

Liberia Transition Initiative  
USAID/Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI)  
Implemented by Creative Associates International Inc. (CAII)



# **Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP)**

## **Mid-Term Evaluation Final Report**

Submitted: February 6, 2006

Consultant: Jo Anne Yeager Sallah

## Executive Summary

Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII) is implementing The Liberia Transition Initiative (LTI), a transitional support program funded by USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI). LTI is a vehicle to provide fast and flexible short-term assistance targeted at key transition needs throughout Liberia, as Liberia emerged from 15 years of war and destruction. LTI commenced operations in July 2004 and was originally scheduled to conclude operations by February 2006. In January 2006, Liberia ushered in a new period with the inauguration of the first woman president of Africa, Mrs. Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf. With this accomplishment, USAID/OTI indicated to Creative in January 2006 that the program would be extended until September 2006, allowing a bridge from the transition period to a resumption of USAID/Monrovia development programming.

In October of 2004, Monrovia witnessed an outbreak of violence stemming from a property dispute, and escalated into fighting and burning of churches and mosques throughout the city. In response to this crisis, LTI developed the Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP), an urban youth education program, focused on peace building and conflict resolution. In order to assess the progress made to date, LTI and OTI called for a mid-term evaluation of CYPEP. The mid-term evaluation was carried out in January 2006 and included interviews, a survey of CYPEP graduates, focus group discussions, and direct observation of CYPEP training sessions.

The CYPEP training was adapted from another LTI initiative, the Youth Education for Life Skills (YES) Program. To develop the CYPEP program, the YES curriculum was streamlined, condensed, and later revised to serve as the basis for the CYPEP training. CYPEP focuses on conflict resolution and the peaceful co-existence of multi-ethnic and religious groups. The strategy employed by CYPEP is to empower peer youth educators who in turn lead other community youth in a six-week participatory training program, aimed at transforming youth and giving them a new role as peace agents in their communities.

After one year of operations, CYPEP has been implemented in over 96 communities throughout Liberia. Over 4,800 urban youth have graduated from the program, 250 local facilitators trained, and eight local NGOs contracted to implement the program at the community level. A survey of CYPEP graduates as well as focus group discussions and individual interviews revealed that 62% of participants felt a strong sense of personal satisfaction from their participation in the program. Participants cited examples of how they are now able distinguish right from wrong, have a new sense of self identity and respect for others, as well as practical skills on how to resolve conflict and serve as a unifying and positive force in their communities. When survey respondents were asked which topics they considered the most important to their lives, the top five responses were (in order of frequency):

- Peace/Conflict Resolution
- HIV/AIDS/STIs
- My Identity (My skills and abilities)
- Good Governance
- Personal Health and Hygiene

Given the restructuring of the CYPEP curriculum for Phase II, Phase II graduates were also asked which individual sessions were most memorable and important to them. The clear favorite among CYPEP graduates was the session on HIV/AIDS, followed by "Who am I?", then "How to Fix

Palava.” These survey findings illustrate that the accomplishment of the program lies in the opportunity for personal transformation of war-affected youth. CYPEP was able to address a range of topics important to the youth, ensuring that participants remained interested in the subject matter and felt comfortable with the participatory training approach. The program, through its use of peer facilitators allowed participants to explore the facts, acknowledge the realities, and then to understand the choices available to them.

Having completed two phases of the program, a proposal has been submitted to USAID/OTI to continue the program for a third phase until July 2006. This additional phase of the program would target an additional 61 communities and 7,500 participants, using the proven CYPEP curriculum and training methodology.

**Key Findings from the evaluation include :**

- Creative Associates was successful in identifying a pressing, unforeseen need, and then developing an appropriate response in a timely fashion. USAID/OTI has been likewise instrumental in supporting this quick response.
- The CYPEP concept, approach, and partnership arrangements employed by Creative Associates to implement the program are effective and appropriate for the Liberian context.
- While behavior change is difficult to track, surveys conducted and personal interviews confirm that participants genuinely feel that their lives have been improved and a positive and lasting change has occurred as a result of the training.
- The value of CYPEP goes beyond peace education and conflict resolution. It serves as a foundation to re-build the shattered lives of a whole generation of Liberian youth who have missed out on the normalcy of growing-up.

