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1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report represents the results of an evaluation of Search for Common Ground’s 22-month, USAID-funded Youth and Community Mediation Center project in Casablanca and Tetouan, Morocco. SFCG-M commissioned the evaluation with the following objectives:

- To assess the performance of the project along the [dimensions of] relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impacts, and sustainability; and
- To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the project and come up with findings, lessons and recommendations to guide and inform future program work with special focus on Community Mediation and Youth Development in Morocco.

The evaluation team conducted data collection in late July 2009, during which some relevant actors and participants were on vacation, but managed to speak with a significant number of youth participants and non-participants, community members, other local stakeholders, and project staff.

The YCMC project itself was designed “To mitigate communal conflict by engaging youth constructively in Morocco’s democratic and economic development,” through the establishment of three YCMCs in Casablanca and one in Tetouan. At these centers, the project would facilitate the training of 105 marginalized youths (75 in the Casablanca centers and 30 in the Tetouan center) in social mediation, and employability and entrepreneurship, with two specific objectives:

- Prevent and resolve communal conflicts: Trained youth leaders will mediate, resolve day-to-day conflicts, facilitate community dialogue, and foster stability and cooperation within the targeted communities, as well as in schools and in community-government relations, thereby contributing to the creation of a culture of participation, dialogue, and tolerance.

- Promote youth employment in the targeted communities: Trained youth leaders will offer coaching, training, and orientation to marginalized youth to enhance their employability, liaise with relevant government to access job and training opportunities, and encourage youth entrepreneurship.

Through the course of its assessment, the evaluation team has found the YCMC project largely successful in meeting its first objective, to “Prevent and resolve communal conflicts.” Many of the project participants that took part in the evaluation team’s focus groups and surveys reported that the project’s trainings have had important impacts on their lives, even prompting behavioral changes. Results include participants’ successful resolution of 469 mediation cases (as reported by project staff), the launching of efforts to establish mediation cells at five high schools in Casablanca, and the founding of the independent Moroccan Association of Youth Mediators (AMJM).

The project has been moderately successful in achieving its second objective, to “Promote youth employment in the targeted communities.” This component of the project, however, was significantly hindered by the fact that, at the time of this evaluation, the small grants that were to be provided to the youths on the basis of business proposals of their own design had not materialized. Project participants report that the project succeeded somewhat in opening
them up to new economic opportunities, but participants’ own efforts to “offer coaching, training, and orientation to marginalized youths” has been limited.

Findings:

The evaluation team has identified the following general results in its assessment of the project’s performance:

➢ Relevance: The project’s concept and design appear to have been largely relevant to the needs of the participants and communities in which it was implemented, even if many of the youths claim to have held few expectations when they entered the project.

➢ Efficiency: Project efficiency was strong on several accounts, with participants giving high marks to trainers and trainings. Despite obstacles, project activities were conducted in a timely and participatory fashion. The organization and management of the YCM centers could have been improved, as could record keeping practices for the project.

➢ Effectiveness: The final results of the project’s PMP show that, in general, the youth, community members, and community leaders believe that the project has met its main objectives. Overall, 70 percent of those surveyed in both cities directly link a reduction of social tensions to the work of mediation centers, while 65 percent directly link an increase in economic opportunities for youth to the work of mediation centers. Sixty-seven percent of youth reported that they can identify sustainable employment opportunities, but just seven percent of project participants stated that sustainable employment opportunities are available in their communities, a potential product of the poor economic conditions existing in these areas and in this time period. Due to flaws in the design of the PMP, reliance on low sample sizes was necessary for all surveys, raising questions about the accuracy of the results for several indicators. In some instances, unexplained differences in the baseline figures for both cities render final results difficult to interpret.

➢ Impact: In the area of social mediation, the project has had a strong impact on project participants, while its impact has been less strong in the area of employability and entrepreneurship. At the community level, the project has had a noticeably weaker impact. Project participants have been more engaged in promoting social mediation than employability and entrepreneurship in their communities. In such large districts, more time may be needed to observe the full scope of the project’s impact on the targeted communities.

➢ Sustainability: The question of sustainability remains the project’s Achilles’ heel. While the partnership agreements signed by SFCG-M’s and its partner associations hold the latter responsible for the continued operation of the YCM centers, the commitment of three of the four partner associations is questionable. In addition, two of the four neighborhoods remain without permanent centers at this point in time. All of the centers lack equipment and resources, such as training materials, to facilitate the training of other youths. In Casablanca, this deficiency is in large part due to a delay in funding provided by the INDH. In all four cases, it remains unclear how the centers will continue to function, and with what funding, once SFCG-M’s grant ends.
The project participants have shown a strong interest in continuing to promote social mediation, but the burden will rest largely on their shoulders.

Recommendations:

In response to these findings on the YCMC project, the evaluation team has identified a series of priority actions which could help future projects of this nature mitigate risks and avoid obstacles. These include:

- **Hold Elections to Involve Youth More Directly in YCM Center Management:** Allowing youths to elect their peers to leadership positions within each center could have helped provide the centers with an organizational structure and mechanisms for distributing responsibility among the project participants, with positive effects on participants’ self esteem and sense of ownership of the centers and their work.

- **Balance the Size and Scope of Outreach Campaigns:** In some instances, a more focused concentration of outreach activities on specific groups that express a sincere demand for the skills provided by project participants can help institutionalize social mediation practices.

- **Improve Contingency Planning:** The evident challenge of working with the INDH, including funding delays, unfulfilled promises, and untimely demands that SFCG-M partner with particular organizations, took their toll on the YCMC project. Developing a strong contingency plan and risk management scheme is necessary, particularly if bureaucratic public institutions like INDH are to play a central role in the success of a project.

More detailed recommendations are presented in section 6 of this report.
2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Overview of Report

The present evaluation report is composed of six sections. The first section presents an Executive Summary of the evaluation, as well as its findings and recommendations. In the second section, a presentation of the evaluation’s objectives and scope is followed by a description of the evaluation methodology and some of the methodological challenges encountered. The third section provides context on SFCG-M and its role, as well as on the obstacles to socioeconomic development in Moroccan society which this project has sought to address. The fourth section outlines the different activities which SFCG-M undertook during the course of the project, while the fifth section provides a comprehensive analysis of the project’s success in meeting its objectives, based on the findings of the evaluation process. The sixth section explores five facets of the evaluation’s findings, offering further insights into the project’s achievements and shortcomings, with accompanying recommendations.

Finally, the report also includes five annexes: the evaluators’ Terms of Reference, a list of Persons Interviewed, the Questionnaire Used for Data Collection, a Timeline of Project Activities, and the Biographies of the Evaluators.

2.2 Objective and Scope of Evaluation

The present report is the result of a formal evaluation of the USAID-funded YCMC project executed by SFCG in the Moroccan cities of Casablanca and Tetouan from January 2008 through September 2009. The evaluation was conducted by a team of outside experts, consisting of team manager Andrew G. Mandelbaum, methods specialist Diva Dhar, and reporting and analysis specialist Andrew G. Farrand.

This team conducted its evaluation in the final weeks of the project and in accordance with the TOR (attached as Annex A), which called on the evaluators to: “Identify the strengths and weaknesses of the project and come up with findings, lessons and recommendations to guide and inform future program work with special focus on Community Mediation and Youth Development in Morocco.”

The TOR also proposed several particular areas on which the team should focus its evaluation of the project’s performance, namely:

- Relevance of project design to the problems of target groups,
- Project’s efficiency in translating inputs (time, resources, etc.) into outputs,
- Effectiveness of project outputs,
- Project’s impact on target groups,
- Sustainability of project outputs once the project ends, and
- Extent to which the implementation process has been participatory and empowering of the target groups.

In the course of its mission, the evaluation team has made an effort to address these avenues of inquiry. As described immediately below in section 2.3, the evaluators also sought to gather information on the project’s wider impacts at the community level, as well as information on internal and external factors which influenced the project’s performance.
These data, along with the subsequent analysis provided in this report, are intended to serve as a resource for SFCG, USAID, and other interested parties seeking to achieve tangible results in the fields of community mediation and youth development in Morocco or similar contexts.

2.3 Approach & Methodology

This evaluation’s approach focused on three principal channels of inquiry.

First, the evaluation team concentrated its foremost efforts on gathering information on the project’s impacts on its primary beneficiaries – the “youth leaders,” or “marginalized youths,” targeted directly by SFCG’s interventions.\(^1\) The evaluation sought to engage these beneficiaries, ascertain how they were affected by the project, and gauge to what extent they internalized and applied the ideas and skills that the project promoted. The inclusion of a control group in the data collection process allowed the evaluation team to draw stronger conclusions about the project’s direct, first-level effects.

Beyond this direct impact, the evaluators also sought to gauge the secondary effects which the project had on “marginalized youths” and the broader local communities. This line of inquiry endeavored to consider the project’s principal community-level input – the establishment of the four YCMCs – as well as the sum of the results observed at the individual level, and the degree to which those results impacted the community more broadly. Interviews with members of the community – including teachers, local leaders, activists, and parents – provided an effective lens for understanding project impacts at the community level.

Finally, at both the individual and community levels, the evaluators sought to measure the project’s overall success (measured by the factors of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability, as per the evaluation TOR) and to identify factors that contributed to its achievements and its shortcomings. The evaluation probed a number of issues related to the project’s performance, and sought to understand both internal and environmental factors which may have posed opportunities or constraints to particular aspects of the project.

Across these diverse lines of inquiry, the evaluation team implemented a four-stage evaluation process which culminated in the production of the present report:

- **Preparation** (July 1 - July 22, 2009)
  Preliminary site visits, refining of methodology and tools

- **Data Collection** (July 23 - August 10, 2009)
  Surveys, focus groups, interviews, document review, observation

- **Analysis and Report Writing** (August 11 - August 24, 2009)
  Data analysis, development of draft report

- **Finalization** (August 25 - September 4, 2009)
  Refining of analysis and supporting documentation, production of final report

---

\(^1\) Because the “youth leaders” come from “disadvantaged” or “at-risk” areas, the project has considered them to be among the “marginalized youths” that the project has targeted.
The data collection phase blended both quantitative and qualitative information gathering mechanisms.

Quantitative methods included:

*Questionnaires:*

By surveying a stratified random sample of 30 project participants and 24 non-participating youths, the evaluation team developed an extensive database of information about the project’s beneficiaries and their peers. In order to conclude the project’s Performance Monitoring Plan, the evaluation team has also surveyed an additional group of 19 community members and community leaders (referred to as “community members”), consisting of leaders of NGOs, officials in public institutions, parents of project participants, and other community members.

These same project participants and community members participated in the interviews and focus groups described below.

In addition to offering a deeper understanding of the backgrounds of the participating youths (education level, age, occupation, socio-economic background, etc.), the questionnaires provided data that shed light on the impact of the project’s different inputs. In particular, the questionnaires helped the evaluators to assess targeted youths’ perceptions of the quality of different project components; the project’s impact on youths’ motivation and psychosocial welfare; and its impact on their professional careers and local environment.

*Document Review:*

The project’s PMP provided a second source of quantitative data. The PMP offered indicator benchmarks collected over the life of the project, establishing a basis for comparison between baseline, midterm (for Casablanca), and final indicators.

SFCG-M’s quarterly reports to USAID provided periodic figures which were used to gauge the project’s progress toward completion at various stages of implementation.

Qualitative methods included:

*Interviews and Focus Groups:*

The evaluation team delivered questions in interview format to five SFCG-M staff members (including the coordinators in Casablanca and Tetouan), one USAID official, 14 project partners in local NGOs, two INDH officials, four officials at public institutions, and community members including four parents of project participants, two participants in outreach campaigns, and two others.

---

2 The evaluators aimed to survey a random sample of 8-10 project participants per center, around 30 – 40 percent of the total population of project participants and a sufficient number to obtain a representative sample. By having each participant bring a non-participating peer, the evaluators hoped to achieve a comparable amount of non-participants to act as a “control group.” A more detailed explanation of the survey participants is available in section 2.4 Methodological Challenges.
Four focus groups were also conducted – in each of the four targeted communities – allowing a total of 30 project participants to share their views and build off one another’s comments in a more spontaneous group setting. The information, opinions, and accounts shared in these sessions proved useful as anecdotal support for certain trends evident in the quantitative data, and as potential alternative explanations for others.

**Document Review:**

The document review covered the five quarterly reports produced to date for USAID during the course of the project, baseline evaluations and situational reports completed for both Casablanca and Tetouan, a midterm evaluation report for Casablanca, a social mediation training manual, four partnership agreements, other assorted project documents, and newspaper articles. These documents allowed the evaluators to understand the project’s dynamic implementation environment as well as SFCG-M’s adaptations to that environment over the life of the project.

**Observation:**

The evaluation team’s direct observation of the project’s inputs offered another perspective beyond that available through the data collection methods described above. Evaluators’ presence at a microfinance training session with an ANAPEC representative in Casablanca, observation of a youth meeting with USAID and SFCG on July 24 in Casablanca, and a focus group conducted by USAID in Tetouan

3 provided insights into youths’ level of engagement, interactions with staff and trainers, degree of self esteem and confidence, and other variables not easily quantified by other means. While direct observation experiences were too limited to form the basis of generalized conclusions, they served to give the evaluators a valuable grounding in the unique local contexts of the project.

**2.4 Methodological Challenges**

While all social projects seek to have a measurable impact, isolating the real effect of a project is difficult, as it is often intertwined with other factors that influence the outcomes of interest.

In this context, the most rigorous methodology for assessing the SFCG project’s impact would have been to compare outcomes for two randomly selected groups: one group of beneficiary participants (treatment group) and another group of non-participating youth (control group). The random composition of the two groups would have ensured that participating and non-participating youth were comparable on all indicators, and that any differences between them at the end of the project arise from the project itself. However, the major constraint in the final evaluation of this project was the lack of a strict control group designated for the duration of the project.

