisational development as a prerequisite for lasting inclusion, recognising that participation outcomes are shaped by the structures, cultures, and practices of organisations themselves.

YO-IN is also strongly aligned with the European Youth Work Agenda and the Bonn Process, which call for greater recognition, quality development, professionalisation, and capacity building within youth work. The project contributes to these ambitions by establishing a structured framework through which organisations can assess and strengthen their inclusion practices, while also recognising and making visible the efforts of organisations that are committed to inclusive youth work. In doing so, YO-IN responds to broader calls within the youth sector for practical quality standards and pathways for organisational improvement. The project's emphasis on training, peer learning, continuous improvement, and organisational transformation reflects the Bonn Process vision of a youth work sector that is both high-quality and accessible to all young people.

More broadly, YO-IN contributes to the implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) by promoting the full and effective participation of young persons with disabilities in civic and social life on an equal basis with others.

It supports several EU Youth Goals, particularly Inclusive Societies, Quality Learning, Space and Participation for All, and Youth Organisations and Programmes, by strengthening the capacity of youth organisations to create environments in which young persons with disabilities can participate, learn, lead, and influence decision-making.

Through its unique partnership between youth organisations and organisations of persons with disabilities, YO-IN also promotes greater cooperation between sectors that have historically operated separately, creating new opportunities to embed disability inclusion within mainstream youth work and to strengthen the role of youth organisations as spaces for participation, citizenship, and social change.

Methodology

Survey Design

The survey was designed to generate evidence for the development of the YO-IN Quality Label and its implementation methodology. Recognising that disability inclusion requires organisational change, the survey explored the factors that shape organisations' readiness, capacity, and ability to implement inclusive practices.

Questions were designed to produce both categorical and ordinal data. Multi-select questions were used where the phenomenon under study is inherently multidimensional, such as barriers to change or existing inclusion tools, while ranked preference questions made it possible to identify priorities rather than relying only on frequency counts. Frequency data reveals what is common, while ranking reveals what organisations value when forced to choose. Open-text questions were also available for additional qualitative input.

Analytical Framework

The survey was designed around an analytical framework intended to assess the organisational factors that enable or constrain disability-inclusive change within youth organisations. The framework sought to understand their structures, capacities, experiences, and motivations in order to inform the design of a Quality Label and implementation methodology that is both ambitious and realistic for the youth sector. The questionnaire was therefore organised around 5 analytical dimensions:

1. organisational profile;
2. governance and decision-making;

3. operational and financial capacity;
4. existing inclusion measures and prior experience;
5. motivations and support needs.

The 1st dimension, organisational profile, sought to map the diversity of youth organisations participating in the survey. Questions on organisational role, legal status, main activities, size, and geographical scope were included to understand the range of organisational models represented in the sample and to assess whether different forms of guidance, evidence requirements, or implementation pathways may be needed for different types of organisations. This dimension also supports the interpretation of findings across the remainder of the survey by providing important contextual information about the organisations involved.

The 2nd dimension, governance and decision-making, explored how organisations are managed and how organisational change is likely to occur in practice. Questions examined decision-making structures, levels of procedural formalisation, and policy review processes in order to understand the degree to which organisations have established systems through which inclusion measures can be adopted, monitored, and sustained. This information is particularly relevant for determining how the future methodology can accommodate organisations with different governance arrangements and levels of organisational maturity.

The 3rd dimension, operational and financial capacity, focused on the resources available to organisations and the practical constraints they face. Questions relating to funding sources and stability, staffing structures, organisational development capacity, available time, and barriers to change were included to assess the extent to which organisations are able to engage with structured improvement processes. As youth organisations frequently operate under resource constraints, this dimension provides evidence to support the development of implementation approaches that are proportionate to their operational realities.

The 4th dimension, existing inclusion measures and prior experience, examined organisations' current level of disability inclusion maturity. Questions explored the presence of accessibility and inclusion measures, as well as organisations' experience working on disability inclusion. The purpose of this dimension was to

establish a baseline understanding of existing practice and identify the extent to which organisations have already embedded inclusion within their structures and activities. This information is intended to support the development of differentiated entry points and progressive improvement pathways within the YO-IN methodology.

The 5th dimension, motivations and support needs, investigated why organisations engage with inclusion work, what forms of support they consider most valuable, and how responsibility for inclusion is distributed internally. These questions were designed to inform the design of training, guidance materials, and support mechanisms, while also helping to identify the most effective ways of communicating and promoting the methodology. Open-ended questions at the end of the survey further enabled respondents to highlight issues not captured elsewhere and express interest in participating in future project activities.

In addition to analysing each dimension individually, the framework included a cross-sectional analysis examining how organisational characteristics interact. This involved assessing relationships between organisational size, governance structures, resource availability, inclusion maturity, and operational constraints in order to identify capacity profiles, implementation risks, and support needs. Particular attention was given to factors such as volunteer dependence, funding stability, procedural formalisation, and available time, as these are likely to influence organisations' ability to engage with organisational change processes. The cross-sectional analysis also provided an evidence base for understanding how youth organisations differ from business environments, thereby informing the adaptation of existing organisational transformation methodologies to the specific realities of the youth sector

Survey Dissemination Strategy

The dissemination strategy for the Youth Organisations for Inclusion Survey was designed to maximise both the number and diversity of responses from youth organisations across Europe. Rather than relying on passive promotion, the strategy adopted a proactive, relationship-based approach, recognising that direct engagement is the most effective means of securing participation. The objective was not only to achieve the response target required by the project, but also to gather a

geographically balanced and representative sample of organisations with varying sizes, thematic focuses, and levels of experience with disability inclusion.

Dissemination activities were structured around 3 complementary channels:

1. direct outreach to youth organisations;
2. public promotion through social media and newsletters;
3. amplification through partner networks and umbrella organisations.