**Major recommendations include :**

- While the results of the program to date are impressive, there is a need for follow-up activities. Recent graduates will feel a stronger sense of personal transformation if they can participate in follow-up activities such as community youth clubs, community development activities, and community focused volunteer activities. For the longer term, CYPEP graduates must see that there are other venues available for them including vocational and skills training, literacy, health education, etc. CYPEP should be seen as an important first step in supporting Liberian youth.
- As USAID/Monrovia prepares for the handover from OTI, the next phase of programming would be well served by incorporating the CYPEP training into their sectoral training. CYPEP has been successful in creating an environment for positive behavior change and would increase the potential success of other USAID programs. CYPEP can be utilized by USAID in several ways:
  - As an entry point for participants in vocational and skills training (after completing CYPEP, participants will be better prepared to participate in a more structured skills training setting)
  - As an additional element for over-aged student school programming (i.e. after school clubs for LTI’s Accelerated Learning Program (ALP))
  - As a model for other types of programs, including health education, environmental education, literacy, etc. The participatory learning approach using

peer facilitators and a message-based program can be adapted to a variety of programmatic needs.

- Monitoring indicators need to be developed and data collection and reporting capacity among partners strengthened. While challenging, a system for monitoring beneficiary impact should be developed.
- Partners need to better monitor master trainers and local facilitators to ensure that their skills are improved and that a clear message is communicated to participants at each session.

### **Conclusions:**

With the majority of Liberians being under the age of 35, the CYPEP is an effective vehicle to target the needs of urban youth, and ultimately to promote a more peaceful society. Graduates of the CYPEP training indicate that they have undergone a personal transformation as a result of CYPEP. By using local facilitators to lead participants through sixteen focused topics, participants are encouraged to actively share their ideas and together, they learn from each other, sending the message that they are an important person in the training and in their community. The program has made a positive contribution to the successful transition in Liberia, as complimentary voluntary activities helped to reinforce the training themes of voter education and environmental sanitation. The program has potential in a post-transition Liberia, as future vocational and skills training, health education, and literacy training for example could benefit from participants having undergone the CYPEP training in advance.

## List of Acronyms

ARS	Agricultural Relief Services
CAII	Creative Associates International Inc.
CYPEP	Community Youth Peace Education Program
DEN-L	Development Education Network - Liberia
FLY	Federation for Liberian Youth
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome
KL	KL Foundation for Welfare and Development
LF	Local Facilitator
LTI	Liberia Transition Initiative
MT	Master Trainer
NGO	Non Governmental Organization
OG	Obaa's Girls Scholarship
OLMY	Organization for Liberian Muslim Youth
OTI	Office of Transition Initiatives
PRA	Participatory Rural (or Rapid) Appraisal
REFOUND	Rural Empowerment Foundation
SCG	Search for Common Ground
SOW	Scope of Work
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
TDS	Talking Drum Studio
UNICEF	United Nations
UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia
UFAR	United Family for Reconciliation
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
YELL	Youth Empowerment and Leadership in Liberia
YES	Youth Education for Life Skills