To overcome this flaw in the initial design of the project, the evaluation team attempted to establish a provisional control group of non-participants for the final evaluation. In order to create a control group that resembled the treatment group of participants, the evaluation team

3 The Tetouan event should have been a microfinance training led by Moukawalati, a public institution. However, representatives from Moukawalati canceled just prior to the event’s schedule start, citing the fact that it was a Saturday.
laid out the following criteria for the non-participating youth who would be invited to the centers for the evaluation:

- Age between 18-29 years;
- Residents of the same district as the participating youth;
- Minimum requirement having graduated high school or be near to completing high school.

The coordinators of each center were instructed to ask each participant to bring with them an acquaintance who met the above criteria. While this was the only feasible way of creating a provisional control group, the lack of a strict control group explains some discrepancies in the characteristics of participating and non-participating youth.

The differences in the basic characteristics of the samples of project participants and non-participants are evident in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Non-Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of youth</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>surveyed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>47% female</td>
<td>33% female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>53% male</td>
<td>67% male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average age (years)</td>
<td>23.7 years</td>
<td>21.9 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baccalaureate</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project participants in the survey are more balanced between males and females than the nonparticipants, and they are also an average of 1.8 years older. (Although all but one of the nonparticipants are within the same age range as the participants. The single exceptional individual was 1 year younger.) All of those surveyed hail from the same neighborhoods, suggesting that they are also from a similar socioeconomic class. However, the participants proved to be better educated as 53 percent had at least some university level education compared with just 17 percent of the non-participants. As explained above, these differences stem from the fact that there was no strict control group demarcated for the duration of the project.

A number of other challenges hampered the efforts of the evaluation team to collect the desired data. Most importantly, interviews and surveys could not be conducted with local authorities. Interviews were conducted with two INDH officials, but because these interviews could not be obtained until the end of the evaluation, these individuals could not partake in the survey. Due to summer holidays, teachers and school administrators were on vacation and could not be reached, nor could the evaluation team visit the mediation cells.

All 30 project participants who took part in the evaluation team’s survey also took part in its focus groups. Although the female-male ratio among this sample is quite even (14-16), the

---

4 This figure includes the 13 percent of nonparticipants with university level education and 4 percent with master’s level education.
sample is biased toward Tetouan participants. Fifteen participants were surveyed in both Tetouan and Casablanca, even though the Casablanca centers have trained more youth than the Tetouan center (75 vs. 30). This problem arose despite the evaluators’ requests to the project coordinators and despite the project coordinator’s efforts to bring between eight and ten participants from each center based on a randomized list provided by the evaluators. Due to summer holidays and Ramadan, many people were not available. Ultimately, six participants came from Moulay Rachid, seven from Sidi Moumen, and two from Mers Sultan el Fida. Despite rescheduling the focus group in Mers Sultan el Fida after just one participant came to the initial focus group, the evaluation team was unable to obtain a much better turnout.\(^5\)

\(^5\) The evaluation team bought a phone card for the participant who came to the initial focus group and asked that he call his peers. Although he obtained a number of positive responses, only one other participant ultimately came.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 Search for Common Ground in Morocco

Founded in 1982, SFCG has worked since its inception to provide individuals and communities with the tools to mitigate conflict and build consensus on the basis of shared values. Its stated mission is “to transform the way the world deals with conflict: away from adversarial approaches, toward cooperative solutions.”6 It pursues this goal through a wide range of measures – from traditional conflict resolution training to innovative radio and television programs to projects integrating arts or sports in order to encourage dialogue and collaborative approaches to resolving conflict.

The organization’s work currently touches communities in 19 countries and regions around the world: Angola, Burundi, Côte d’Ivoire, DR Congo, Guinea, Indonesia, Israel-Palestine, Liberia, Lebanon, Macedonia, Morocco, Nepal, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Ukraine, USA, US-Iran, and West Africa.

SFCG first opened its doors in Morocco in 2001, and began to collaborate “with Moroccan society to transform the manner in which people and institutions resolve conflicts and to develop a culture of mediation in Morocco.”7 Since that time, SFCG-M has implemented programs to help build sustainable development capacity and empower women in impoverished communities, train journalists and encourage the growth of local media outlets, and improve outcomes in labor disputes between unions and employers. Over the past several years, SFCG-M has worked to build national capacity to provide alternative conflict resolution services in both civil and business disputes, and worked to expand family mediation services in the country. SFCG-M’s most recent projects include efforts to promote alternative dispute resolution within the Moroccan judiciary, build the conflict mediation and management skills of civil society leaders in underprivileged areas, and support the efforts of the Réseau Maillage youth network to build mediation capacity in local communities.

Building off the success of its work in support of Réseau Maillage, in January 2008 SFCG-M began the innovative YCMC project in order to expand its assistance to some of Morocco’s most vulnerable youth.

3.2 Conflict Resolution and Employability & Entrepreneurship

For urban youths in Morocco today, a convergence of numerous, daunting challenges creates an environment in which opportunities for success appear increasingly rare. Poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, and other obstacles converge to leave many youths increasingly marginalized. Over the last decade, the growth of Morocco’s GDP and gradual opening of the political space have been largely unfelt in urban slums. Access to public services like sanitation and education does not always extend to disadvantaged areas, leaving these residents and their children at greater risk of continued marginalization.

These problems are compounded by the mass migration of rural Moroccans to the cities and an explosion of the young population, producing a potentially dangerous mix. Promoters of extremist ideologies have learned to exploit the hopelessness and alienation prevalent among

---

7 Terms of Reference (see Annex A).
unemployed, disadvantaged urban youths, who may lack role models, strong family structures, or other traditional support mechanisms. Communities faced with such issues can become increasingly rife with crime, violence, and social conflict.

The Moroccan government is taking an increasingly active role in combating many of these scourges of urban life, particularly through the INDH and other development campaigns. In addition these public efforts, community members themselves have the capacity to combat the challenges in their daily lives. The YCMC project has embraced this concept of social transformation from the ground up and sought to create change through two principal methods.

First, through the promotion of social mediation, the YCMC project has endeavored to convert the frustrations of youths into positive energy by empowering them to act as autonomous leaders and community-level problem solvers, actively seeking out disputes in need of mediation. Exposure to conflict resolution techniques and their implementation can allow youth to intervene effectively in tense situations. In disputes between neighbors, spouses, siblings, students and teachers, or others, youth mediators can help the conflicting parties define and clarify issues, reduce obstacles to communication, explore possible solutions, and reach a mutually satisfactory agreement. Ultimately, through their new role as community leaders, youth can help shift attitudes within their neighborhoods to the point that community members no longer view conflict necessarily as a zero-sum game, but instead as one in which positive outcomes are possible for all involved.

Second, through its entrepreneurship and employability component, the YCMC project has sought to offer youths the skills and knowledge necessary to recognize and take advantage of available economic opportunities. Youth leaders can offer more to potential employers if they possess knowledge of entrepreneurship and business development, fundraising and management, computer skills and financial tools. Because many youths are unaware of public job placement and employment services, few capitalize on these opportunities; raising awareness of these services and how to use them can open new job opportunities. Understanding how to access available bank loans or micro-finance funding can also provide youths with a means of economic advancement. These employability gains hold potential benefits for the youths and for the disadvantaged communities at large, which may benefit from the opportunities that the youths themselves can achieve and from those that they can help others attain.
4. OVERVIEW OF PROJECT

4.1 Objectives

In January 2008, SFCG-M began work under a $284,556 grant from USAID to implement a 19-month youth training project at three sites in Casablanca. The project also was to include a GOM contribution of $40,000 through the local INDH office. As stated in the PMP, its goal was “To mitigate communal conflict by engaging youth constructively in Morocco’s democratic and economic development, through the establishment of community mediation centers, in three marginalized districts of Casablanca.”

While on September 18, 2008 USAID increased the project duration to 21 months and the grant’s value by $119,990 in order to accommodate the addition of a fourth site in Tetouan, the project’s two objectives remained constant:

- **Prevent and resolve communal conflicts:** Trained youth leaders will mediate, resolve day-to-day conflicts, facilitate community dialogue, and foster stability and cooperation within the targeted communities, as well as in schools and in community-government relations, thereby contributing to the creation of a culture of participation, dialogue, and tolerance.

- **Promote youth employment in the targeted communities:** Trained youth leaders will offer coaching, training, and orientation to marginalized youth to enhance their employability, liaise with relevant government to access job and training opportunities, and encourage youth entrepreneurship.

Through this project, SFCG-M sought to attain the following five results:

- Community mediation and conflict prevention practices institutionalized in the three targeted impoverished areas of Casablanca and in one in Tetouan;
- Increased access to the job market for marginalized youths;
- Strengthened local civil society;
- Improved community-government relations;
- Enhanced democratic citizenship and economic participation among marginalized youth in Morocco.

4.2 Activities

In order to establish the YCMCs and effectively carry out training activities, SFCG-M conducted a significant number of organizational setup steps. Then, in accordance with the two objectives just mentioned, training activities were organized along two main axes – conflict mitigation and employability. To facilitate youth participants’ efforts to apply their new skills for the benefit of their peers and local communities, SFCG-M worked to guide participants in a series of practical mediation and entrepreneurship activities. Finally, the project held retreats for a select group of project participants from each city, helping to consolidate their skills, share their mediation experiences, and develop plans for future activities.

---

8 Source: Midterm Evaluation Report.
A comprehensive list of project activities is included as Annex D.

Organizational Activities

The establishment of the YCMCs and management of the project’s numerous partners required a significant amount of organizational effort and behind-the-scenes coordination throughout the life of the project.

SFCG-M began the project by conducting a needs assessment mission to two of the three targeted communities in Casablanca – Moulay Rachid and Sidi Moumen – in order to gauge the capacities of youths in the locations.

A startup seminar followed on June 12, 2008, allowing SFCG-M an opportunity to publicize its project and generate interest among youth and community members.

Later that month, SFCG-M convened the first meeting of the project’s Steering Committee, composed of youth leaders, SFCG, INDH, and Réseau Maillage in Casablanca, and created to facilitate coordination among project stakeholders and ensure that the project’s interventions complement ongoing local development efforts and respond to the local population’s needs. The Steering Committee met periodically throughout the project, guiding its implementation by reviewing work plans, training modules, and the participant application process.

SFCG-M received additional funding in September 2008 to add a fourth target area in the northern city of Tetouan. As in Casablanca, a local coordinator was hired to manage project activities and relationships with institutional partners.

In both Casablanca and Tetouan, the establishment of the YCM centers was a major undertaking requiring coordination between SFCG-M and a host of governmental and institutional partners. Nine months after the initial grant was awarded and two months after trainings began in Casablanca, the INDH requested SFCG-M to change its main partner organization in the city. This setback, and resulting difficulties in identifying partners with the capacity and interest in the project of Réseau Maillage, the initial partner, delayed the institutionalization of SFCG-M’s relationships with local partners until the project’s second year. On February 13, 2009, SFCG-M signed an MoU with each of the three partners selected: Casa Fleur (Sidi Moumen), Association Rahim (Moulay Rachid), and Assocation Najah (Mers Sultan El Fida). In Tetouan, SFCG-M forged ahead with its initial plan, signing a partnership agreement with the Tetouan Asmir Association on February 17, 2009. These agreements formalized SFCG-M’s relationships with its local partners and facilitated arrangements for the establishment of dedicated YCM centers.

In both cities, SFCG-M staff and local coordinators held frequent meetings with government officials, city council members, INDH representatives, and community leaders in order to ensure the continued buy-in and support of essential institutional partners.

Youth Capacity Building Activities

In July 2008, SFCG-M launched a call for applications in the three target communities in Casablanca, and held an information session for interested youth in order to present the various elements of the YCMC project and answer youths’ questions. Although relatively
successful in Sidi Moumen and Moulay Rachid, the call for applications failed to recruit the desired amount of youth participants in Mers Sultan el Fida. While project activities began in Sidi Moumen and Moulay Rachid, a second call for applications was launched in Mers Sultan el Fida in August 2008, attracting a significant number of applications and allowing SFCG to select a further 25 youth participants. This step brought the total number in Casablanca to 76 youths, in line with the project’s target of 75 individuals.

Using temporary spaces provided by project partner organizations prior to the MoU signatures, SFCG-M then launched an extensive series of capacity building sessions for the selected participants, grouped into two distinct modules, as follows:

**Conflict Prevention, and Resolution and Mediation Techniques**: The first module, led in large part by SFCG-M’s own training staff, sought primarily to develop participants’ capacity to head off and resolve conflicts in their communities. It employed case studies, group exercises, and role playing to build youths’ knowledge, skills, and self-esteem, with the ultimate goal of creating a pool of autonomous, motivated youth mediators able to intervene constructively and solve both the day-to-day and larger conflicts arising in their neighborhoods.

The training module in Conflict Prevention, Resolution and Mediation Techniques was comprised of five individual sessions:

- Conflict Resolution & Non-Violent Communication;
- Negotiation, Facilitation Skills, & Mediation Skills;
- Self Esteem;
- Leadership Skills; and
- Advanced Mediation, Citizenship, Human Rights Education & Advocacy.

**Entrepreneurial Spirit Promotion**: A business development consultant led the second training module, which aimed to introduce participants to entrepreneurship and demonstrate its merits as a viable professional alternative. The trainings offered tools and techniques in small business creation, business strategy development, effective use of business technologies, and fundraising. As in the first module, trainings sought to develop youth participants into autonomous actors, capable of coaching peers in their neighborhoods in entrepreneurship and accessing the labor market.

The training module in Entrepreneurial Spirit Promotion was comprised of seven individual sessions:

- Creation of a Micro-Enterprise;
- New Technologies of Information and Communication (NTIC);
- Strategic Planning & Commercial Communication;
- Project Management;
- Fundraising;
- Micro-Credit & Income Generating Activities; and
- INDH Funding Procedures for Youth Projects.

After the completion of this initial training cycle, SFCG-M continued its capacity building efforts through the organization of youth retreats, held January 28-30, 2009 for Casablanca
participants and June 23-30, 2009 for Tetouan participants. From the retreats, the business consultant, with input from the youth, developed an enterprise guide which is being published in French and Arabic (100 and 300 copies respectively).

Additional business trainings were also organized, bolstering participating youths’ knowledge of steps necessary to gain access to micro-finance and government employment services.