Project partners were encouraged to contact organisations personally within their networks, supported by coordinated communication through LinkedIn, Facebook, newsletters, websites, and informal channels such as WhatsApp groups. This multi-layered approach aimed to combine broad visibility with the trust and credibility that come from established organisational relationships.

The survey targeted a wide range of youth organisations, including local grassroots initiatives, national organisations, and European youth networks. Importantly, dissemination did not target organisations already specialising in disability inclusion. Mainstream youth organisations at different stages of their inclusion journey were actively encouraged to participate, ensuring that the survey would capture the diversity of experiences, capacities, and challenges present across the sector.

All communications presented the survey as an opportunity to contribute to the co-creation of a European framework for inclusive youth work rather than as an assessment or compliance exercise. Messaging emphasised shared learning, organisational experiences, and the potential for respondents to influence the development of the YO-IN Quality Label. In this way, the dissemination strategy sought not only to collect data but also to position the survey as an initial step in a broader collaborative process of strengthening disability inclusion within the European youth sector.

The survey was administered anonymously online, with respondents providing explicit informed consent prior to participation in accordance with the YO-IN Data Protection Notice. To maximise accessibility and participation, it was made available in accessible digital formats and remained open for an extended period, allowing organisations with limited administrative capacity sufficient opportunity to respond

while accommodating the resource constraints that the research itself sought to examine.

Limitations

The survey design and dissemination strategy carry certain limitations that should be taken into account when interpreting the findings.

The anonymous online format, while necessary to protect respondents and encourage honest reporting, also limited the possibility of following up on open-text responses to clarify ambiguous answers or probe emerging themes in greater depth. As with any self-reported data, responses on governance formalisation, internal capacity, and existing inclusion measures reflect organisations' own perceptions of their practices rather than independently verified assessments, which may introduce some variation between reported and actual practice.

A further limitation concerns the composition of the respondent sample. Although the survey was intended primarily for youth organisations, a number of organisations of persons with disabilities appear to have participated. While these organisations provide valuable perspectives, they were not the primary target group for the research, as their specialist expertise, stronger inclusion focus, and greater familiarity with accessibility issues may distinguish them from mainstream youth organisations. Their inclusion in the sample may therefore contribute to higher reported levels of inclusion maturity, organisational readiness, and interest in disability inclusion than would be expected within the broader youth sector.

Dissemination activities also targeted organisations participating in existing quality assurance and recognition frameworks, including organisations engaged in programmes such as the European Solidarity Corps. This may have increased the likelihood of responses from organisations already accustomed to organisational development processes, quality standards, and structured improvement activities. Consequently, the survey may overrepresent organisations that are already motivated and willing to engage in organisational change, while underrepresenting those with lower levels of engagement, fewer resources, or less interest in formal improvement frameworks.

Finally, the survey dissemination strategy relied heavily on the existing networks of project partners. While this approach was effective in reaching a diverse range of organisations, it may also have introduced selection effects. In particular, organisations connected to the European Disability Forum and its members may be more likely to have prior experience with disability-related issues or stronger awareness of accessibility and inclusion. Similarly, organisations connected to partners such as Somos Europa and High on Life may share similar organisational profiles, service areas, or approaches to youth work. As a result, the sample may not fully reflect the wider population of youth organisations operating across Europe, particularly those with limited exposure to disability inclusion or fewer links to European-level networks.

Organisational Profile of Youth Organisations

The organisational profile of respondents is relevant not only for describing the survey sample, but also for informing the future design of the YO-IN tools. Youth organisations differ in their governance models, legal status, activity areas, size, resources and territorial scope. Therefore, tools developed by the project will need to combine a common framework for disability inclusion with enough flexibility to be adapted to different organisational realities. This is particularly important for the YO-IN Quality Label, which should remain applicable to both small volunteer-based organisations and larger service providers, public bodies or organisations working across several geographic levels.

Youth-Led and Youth-Serving Organisations

The survey sample is divided into two distinct organisational models:

- Youth service organisations that are focused on providing services to young people without requiring youth leadership in their governance (n=45).
- Youth-led organisations where young people hold primary leadership and governance positions (n=24).

This distribution broadly reflects the composition of the European youth sector, where service-oriented organisations tend to be more numerous but youth-led structures play a disproportionately important role in advocacy and civic participation.

Both types are equally relevant to the YO-IN Quality Label, as the barriers and enablers of disability inclusion operate differently depending on who holds decision-making power within an organisation.

Legal Status and Organisational Models

Registered non-profits overwhelmingly dominate the sample (n=69), accounting for nearly four-fifths of all respondents (n=55). This trend is evident across both major organisational categories. Among youth-led organisations (n=24), most were registered non-profits (n=18), with the remainder consisting of foundations, public bodies, and social enterprises (n=6). Similarly, among youth-serving organisations (n=45), the large majority were registered non-profits (n=36), while smaller numbers identified as public bodies (n=7) or social enterprises (n=2).

The presence of public bodies within the sample (n=8) is noteworthy, as these organisations are likely to operate under different governance arrangements, accountability mechanisms, and decision-making procedures than non-governmental organisations. These structural differences may influence both their capacity to implement inclusion measures and their engagement with a voluntary quality label or certification process.

Social enterprises represented a comparatively small proportion of respondents (n=4), but they nevertheless constitute an important organisational model within the youth sector. Unlike many grant-dependent organisations, social enterprises typically combine social objectives with income-generating activities, which may provide additional financial resources while also introducing different operational pressures and organisational priorities.