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	ii
List of Acronyms .....	v
Table of Contents .....	vi
List of Tables .....	viii
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Background .....	1
1.2 Mid-Term Evaluation Objectives and Methodology .....	1
1.3 Evaluation Limitations .....	2
2.0 Community Youth Peace Education Program .....	2
2.1 Program Concept and Rationale .....	3
2.2 CYPEP Approach.....	3
2.2.1 Training Methodologies .....	3
2.2.2 Graduation and Youth Assemblies .....	4
2.2.3 Community Projects/ Small Grants .....	5
2.3 Program Implementation.....	7
2.3.1 Identification of Intervention Communities.....	7
2.3.2 Local Partnership Selection Procedure .....	7
2.3.3 Local Partner Staffing .....	9
2.3.4 Community Sensitization.....	10
2.3.5 Identification of Local Facilitators.....	11
2.3.6 Identification of Suitable Training Sites .....	11
2.3.7 Training Curriculum .....	12
2.3.8 Local Facilitator Training of Trainers.....	13
2.3.9 Participant Training.....	13
2.4 LTI Management Structures .....	15
2.5 Project Monitoring and Evaluation.....	15
3.0 Achievements to Date .....	16
3.1 Quantitative Results .....	16
3.2 Survey Results.....	17
3.2.1 Key Findings.....	18
3.2.2 Relevance of Training Sessions .....	19
3.2.3 Training Facilitation and Logistics .....	20
3.2.4 Impact on Participants.....	21
3.2.5 Suggestions for Improving CYPEP Training .....	23
3.3 Qualitative Data .....	23
3.3.1 Selected Quotes from Survey Respondents and Interviews .....	23
3.3.2 Community Observations .....	24
3.4 Testimonies: In their Own Words.....	25
3.4.1 Elizabeth Newton, Participants’ Mother, Soul Clinic, Monrovia .....	25
3.4.2 Mr. F. David Nebra, Community Leader, Old Road, Monrovia .....	26
3.4.3 Robert Gboluma, CYPEP Graduate, Old Road, Monrovia .....	26
3.4.4 Yvonne Clemens, CYPEP Graduate, Old Road, Monrovia .....	27
3.4.5 Joanne Freeman, CYPEP Graduate, Old Road, Monrovia .....	27
3.4.6 Uku Bono, CYPEP Master Trainer/Facilitator, OLMY .....	28

3.4.7	Marcy Larmi, CYPEP Graduate, Soul Clinic, Monrovia .....	29
3.4.8	Lusu Blame, CYPEP Graduate, Soul Clinic, Monrovia .....	29
4.0	CYPEP Strengths and Weaknesses.....	29
4.1	Strengths .....	30
4.2	Weaknesses .....	31
5.0	Recommendations .....	32
6.0	Key Findings and Lessons Learned .....	34
7.0	Conclusions .....	36
	Appendices.....	37
	Appendix A: Scope of Work.....	38
	Appendix B: List of Persons Contacted .....	41
	Appendix C: CYPEP Mid-Term Evaluation Questionnaire .....	43
	Appendix D: CYPEP Mid-Term Evaluation Interview Guide .....	48
	Appendix E: List of Phase I CYPEP Small Grants.....	51
	Appendix F: Sample Schedule for Training of Trainers.....	52

## List of Tables

Table 1. List of Partners by Phase .....	8
Table 2. Number of Facilitators Trained, by Partner and by Gender .....	13
Table 3. Number of Participants by Partner by Gender, by Phase .....	16
Table 4. Participant Targets vs. Actual CYPEP Graduates by Partners .....	17
Table 5. Number of CYPEP Graduates in Seeds of Peace Program.....	17
Table 6. Survey Respondent Summary .....	18
Table 8. Frequency of Most Important Topics Listed by Participants.....	19
Table 9. Session Ranking .....	19
Table 10. Facilitator Effectiveness.....	20
Table 11. Appropriateness of the Training Period .....	21
Table 12. Training Site Facilities .....	21
Table 13. Frequency of Reported Changes in Behavior .....	22
Table 14. Examples of Changed Behavior .....	22
Table 15. Suggestions for Improving CYPEP .....	23



## **1.0 Introduction**

Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII) contracted the services of an international consultant to conduct a mid-term evaluation of the Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP), carried out under the Liberia Transition Initiative (LTI), funded by USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives (USAID/OTI). The evaluation covers the period of January - December 2006, and was carried out over a one-month period from January 8 – February 6, 2006 with assistance from LTI and CYPEP partner staff. This report presents the findings of the mid-term evaluation, as well as documents LTI and its implementing partners' experience with the CYPEP.