Finally, to empower participating youth to spread their knowledge and capacity in conflict mediation and resolution to others, SFCG-M conducted “training of trainers” retreats on April 15-17, 2009 for Casablanca participants and June 23 - July 3, 2009 for Tetouan participants.

Outreach Activities

After building youth leaders’ mediation and entrepreneurial capacities through the training modules detailed above, SFCG-M sought to provide them with opportunities to put their new skills in practice. While the communities themselves benefited directly from these events, the events also played an important role in building the self-confidence of the youth participants and offering them greater visibility and status as respected mediators in their communities.

SFCG-M guided and supported youth’s efforts to organize public events – such as sports tournaments, environmental cleanup days, or cultural festivals – that incorporated public debates, town-hall meetings, or round tables. The planning process for these events included development of awareness objectives, work plans, and budgets, and allowed youth leaders the opportunity to put their new management and organization skills in practice. Promotional efforts such as flyering campaigns allowed youths to develop their outreach and communications skills. Finally, the events themselves offered youths an opportunity to see the fruits of their training, as they played the role of the experts, facilitating and guiding discussions among community members on consensus issues such as crime and security, drug use, public sanitation, unemployment, and other shared challenges, and providing information on problem solving and conflict resolution techniques.

Project participants in Casablanca organized six major community outreach activities of their own design in late 2008, in addition to several narrowly targeted ones, and their peers in Tetouan held six similar activities in spring 2009. Participating youth in Tetouan also organized a conflict resolution awareness campaign in six area secondary schools, in which they educated younger students about participatory and constructive mediation approaches through presentations, skits, and question-and-answer sessions.

Entrepreneurial Activities

The disbursement of small grants to project participants with the best entrepreneurship ideas was expected to follow the Entrepreneurial Spirit Promotion trainings. INDH ultimately did not make available the funds it had promised for this activity, but SFCG-M plans to provide participants with two small grants from the USAID project budget, to be awarded during the closing ceremony.
5. PROJECT EVALUATION

5.1 Overview

As described above, the Youth Community and Mediation Centers project was designed to establish three YCM centers in Casablanca and one center in Tetouan. A total of 105 youth leaders (75 in the Casablanca centers and 30 in the Tetouan center) were selected to be trained in two principle areas: social mediation, and entrepreneurship and employability.

The evaluation team has found that the project was successful in training the youths in both areas of concentration. In particular, the project was highly successful in educating the youths about social mediation and dispute resolution, and in encouraging the youths to promote these ideas in their communities. Many of the project participants that participated in the evaluation team’s focus groups and surveys reported that the project’s trainings have had important impacts on their lives, even prompting significant behavioral changes. Results include the resolution of 469 mediation cases, the launching of efforts to establish mediation cells at five high schools in Casablanca, and the founding of the Moroccan Association of Youth Mediators (AMJM). These last two activities were not planned in the original project design, but rather were initiated by the youth.

Trainings in employability and entrepreneurship were not as influential on the youths as the trainings in conflict resolution. A key element of this aspect of the project – small grants provided to the youths on the basis of business proposals – was greatly hindered by a reduction in INDH funding. Though SFCG-M will be able to award two small grants to youths through its USAID funding, the delays and uncertainty surrounding this component denied the project an important incentive to encourage youths to pursue the creation of their own enterprises. The project participants report that the project has had moderate success in opening them up to new economic opportunities. The establishment of the AMJM, which has been entirely led by the participants, demonstrates that some highly motivated participants have put to use the skills that they have learned in both components of the project, and will continue to do so.

The institutionalization and organization of the centers yielded mixed results. It remains unclear how the centers will continue to function in the future, and with what funding. Two of the four neighborhoods were without permanent centers during the data collection phase of this evaluation (July 2009). All four centers lack essential equipment and resources, including training materials to allow participants to train their peers in the wider community. At the retreats, which were held in the later stages of the project, project staff trained youths in case management and project management, and helped develop action plans for the centers with a work schedule and the definition of roles for each participant. Still, the centers appear to lack an effective organizational structure or management scheme. Helping the youths to develop such structures – perhaps through elections for leadership positions within each center – could have contributed significantly to their feelings of ownership of the centers and the centers’ activities.

The institutionalization of the centers is also in doubt as a result of the questionable dedication of the three NGO partners to the project’s objectives, particularly in Casablanca. Even in Tetouan, where Association Tetouan Asmir houses the center and has voiced a sincere interest in the project’s continuity, responsibility for fundraising will largely fall on the youths themselves.
A more detailed explanation of the evaluation’s findings follows.

5.2 Conflict Resolution Activities

The project’s greatest success was in training the participating youths in social mediation and conflict resolution skills, and helping them to both implement and spread those skills in their communities. The project appears to have done so by providing the participating youths with a framework for dealing with conflict. This foundation helped them to cope with problems that they confronted, and to seek opportunities to reach out to others and share what they learned.

According to project documents, over the life of the project, the youth mediators resolved a total of 469 cases of conflict in their daily lives, and achieved a successful resolution of nearly 90 percent of those cases. Sixty percent of the mediated cases were school conflicts, while 25 percent were neighborhood conflicts, and 15 percent familial conflicts.

Communities continue to feel the impact of these young mediators’ presence, and will likely do so well after the end of the project. But through the conflict resolution trainings, the project made some of its most palpable and immediate impacts on the youth participants themselves. One male participant in Mers Sultan el Fida summarized the project’s impact on him as follows, in a sentiment echoed by others:

“Our lives are completely different now. They are different in everything – in school, in associations, and in our families.”

As for exactly how their conflict resolution skills impacted them, the participants offered a variety of responses. A number of them indicated that the dispute resolution component of the project prompted key changes in their outlook and behavior. Participants commonly responded that, prior to the conflict mediation trainings, they had been unwilling to listen to or understand the position of the other in an argument, but that their approach has now changed. Other changes also manifested themselves in the participants’ daily lives, as they describe below:

“I didn’t understand balance, so I would cut off my relationships if I had a problem… but I’ve learned the ideas of mediation and understanding and have realized that I own when understanding stops. I don’t have to cut off the relationship.” (Female, Tetouan)

“Through the training in social mediation, I acquired ideas about how to deal with people. I learned not to rush into making decisions and not to overreact to conflict. As a mediator, I respect the steps of mediation… I can say that I benefited from the social mediation project.” (Male, Sidi Moumen)

“I was always extreme in my opinions… Now, I’ve become more understanding and see the problem from its roots. I have more courage when it comes to arguments and confidence that solutions can be found… It has changed the way I talk with my family.” (Male, Tetouan)
“Before, I had no idea how to resolve a conflict – I only saw the results of the problem, not the problem itself. Now, I know how to sit and think through a problem.” (Female, Mers Sultan el Fida)

For many, the framework provided in the social mediation trainings appears to have endowed them with an inner strength that helps them interact and communicate with others. As such, their perceptions of the power dynamics in their daily interactions have shifted:

“Before, it seemed that power and authority were the best mechanism for resolving disputes and mediation was the domain for the authorities and tribal leaders. Now, there is equality between people in mediation as a new way of conflict resolution... With mediation, youths have the capacity and tools to resolve conflicts without the ‘old people.’ It’s not owned by anyone – anyone can practice it.” (Female, Sidi Moumen)

A number of individuals who know the youth participants personally attested to the behavioral changes that some of the youths described themselves. As the mother of a participant in Sidi Moumen explained of her son:

“Before the trainings he didn’t understand very much and he was not very good in school… Now he understands more and is seen more as a leader… He is active and even talks with older people. He has no fear of talking with them.”

The mother continued to explain that her son is better off than many others in the neighborhood, who fall into the vices that are all too available in these poor urban districts: “He doesn’t smoke, go to bad places, or do drugs. There are so many other kids sick in the hospital.”

At Association Colombe Blanche, an NGO in Tetouan which helped link the project to other local associations, leaders were excited about the changes they could see in the three members of their organization who are also project participants. The association’s president, Ahmed El Idani, described a situation in which a girl came to the Tetouan YCM Center after having a dispute with her family:

“She came to the association and I referred her to Houria [a project participant]. Houria intervened and used her skills to come up with a solution... Houria is a success of the project. She had a problem facing others, but this problem no longer exists because of the project.”

El Idani concluded that the project “has helped make the girls into leaders.”

An essential part of the project’s conflict resolution component was the outreach campaign, which the youth participants conducted with the guidance of the project. The outreach campaign gave the youths an opportunity to pilot their own project, and to teach others the skills they had learned in conflict resolution. A number of youths chose the outreach campaign as their favorite activity of the project. In the words of one participant:

“During the outreach campaign I felt like a different person. It gave me an opportunity to go out and to not be embarrassed.” (Female, Tetouan)
One critique expressed by a number of the youth participants was that the outreach campaign was too short. One male participant in Moulay Rachid expressed this sentiment, “There need to be more outreach campaigns in the area of mediation because this is still new for the people in our neighborhoods.”

Mustapha Tallal, the president of a local NGO that took part in the outreach campaign in Tetouan, agreed that “[Through the outreach campaign] the project had a positive impact, but there needs to be more continuity in order to promote the culture of mediation.”

In Casablanca, the outreach campaign took place in high schools and the local communities, while in Tetouan, the events were conducted in middle schools – as opposed to high schools – and the local communities. The success of the outreach campaign in Casablanca was made evident by an invitation from several school administrators to the youth mediators to conduct a one-day conflict mediation seminar series for students. Ultimately, this effort resulted in the creation of mediation cells at several high schools. Soon after, project participants began training youths in the schools to oversee the mediation cells and conduct mediations. However, this process was interrupted by the summer vacation. It is set to resume in late September when school resumes.

Another success – and one with the potential to outlast many of the others – resulting from the conflict resolution component of the project is the decision taken by a number of youths in Casablanca to form their own independent mediation association, AMJM. The association held its general assembly in May 2009 and, with the assistance of SFCG, has submitted its application for formal recognition to the local authorities.

5.3 Entrepreneurship & Employability

In a number of ways, the entrepreneurship and employability component of the project’s training cycle was secondary to the conflict resolution component. The YCM centers, as their name would suggest, were primarily tasked with a mission and activities focused on conflict resolution. The project’s outreach campaign activities, as well, favored mediation activities. This imbalance is one of two major factors that likely contributed to the less pronounced gains among project participants in the areas of entrepreneurship and employability, as compared to conflict resolution. (The second factor – the lack of small grants for entrepreneurship activities – is discussed later in this section.)

Project participants tended to appreciate both aspects of the training, but indicated in their statements during focus groups that the entrepreneurship and employability component had a lesser impact on their lives. According to a female participant in Tetouan, “Entrepreneurship opened doors for me… but it was not as important as the conflict resolution component of the project.”

This perspective was bolstered by the survey results, which showed that participating youths rated their level of benefit from trainings in employability and trainings on entrepreneurship at 6.19 and 6.85 out of 10, respectively, compared to a score of 8.5 for trainings in conflict resolution.

---

9 According to the YCMC Coordinator in Tetouan, the project’s efforts to gain access to the high schools were rebuffed, so the participants chose to adapt their campaign for middle schools.
resolution. A number of youths commented that the trainings in this area were “superficial,” while others also reported that they felt confident that they could start their own enterprises:

“There are very few jobs in Morocco. Now, after the training, if we wanted to start our own project, we can do that. ... Before, we were afraid to confront someone who has power in the framework of searching for work, and now we can confidently work with them.” (Female, Sidi Moumen)

Project participants rated the project’s success in teaching them job search skills at 7.18 out of 10, and the project’s success in helping increase their access to potential economic opportunities marginally lower, at 6.87 out of 10.\textsuperscript{10} Moreover, 33 percent of the project participants who completed the survey said that they received job offers due to opportunities that were opened to them through the project. However, these respondents represented only 20 percent of the participating youths in Casablanca, compared to 53 percent in Tetouan, indicating a substantial difference between the opportunities identified in the two cities. Just one participant reported accepting a job that was found as a result of this project. Some youths indicated that the jobs that they were offered were either not suited to their skills or were temporary.

As a result of project trainings, a number of participants have registered with ANAPEC, a public entity that seeks to link job seekers to employers. At least two project participants, both in Tetouan, have received job offers through this channel, but neither accepted the position offered, citing the jobs’ requirements as ill suited to their skills and interests. Several participants in Casablanca reported that they have not heard from ANAPEC since registering, and are therefore disappointed in the service.

Beyond the initial entrepreneurship and employability trainings, the project was intended to assist participants to export their skills to other marginalized youths, an objective whose results are highly mixed. In the focus groups conducted by the evaluation team, project participants were able to cite few examples of assistance given to other youths in this area. In the surveys, participants were more likely than non-participants to assist others to find jobs (64 percent versus 53 percent, respectively) in the past year. But a vast difference existed between the figures in Tetouan, where 86 percent of participants had helped at least one other person find a job in the past year, and Casablanca, where only 43 percent did so.

The second major factor which may have limited the success of the project’s entrepreneurship and employability component was the lack of promised resources to allow for the distribution of startup grants to participants. Aside from the prospect of directly gaining employment, the primary incentive for participation in the entrepreneurship and employability trainings was the possibility of receiving a small grant. Participants were told that they would develop business plans, and that the best plan in each district would be funded with a startup grant. According to SFCG-M’s Terms of Reference (TOR), “INDH would provide $16,000 in material and logistical support as well as an additional $24,000 in small grants that would enable at-risk youth to start small businesses.” Although the TOR warns that these funding figures were “contingent on final approval of the INDH Casablanca steering committee,” INDH officials denied that they were to provide funds for the small grants and suggested that this was SFCG-M’s responsibility. Because the two organizations

\textsuperscript{10} For both of these questions, the mean responses of youths in Tetouan and Casablanca were within 0.5 points of one another. However, the variance among responses was between 0.6 and 1 points larger for Casablanca than Tetouan, indicating a somewhat wider range of opinion in Casablanca.
did not formalize a contract at the onset of their partnership, this issue cannot be clarified. Despite a sustained effort by SFCG-M to identify an alternative option, no other public entity or private sponsor could be found to replace it.