Main Activity Areas

Training and educational activities were the most commonly reported primary area of work among responding organisations (n=21). This was followed by:

- Social and community programmes (n=16)
- Youth exchanges and mobility activities (n=13)
- Events and campaigns (n=6)
- Advocacy and representation (n=4)
- Capacity-building of member organisations (n=2)
- Mixed or hybrid activity profiles that did not fit neatly within a single category (n=7)

Some differences are visible between organisational types. Among youth-led organisations (n=24), a relatively large proportion identified events and campaigns (n=4) or advocacy and representation (n=2) as their primary activity. Although these absolute numbers are small, they represent a notable share of the youth-led subgroup and reflect the strong civic participation and representation functions often associated with youth-led structures.

By contrast, youth-serving organisations (n=45) were more strongly concentrated in service-oriented activities, particularly training and education, social and community programmes, and youth mobility initiatives. This distribution is consistent with their primary role of providing structured services, programmes, and opportunities for young people, rather than focusing principally on advocacy, campaigning, or representation activities.

Organisational Size and Operational Scope

The responding organisations are predominantly small to medium-sized in terms of paid staffing. The largest group reported employing between 1 and 5 paid staff (n=30), followed by organisations with 6 to 20 paid staff (n=25). A further 9 organisations reported having no paid staff, relying entirely on volunteers, while only 4 organisations employed more than 50 staff members.

Volunteer involvement adds an important layer to this picture. While many organisations have limited paid staffing, volunteer participation is often substantial:

- 41 organisations reported involving 6 or more volunteers
- 18 organisations reported involving 20 or more volunteers

This suggests that organisational capacity in the youth sector frequently depends on a combination of paid and volunteer contributions rather than professional staff

alone. At the same time, such reliance on volunteers can create challenges for sustained organisational development. Volunteer turnover was identified as a barrier to organisational change by 17 respondents, highlighting the difficulties organisations may face in maintaining continuity, institutional knowledge, and long-term implementation efforts, including those related to disability inclusion.

Responding organisations also demonstrated considerable geographic reach. Most operate across multiple territorial levels simultaneously, with organisations reporting an average of 2.3 operational scopes each. The most frequently reported were:

- Local level (n=37)
- European level (n=36)
- Regional level (n=33)
- National level (n=31)
- International level (n=24)

More than one-third of respondents (n=26) indicated that they operate across 3 or more geographic levels, demonstrating that many organisations combine local service delivery or community engagement with wider national, European, or international activities.

Differences also emerge between organisational types. Youth-led organisations (n=24) exhibited a more internationally oriented profile, with 12 organisations reporting activity at the local level, 12 at the European level, and 12 at the international level. Youth-serving organisations, by contrast, were more strongly concentrated at local and regional levels, reflecting their greater emphasis on delivering activities and services directly to young people within specific communities and territories.

Governance and Decision-Making

Decision-Making Structures

Strategic decisions within the surveyed organisations are rarely made by a single individual. On average, organisations identified close to 2 distinct decision-making

actors, and more than half of respondents (n=37) reported that 2 or more bodies share this responsibility, typically a combination of a director, a board and the staff.

Decision-making actors include:

- directors or management (n=42);
- staff team collectively (n=36);
- board (n=35).

Volunteers held a formal role in decision-making in a smaller though still notable proportion of organisations (n=17).

A modest difference emerges between the two organisational models. Youth-led organisations rely somewhat more on board-level decision-making, consistent with governance structures built around youth leadership, while youth service organisations rely more heavily on directors and staff teams. This distinction is relevant for implementation planning: organisations where a single figure can approve internal changes are likely to move through a new process more quickly than those requiring board-level sign-off. The project should therefore expect organisations to progress through implementation at different speeds, not as a result of differing levels of commitment, but as a direct consequence of how their internal governance is structured.

Level of Procedural Formalisation

Respondents were asked to describe how formalised their internal procedures are, that is, the extent to which policies and processes exist in written form and are formally adopted by leadership or governing bodies. Approximately 58% or respondents (n=40) reported procedures that are mostly or fully formalised. A further 16 organisations reported partially formalised procedures, while 13 organisations, representing almost one-fifth of the sample, indicated that their procedures were largely informal or absent.

While the majority of organisations therefore operate with at least some degree of structure, a meaningful minority do not. This has direct implications for the design of the Quality Label, an implementation pathway that assumes a baseline of written

policy and formal governance processes would be unworkable for a significant share of the sector.

The degree of procedural formalisation appears closely linked to organisational structure. Among professional staff-led organisations (n=26), a clear majority (n=18) reported that their procedures were fully or mostly formalised. At the other end of the spectrum, mainly volunteer-led organisations (n=8) reported the lowest levels of formalisation, with none describing their procedures as fully formalised and 3 organisations reporting largely informal arrangements. Organisations combining a small staff team with volunteers fall between these two extremes, showing a wider spread across formalisation categories.

This pattern correlates strongly with organisational capacity for internal development. Among organisations reporting very limited capacity, the large majority described their procedures as informal; among organisations reporting substantial capacity, the opposite was true. This suggests that lower formalisation reflects resource constraints rather than a lack of organisational commitment to structured practice.

Frequency of Policy Review

Most organisations do not follow a fixed schedule for reviewing or updating their internal policies. Half of respondents (n=34) indicated that updates occur only when a need is identified, rather than on a predetermined cycle. Annual reviews were reported by 9 organisations, reviews every 2 to 3 years by 11, and updates primarily driven by funder requirements by 10 organisations. 5 organisations reported no formal review process at all.

This reactive pattern is present even among organisations with formal procedures. Among those describing their procedures as fully formalised, more reported updating policies only when prompted by a specific need than on a scheduled annual basis. This indicates that the existence of formal procedures does not, on its own, guarantee a structured review cycle; in most cases, policy revision continues to depend on an external or internal trigger rather than routine practice.