### **1.1 Background**

The Liberia Transition Initiative (LTI) is funded by USAID's Office of Transition Initiatives (OTI), and is implemented by Creative Associates International, Inc. (CAII). LTI provides fast, flexible, short-term assistance targeted at key transition needs throughout Liberia. The programs originally envisioned under the LTI included: small grants, community reintegration for war-affected youth through a non-formal youth training program called the Youth Education for Life Skills (YES), and an accelerated learning program for over-aged students. The LTI team commenced efforts in July 2004 and within three months a project office with four American advisors and 30 Liberians professionals were employed and functioning in their respective jobs. The contractual period for LTI is July 2004 through February 2006, with the possibility of an extension to September 2006, based on the resumption of normal Government of Liberia operations. In January 2006, USAID/OTI indicated that LTI would be extended until September 2006, allowing the Creative team to pursue the most important and successful aspects of the initiative. Two key objectives have guided the development of all LTI activities:

LTI Objectives:

- Increase public understanding of key political transition issues; and
- Promote community reintegration and peaceful resolution of conflict.

One key element of LTI is the ability to be flexible and support initiatives that directly respond to critical problems facing Liberia's transition to stable and peaceful democratic rule. It is within this context that the Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP) was developed in November 2004 to promote peaceful co-existence among multi-ethnic and religious communities.

### **1.2 Mid-Term Evaluation Objectives and Methodology**

The evaluation was designed to review the concept and approach of the CYPEP, to document lessons learned, and to highlight successes and challenges, making recommendations for future programs of this nature. The Scope of Work for the mid-term evaluation is attached as Appendix A.

The mid-term evaluation methodology involved document review, interviews, focus group discussions, direct observation of selected training sessions, and a survey of participants. A List of Persons Interviewed is included as Appendix B. Interviews were conducted with all key partners in the Monrovia area, and selected participants in other localities (Tubmanburg and Kakata).

A questionnaire was developed to gain insight into CYPEP participants' reactions to the training content, methodology, and logistics, and to estimate the impact the training has had on their lives. The survey sample frame was Monrovia and Kakata. Respondents were randomly selected from participant training rosters in those areas, and included graduates and non-graduates. Partners were then asked to contact the participants and have them come to a central location where trained enumerators administered the questionnaire in one-on-one discussions. Based on a review of the completed questionnaires a coding guide was developed to group the responses to the open-ended questions into categories. The survey data was used in conjunction with interviews and document review to form the basis of the conclusions for this report. The survey questionnaire is included as Appendix C. An interview guide was also developed and is attached as Appendix D.

### **1.3 Evaluation Limitations**

The lack of a baseline and/or established monitoring indicators for the CYPEP presented a challenge for the mid-term evaluation. Given that the CYPEP was added as an activity after LTI was already up and running, and that the effectiveness of CYPEP required a rapid response to the escalating urban violence, CYPEP was started without conducting a formal baseline survey. This posed a limitation for the mid-term evaluation since there is no starting point from which to compare program outcome and impact. Furthermore, there are no set indicators used to monitor the program. While data<sup>1</sup> is collected from the CYPEP partners, there are no fixed indicators that are used to track performance. Available data was compiled by LTI in order to capture progress and outcome to the extent possible for the purposes of the mid-term evaluation.

Another limitation was the time frame and time allocated for the mid-term evaluation. The evaluation was carried out at a busy time in Liberia, as the Inauguration of President Ellen Johnson Sirleaf took place while the survey teams were scheduled to be in the field. Due to time limitations, the sample frame was then limited to two of the six areas covered by the CYPEP program. While a larger sample frame would have been preferable, the responses across the two cities surveyed were remarkably similar. Interviews and a focus group discussion were conducted in one additional location, Tubmanburg. The responses in Tubmanburg mirrored those of survey respondents. Therefore, the sample frame is believed to be representative of the larger group. For the final evaluation of this program, a wider sample should be conducted, including all CYPEP areas as the sample frame, as well as using a larger sample size.

## **2.0 Community Youth Peace Education Program**

The Community Youth Peace Education Program is an off-shoot of the Youth Education for Life Skills (YES) Program which is being implemented under LTI's community reintegration for war-affected youth component. Responding to a specific crisis situation in the city of Monrovia in October 2004, LTI was able to tailor its existing program to meet the pressing needs of war affected youth in key Liberian urban centers. CYPEP focuses on promoting peaceful resolution of conflicts and the peaceful co-existence of multi ethnic and religious groups. The strategy employed by CYPEP is to empower peer youth educators who in turn lead other youth in a six week participatory training program, aimed at transforming youth and giving them a new role as peace agents in their communities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Partners track participant attendance for each of the CYPEP sessions, disaggregated by gender.