The lack of funding impeded youths’ efforts to realize their diverse community-based business and development projects. The survey found that 77 percent of participants had an “ongoing or future project to improve [their] personal or communal welfare” (as compared with 48 percent of non-participants). These projects ranged from as-yet-undefined ideas such as “enterprise with diverse specialties” and “project to end poverty in the neighborhood,” to large-scale projects such as an “import-export company,” to clearly defined small-scale enterprises such as a real estate agency. Just one participant has indicated that her project has already been launched, perhaps an indication of the infeasibility of some of the project concepts, or a result of the lack of seed money. A further 29 percent of participants surveyed claimed to have a precise timeframe in mind for their project’s launch, but in the focus groups, none of the participants suggested that they had written a business plan or budget in pursuit of their own enterprise. Uncertainty as to whether or not the small grants would eventually be available – a question unclear to the participants and the evaluators at the time of data collection – may have reduced youths’ incentives for active participation in this component of the project.

One vivid example of the participating youths’ acquisition of entrepreneurial spirit is the effort of project participants in Casablanca to establish the AMJM. Realizing the need for an official legal framework in which to continue the social mediation project, the youths resolved to form their own organization. The founders also hold a practical perspective on funding. Whereas many organizations tend to think about funding prior to the execution of initiatives, members of AMJM recognize that the best way to attract funding is through the execution of initiatives:

“Now we’ve taken the first step which is establishing the association. The second step has to do with the budget. We will attempt to come up with realistic projects for our neighborhoods that will interest us and interest the youths in our field. These projects will lead us to obtaining funds and resources from donors…. Funding won’t be a problem. The problem is to come up with realistic and doable projects because the donors are there. We just need to present projects and ideas that are realistic and that mesh with the principles of the association and the community…. The support will follow.”

(Male, Sidi Moumen)

The participants’ ability to rapidly realize the goal of a youth mediation association and the thought process driving the organization’s business model reflect positively on the employability and entrepreneurship efforts of the YCMC project, but feasibility, strategic planning, and sustainability remain challenges for many of the youths’ initiatives.

### 5.4 Establishment of the YCM Centers

The most difficult challenge facing the project has been establishing the four YCM centers. At the moment, none of the centers are functioning, self-sufficient organizations, although SFCG expects the three centers in Casablanca to open officially at some point in September 2009 (the Tetouan center opened in April 2008). All four centers currently lack equipment and resources, and two centers in Casablanca remain without permanent locations, as SFCG-
M’s partner organizations have yet to fulfill their agreement to “Put at the disposition of the youths a permanent room that serves as a social mediation cell for the social mediators and the project.” In two instances, the room is being provided by Moroccan public institutions (the INDH and the Mohammed V Foundation) instead of the partner organization. In the other, the permanent room has not yet been made available and the participants have been loaned another room by the INDH for trainings and other activities.

Responsibility for the lack of equipment in Casablanca rests with the INDH, which was delayed in providing the funding that was promised to SFCG-M by its previous director, Governor Dades, in the fall of 2007. A change of leadership appears to have led to a shift in priorities at INDH in Casablanca. Though SFCG-M made efforts to maintain INDH engagement by including it in the steering committee and providing regular project updates, and made numerous efforts to obtain the promised funding, the equipment had still not been delivered at the time of this evaluation. As a result of these delays, SFCG-M requested and was granted a no-cost extension on the project from July 31 to September 30, 2009.

The current status of each center is as follows:

- The Sidi Moumen center, the only one the evaluation team was able to enter in Casablanca, contains several chairs and tables – a meeting place large enough for all of the participants at that site. It is housed in the Forum of Social Initiatives building owned by the Mohammed V Foundation, a public institution, in a room made available by the INDH.

- In Mers Sultan el Fida, activities have been conducted in a temporary center. A permanent center is supposed to be created in Youth Center Bouchantouf, with which the project’s partner organization, Association Nahaj, is affiliated. However, the presidents of the center and of the association told the interviewers that the INDH-funded social mediation center would not be available to the project’s participants. Instead, it would only be of use to the youths affiliated with the Bouchantouf Center and network. The leaders were adamant that SFCG-M had not lived up to its contract and that it was required to conduct trainings for their own youths. This claim does not appear to be supported by the contract itself and SFCG-M staff say that SFCG-M and Association Nahaj had agreed that trained youth would train other youth in the Association Nahaj as well as other association members.

- In Moulay Rachid, activities have been conducted in a room provided by the INDH and shared with other associations, or in a space provided by Association Rahim, the partner organization in that district. SFCG staff have been told that the room provided by the INDH will be for the sole use of the project participants.

- The Tetouan center is different from its sister centers in Casablanca in that it is housed within the building of the local partner organization, Association Tetouan Asmir. The center was opened on April 2, 2009 and is a small room (SFCG pays a fee to rent a conference room in the Asmir building for trainings). It possesses a single computer without internet, telephone, or fax.

---

11 See the MoUs signed between SFCG-M and partner organizations.
12 The other two centers in Casablanca were being refurbished during the summer holidays.
Another common problem is the availability of the centers. The building in Sidi Moumen was closed five out of six times that evaluation team members tried to enter. Although this may have been partially the result of the summer vacation, project participants report that access has been a problem, though one they have learned to cope with. Because the Asmir Association is closed on weekends, the Tetouan center is closed at the time when the youths are most available.

Despite the resource deficiency and problems establishing permanent homes for the centers, SFCG forged ahead with its training calendar and found locations to conduct its activities. Without the centers, however, the project has been less successful in establishing a management system and shaping the participants associated with each center into an organization. While youth participants did receive training in management, organizational planning, and other skills that may have helped them manage the YCM centers semi-independently, they did not have an organizational structure to do so.

One consequence of the lack of an organizational or administrative structure in the centers is that the evaluation team has not been able to secure lists with basic information about the cases that the youths have mediated. This problem was echoed by Mohammed Zeinoun, the president of Association Rahim, who insisted that “We cannot judge the success of the project without seeing a dossier of the cases [mediated by the youths]. I’ve heard about them, but where is a dossier?” Although the project conducted trainings on case management and project management, applying more of these principles to the project itself would have reinforced the lessons and helped prepare the youths for running the centers without the involvement of SFCG.

During the focus group in Moulay Rachid, the neighborhood from which the AMJM president and several other leaders hail, two male participants debated the status of the Moulay Rachid center, highlighting some of the main issues facing the youths as SFCG participation in the project nears its end:

Male 1: “Everyone has to know that we are responsible in continuing our path and organizing our activities whatever the circumstances… We benefited from a training that was made by SFCG and we want to continue our activities in the future. Everyone has to know that SFCG will leave some day.”

Male 2: “I feel capable of convincing youth to join the association starting from tomorrow, but where are the mechanisms? Where are the centers?”

All of the youths expressed gratitude towards SFCG for helping them acquire the necessary knowledge and skills to continue to promote social mediation. For some, despite the challenges that remain, SFCG has played its part. For others, SFCG could have provided more support – for example, permanent centers and extra mediation training books for use in trainings that they conduct – to help them continue their efforts to expand mediation activities.

5.5 NGOs and Public Institutions

Overall, many of those interviewed and surveyed for this evaluation agreed that the project helped bring NGOs together with INDH and other government institutions to spread the culture of social mediation. This includes 70 percent of youths and 59 percent of community
members and leaders (including NGO leaders, members of government institutions, and other community members). Project trainings in conflict resolution and entrepreneurship incorporated a host of NGOs and public institutions, giving the youths an opportunity to become acquainted with different actors in the community and a range of services available to assist them in, for example, their job searches. For a number of NGOs and public institutions, the project provided an introduction to a field in which others are not working. According to Mohammed Bakkali, a regional delegate for Entraide Nationale in Tetouan: “It’s the first of its type – no one was doing conflict resolution in many of these areas prior to the project.”

Beyond these perspectives is a more complex web of relationships that became apparent to the evaluation team through its focus groups, interviews, and surveys.

While the project introduced the youths to many NGOs and public entities, for the most part it appears that the youths have been slow to pursue many of these relationships on their own. There are a range of explanations for this phenomenon. For examples, it could be that the youths did not feel they could trust the potential partner, they did not believe that the partner could assist them effectively, or that they did not have the courage to pursue the relationship. Due to the long history of poor relations between residents of disadvantaged areas and the authorities on all levels, a long period of trust building is likely necessary before these relationships bear more fruit.

In the case of the local authorities, 67 percent of the project participants who took the survey agreed that they are “better acquainted” with local authorities. Just 33 percent indicated that they had a “better impression” of local authorities than they had previously. For the most part, however, it seems that participants had little direct contact with either local authorities or the INDH. In the words of one youth:

“As youths, whenever we wanted to do a training in mediation, we only worked with people from SFCG… Even though the INDH had a partnership, we never saw them… In order to gain permission for the outreach campaign, we needed permission from the authorities… but only Redouan [the coordinator] was involved in this.” (Male, Sidi Moumen)

Although the two INDH officials interviewed for this evaluation had attended some project activities, they suggested that they did not interact with the youths enough to offer their impressions.

Generally speaking, youths responded that they “did not have a problem” with the INDH or local authorities, as one participant suggested (Male, Mers Sultan el Fida). Yet, in dealing with local authorities to establish their own association, some problems have occurred:

“As our relationship with SFCG [while establishing the youth mediators association], we faced a number of obstacles from the government… They asked us questions about our political affiliations.” (Male, Moulay Rachid)

Permission could not be obtained for the evaluation team to interview local authorities despite SFCG intervention.
For NGOs, relationships with the INDH and local authorities were mixed. Lahcen Ifna, the president of Casa Fleur, an official in the Social Department at the Sidi Moumen Prefecture, and the president of the building in which the YCM center in Sidi Moumen is housed, praised the relationships between NGOs, the INDH, and local authorities and said of the center in his district: “All is well funded.” According to the president of Association Najah, the INDH was upholding its end of the bargain, despite pairing down its initial pledge of 130,000 dirhams (approximately $16,250) to just 50,000 dirhams (approximately $6,250). However, the president of Youth Center Bouchentouf staunchly asserted that the funding provided was not sufficient to create a center: “We can’t give [SFCG-M] space for this amount of money!”

The two other partner associations appeared to be less enthusiastic about their relationship with the INDH. Of INDH in Tetouan, the president of Association Tetouan Asmir reported concisely: “The INDH did not participate or open its doors to the project.”

The relationships between youths and the partner NGOs are mixed, which poses a threat to the sustainability of project activities and results. According to project manager Kawtar Amraoui,

“The idea is for follow-up to be done by the associations. Because when the project ends, funding ends as well, and staff will be working on other projects. However, the engagement of the youth is concrete, voluntary and will last.”

Ms. Amraoui said that SFCG plans to follow up and remain in touch with the associations and the project participants. It also expects to engage some of the youths to assist the promotion and implementation of its other projects – for examples, conducting outreach in support of its television show “The Team” and helping to conduct mediations related to its prisons project. At this time, SFCG-M does not have any concrete plans to design and seek funding for a follow-on project or a new project with AMJM.

In general, the NGOs appeared to be somewhat removed from the project. None of the leaders of partner NGOs mentioned youths by name or gave examples of their work. In Casablanca, this appears due largely to the change of partner organizations that SFCG was asked to make mid-project. The relationships between youths and partner associations vary from neighborhood to neighborhood. In Sidi Moumen, the relationship was cordial, with no friction reported. In Moulay Rachid, the youths were thankful that Association Rahim provided space for their trainings, but otherwise provided little comment. However, the president of Association Rahim expressed some frustration with the youths, in particular for not consulting him in the process of creating their mediation association. He also expressed displeasure because the youths “always want to be on the top,” and care about their personal success above all else.

As previously mentioned, there is little relationship between the partner association in Mers Sultan el Fida and the youths in that area. Although the two youths expressed that the relationship was “fine,” Idriss El Kehel, the association’s president, clearly stated:

“There is no relationship between us and the youths… The youths never come here [to Youth Center Bouchentouf] – we never see them.”

In Tetouan, Abdeslam Chaachou, the president of Association Tetouan Asmir, professed that until now, the association has been “observing” the project. However, he stated:
“Asmir wants to continue managing the project and to incorporate it into its own activities. We would now like to become a greater part of the project. One aspect of this would be to bring in other youths to be trained by the youth mediators [in addition to] providing trainings with other mediation professionals.”

Despite Asmir’s laid back role and the issues related to the size and resources of the center it has provided, the youths were positive about the relationship. They said that the association has been supportive, but that they knew little about the other associations in the area aside from those to which they might belong. And, although Asmir’s involvement has made their situation relatively easy, it may have prevented the youths in Tetouan from taking a more active role in the project. According to one participant:

“While Asmir has been helpful and we appreciate its help, we do not really have our independence. We do not have responsibility for ourselves…”

It is uncertain exactly how significant this issue of independence really is, as the SFCG coordinator for the Tetouan center indicated in an interview that the youths have been reluctant to take responsibilities when those opportunities have arisen.

In summary, it appears that the only partner association with a sustained, genuine interest in the success of the YCMC project was Association Tetouan Asmir. According to its president, Abdeslam Chaachou:

“… We really liked the idea from the very beginning because there is such a lack of this type of work [in conflict resolution] in Tetouan… There are conflicts between neighbors and between neighbors and local authorities... So we embraced the idea [of the social mediation center]…“In Tetouan the situation is tense and very difficult because of drugs, contraband, illegal immigration, pre-terrorist cells, etc. It’s an exceptional case that requires serious attention, so we want to build up this capacity [in conflict resolution].”

Still, questions remain about how the association will incorporate the youths and the center into its activities. For their part, the youths in Tetouan have yet to resolve their organizational status (whether they will join the AMJM as a Tetouan branch or form their own association), a process that must occur in order for the youths to form a partnership with Association Asmir.

In Casablanca, the motivations of the partner organizations were less clear. Two of them did not appear to have a good conception of what mediation is about. In Arabic, the term for “mediator” is the same as the term for “intermediary.” In explaining their commitment to mediation, the presidents of these organizations focused instead on the important roles of intermediaries. The third partner association in Casablanca appeared to desire a new project altogether. His vision was for a mediation center to be created to train professionals in the art of mediation, to be accompanied by a law library and other resources to promote a more business-oriented type of mediation.