This finding is relevant to the long-term sustainability of the Quality Label. If organisations do not independently schedule policy reviews, a renewal mechanism built into the certification process itself is likely to be more effective than relying on organisations to initiate updates on their own. It also points to the importance of institutionalising the Label through ongoing incentives and recognition structures that encourage organisations to maintain engagement beyond initial certification. Such mechanisms could help ensure that inclusion remains an organisational priority over time, rather than becoming vulnerable to changes in staff, leadership, funding cycles, or project priorities.

Implications

The evidence presented in this section indicates considerable diversity in governance structures and procedural formalisation across the surveyed organisations. Some organisations are positioned to move through an internal approval process relatively quickly, owing to streamlined, director-led decision-making. Others operate within governance structures that require board-level approval, introducing longer and more formal timelines. Approximately 20% of organisations currently lack the basic policy infrastructure that a more demanding implementation process would typically presuppose.

These findings indicate that a single, uniform implementation timeline would not be appropriate across the sector. A differentiated approach is recommended, comprising a lower-threshold pathway suited to organisations with limited formalisation and capacity, alongside a more structured pathway for organisations already operating with established governance and policy processes. Such differentiation is not merely advisable but appears necessary if the Quality Label is to be accessible across the full range of organisational profiles identified.

Resources, capacity and operational realities

Funding

Project grants represent the dominant source of income (n=64) across the sample and identified as the primary funding source by approximately two-thirds of respondents (n=45). Public funding for core operational costs is the second most common source (n=35), followed by donations (n=25), membership fees (n=17), and service contracts (n=14). This reliance on project-based funding rather than core operational support is a structural feature of the sector with direct implications for the feasibility of sustained organisational change.

This reliance on project-based, short-term funding is reflected in relatively low levels of funding stability across the sample. Only 4 organisations report fully stable multi-year funding, while 25 describe their situation as mostly stable and 24 as mixed. 16 organisations report unstable funding conditions, either mostly short-term or highly unstable on a project-to-project basis.

Among organisations whose main funding source is project grants, 7 report very unstable, project-to-project funding, compared to only 1 organisation among those relying primarily on public operational funding. Project-dependent organisations are therefore disproportionately represented among those facing the most precarious funding conditions, a pattern that carries direct consequences for their capacity to commit to a multi-year organisations change.

Organisational Capacity

Organisations were asked to assess their own capacity to work on internal development activities, such as introducing new policies or procedures. The majority (n=31) reported moderate capacity, followed by very limited capacity (n=23), and substantial capacity (n=13). In practical terms, one-third of the sample currently has limited internal capacity to undertake structured organisational change of any kind, independent of the specific subject matter involved.

This capacity is closely linked to funding stability. Among organisations with very unstable, project-to-project funding (n=9), the majority report very limited internal development capacity (n=8), while organisations with fully stable multi-year funding report no instances of very limited capacity at all. This correlation suggests that funding precarity does not only constrain financial resources directly, but also undermines the broader organisational capacity required to plan, resource and sustain structured improvement processes such as those envisaged under YO-IN.

Available Time

Respondents were asked how much time their organisation could realistically dedicate to a structured improvement process such as inclusion planning. Half of the sample (n=35) indicated that only a few days spread over several months would be feasible, while 14 organisations reported being able to commit just 1 to 2 days annually. A further 2 organisations reported having no time available at all. Just over a quarter of the sample (n=18), indicated that an ongoing process would be feasible.

Time availability appears to be closely connected to broader organisational capacity. Organisations reporting lower levels of capacity for internal organisational development were generally able to dedicate only limited time to structured improvement processes, whereas those with greater capacity were more likely to indicate that longer-term or ongoing engagement would be feasible. This suggests that limited time should not be understood simply as a question of organisational priorities or motivation.

Main Barriers

When asked to identify the principal barriers to organisational change, respondents most frequently cited a lack of staff time (n=55) and a lack of funding (n=40), placing both barriers well ahead of all others. Other barriers included:

- volunteer turnover (n=17);
- limited expertise (n=17);
- perception that inclusion work is a lower priority compared to core service delivery (n=14);

- complex governance structures (n=10);
- internal resistance to changing established practices (n=8).

The clear dominance of staff time and funding over factors such as expertise or internal resistance is a significant finding for the design of the YO-IN methodology. It indicates that the central obstacle to implementing inclusion processes is not primarily a knowledge gap or a lack of organisational will, but a structural shortage of the operational resources required to act on existing commitment.

Implications

Taken together, the evidence presented in this section points to a set of interconnected structural constraints rather than isolated barriers. Unstable, project-dependent funding limits organisational capacity for internal development. Limited capacity in turn restricts the time organisations can realistically commit to a structured process, and limited time and funding together emerge as the 2 most frequently cited barriers to organisational change overall. These 3 dimensions reinforce one another, meaning that any single intervention addressing only one (for example, providing guidance materials without addressing time constraints, or vice versa) is unlikely to be sufficient on its own.

For the implementation of the YO-IN methodology, this has several practical implications. First, the requirements built into the Quality Label and associated tools should be calibrated for organisations whose realistic capacity is measured in days rather than weeks or months. Second, given that funding instability is concentrated among project-grant-dependent organisations, the project should anticipate uneven rates of participation and completion linked to funding cycles and should consider building flexibility into implementation timelines to accommodate this. Third, since lack of staff time and funding consistently outweigh expertise or attitudinal barriers, the methodology is more likely to succeed if it minimises the administrative and time burden of participation rather than relying primarily on the provision of additional knowledge or persuasion. These findings collectively support a phased, low-burden implementation model as the most operationally realistic pathway for the majority of organisations represented in the sample.