## **2.1 Program Concept and Rationale**

The CYPEP was developed in response to an outbreak of violence in Monrovia in October 2004. In reaction to what was reportedly a violent encounter over a property dispute between two Liberians – one Christian and one Muslim, bands of youth burned down churches and mosques in Monrovia, thus escalating a dangerous trend of “mob justice” in the capital city. The conflict exposed the level of tension and pent-up frustration among Liberia’s urban youth. In response, LTI’s YES Program Manager, Mr. James Yarsiah, spearheaded a meeting with international and local NGOs to brainstorm possible actions to reduce this harmful trend. Ultimately, these discussions led to the development of an abridged life skills training program targeting urban youth in Liberia. Build on the existing Youth Education for Life Skills (YES) program that targeted at-risk rural youth (ages 18-35), LTI in collaboration with USAID/OTI and local partners, developed the Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP). From November 2004 to February 2005, LTI worked to further develop the program concept, identify potential communities for intervention and implementing partners, and sought to gain approval from USAID/OTI to proceed with the program. Clearly under the mandate of LTI and seen as a critical intervention, CYPEP was approved to go forward in January 2005.

## **2.2 CYPEP Approach**

Using as its foundation, the curriculum developed for the larger YES Program, a shorter or abridged course (6 weeks instead of 5 months) was developed and plans initiated to commence training by February 2005. LTI staff surveyed urban areas with large youth populations to identify priority areas, as well as met with existing local organizations with established youth programs to assess their capacity to implement the CYPEP program and to manage assets and funds, and provide timely reporting to LTI.

### **2.2.1 Training Methodologies**

Similar to the YES program, CYPEP is based on two key concepts: participatory learning and peer facilitation. Instead of a traditionally formal approach to teaching in which learning is passive, CYPEP employs an active and participatory learning approach, whereby participants are seen as resource persons, with important ideas and opinions to be shared and considered. Learning is active, with information transmitted through experience and information exchange among participants, rather than a one-directional flow of information where the teacher gives the pupil lessons to learn and memorize. By using this approach, youth that are not comfortable with the formal classroom setting are encouraged to participate, and learning is more exciting and interesting. Furthermore, participants are more likely to remember the key messages from each session because they have connected the training session messages to their own personal experience. There is no testing or requirement to read and write; all that is required is that each person participates.

Local peer facilitators are another key element of the program. Implementing partners first conduct a sensitization campaign in each community to explain CYPEP to the elders, community leaders, and youth. From this campaign, local community leaders and residents nominate youth from their communities to serve as local facilitators. These local facilitators are critical because the youth in the community are more likely to listen to “one of their own members” and take note of the information being provided, and be more convincing. The youth who are selected by their community to be local facilitators are proud that they have been selected to receive specialized training. Local facilitators are brought together for a two-week training at which time they learn

the principles of participatory learning, participatory learning techniques, and review the lesson plans for each of the sixteen CYPEP sessions. A team of three facilitators works together during each training session. Ideally facilitators take turns at different tasks (leading groups/talking/asking probing questions; recording responses on the flip chart; and posting flip charts on the walls for participants to review).

The local partner is responsible for providing a Program Coordinator and Master Trainers. The Program Coordinator position salary is covered in full by the CYPEP program and serves as the main contact point for LTI. Master Trainer salaries are also covered by CYPEP funding and serve as supervisors and advisors to the Local Facilitators. They attend the CYPEP training sessions and ensure that routine monitoring is being done correctly and in a timely fashion. A portion (25%) of the partner's Executive Director and Finance Manager/Administrative support are also covered by CYPEP. The number of Master Trainers will depend on the number of training sites agreed upon between LTI and the partner. In general, one Master Trainer oversees three training sites. Local Facilitators receive payment for their service. A set fee of US \$15.00 per month has been established for Local Facilitators, regardless of their location.<sup>2</sup>