Lastly, leaders of some NGOs that were involved in the project at some point but were not the primary partner organizations reported that they felt snubbed by the project. Nawal Khaled, the Secretary General of Association Alhale in Casablanca explained: “Our
association provided the project with youth. We had an idea about the project, but now there is no relation between our organization and the project.” According to Ahmed El Idani of Colombe Blanche in Tetouan:

“Initially, we were a middle man between SFCG and local civil society. There was an information day about mediation and trainings in mediation… The important thing is: how did we change from being a middle man to being beneficiaries? How did they forget this important role that we used to have?”

SFCG-M Country Director Suzanne Muskin and Program Manager and Trainer Kawtar Amraoui explained that these associations, like many others, were invited to seminars and were interested in being partners but were not ultimately chosen by the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee based its selection of partners on representation in the communities, number of years of existence, experience with youth, and availability and commitment to establish a permanent center in their association headquarters. As is discussed in section 6.2 on project efficiency, it is possible that more could have been done to include associations in need of project assistance, particularly those who could have brought to the table their own resources and dedicated memberships.
6. OVERALL ASSESSMENT

6.1 Relevance

Overall, the concept and design of the project were relevant to the needs of the participants and communities in which they were implemented. Seventy-three percent of project participants agreed (including 37 percent who agreed strongly) with the statement, “Trainings were generally relevant to my needs.” Most of the youths seem to have had few expectations when they entered the project. Several suggested that they had recently finished their studies and had free time. As one project participant said:

“I knew nothing about the project but the headline of ‘social mediation.’ I was interested to find out more… We have many disputes here and little positive communication.” (Female, Tetouan)

Although several NGOs agreed that the project was relevant to the needs of their communities, SFCG-M’s three partner organizations did not appear entirely dedicated to the idea (as discussed in section 5.5 on NGOs and Public Institutions). This unfortunate situation, which resulted in part from INDH’s demand mid-way through the project that SFCG-M change its partner organizations, has presented a challenge to project institutionalization. SFCG-M staff have expressed to the evaluation team that the project would have a greater likelihood of sustainability in Casablanca if it had maintained the partnership arrangement with Réseau Maillage as originally planned.

Both project components – conflict resolution and employability – were relevant to the needs of project participants and the community at large, but it appears that they were treated as two separate objectives with few overlapping qualities. The YCM centers, though not immediately established or equipped with necessary materials, could nonetheless have been used as a tool for developing the synergies between these two components. Teaching management skills to youth participants by allowing them to help manage the YCM centers could have helped reinforce the employability and entrepreneurship component of the project while serving its first objective of preventing and resolving communal conflicts. The resulting synergy would have increased the relevance and practical applicability of both components for the participants.

Recommendations:

- Improve Contingency Planning: The evident challenge of working with the INDH, including funding delays, unfulfilled promises, and untimely demands that SFCG-M partner with particular organizations, took their toll on the YCMC project. Developing a strong contingency plan and risk management scheme is necessary, particularly if bureaucratic public institutions like INDH are to play a central role in the success of a project.

- Exploit Potential Synergies Between Project Components: Giving participants an opportunity to practice their employability skills through the management and organization of the YCM centers, can reinforce both skill sets and increase their relevance and applicability for participants.

6.2 Efficiency
The overall efficiency of the project was strong on several accounts.

Project staff were responsive to changes in the implementation environment, and earned high marks from Idriss Touijer, the Cognizant Technical Officer in charge of the project at USAID, for being “aggressive” in order to keep the project on track and for “knocking on all doors” to find funding for the small grants, even if this effort was ultimately unsuccessful.

For the most part, project activities were conducted in a timely and participatory fashion. A number of participants and some NGOs expressed their support for a longer outreach campaign. In both cities, project participants indicated that the end of the school year rushed their outreach activities.

Project trainings effectively engaged youths in a participatory fashion. One male participant in Tetouan noted that “Conflict resolution trainings were participatory and included other associations and institutions, bringing us together with different social groups.” The trainings in employability and entrepreneurship included officials from ANAPEC, Moukawalati, several micro-finance institutions, and others. Overall, participants were pleased with the trainings and the trainers, several of whom are SFCG staffers, earned high marks from participants – an average satisfaction mark of 8.6 out of 10.

Participants in Casablanca rated the management of the YCM Centers higher than their peers in Tetouan – 7.4 out of 10 compared to 6.2 out of 10.\(^{13}\) Despite there being a single coordinator for the three Casablanca centers and a single coordinator for the single Tetouan center, 47 percent of participants in Casablanca agreed with the statement that “I could always get the support I needed from project staff,” and several youths praised the Casablanca coordinator for his assistance, in particular in helping them establish AMJM. In Tetouan, just 27 percent of participants agreed with the same statement. The latest Tetouan coordinator joined the project following the departure of a coordinator who was very popular with participants, some of whom complained that the replacement coordinator did not select participants for the training of trainers event in a fair and transparent way and that she selectively informed participants of project activities.\(^ {14}\) Responding to the participants’ claims about the fairness of the selection process for the training of trainers event, project manager Kawtar Amraoui stated: “It was a fair and transparent process. Criteria were established prior to selecting the youth for the retreat.” She added that the selection processes for both cities was a joint undertaking by the coordinators and herself.

Project efficiency could have been improved in several areas. For example, record keeping practices at the centers were spotty and obtaining basic information about the mediation cases undertaken by the project participants was difficult and does not appear to be supported by documentation. Project reporting could have been improved by the adoption of more consistent methods. For instance, all activities were not always reported with dates, participation figures, and outcomes.

The establishment of organization structures for the centers, which all four centers currently seem to lack, could have contributed to solutions for these efficiency issues. Youths could

\(^{13}\) The variance in responses for both areas was also high, indicating that youths had an array of different opinions on the matter.

\(^{14}\) The coordinator responded to this criticism by stating she was never given the full list of contacts with their correct phone numbers.
have begun to assume organizational responsibilities that have generally fallen to SFCG’s local coordinators, such as organizing events, collecting data on participants’ case work, and more (although the youths participated in an ad hoc fashion to help organize some of the outreach campaigns). At the training of trainers retreats, SFCG-M staff worked to help participants develop action plans and other organizational tools, but holding elections for leadership positions and assigning tasks to those positions could have helped further. Such steps would have provided the centers with a human resources structure and begun the process of transferring responsibilities to the youths – a process that must now take place in the project’s final month if it is to take place at all. These organizational structures could have provided greater efficiency in center management, improved mechanisms for transferring feedback to SFCG staff in Rabat, and given a greater sense of project ownership for the participants themselves.

Recommendation:

➢ Hold Elections to Involve Youth More Directly in YCM Center Management: Allowing youths to elect their peers to leadership positions within each center could have helped provide the centers with an organizational structure and mechanisms for distributing responsibility among the project participants, with positive effects on participants’ self-esteem, skills development, and sense of ownership of the centers and project.

➢ Treat Center Management as Part of Entrepreneurship and Employability Component: A structure of YCMC management would have encouraged youth participants to assume collective responsibility for the centers’ success, a hands-on learning opportunity that may even have compensated for the lack of available resources.

6.3 Effectiveness

To assess the project’s effectiveness, the evaluation team has examined the Performance Monitoring Plan, which tracks results over the life of the project. The assessment of the PMP is divided into three sections: conflict resolution, employability and entrepreneurship, and NGO-government relations.

While methodological constraints have been discussed (see section 2.4), several constraints merit further attention here. Four indicators (A.1, A.2, A.3, and B.2) rely solely on the responses of “community members,” a category that represents community members and leaders such as teachers, parents, NGO leaders, and officials at public institutions. Because the districts targeted by the project host an average of over 300,000 residents, “community members” are to ostensibly have some familiarity with the project and its impact on the community, without which they would not be able to answer questions about the project at all. Aside from raising questions as to the representativeness of the sample, this technique limited the evaluation team, like the staff conducting the previous surveys, to surveying a small sample of “community members,” a practice that grants each individual community member interviewed with an artificially high influence on the statistics. For example, each community member questioned during the final survey in Casablanca represented one ninth of the sample, and consequently carried at least an 11 percentage point weight (or more in

15 “Community members” consists of leaders of NGOs, officials in public institutions, parents of project participants, teachers, and other community members.
cases where not all respondents answered). Greater care should have been taken in designing the PMP methodology to prevent such problems.

In addition, the baseline surveys for both cities were conducted after substantial portions of the project’s trainings had already been conducted. In Casablanca, both of the project’s primary training modules were conducted prior to the baseline survey. In Tetouan, the social mediation module had also been completed prior to the baseline survey (see Annex D: Timeline of Project Activities). Disaggregated data for the baseline figures are not available for either city. Moreover, according to the project’s quarterly reports, no activities were conducted in Casablanca between the baseline and midterm surveys.

**Conflict Resolution**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Casablanca</th>
<th>Tetouan</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator G.1: % of youth, community members and local leaders who directly link a reduction of social tensions to the work of mediation centers.</td>
<td>20% 35% 72%</td>
<td>32% 69% 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator A.1: % of community members who say that youth play an important role in promoting a culture of peace in the community. (note: “peace” includes non-violence and mediation)</td>
<td>75% 82% 56%</td>
<td>38% 50% 53%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator A.2: % of community members who say that youth manage to counter negative messages as a result of the work of community mediation centers.</td>
<td>47% 69% 67%</td>
<td>36% 30% 47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At least 70 percent of the respondents to the survey in Casablanca and Tetouan indicated that the mediation centers directly link a reduction in social tensions to the work of mediation centers (Indicator G.1), doubling the results from the last time that both communities were surveyed. This jump likely has to do with the increased familiarity of all the relevant constituencies with the project’s work and the participating youths.

The final results for the next two indicators were mixed. In Casablanca, there was a sharp decrease in the percentage of community members who said that youth play an important role in promoting a culture of peace (Indicator A.1), while the percentage of community members responding affirmatively to the same question in Tetouan increased. The stark contrast between the baseline figures for these two cities raises questions about the validity of the indicator. There is little reason to believe that such a difference of opinion exists between community members in the two cities, and documents provided by the project do not attempt to determine the cause. According to the final survey results, the opinions of community
members in both cities are now in the same vicinity: around 50 percent believe that youths promote a culture of peace in their communities.

In both cities, the percentage of community members who say that youth manage to counter negative messages as a result of the work of community mediation centers (Indicator A.2) reduced marginally from the previous times that these questions were asked. This could be due to the sampling problem explained above. Overall, the Casablanca result appears to confirm an increase in 20 percentage points in this indicator since the baseline. In Tetouan, the statistic remains in the same range as the baseline.\(^{16}\)

**Employability & Entrepreneurship**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Casablanca</th>
<th>Tetouan</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator G.2: % of youth, community members and leaders who directly link an increase in economic opportunities for youth to the work of mediation centers.</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator B.1: % of trained youth who report the availability of sustainable employment opportunities in their communities.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator B.2: % of community members who say that mediation centers are playing a role in promoting economic opportunities for youth in the community.</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator B.3: % of youth who identify sustainable employment opportunities.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the Casablanca baseline survey was conducted after the project’s entrepreneurship and employability trainings took place while the Tetouan baseline survey was conducted before, the baseline ratings in Tetouan were higher than those in Casablanca for all of the entrepreneurship and employability indicators. While both cities are facing depressed economic circumstances, part of the difference could lie in the ways that the Casablanca and Tetouan participants were recruited. Whereas SFCG-M relied on a recruitment drive for many of the participants in Casablanca, participants in Tetouan mostly hailed from other NGOs. It is possible that the greater participation by Tetouan participants in associations led

---

\(^{16}\) In neither survey were enough individuals polled among the community members (8 in each) to suggest that a single digit decrease in the percentage of this indicator is meaningful.
to greater awareness of economic opportunities or that their increased participation in associations indicates a greater level of economic participation as well.

More economic opportunities in the form of job offers were opened to project participants in Tetouan than to those in Casablanca. Nonetheless, more youth, community members, and leaders in Casablanca (73 percent) felt that the centers’ work was directly linked to an increase in economic opportunities (Indicator G.2). Interestingly, non-participating youth were the main source of this difference, as 69 percent compared with 38 percent in Tetouan agreed with the question.

The 54 percentage point leap in Casablanca since the February 2009 midterm survey seems drastic, but could be the result of a series of micro-finance trainings and several other project activities held between the midterm and final surveys that reversed the previous opinions of a high proportion of participating youths, and community members and leaders. In Tetouan, however, the figure remained relatively unchanged. Without disaggregated information from the baseline survey for Tetouan, we cannot understand why this baseline figure was already so high (59 percent) to start.

Just one trained youth in Casablanca and one in Tetouan reported the availability of sustainable employment opportunities in their communities (Indicator B.1). The most plausible explanation is that the increasingly depressed economic environment has dampened what few job opportunities used to exist in the communities.17

Sharp increases were seen in the percentage of community members who said that mediation centers are playing a role in promoting economic opportunities for youth in the community (Indicator B.2) in both Casablanca and Tetouan (28 and 37 percent, respectively). Substantial increases in the percentage of youths in both Casablanca and Tetouan who say they can identify sustainable job opportunities (17 percent and 47 percent, respectively) were also observed (Indicator B.3). These indicators appear to confirm that the entrepreneurship and employability component of the project has had a moderate impact on the project participants and on the community via the project participants.

**NGO-Government Relations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Casablanca</th>
<th>Tetouan</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indicator A.3: % of community members that report an increased cooperation and partnership between associations and local municipalities.</td>
<td>23% Not Reported</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>54% 63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17 It should be noted that just 6 participating youths were surveyed for the Casablanca baseline and 10 for the Tetouan baseline. With such few responses, the representativeness of these samples is questionable.
In both Casablanca and Tetouan, the percentage of community members that reported an increased cooperation and partnership between associations and local municipalities (Indicator A.3) increased. In Casablanca, where six months passed between the baseline and final surveys, a 33 percent increase occurred. In Tetouan, where the two surveys were separated by just three months and the baseline indicated a much higher starting point than the baseline in Casablanca, a nine percent increase occurred.