Inclusion Readiness

Existing Inclusion Measures

Organisations were asked which inclusion-related measures they currently have in place. Dedicated projects or activities focused on disability inclusion were the most commonly reported measures (n=45), followed by staff or volunteer training on accessibility (n=41), and accessibility guidelines for events and activities (n=35). Structural measures were reported by fewer organisations:

- monitoring or feedback systems on accessibility (n=27);
- written accessibility policy (n=23);
- dedicated accessibility budget line (n=23);
- designated inclusion focal point (n=20).

6 organisations reported having none of these measures in place.

This pattern reveals a clear hierarchy in how inclusion is currently practised across the sector. Project-based and activity-level engagement is widespread, but the more embedded, structural measures (policy, budget, monitoring and dedicated personnel) remain considerably less common.

On average, organisations reported just over 3 measures each, though this varied widely, from those with one measure (n=17) to those with a full range of seven measures (n=5). This spread indicates substantial variation in how far organisations have progressed from occasional, project-based inclusion activity towards systemic, organisation-wide practice.

Prior Experience with Disability Inclusion

When asked to characterise their overall experience with disability inclusion, responses were fairly evenly distributed across the maturity spectrum:

- no experience at all (n=12);
- limited experience (n=10);

- some experience (n=28);
- strong experience (n=12);
- core area of expertise (n=7).

Self-reported experience level corresponds closely with the number of concrete inclusion measures an organisation has in place. This lends confidence to both measures as indicators of genuine inclusion maturity rather than self-assessment alone.

The open-text responses accompanying this question add qualitative depth to these figures. Descriptions ranged from organisations making isolated physical adaptations, such as installing a mobile ramp or beginning to consider sensory-friendly spaces, to organisations with sustained, multi-year engagement through dedicated Erasmus+ projects, formal policy statements, and ongoing partnerships with disability-specific institutions. Several respondents also described organisations run by or substantially staffed by persons with disabilities themselves, representing a qualitatively distinct form of expertise grounded in lived experience rather than externally adopted practice.

Implications

Taken together, the data from this section supports a differentiated reading of inclusion maturity across the sample that can be organised into 3 broad levels, each with distinct characteristics in terms of measures in place, prior experience and likely support needs within the YO-IN Quality Label.

The first level, which can be described as initial, encompasses organisations reporting no or limited experience and fewer than 2 inclusion measures on average. For these organisations (n=22), engagement with disability inclusion has either not begun or remains entirely ad hoc, without any of the structural measures that would indicate an embedded organisational commitment. A clear, low-threshold entry point that does not presuppose prior knowledge or existing infrastructure is therefore the most critical design requirement for this group, alongside basic awareness-building tools that can serve as a genuine starting point rather than a simplified version of a more demanding process.

The intermediate level is the largest segment of the sample (n=28) comprising organisations with some experience and an average of just over 3 measures in place. These organisations have typically developed project-level inclusion activities and some operational tools, such as accessibility guidelines or staff training, but have not yet embedded inclusion into their structures. Their primary need is consolidation moving from episodic, project-driven practice towards structural, organisation-wide commitment.

At the advanced level, organisations report strong experience or disability inclusion as a core area of expertise, with an average of roughly 4 to 5 measures already in place. For these organisations (n=19), the challenge is not building inclusion capacity from scratch but sustaining, deepening and formalising what already exists. Their experience and existing infrastructure make them well placed to contribute to peer learning within the wider YO-IN network, a role that could itself be recognised within the certification framework.

These classifications have direct relevance for the design of the Quality Label. A single-entry threshold calibrated to the mid-point of the sample would likely exclude the initial-level group entirely, while offering insufficient distinction or challenge to the most advanced organisations. Structuring the Label instead around these 3 classifications, with differentiated entry points, evidence requirements and implementation timelines, would yield meaningful and motivating journeys. It would also establish clear progression pathways as inclusion maturity develops over time.

Inclusion Drivers and Support Needs

Values-Based Motivations

When asked what motivates their organisation to work on inclusion and accessibility, respondents overwhelmingly pointed to internal, values-driven reasons rather than external pressure. Organisational values or mission was the most frequently cited motivation (n=55), followed closely by staff or member initiative (n=44). This pattern holds consistently across the maturity spectrum: organisational values were cited as a motivator by organisations at every level of inclusion experience, including the

large majority of those with some, strong or core expertise. This indicates that values-based motivation is not simply a feature of advanced organisations but a near-universal starting point across the sector.

Beneficiary and Partnership Expectations

The needs of beneficiaries were also identified as an important driver of disability inclusion (n=35), highlighting that many organisations view inclusion as an integral part of meeting the needs and expectations of the young people they serve. External factors also played a role, with partnership expectations cited by 22 organisations and reputation or visibility considerations by 21. While these influences were less prominent than values-based motivations, they nevertheless demonstrate that relationships with partners, stakeholders, and wider communities can contribute meaningfully to organisational engagement with inclusion efforts.

Legal and Funding Incentives

Compliance-oriented motivations were notably less prominent than values-based or beneficiary-driven ones. Funder requirements were cited by only 16 organisations, and legal requirements by 12, placing both well below organisational values, staff initiative and beneficiary needs. This ordering is significant: it suggests that inclusion work across the sector is currently driven primarily by intrinsic organisational commitment rather than external obligation, and that legal or funding compliance functions as a secondary reinforcing factor for a minority of organisations rather than the primary engine of change.

Preferred Support Mechanisms

Organisations were asked to rank 8 types of potential support from most to least useful for implementing a disability inclusion improvement process. Based on the average ranking position across all 69 responses, templates and examples of good practice emerged as the most consistently valued form of support, followed closely by financial support, training and workshops, step-by-step guidance, and strategic planning. Peer learning with other organisations, evaluation and monitoring support,

and individual coaching or mentoring were ranked lower overall, though still considered useful by a meaningful share of respondents.