Other inputs provided to the partner by CYPEP include: a generator to ensure proper lighting for training sites, one television and VCR, and training materials (flip chart stands, newsprint paper for sessions, markers, tape, etc.). If a vehicle is necessary to monitor the program, funds are made available for vehicle rental. In an effort to integrate CYPEP into the on-going youth programs of the partner, sports jerseys and sports equipment are provided to encourage a sense of unity and friendship among participants, many of whom have historically been divided by tribalism or religion. The partner also receives a computer and printer to ensure timely reporting to LTI. A typical contract budget for a partner carrying out one phase of training is US\$ 50,000, or US\$10,000 per month. Within each phase, there is expected to be two cycles of training, such that the training is offered twice in one community. There may be multiple classes in one community during one cycle based on the demand and the partner's capacity to effectively manage the sessions.

### **2.2.2 Graduation and Youth Assemblies**

Partners set their own requirements for graduation in consultation with the participants.<sup>3</sup> For some groups, they must attend four out of six weeks in order to graduate. For others, absences are not allowed and participants must complete all 16 sessions. Those that successfully attend the required number of sessions are awarded with a personalized certificate from LTI.

The last session of the six-week CYPEP program focuses on reflection of what participants have learned, and what they will do differently in the future, and what contribution they can make to their community and the nation. The intention of the session is to allow participants to reflect on what they have accomplished and be proud of their success and commitment. Participants are able to receive acknowledgement from the community in both their individual graduation sessions, as well as a larger youth assembly.

For each city, one Youth Assembly is held after each CYPEP training phase. For example, all participants who completed CYPEP in Monrovia were invited to participate in a two-day event in

---

<sup>2</sup> The Local Facilitator fee is the same in the YES Program that targets rural communities rather than urban area.

<sup>3</sup> LTI has established that a minimum of 13 out of the 16 sessions must be attended in order to graduate from the program. A participant can make up the missed sessions during the next cycle in order to graduate.

July 2005 to celebrate their successful completion, to continue to build unity among the different training groups, and to share their transformation stories with the larger community. Drama and dance troupes provide entertainment during the Assemblies, echoing the themes of peace building and unity. All Youth Assemblies proved highly successful and further unified youth, many of whom in the past would have incited violence when groups from different religions and ethnic groups were present.

### **2.2.3 Community Projects/ Small Grants**

As a part of Phase I, after participants had completed their training, it was announced that in an effort to mobilize the youth and put the lessons learned from the training into practice, a grant fund was made available. Facilitators were trained in project identification using participatory assessment tools and then worked with the CYPEP graduates and the community leaders to identify potential projects for funding under the program. Once a project was identified and approved, LTI staff in conjunction with the local partner would survey the proposed project site, estimate the material needs, procure the materials, and contract the specialized labor to complete the project. The community contributes time and local materials, including land in infrastructure projects.

Project selection was based mainly on the YES Program small community selection guidelines, developed by Creative and other YES partners, with guidance from USAID/OTI. Participatory Rapid Appraisal (PRA) planning techniques were employed by participating youth to identify the key problems of their communities and on the basis of this identification, to rank possible solutions. The process also promoted dialogue and consensus building with community elders, residents, and leaders. Together the youth and elders emerged with a ranking of projects from 1 – 3, with 1 being the priority activity. Each project was to be funded by OTI with an in-kind grant of roughly U.S. \$5,000 or less.

A summary of the CYPEP Phase I Community Grants is provided in Appendix E. The table provides a description of the specific projects identified by the Phase I communities as well as the amount and status of the projects. Out of 21 grants originally identified, four have been completed and dedicated, eight are currently in progress, five have been approved for funding and start up is anticipated shortly. Four of the 21 grants were cancelled prior to start up. Typically these grants were cancelled because the community failed to provide their agreed upon contribution, and/or acquiring land for the project was impossible. Land owners in the community refused to provide land space for the project. In financial terms, a total of \$106,388.66 was originally approved for small grants. However, after the four projects were cancelled as noted above, the current financial obligation for small grants is US \$ 86,130.00.