**Recommendations:**

- **Define a Strict Control Group:** As explained in section 2.4 on Methodological Challenges, the best way to measure a program’s impact is to compare program beneficiaries (treatment group) and another group of non-participating individuals (control group). The random composition of the two groups would have ensured that participating and non-participating youth are comparable on all indicators, thereby ensuring that the only difference between the youth arises from the project itself.

- **Improve PMP Design:** The design of the project’s PMP by SFCG-Washington posed a number of constraints on data collection. A better PMP survey design would include questions that can be asked of a sufficiently large number of individuals (rather than restricting questions only to “community members”), test outcomes that the project participants can practically affect (not expect 25 youths to have a significant impact on a community of over 300,000), and are asked in a consistent manner before and after project activities are conducted. Ultimately, the PMP needs to be designed in accordance with basic statistical standards in order to properly measure project effectiveness, as well as in a practical manner that project staff can be reasonably expected to carry out.

**6.4 Impact**

Sections 5.2 and 5.3 focused on the project’s impact on the youth participants in the areas of conflict resolution and employability and entrepreneurship. Overall, it appears that the project has had a strong effect on the project participants. At the community level, the project has had a markedly weaker impact. This difference is likely due, in part, to the sheer size of the neighborhoods that the project has targeted, as well as the timeline of this evaluation, which coincided with the end of major project activities and thus may not have allowed sufficient time for all the project’s impacts to be felt.

**Impact on Youth Participants**

The project’s effects on the youth participants have been substantial: on average, those who participated in the survey rated the project’s impact on their lives at 7.45 out of 10. On nearly all survey questions aimed at assessing the character differences between the project participants and a control group of non-participants, the project participants scored better. For instance, 64 percent of project participants and 24 percent of non-participants responded that people see them as leaders. Project participants also indicated that they were asked questions on “family issues” 25 percent more frequently over the past 30 days than were non-participants. Moreover, project participants reported being more satisfied in life than non-participants, as well as being more confident that they could find jobs that suit them.

**Impact on Communities**
The project’s impact on the community level is modest at present. Asked to rate how much they thought the center has helped improve their contributions to the community, the average response of project participants was 5.9 out of 10 – slightly lower than their average responses on impact-oriented questions. One possible explanation is that many of the projects they have begun, such as training students to resolve disputes in the mediation cells that have been established in high schools, remain works in progress.

The project participants have also begun to influence their communities, and most of the efforts they have made are related to the social mediation component of the project. Thirty-seven percent of participants have trained at least one other person in social mediation, and the average number of people trained per participant is 31.18 Moreover, according to project documents, 469 mediations have been successfully resolved by the participants. With their outreach in schools and the creation of AMJM, the youths’ efforts to affect the community have been strong.

As previously discussed, the project participants have not shown the same enthusiasm for promoting entrepreneurship and employability. Some efforts have been made, and 64 percent (compared with 53 percent of non-participants) have helped at least one other person find a job in the past year, although Tetouan participants were more effective in this area than their colleagues in Casablanca. While they have formed their own NGO, no participants reported creating their own business plan or budget. That they have not personally embraced this aspect of the project indicates that they are unlikely to play the role of advocates for entrepreneurial skills.

Expectations for the community-level impact must be grounded in an appreciation for the modest scope of this project, which was in its final month at the time of this evaluation, had very limited resources, and focused on training 105 youths. Abderrahim Fahim, a consultant for ANAPEC in Casablanca, stated: “Frankly, in my neighborhood I didn’t see any beneficiary, because the region is very large.” Estimates from the project’s quarterly reports indicate that the project reached between 10,000 and 11,000 residents through its outreach campaigns. An unknown number of Moroccan citizens were reached indirectly through the project’s media coverage, which includes at least four television appearances, six radio broadcasts, and 16 newspaper articles. These efforts, while considerable in light of the resources available for this project, appear less so when one considers that an estimated 1.5 million people reside in the disadvantaged communities targeted by the project.19

Recommendations:

- Balance the Size and Scope of Outreach Campaigns: According to project participants and NGOs in several neighborhoods, the success of the outreach campaign was limited by the lack of a sustained outreach campaign. This was particularly apparent in Tetouan, where several NGOs (including Colombe Blanche, Association Hay Nakkata, and women’s associations affiliated with Entraide National) were the targets of one or no activities, but, by a number of accounts, were interested in developing a more sustained relationship with the project participants through more in-depth social mediation trainings. Rather than conduct outreach activities at 6 local associations in 6 different locations, the project could have focused on fewer associations – those that demonstrate a

---

18 If the project participants conducted trainings together, which is likely, these figures are inflated.
demand for the services of project participants – more intensively. Finding a better balance between the reach of the outreach campaign and the depth of the outreach could have deepened the impact of the youth mediators and provided them with more opportunities to conduct trainings.

- Limit Youth Selection to a Few Neighborhoods: In Tetouan, project participants hailed from at least 6 distinct neighborhoods, spreading the youths out and reducing the opportunities for peer interaction. In districts that supported a larger quantity of project participants, peer support appeared to be stronger, creating synergies that could lead to positive outcomes such as the establishment of mediation cells.

### 6.5 Sustainability

The evaluation team was impressed by the will and determination of project participants to sustain the project’s goal of promoting social mediation. Through their own initiative, the participants in Casablanca formed AMJM, an association expected to soon have legal status and the ability to sign partnership agreements with other associations. Ninety percent of those surveyed agreed (63 percent of them strongly) to the statement “I will continue to come to the centers even though SFCG will no longer be involved.” As has previously been described, the type of thinking that is informing the decisions made by the AMJM in terms of how to pursue its objectives and obtain funding from donors offers further hope that it will be able to continue functioning without SFCG assistance.

However, the conclusion of SFCG’s assistance – and USAID funding – means that the project participants will have to continue their efforts to promote social mediation without funding until they can find a new donor. According to SFCG Project Manager Kawtar Amraoui, finding a partner organization to play this role will be difficult:

> “I’m not sure that [the 4 partner associations] will agree on funding [AMJM]. The type of cooperation that will be there will be more technical, institutional in terms of knowledge, skills, exchange of experiences, in offering a locale to an association that does not have one, etc… I don’t see this happening in a material [or financial] sense – one association giving funding to another.”

Project participants will have to design their own projects and seek their own funding sources. Had they been working to maintain a functioning organization throughout the course of the project, the experience would likely have served them well.

In order to help the project participants undertake this daunting task, strong relationships with the partner NGOs are vital. However, as has been discussed in section 5.5 on NGOs and Public Institutions, the relationships between the youths and the partner NGOs in Casablanca remain precarious and the dedication of the NGOs to the project’s goals are not certain. Even in Tetouan, where Association Tetouan Asmir is interested and capable of playing a greater role in the project, the project participants currently lack the legal framework necessary to establish such a relationship.

Although the partnership agreements signed by SFCG-M’s and its partner associations hold the latter responsible for the continuity of the centers, institutionalization of the project’s goals remains precarious in all four communities.
Assuming that the project participants are able to sustain their efforts to promote social mediation, a number of opportunities exist to exercise and continue to nurture their skills. In Casablanca, project participants can continue to train youths at the five mediation cells in the local high schools. In Tetouan, project participants identified several opportunities in universities, schools, and local associations where their services are welcome. Other offers have come from Asmir, which has an unexploited partnership with the Ministry of Education, and Association Colombe Blanche, which has the capacity and expressed desire to “figure out how to integrate social mediation into our programs.”

The combination of the youths’ enthusiasm and ample openings for expansion of the social mediation model present an ideal opportunity for donors interested in capitalizing on the progress made in the course of the YCMC project.

Recommendation:

- Consider Alternative Means of Institutionalizing YCM Centers: Future efforts to establish community mediation centers should try different ways of ensuring institutionalization. At this time it is not immediately clear whether this project’s YCM centers will continue to operate. Should they fail to continue, it may indicate that all-volunteer mediation centers are not viable ways to ensure long-term institutionalization, or that all-volunteer efforts require longer grant periods in order to nurture organizational cohesion and gradually develop participants’ ownership of project infrastructure and activities.
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Terms of Reference & Request for Applications

Search for Common Ground in Morocco seeks proposals from qualified evaluation teams with expertise in Morocco to conduct a programmatic evaluation of a youth development project focusing on mitigating communal conflict by engaging youth constructively in local democratic and economic development through the establishment of Youth Community and Mediation Centers in Casablanca and Tetouan.

Submission deadline is 28th May 2009.

1. BACKGROUND

1.1 Search for Common Ground in Morocco

Since 2001, Search for Common Ground in Morocco (SF CG-M) has worked with Moroccan society to transform the manner in which people and institutions resolve conflicts and to develop a culture of mediation in Morocco. In order to reduce the risks and costs of disputes, Search for Common Ground in Morocco enhances the capacity of individuals and institutions to resolve conflicts cooperatively and develops a culture of dialogue by bringing together key actors, including civil society, government, and media.

1.2 Search for Common Ground

Since 1982, Search for Common Ground (SFCG), an international non-governmental organization, has been working to transform the way the world deals with conflict: away from adversarial confrontation, toward cooperative solutions. Our philosophy is to “understand the differences,” but “act on the commonalities.” SFCG is engaged in a long-term process of incremental transformation, so we make long-term commitments. We seek cross-cultural integration of indigenous and international concepts of conflict prevention. We work with partners on the ground to strengthen local capacity to deal with conflict. SFCG currently works in or with nineteen countries: Angola, Belgium, Burundi, D.R. Congo, Egypt, Guinea, Indonesia, Iran, Ivory Coast, Lebanon, Liberia, Macedonia, Middle East (with offices in Jerusalem and Amman), Morocco, Nepal, Sierra Leone, Ukraine, USA and West Africa. Our “toolbox” includes mediation/facilitation training, community organizing, radio/TV, journalism, sports, drama, and music.

1.3 Project summary:

In collaboration with the local Moroccan government, and with the support of the National Initiative for Human Development (INDH), Search for Common Ground Morocco (SFCG-M) received a grant of from USAID Morocco to implement a 19-month project (January 2008 to July 2009) which aims to mitigate communal conflict by engaging youth constructively in local democratic and economic development processes, through the establishment of four Youth Community and Mediation Centers (YCMC) in the cities of Casablanca (3) and Tetouan. To this end, SFCG-M pursued two major objectives:

- Prevent and resolve communal conflicts: SFCG trained youth leaders to mediate, resolve day-to-day conflicts, facilitate community dialogue, and foster stability and cooperation
within the targeted communities, as well as in schools to contribute to the creation of a culture of participation, dialogue, and tolerance; and

- Promote youth entrepreneurial spirit in the targeted communities: SFCG worked with partners and consultants to offer coaching, training, and orientation opportunities to marginalized youth to enhance their employability, to help them access job and training opportunities, and encourage youth entrepreneurship.

To achieve the aforementioned objectives, Search for Common Ground-Morocco implemented the following activities:

- Assessment missions
- Identification of the targeted local municipalities/communities, selection of youth NGOs
- Start up seminars in Casablanca and Tetouan
- Training on non-violent communication skills
- Training on conflict resolution techniques and skills
- Training on negotiation and facilitation skills
- Training on Community mediation
- Training on Leadership and self esteem
- Training on project management
- Training on small business creation
- Training on ICTs
- Training on strategic planning and commercial communication
- Training on revenue generating activities
- Training on fundraising techniques
- Training of trainers
- Awareness raising campaigns
- Outreach and open day activities
- The organization of retreats
- Partnerships with local associations to host community mediation centers
- Elaboration of a guide on entrepreneurship and the creation of small business

2. RFA for External Evaluation

2.1 Organizational Goal
SFCG, as an organization, has committed to conducting programmatic evaluations in order to maximize the effectiveness of our programming and engage in continuous improvement and learning within programs and across the organization.

2.2 Program Evaluation Objectives

The evaluation is intended principally for learning and accountability purposes. It is expected to generate relevant findings, lessons, and recommendations which will be shared with key stakeholders of the project and used to inform future programming with respect to social and community mediation and youth development.

A successful application will build the evaluation of the project around the PMP (Performance Monitoring Plan) adopted by the project. The evaluation should address the overreaching goals and objectives of the project while assessing the relevance and
effectiveness of implemented activities with respect to the set goals. Mainly, the evaluation should address the following areas:

- To assess the performance of the project along the following dimensions;

Relevance: How appropriate has been the project design? To what extent did the stated objectives correctly address the problems and real needs of the target groups with respect to the project objectives?
Efficiency: How were project inputs (funds, expertise, time, etc) converted into results in required quantity and quality and in good time?
Effectiveness: To what extent have the stated project results and purpose been achieved in a sustainable way? How effectively and efficiently activities have been managed and implemented?
Impacts: What sustainable changes – positive/negative, intended/un-intended – did the project produce on the target groups?
Sustainability: What is the likelihood of the project to continue after end of the project? What sustainability measures have been put in place?
Implementation processes: To what extent were the activities of the project implemented in participatory and empowering manner? How involved were the key stakeholders of the project in planning and execution of activities, and steering the project?

- To identify the strengths and weaknesses of the project and come up with findings, lessons and recommendations to guide and inform future program work with special focus on Community Mediation and Youth Development in Morocco.

2.3 Audience

The primary audience of this evaluation is SFCG staff and SFCG’s donors. Being an open source organization, Search for Common Ground publishes all evaluations of implemented projects on its website (www.sfcg.org) for any stakeholder interested in learning about our work and the sectors we work in.

2.4 Evaluation Methodology

The SFCG approach to evaluation is grounded in the guiding principles of our work: participatory; culturally sensitive; committed to building capacity; affirming and positive while honest and productively critical and valuing knowledge and approaches from within the context.

3. SCOPE OF WORK

The evaluation will cover the accomplishment of all the expected results as outlined in the project contract and project action plans. All the different project components and activities stated in the original log frame will be assessed.

3.1 Evaluation criteria:
The evaluation will concentrate on the five evaluation criteria elaborated below, namely; relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impacts and sustainability of the project.
3.1.1 Relevance: The main focus will be on the appropriateness of the project’s concept and design to the overall situation of the targeted communities.