When looking specifically at which support type organisations placed first, financial support stands out, selected as the single most useful form of support by 20 organisations, the largest number for any individual option. Templates and examples of good practice, selected by 13, training and workshops, selected by 12, and step-by-step guidance, selected by 10, follow as the next most frequently top-ranked options. Taken together, these results indicate a clear preference for concrete, practical and resource-based support over more abstract or process-oriented forms of assistance such as evaluation frameworks or one-to-one coaching, which were consistently ranked toward the lower end of the scale.

Internal Responsibility for Inclusion Processes

Respondents were asked who currently leads, or would lead, inclusion efforts within their organisation. Staff members were the most commonly identified group (n=33), organisations, followed by leadership or management (n=25). Volunteers were identified as leading inclusion efforts in 6 organisations, while a dedicated inclusion focal point was reported in only 4 cases. 1 organisation indicated that no one currently holds specific responsibility for this area.

This distribution holds broadly consistent across experience levels: even among organisations with some or strong experience in disability inclusion, dedicated focal points remain rare, and responsibility continues to rest primarily with general staff or leadership rather than a specialised role. This indicates that, even where inclusion work is relatively advanced, it is more often absorbed into existing roles than assigned to a distinct function within the organisation.

Implications

The evidence in this section points to a sector that is intrinsically motivated but operationally under-equipped. Organisations are not waiting to be persuaded of the value of inclusion; the data shows that values and staff initiative already drive engagement far more than legal or funding pressure. What organisations lack is

practical means: concrete tools, financial resources and accessible guidance that can be implemented by non-specialist staff or leadership, since dedicated inclusion roles remain the exception rather than the rule.

This combination of strong intrinsic motivation, limited specialised capacity, and a clear preference for practical, low-complexity support has direct implications for both the Quality Label and supporting materials. Materials should be designed for use by general staff or management rather than assuming a dedicated inclusion officer, prioritise templates, examples and clear step-by-step guidance over abstract frameworks, and should be communicated in terms that reinforce organisational values and mission rather than compliance obligations, reflecting the genuine drivers identified across the sample.

Cross-Sectional Analysis

This section constitutes the central analytical component of the report, translating survey findings into practical implications for the adaptation of the YO-IN methodology and certification framework. It combines multiple organisational indicators to identify structural implementation patterns, feasibility risks and differentiated organisational profiles.

The analysis draws on capacity, time availability, funding stability, formalisation level and inclusion experience as its primary variables.

Capacity Segmentation

To move beyond single-variable comparisons, 3 dimensions from the survey were combined into a composite capacity indicator: self-reported capacity for internal organisational development, realistic time availability for a structured improvement process, and funding stability. These three elements were selected because they tend to reinforce one another (organisations with very limited time also tend to have unstable funding and low internal capacity) and because together they provide a more complete picture of what an organisation can realistically take on than any single measure would on its own. Based on this combined score, the 67

organisations for which complete data was available were grouped into three capacity profiles.

Low-capacity organisations (n=9) face the most pronounced barriers to organisational change across governance, resources, and operational capacity. The majority are volunteer-led (n=6), with no professionally staffed organisations represented in this group. Funding is typically insecure, with most relying on short-term, project-based income, while organisational procedures tend to be less formalised. Time is also a significant constraint, with some organisations reporting that they have little or no capacity to engage in structured improvement processes.

These organisations consistently identified lack of funding and lack of staff time as their principal barriers, with volunteer turnover also emerging as a recurring challenge. Levels of prior experience with disability inclusion were generally lower than in other capacity groups, suggesting that many are at an earlier stage of their inclusion journey. Together, these factors indicate that organisational constraints are cumulative: limited resources, limited formalisation, and limited time reinforce one another and reduce organisations' ability to engage in longer-term development processes.

The findings suggest that low-capacity organisations are likely to require additional support if they are to participate successfully in a certification or organisational improvement process. Approaches that depend heavily on extensive documentation, formal policies, or complex administrative requirements risk creating barriers to participation. Instead, implementation pathways for this group may need to emphasise accessible entry points, practical guidance, and incremental progress, allowing organisations to build capacity and establish foundational inclusion practices before progressing to more advanced organisational requirements.

Medium-capacity organisations (n=28) present a considerably more varied picture. Work structures range from mainly volunteer-led (n=2), to small staff-plus-volunteer teams (n=16), to professionally staffed organisations (n=9). Funding stability is mixed, with most reporting either mixed conditions (n=15) or mostly short-term funding (n=5). Only 6 organisations reported mostly stable multi-year commitments. Formalisation levels also vary widely from fully formalised (n=4) to mostly informal

(n=7). Inclusion experience is also distributed across all levels, with nearly half reporting some experience (n=13).

Lack of staff time is the dominant barrier in this group by a significant margin (n=26) suggesting that these organisations are engaged and motivated but stretched too thin to take on additional processes without careful planning. This group represents the most important design challenge for the Quality Label, as these organisations have enough capacity to participate meaningfully but are also the most likely to disengage if requirements feel disproportionate relative to their available resources. Unlike low-capacity organisations, they do not need a simplified process, they need a well-paced one. Clear milestones, flexible timelines and concrete tools that can be used directly without significant adaptation would make the difference between sustained engagement and dropout for a large share of this group. Given that they make up the largest segment of the sample, getting this balance right is arguably the most critical design decision for the methodology as a whole.

High-capacity organisations (n=30) are predominantly professionally staffed (n=17) or a combination of staff and volunteers (n=13), with no mainly volunteer-led organisations in this group. Funding tends to be comparatively stable, with 19 reporting mostly stable multi-year funding and 4 reporting fully stable funding. Most have mostly or fully formalised internal procedures (n=24). Lack of staff time remains the leading barrier even here (n=21), though complex governance structures (n=7) and internal resistance to change (n=5) emerge more prominently in this group than in the others. This reflects the greater organisational complexity that comes with more developed structures.

Inclusion experience is highest in this group, with 8 organisations reporting strong experience and 5 identifying disability inclusion as a core area of expertise. For these organisations, the risk is not feasibility but relevance. If the Quality Label's upper tiers do not offer sufficient depth or rigour, they may find little added value in pursuing certification beyond what they already do, especially considering the lack of importance of external recognition. Their existing experience and infrastructure make them well placed to act as reference points or peer learning partners for lower-capacity organisations within the YO-IN network, and this role could itself be recognised and considered a motivating process within the certification framework.

Feasibility Risk Assessment

Beyond the capacity segmentation, the survey data allows for the identification of specific structural risk factors that may affect an organisation's ability to complete or sustain implementation of the YO-IN methodology. Four primary risk factors were identified based on the survey findings, namely mainly volunteer-led work structure, very unstable or mostly short-term funding, low procedural formalisation, and severely limited time availability. Individually, these risk factors affect significant minorities of the sample:

- mainly volunteer-led structures (n=8);
- very unstable or mostly short-term funding (n=16);
- mostly or fully informal procedures (n=13);
- very limited time availability (n=16).

However, the more analytically significant finding concerns the co-occurrence of multiple risk factors within single organisations. 14 organisations face 2 or more concurrent risk factors and represent a group for whom standard implementation timelines and requirements are likely to be unfeasible without active support or flexibility.

Volunteer dependence emerges as a particularly important implementation risk because it affects not only an organisation's current capacity but also its ability to sustain engagement over time. Unlike paid staff, volunteers cannot be assumed to remain involved throughout a multi-month improvement process, and turnover can interrupt continuity, weaken institutional memory, and delay progress. This risk is reflected in the survey findings, where volunteer turnover was identified as a barrier by 17 organisations, including 4 of the 9 low-capacity organisations.

To mitigate these risks, the project should consider a modular approach to implementation. Designing the methodology so that individual stages or components can be completed independently would allow organisations to make progress incrementally and reduce the impact of changes in personnel. Under such an approach, the departure of a key volunteer would be less likely to disrupt the overall process, as completed elements would remain valid and organisations could resume

implementation without having to revisit earlier stages. This would make the methodology more resilient to the operational realities of volunteer-led organisations and increase its accessibility to organisations with limited capacity.

Unstable funding presents a distinct implementation risk. Organisations that rely primarily on project-based funding may experience sudden reductions in staff or operational capacity when one funding cycle ends before another begins. This can make it difficult to sustain engagement in a structured improvement process and may create a mismatch between fixed certification timelines and the realities of short-term funding arrangements.

Low levels of formalisation and limited time availability create a particularly challenging combination. Organisations with fewer formal procedures often need to invest significant effort in developing the policies, processes, and documentation that would support organisational change. At the same time, these organisations tend to have the least capacity to dedicate time to such work.

This finding strengthens the case for a genuinely tiered approach to certification. Early stages of the process should allow organisations to demonstrate commitment and make tangible progress without requiring extensive policy development or administrative documentation. More advanced requirements can then be introduced progressively as organisations build their capacity, formalise their procedures, and strengthen their inclusion practices over time.

Sector Difference From Business Environments

The Bequal model, one of the key reference frameworks on which the YO-IN Quality Label is based, was originally designed for the business sector. Structured around 7 categories, 19 indicators and 69 verification sources, it evaluates areas such as strategy and leadership, senior management commitment, human resources management, regulatory compliance and inclusive policies across all selection, employment access, professional promotion and training procedures. The certification process is divided into 3 stages:

1. Advisory;

2. Inspection;
3. Certification.

It has proven effective in corporate and public administration contexts. Its direct transfer to youth organisations, however, would require significant adaptation, for reasons that the survey data makes explicit.

Business-oriented certification models are built on a set of organisational assumptions that do not hold for the majority of youth organisations. They presuppose stable, multi-year funding, a paid and relatively stable workforce, dedicated administrative functions, written policies and procedures approved by senior management, and the capacity to assign staff specifically to compliance, audit, and quality processes. The survey data demonstrates that these aspects are absent, partially or entirely, across a substantial share of the sample.

Beyond the quantitative indicators explored in previous sections, the structural logic of youth organisations differs from business environments in ways that go beyond resource levels. Decision-making is frequently distributed across boards, staff teams, volunteers, and membership bodies, extending internal approval processes well beyond those typical in commercial contexts. The primary motivation for inclusion work, as the survey data shows, is organisational values and staff initiative rather than competitive advantage, reputational gain, or legal compliance, the three pillars that constitute Bequal’s value proposition. The relationship between youth organisations and the young people they serve is also fundamentally different from the employer-employee or provider-consumer relationship that frames disability inclusion in most business certification models. In youth organisations, young persons with disabilities are not primarily clients or workers but participants and, in youth-led structures, leaders.

The Bequal model's core logic is directly transferable and highly relevant to the YO-IN context. What the evidence in this section establishes, however, is that the specific indicators, evidence requirements, timelines, and procedural assumptions embedded in business-oriented models need to be substantially reworked to reflect the operational realities of the youth sector. This reworking should be grounded in

the empirical data collected through the survey rather than in assumptions imported from a different organisational context.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This section brings together the main findings of the report and translates them into strategic recommendations for the YO-IN project consortium. It offers a consolidated reading of the evidence and identifies the most important implications for the adaptation of the methodology, the design of the Quality Label and its supporting materials.