- Extent to which the stated objectives correctly address the problems and real needs of the target groups in terms of empowerment and capacity building.
- Relevance of project design within the framework of INDH programs and guidelines to decrease vulnerability and social disadvantage.

3.1.2 Efficiency: The main focus will be on how well the project activities used resources to achieve the intended results:

- Whether project activities were done right i.e. on time, in expected quantity and quality, and through participatory processes.
- General implementation and management of the project in terms of quantity, quality, and timeliness of inputs and activities, adherence to work-plans, action-plans, logical framework, and budgets.
- Responsiveness of project management to changes in the environment in which the project operates.

3.1.3 Effectiveness: The main focus will be on extent to which the project achieved its stated results and purpose in a sustainable way. In particular:

- The progress made in achieving the results of the project at all levels. The project Logical Framework will be used as the basis for analysis and assessment.
- Efforts made in capacity building of community mediation centers and community mediators and whether the strategies adopted are working or not working and why.
- Project’s management of risks during implementation, taking into consideration those stated at the beginning of the project.

3.1.4 Impact: The main focus will be on whether the project’s overall objectives have been achieved or are likely to be achieved, specific changes that the project has brought about in the lives of target groups (youth, community members, schools etc), and impacts realized or likely to be realized in relation to cross cutting issues such as gender, youth leadership, violence and crime reduction, vulnerability reduction, youth empowerment. In particular due attention should be paid to;

- Achievements of the project against the original results (outcomes), outputs, and activities specified in the project log frame.
- Level of awareness of the stakeholders, participants and community members, regarding the project outcomes.
- Level of ownership of the project by the partners (INDH, Local associations) communities and beneficiaries and their commitment to support the project after the expiry of the project period.
- Extent to which the project has impacted on the leadership and agency skills of trained youth.
- Extent to which the project set up new mechanisms for mitigating communal conflicts.
- Project impact on enhancing employability and access to job opportunities in targeted communities.

3.1.4 Sustainability: The main focus will be on whether the outcomes and changes brought about by the project are likely to continue after the end of the project:

- Extent to which the trained young mediators and local partners are committed to pursuing community mediation activities after the expiry of the project.
- Conduciveness of the socio-cultural factors to the continuity of the project activities.
• Extent to which the capacity was built of the community mediation centers and local partners to continue offering community mediation services.

3.2 Location
Data should be collected primarily in Casablanca and Tetouan along with supplemental interviews with institutional partners that were involved in the project.

3.3 Deliverables
3.3.1 Final Report: The evaluation report should be in English and include:
• Executive summary of key findings and recommendations – no more than 2 pages
• Table of contents
• Research findings, analysis, and conclusions with associated data presented, where appropriate in clear graphs or charts
• Recommendations for Future Activities
• Appendices, which include collected data, detailed description of the methodology with research instruments, list of interviewees, bibliography, and evaluator(s) brief biography

Final report should be submitted as follows:
• Exhaustive final report to be submitted as 3 bound hard copies and 1 copy as a PDF document and 1 copy as a Microsoft word 2003 copy.
• A summary document should also be submitted; this should be 6-10 pages, include executive summary and cover the major conclusions and recommendations.

Deliverables must be submitted before the set deadline to Seddik Ouboulahcen- Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist at souboulahcen@sfcg.org and Suzanne Muskin – Chief of Party at smuskin@sfcg.org

SFCG will exercise no editorial control over the final evaluation report. Both the final and the summary report will be credited to the consultancy team and potentially placed in the public domain at the decision of SFCG.

3.4 Duration & Deadlines
The proposed timeline for this contract is:
• 1 st of June : Start of evaluation mission
• First two weeks of June: Design, finalization and refining of methodology and tools
• 30 June: Data collection completed
• 13 July: Deadline for first draft
• 27 July : Final receipt of all deliverables

3.5 Logistical Support
SFCG will provide preparatory materials to the evaluation team, including relevant background materials and a briefing from SFCG staff.

4. THE EVALUATION TEAM

4.1 Evaluators’ Responsibilities
Proposals should include a description of the evaluation team to include primary staff as well as administrative support staff. The evaluators will be expected to travel to the various
locations cited above to conduct this work. The final writing of the deliverables does not have to take place in the location where the evaluation has been conducted.

The evaluator/team is expected to be responsible for the following:

- Formation of an evaluation team
- Identify and define evaluation priority areas, methodology and sources of information
- Design and implement data collection
- Facilitate survey crew training and data collection tools
- Engage stakeholders in the evaluation process
- Data analysis and report writing
- Develop and present a draft evaluation report to SFCG staff
- Produce a 6-10 pages evaluation summary report, covering key findings, major conclusions and recommendations, for organizational sharing and learning
- Write and submit a final evaluation report

4.2 Required Qualifications (for evaluation team as a whole)

- Standard Arabic, Moroccan Arabic, French and English proficiency
- Excellent written communication skills
- In-country work experience
- Evaluation methods and data collection skills
- Experience in development evaluation

5. APPLICATION GUIDELINES

Applicants must submit the following materials to Seddik Ouboulahcen- Design, Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist at souboulahcen@sfcg.org or by mail at the following address: Search for Common Ground in Morocco 30 rue Aguelmane Sidi Ali No. 8 Agdal, Rabat.

The submission deadline is 28 May 2009.

1. A cover letter with contact information that summarizes qualifications for those key individuals proposed to conduct the evaluation
2. The proposed evaluation methodology should outline (approximately 8 pages, not including appendices):
   a. Analytical Framework
   b. Research questions
   c. Sample Planning (proposed sample groups and timeline for data collection and analysis)
   d. Data collection tools for each target groups
3. Description of past evaluation experiences including references.
4. Evaluators' curriculum vita (to include all staff who will engage in data analysis)
5. Detailed proposed Budget
6. Statement of availability
7. Any other supporting documents

For additional information on SFCG in Morocco:
http://www.sfcg.org/programs/morocco/programs_morocco.html
Annex B: Persons Interviewed

Tetouan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name (If known)</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ahmed El Idani</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>La Colombe Blanche</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youssef Imrout</td>
<td>Administrative Consultant</td>
<td>La Colombe Blanche</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohamed Bakkali</td>
<td>Provincial Delegate</td>
<td>Entraide Nationale</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdeslam Chaachou</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Association Tetouan Asmir</td>
<td>07/22/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azzedine El Mounsi</td>
<td>Head of Pedagogy Affairs</td>
<td>National Delegation of Education</td>
<td>07/23/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mounaim Ben Ali</td>
<td>SG, project participant</td>
<td>Association of Hay Mouklata</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha Tallal</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Assoc. Hay Nakkata pour le Développement Social</td>
<td>07/25/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hicham Fares</td>
<td>DPD Director</td>
<td>ANAPEC/Moukawalati</td>
<td>07/23/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Residents</td>
<td>Participants in Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Campaign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Hay Mouklata</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Father of a mediator</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>07/25/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Casablanca (general):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Khaloul</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Association of Young Mediators</td>
<td>07/21/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fahim Abdelrahim</td>
<td>Employment Consultant</td>
<td>ANAPEC</td>
<td>07/23/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zine el abidine El Azhar</td>
<td>Director, Social Department</td>
<td>INDH</td>
<td>09/08/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mustapha Chadli</td>
<td>Chief, Division of Solidarity and Social Action</td>
<td>INDH</td>
<td>09/08/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Casablanca - Mers Sultan el Fida:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merwan Sarouf</td>
<td>Assistant Director</td>
<td>Center Social du Quartier Omar Ibn Khattab</td>
<td>07/23/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M’jid Makhouk</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Conseil de dar Chabab Bouchentouf</td>
<td>07/28/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driss al-Kihal</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Association Najah</td>
<td>07/28/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saadia Ifghan</td>
<td>Mother of participant</td>
<td>Mers Sultan el Fida</td>
<td>07/22/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Casablanca - Moulay Rachid:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Institution/Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nawal Khalid</td>
<td>Secretary General</td>
<td>Association Alhale</td>
<td>07/22/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mohammed Zeinoun</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Association Rahim</td>
<td>07/21/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Moulay Rachid</td>
<td>07/22/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Mother of participant</td>
<td>Moulay Rachid</td>
<td>07/22/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Casablanca - Sidi Moumen:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lahcen Ifna</td>
<td>Social Department, Prefecture / President</td>
<td>Casa Fleur</td>
<td>07/20/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Mother of participant</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>07/20/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SFCG & USAID:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Muskin</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>08/04/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seddik Ouboulahcen</td>
<td>Design, Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Specialist / Trainer</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>08/04/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawtar Amraoui</td>
<td>Program Manager / Trainer</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>08/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Badiaa El Allali</td>
<td>Coordinator - Tetouan</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redouane Houlam</td>
<td>Coordinator - Casablanca</td>
<td>SFCG</td>
<td>07/21/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idriss Touijer</td>
<td>Cognizant Technical Officer</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>07/24/09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex C: Questionnaire Used for Data Collection

Instructions:

The survey is presented in the form of a questionnaire. The entire questionnaire will be conducted for youths that have participated in the project and youths that have not participated in the project. They will be given directions by the surveyors and will fill out the questionnaires themselves. Of the participating youth, 8-10 from each center are expected to take the survey. These will be the same 8-10 who participate in the focus group (they will take the questionnaire first). Non-participants will mostly consist of friends of the participating youth and 5-6 will participate from each district. Overall, 32-40 participating youths and 20-24 non-participating youths are expected to participate.

Section 2 of the survey consists of questions from the project’s PMP. These will be asked of the constituencies mentioned above. In keeping with the way the PMP has been conducted in the past, they will also be asked in interviews to community leaders and members. “Community leaders” refers to the project’s institutional partners and other leaders from local government, INDH, and NGOs. “Community members” refers to teachers, parents, and other members of the community who, having no official partnership or role in the project, may have come into contact with the centers or youths trained by the project.

Questionnaire:

**SECTION 1: BACKGROUND**

| 1. Sex | M = 1  
| F = 2  
| - 97/-99 = NR/NS |
| 2. Age | ______ years |
| 3. Neighborhood | Moulay Rachid  
| Sidi Moumen  
| Mers Sult. el Fida  
| Tetouan |
| 4. Education | High school  
| Baccalaureat  
| University  
| Masters  
| Doctorate |
| 5. Area of Study | Social Sciences  
| Natural Sciences  
| Lit. & Humanities  
| Other |
| 6. What languages do you speak? | 1 = Darija  
| 2 = Classical  
| Arabic  
| 3 = French  
| 4 = Berber  
| 5 = Spanish  
| 6 = English  
| 7 = Other  
| languages  
| 8 = none  
| -97/-99=NR/NS |
| 7. Marital Status: | 1 = Married  
| 2 = Single  
| 3 = Divorced/Separated  
| 4 = Widowed  
| 99 = Don’t know / No Response |
| 8. Employment Status | 1 = Employed  
| 2 = Unemployed  
<p>| 3 = Student |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Current profession or most recent profession</td>
<td>99 = Don’t Know / No Response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10. Do you participate in any groups, clubs, or associations? If yes → 10 & 11 | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
-97/-99 = NA/DK                                                   |
| 11. In what group, club, or association do you participate, or to which do you belong? | 12. When did you last go there?  
1= Yesterday ; 2= Less than a week ago ; 3=Less than a month ago ; 4= Less than a year ago ; 5= More than a year ago ; 99=NR/NS |
| Women’s group                                                           | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Youth group                                                              | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Community organization                                                  | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Political party                                                          | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Religious group / prayer group (mosque, synagogue, church, temple)     | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Cooperative, savings group, credit or micro-finance association, investment or insurance group | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| School committee                                                        | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Other NGO or activities with another NGO                                | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| Other. Describe: …………………                                           | 1 2 3 4 5                                                              |
| NR/NS                                                                   | -99                                                                    |

**SECTION 2: PMP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13. "How do you assess the role played by community mediation centers and youth mediators in reducing tensions and resolving disputes?" | 1 = Very Important  
2 = Important  
3 = Somewhat important  
4 = Not important  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 14. "Do you think the community mediation centers participate directly in supporting the spirit of initiative and entrepreneurship among the youth in your neighborhood?" | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 15. "How do you rate the role played by youth in your community in promoting the culture of social mediation and resolving disputes?" | 1 = Very Important  
2 = Important  
3 = Somewhat important  
4 = Not important |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>&quot;Do youth combat negative and hostile messages in your neighborhood through their work with community mediation centers?&quot;</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>&quot;Do you think that the community mediation project has helped to strengthen cooperation and partnership between youth organizations and local municipalities to promote the culture of social mediation?&quot;</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>&quot;Do you think that community mediation centers play an important role in supporting the spirit of entrepreneurship and creating work opportunities for youths?&quot;</td>
<td>1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat important, 4 = Not important, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Are their sustainable job opportunities in your community?</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>In general, do you mostly agree or disagree with the following statement? &quot;I am currently aware of job opportunities that I am qualified to get.&quot;</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SECTION 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Before being asked to take this questionnaire, had you ever heard of the youth mediation project run by Search for Common Ground?</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If “no”, skip to “Section 4”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>How did you hear about the youth mediation project?</td>
<td>1 = Friend, 2 = Family, 3 = Outreach campaign, 4 = NGO, 5 = School official, 6 = Other: ___________, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Have you participated in an outreach activity conducted by the project?</td>
<td>1 = Yes, 2 = No, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>On a scale of 1-10, how successful was the outreach activity or activities in which you participated in educating the community about the topics that they endeavored to promote?</td>
<td>1 = Very Important, 2 = Important, 3 = Somewhat important, 4 = Not important, 99 = Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Have you participated in trainings held by the project?  
   1 = Yes  
   2 = No  
   99 = Don’t Know

26. On average, how many times do you go to the center per month:  
   _____ times per month

27. How many times per month do you discuss issues related to the project with youths of the project?  
   _____ times per month

28. How many of the project’s programs, workshops, and trainings would you estimate that you have attended?  
   1 = 1 - 5  
   2 = 6 – 10  
   3 = 11 – 15  
   4 = 16 – 20  
   5 = More than 20  
   99 = Don’t Know

29. Outside of the scope of this project, do you participate in any other groups or projects that help people learn about conflict resolution or entrepreneurship?  
   1 = Yes  
   2 = No  
   99 = Don’t Know