Conclusions

The survey provides a detailed and internally consistent picture of the European youth sector that has direct consequences for how the YO-IN methodology should be designed and implemented. Across the 69 participating organisations, a set of structural realities recur with sufficient consistency to be treated not as exceptions but as defining features of the sector. Most organisations are small, project-funded, and volunteer-reliant, operating without stable multi-year income, dedicated inclusion roles, or the written policy infrastructure that standard certification models typically require. Decision-making is distributed across multiple actors (directors, boards, staff teams and in some cases volunteers) and the speed and complexity of internal approval processes varies considerably as a result. Governance formalisation ranges from fully formalised to entirely informal within the same sample, meaning that a meaningful share of organisations would need to build basic procedural infrastructure. And the time available for structured improvement processes is severely limited for the majority, with half the sample able to commit only a few days spread over several months and nearly 20% limited to 1 to 2 days annually.

These conditions do not operate independently of one another. The cross-sectional shows that unstable funding, limited internal capacity, low formalisation, and restricted time availability tend to co-occur within the same organisations, creating compounding constraints that a methodology addressing only one dimension at a time would fail to adequately resolve.

Against this backdrop of structural constraint, the survey also shows that the sector is strongly committed to inclusion. Organisational values and mission were the most frequently cited motivation for inclusion work. This matters because it shows that the main problem is not a lack of commitment. The pattern appears across different levels of organisational capacity and inclusion experience, suggesting that intrinsic motivation is not limited to the most advanced organisations. Rather, it is a broadly shared feature of the sector.

The challenge for YO-IN is therefore not primarily to convince organisations that inclusion matters, but to make it possible for them to act on commitments they already hold. The main barriers are practical and structural: lack of time and lack of financial resources. For this reason, any Quality Label methodology must address these operational constraints directly.

The survey also reveals that inclusion practice across the sample is not uniform but distributed across a wide spectrum of maturity, from organisations with no prior experience or measures in place to organisations for whom disability inclusion is a core area of expertise embedded across multiple structural dimensions.

This distribution is important because it shows that organisations are starting from very different positions. For this reason, the Quality Label should not be based on a single-entry threshold. If the requirements are too high, organisations with fewer resources may be excluded from the process before they can begin. If the requirements are too basic, the Label may not be useful or demanding enough for organisations that already have stronger inclusion practices. The evidence therefore supports a graduated framework, allowing organisations to enter at an appropriate level, progress over time and have their improvements recognised at each stage.

Recommendations

The evidence gathered through this report points to a set of strategic recommendations that should inform the further development of the YO-IN methodology, the design of the Quality Label and its supporting materials.

The main recommendation is that the Quality Label should be structured around at least three certification levels, corresponding to the initial, intermediate and advanced maturity levels identified in relation to inclusion readiness and capacity.

At the initial level, requirements should focus on basic awareness and demonstrated commitment rather than on formal policies or measurable outcomes. Organisations at this stage may not yet have documented procedures in place, but they should be able to show that they are willing to engage with the process. Relevant evidence could include a leadership statement, participation in an orientation session or completion of a self-assessment tool.

At the intermediate level, requirements should focus on the existence and consistent use of some structural measures. These could include an accessibility policy, a dedicated budget allocation, records of staff training or documented steps towards embedding inclusion more systematically across the organisation. This level should recognise organisations that have moved beyond general commitment and are beginning to translate inclusion into organisational practice.

At the advanced level, requirements can reasonably be more demanding. Organisations should be expected to provide comprehensive policy documentation, monitoring and feedback data, stakeholder input, and evidence of sustained improvement over time.

A tiered structure of this kind is therefore the minimum condition for making the Quality Label genuinely accessible across the full range of organisations in the sector, rather than only to those with the strongest resources and most developed internal systems.

A closely related recommendation is that time and administrative burden should be treated as central design constraints in the Quality Label methodology. This is important because many organisations do not have dedicated inclusion staff and are already working with limited administrative capacity. If the methodology requires continuous engagement, extensive documentation, or the creation of new materials from scratch, it may become difficult for less-resourced organisations to use in practice.

For this reason, organisational change should be divided into modules. They should be short, self-contained, and function independently. Organisations should be able to complete a module in a discrete session and still make meaningful progress, even if they cannot engage with the process continuously. The toolkit should therefore provide ready-to-use templates, checklists and concrete examples of good practice, rather than expecting organisations to design their own tools.

The survey data strongly supports this approach. Templates and examples of good practice were the most consistently valued forms of support across the sample, ranking ahead of training, step-by-step guidance and strategic planning support. Practical resources should not be treated as an additional feature added after the methodology is designed, but as a core part of its structure.

References

Council of the European Union. (2020). *Resolution on a framework for establishing a European Youth Work Agenda* (2020/C 415/01). Official Journal of the European Union. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=oj:JOC_2020_415_R_0001

European Commission. (2025). *Priorities of the Erasmus+ programme*. https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/programme-guide/part-a/priorities-of-the-erasmus-programme

European Commission. (2025). *Partnerships for cooperation — Erasmus+*. https://erasmus-plus.ec.europa.eu/programme-guide/part-b/key-action-2/partnerships-for-cooperation

European Council. (2025). *Disability in the EU: facts and figures*. https://www.consilium.europa.eu/en/infographics/disability-eu-facts-figures/

European Disability Forum. (2025). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD)*. https://www.edf-feph.org/un-crpd/

European Youth Work Convention. (2020). *The Bonn Process*. https://www.eywc2020.eu/en/agenda/bonn-process/

Eurostat. (2025). *Disability statistics — poverty and income inequalities*. European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Disability_statistics_-_poverty_and_income_inequalities

Fundación Bequal. (2025). *Modelo de certificación Bequal*. https://bequal.es

United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities* (A/RES/61/106). https://social.desa.un.org/issues/disability/crpd/convention-on-the-rights-of-persons-with-disabilities-crpd

Youth Organisations for Inclusion

Funded by the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.