30. On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being “poor” and 10 being “excellent,” how would you rate:  
   The project’s trainings related to conflict resolution  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

31. The project’s trainings related to employability  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

32. The project’s trainings related to entrepreneurship  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

33. The quality of the trainers?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

34. The materials used?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

35. The resources of the center?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

36. The management of the centers?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

37. The effectiveness of the project?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

38. The level of support offered by local authorities to the project and its goals?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

39. The level of support offered by the INDH to the project and its goals?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

40. The level of support offered by local NGOs to the project and its goals?  
   1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
   99 = Don’t Know

Which of the following statements do you agree with:
41. “I can always access the center when I want.”
   - 1 = Agree strongly
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Somewhat agree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Disagree strongly
   - 99 = Don’t Know

42. “I could always get the support I needed from project staff.”
   - 1 = Agree strongly
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Somewhat agree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Disagree strongly
   - 99 = Don’t Know

43. “Trainings were generally relevant to my needs.”
   - 1 = Agree strongly
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Somewhat agree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Disagree strongly
   - 99 = Don’t Know

44. “I will continue to come to the centers even though SFCG will no longer be involved.”
   - 1 = Agree strongly
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Somewhat agree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Disagree strongly
   - 99 = Don’t Know

45. “I am better acquainted with local authorities than I was prior to my involvement with the project.”
   - 1 = Agree strongly
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Somewhat agree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Disagree strongly
   - 99 = Don’t Know

46. “I have a better impression of the local authorities now than I did prior to my involvement with the project.”
   - 1 = Agree strongly
   - 2 = Agree
   - 3 = Somewhat agree
   - 4 = Disagree
   - 5 = Disagree strongly
   - 99 = Don’t Know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>On a scale of 1-10, with 1 being “none” and 10 being “a lot”:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47. How much have you benefited from the project’s trainings in conflict resolution?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. How much have you benefited from the project’s trainings in employability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. How much have you benefited from the project’s trainings in entrepreneurship?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. How successful has the project been in teaching you skills that help you seek job opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. How successful has the project been in helping increase your access to potential economic opportunities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. How much do you think the center has helped you improve your life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. How much do you think the center has helped improve your contributions to the community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. How much has your community benefitted from the centers?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. How likely are you to ask local authorities for assistance now than you were at the project's initiation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 56. Have you received a job offer due to opportunities opened up by your participation in the project? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 57. Have you taken a job offered as a result of opportunities brought to you by participation in the project? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 58. At least once per month, does someone who is not involved with the project ask you about the project or the activities conducted by the participating youth at least once a month? | 1 = Agree strongly  
2 = Agree  
3 = Somewhat agree  
4 = Disagree  
5 = Disagree strongly  
99 = Don’t Know |
| SECTION 5                                                               |                                                                          |
| 59. Generally speaking, would you say that it is possible to trust people in your neighborhood, or that one can never be too cautious? | 1= oui  
2= non  
-97/-99=NR/NS |
| 60. Generally speaking, would you say that it is possible to trust people who do not live in your neighborhood, or that one can never be too cautious? | 1= oui  
2= non  
-97/-99=NR/NS |
| 61. In the last 30 days, has anyone asked you (or your household) to hold any objects of value (jewelry, money, official documents, etc.)? | 1= Oui  
2= Oui, mais j’ai refusé  
3= Non  
-99= NR/NS |
| 62. In the last 30 days, how many times has someone asked you (or someone in your household) for your opinion in a family question? |                                                                          |
| 63. During the last three months, how many times has someone asked you for your opinion in a question about money? |                                                                          |
| 64. How would you classify your satisfaction regarding your life today? If 10 represents very strong satisfaction and 1 represents very little satisfaction, where would you place yourself? | 1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
99 = Don’t know |
| 65. Do youth combat negative and hostile messages in your neighborhood? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t know |
| 66. How many conflicts have you helped resolve over the past year? | _____ conflicts |
| 67. Have you been a disputant in an issue that has gone to mediation? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 68. Have you conducted a lesson or lessons for others to learn about mediation or other alternative mechanisms for dispute resolution? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know  
If “no,” skip to question 68.                                                                                                                                 |
| 69. How many people have benefited from this lesson (these lessons)?     | _____ people                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| 70. Will you seek a professional career in conflict resolution? (mediation, social work, etc.) | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know                                                                                                                                 |
| 71. If you currently searching for work, how many months have you been searching? | 1 = 1-3  
2 = 4-6  
3 = 7-9  
99 = Don’t know  
4 = More than 9                                                                                                                                 |
| 72. In the past year, how many other people have you helped find jobs?   | 1 = 1-5  
2 = 6-10  
3 = 11-15  
4 = More than 15  
99 = Don’t know                                                                                                                                 |
| 73. On a scale of 1-10 when you are looking for a job, how confident are you that you know how to locate and identify the types of jobs that best suit you? | 1…2…3…4…5…6…7…8…9…10  
-97/-99=NR/NS                                                                                                                                 |
| 74. In general, do you mostly agree or mostly disagree with the following? "Entrepreneurs help create jobs." | 1 = Agree  
2 = Disagree  
99 = Don’t Know                                                                                                                                 |
| 75. In general, do you mostly agree or mostly disagree with the following? "Entrepreneurs think only about their own wallets." | 1 = Agree  
2 = Disagree  
99 = Don’t Know                                                                                                                                 |
| 76. Do you have an ongoing or future project to improve your personal or communal welfare? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know  
If yes, continue to question R18. If no, skip to question R21.                                                                                      |
| 77. If yes, what is this project? (If there is more than one, write about the first that comes to mind) |                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 78. Has the project begun?                                               | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know                                                                                                                                 |
| 79. If not, when are you thinking about starting this project             | 1 = At a precise time  
2 = At an unknown time                                                                                                                                 |
| 80. On a scale of 1-10 are you confident that you can successfully start your own business or NGO? | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know                                                                                                                                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 81. What do you believe is the most likely explanation for people who do NOT start a business? | 1 = Fear of failure  
2 = Not enough money to get the business started  
3 = Satisfied with current job opportunities  
4 = Not enough information on how to start it  
5 = Too difficult to start it  
6 = They don’t have a great product or service idea  
7 = Other  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 82. Are you seen as a leader in your community/school/etc.?             | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 83. Are you registered to vote?                                       | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
| 84. Did you vote in the most recent elections?                         | 1 = Yes  
2 = No  
99 = Don’t Know |
### Annex D: Timeline of Project Activities

**Casablanca:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2008</td>
<td>Start of Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Needs Assessment Mission to 3 Casablanca communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 12, 2008</td>
<td>Casablanca Startup Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 24, 2008</td>
<td>Steering Committee: first meeting (development of workplan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 3, 2008</td>
<td>Steering Committee: second meeting (finalization of workplan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Jun., 2008</td>
<td>Call for Applications: recruitment of participating youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 13, 2008</td>
<td>Selection meeting (evaluation of applications received)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 14, 2008</td>
<td>General information session for selected candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 18-19, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Conflict Resolution and Non-Violent Communication (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 22, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Conflict Resolution and Non-Violent Communication (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 24-25, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Negotiation, Facilitation, and Mediation (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 28-29, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Negotiation, Facilitation, and Mediation (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 6, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Self Esteem (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 8, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Self Esteem (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 11-12, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Creation of a Micro-Enterprise (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 13-14, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Creation of a Micro-Enterprise (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 18, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: New Technologies of Information and Communication (NTIC) (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 20-21, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Strategic Planning &amp; Commercial Communication (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 22-23, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Strategic Planning &amp; Commercial Communication (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug. 25-27, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Project Management (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1, 2008</td>
<td>Steering Committee: selection of further 28 participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1-3, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Project Management (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 4-5, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Creation of a Micro-Enterprise (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 10, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: New Technologies of Information and Communication (NTIC) (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 11-12, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Strategic Planning &amp; Commercial Communication (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Fundraising (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 15, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Fundraising (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 16, 2008</td>
<td>Steering Committee: planning meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 18, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Fundraising (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 19, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Micro-Credit &amp; Income Generating Activities (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 20, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Micro-Credit &amp; Income Generating Activities (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 22, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Micro-Credit &amp; Income Generating Activities (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2008</td>
<td>Planning meeting with youth for awareness raising campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 29-30, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Project Management (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 7, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: INDH Funding Procedures for Youth Projects (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 8, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: INDH Funding Procedures for Youth Projects (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 8, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Self Esteem (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 9, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: INDH Funding Procedures for Youth Projects (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 13, 2008</td>
<td>Governor’s update meeting (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 17-18, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Conflict Resolution and Non-Violent Communication (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20-21, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Negotiation, Facilitation, and Mediation (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 24, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Leadership Skills (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 27, 2008</td>
<td>Governor’s update meeting (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 27, 2008</td>
<td>Steering Committee: INDH contribution, MoU for centers, Nov-Dec outreach strategy validation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 26, 2008</td>
<td>Planning session: Outreach campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Leadership Skills (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Leadership Skills (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 3-4, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Advanced Mediation, Citizenship, Human Rights Education &amp; Advocacy (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 5-6, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Advanced Mediation, Citizenship, Human Rights Education &amp; Advocacy (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 7-8, 2008</td>
<td>Workshop: Advanced Mediation, Citizenship, Human Rights Education &amp; Advocacy (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 19, 2008</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Mediation for Clean Neighborhoods (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 20-21, 2008</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Cultural Competition and Round Table (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 24, 2008 - Dec. 1, 2008</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Round Tables and Soccer Tournament (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 24, 2008 - Dec. 1, 2008</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: No to Violence in Schools (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 28, 2008</td>
<td>Steering Committee: presentation of draft MoU to stakeholders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 5, 2008</td>
<td>Governor’s update meeting (Moulay Rachid)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 8-11, 2008</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Cultural Competition and Round Table (Mers Sultan el Fida)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 15, 2008</td>
<td>SFCG Public Outreach Event: Soccer Tournament and Public Booths (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 26, 2008</td>
<td>Radio interview: “With the Youth” (RTM national station)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 2009</td>
<td>Baseline Survey conducted by SFCG-M M&amp;E staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 28-30, 2009</td>
<td>Winter Retreat at Bouznika Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 2009</td>
<td>Midterm Survey conducted by SFCG-M M&amp;E staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 13, 2009</td>
<td>Signature of partnership agreements (MoU) with 3 associations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 20, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Open House (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 10, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Training: ANAPEC workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 11, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Training: Zakoura Foundation workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 12, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Training: BMCE Bank workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 15, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Training: ANAPEC workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 15-17, 2009</td>
<td>Training of Trainers Retreat in Mohammedia for Youth Trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Training: OFPPT workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 25, 2009</td>
<td>Subscription of youth leaders to ANAPEC services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul. 24, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Finance Training: ANAPEC presentation, Q&amp;A (Sidi Moumen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>Development of Entrepreneurial Guide for Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1, 2009</td>
<td>End of YCMC project activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tetouan:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 18, 2008</td>
<td>USAID approval for expansion of grant scope and amount to include activities and establishment of YCMC in Tetouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 13, 2008</td>
<td>Start of work for SFCG’s Field Coordinator in Tetouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 2008</td>
<td>Situational Analysis conducted by SFCG-M M&amp;E staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 17, 2008</td>
<td>Buy-in Meetings: Wali of Tetouan, VP of Municipal Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec. 19, 2008</td>
<td>Tetouan Startup Seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 12-16, 2009</td>
<td>Buy-in Meetings: local INDH, association officials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med Jan., 2009</td>
<td>Call for Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 16, 2009</td>
<td>Training modules in “Conflict Prevention, and Resolution and Mediation Techniques” and “Entrepreneurial Spirit Promotion” begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 17, 2009</td>
<td>Partnership agreement signed with Tetouan Asmir Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 16-18, 2009</td>
<td>Planning Sessions for public outreach campaign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 30, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Environmental Day, Mediation Forum (Mouklata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar. 31, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Community Mediation for Youth workshop (Kouilma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 2, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Non-Violent Communication and Active Listening, Combating Cigarettes workshops (Jamaâ Mezwak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 2, 2009</td>
<td>Signature of partnership agreement with ANAPEC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 2, 2009</td>
<td>Official Opening of Tetouan YCMC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 3, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Festival and Mediation discussions, Community mediation discussions with business leaders (Neqata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 3, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Public Information Session, Environmental Awareness Campaign, Arts and Culture Festival (Samsa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 6-10, 2009</td>
<td>Baseline study conducted by SFCG-M M&amp;E staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 14, 2009</td>
<td>Signature of partnership agreement with National Delegation of Education in Tetouan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 16-23, 2009</td>
<td>Entrepreneurial Skills Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr. 30, 2009</td>
<td>Outreach Activity: Mediation and Environmental Protection event (Boujarah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 6-8, 2009</td>
<td>Project Management Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 1, 2009</td>
<td>Awareness Campaign Event: Fkh Mourir School (Boujarah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 2, 2009</td>
<td>Awareness Campaign Event: Arrazi School (Jamaâ Mezwak)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 3, 2009</td>
<td>Awareness Campaign Event: 20 August School (Kouilma-Mouklata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 4, 2009</td>
<td>Awareness Campaign Event: 6 November School (Tabola-Neqata)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 5, 2009</td>
<td>Awareness Campaign Event: Allal Bnou Abdellah School (Boujarah)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 6, 2009</td>
<td>Awareness Campaign Event: Fakh Ahmed Lhadad School (Tabola)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 17, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Credit Activity: Al Amana Association for Micro-Finance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 18, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Credit Activity: Banque Populaire Foundation for Micro-Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 19, 2009</td>
<td>Micro-Credit Activity: Fondep Association for Micro-Credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 23-30, 2009</td>
<td>Youth Leader Retreat I in Chefchaouen: case management, strategic planning and entrepreneurial spirit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun. 31 - Jul. 3, 2009</td>
<td>Youth Leader Retreat II in Chefchaouen: training of youth trainers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2009</td>
<td>Development of Entrepreneurial Guide for Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 1, 2009</td>
<td>End of YCMC project activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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