According to LTI, three problems were experienced with the small grants program:

- Delay in the identification of community project by CYPEP communities;
- Delay by community in making their contribution available for the project;
- Full participation of community members in the implementation of community small grants.

Just as had been done in Phase I, it was planned that for Phase II the existence of the grant fund would not be announced until after participants had completed the CYPEP training. Subsequently during the course of Phase II implementation, LTI learned that program funds were insufficient to continue the CYPEP community grants program. While in theory this should not have caused a

problem because the funds should not have been announced until later, during the Phase II project mobilization and staff recruitment process some of the implementing partners assumed that the grants scheme would be automatically continued, and they in-turn built expectations among the participants for a grant program. It took significant efforts on the part of OTI and Creative staff to explain the budget constraints and to dispel the expectations that had been built by partners.

#### **2.2.4 Special Events/Activities**

Just as LTI quickly responded to the October 2004 violence, a series of special events were identified and planned in response to pressing needs of the country. Building on the CYPEP training, two special events were able to further motivate the CYPEP trained youth to work together for the greater good of Liberia. These activities were essential in reinforcing CYPEP participants' understanding of a citizen's rights and responsibilities, and then allow them to put into practice what they had discussed in the training sessions.

##### ***Seeds of Peace***

As Liberia prepared for free and fair presidential and parliamentary elections, the task of educating the population was an on-going effort. However, given that youth (aged 15 and above) make up the clear majority of the Liberian population, the traditional means of voter education would not be enough to ensure a peaceful election. OTI/USAID in collaboration with LTI's local CYPEP partners developed a voter education program, using the same peer counseling techniques used in CYPEP. Participants selected to participate in this country-wide program were largely CYPEP graduates. Participation was voluntary, with participants brought together for a two-day intensive workshop on voter education. Volunteers learned effective communication techniques and focused voter education messages. Volunteers received t-shirts for their participation. During the run-off election volunteers were reconvened and given additional information on the run-off process. They were then redeployed to the field where they shared their knowledge of the run-off with their communities. Volunteers were given a t-shirt to celebrate their participation in the program but no "incentive" or compensation was given for their participation.

Interviews reported several cases where CYPEP participants who worked with Seeds of Peace were then later hired to serve as election monitors. Participants in the Seeds of Peace are overwhelmingly positive, as these youth feel that their actions played a role in the successful election process declared in Liberia in October – November 2005. Seeds of Peace helped to reinforce the messages participants discussed during the CYPEP training, and further empowered youth to speak to others with a positive message of how they can work together to help Liberia secure a brighter future.

##### ***Youth in Action***

In preparation of the Presidential Inauguration on January 16, 2006, Liberia's capital city needed a quick "face lift". The main aim of this exercise was to provide an opportunity for youth to work together and build on those things that united them, irrespective of ethnic, religious or political differences. In order to achieve this LTI /OTI helped to mobilize Monrovia youth to participate in a ten-day clean-up effort. Using the CYPEP partners to spread the word about "Youth in Action", all Monrovia youth were encouraged to participate in the activity. Just as they did in the Seeds of Peace Program, the majority of CYPEP graduates took part in this event. Once again the clean-up exercise drew upon the concepts of "keeping my environment clean" and "knowing my role as a citizen," as many participants realized that we all are responsible for keeping the city clean. Volunteers were provided with t-shirts in appreciation of their efforts. The overwhelming majority of participants during Youth in Action were willing to volunteer their time to prepare for the Inauguration. Only a small group of youth vocalized their discontent and demanded payment

for their labor. After several meetings with the group it became clear that they had not gone through CYPEP, and their perspective on their role and responsibilities as citizens differed from the others, notably the CYPEP graduates. After learning of the CYPEP, they expressed interest in learning more about how they can benefit from the program.

## **2.3 Program Implementation**

The program has progressed through several stages, and addressed numerous components at each stage. To date, two Phases have been implemented, and proposals for a third phase have been submitted to USAID/OTI. Phase I served as a pilot, which was then expanded in Phase II to new communities. Phase III proposals call for yet more training to be carried out in various parts of the country, scheduled for February – June 2006. These numerous components of the program are discussed below and where problems were noted, they are discussed along with recommendations to address the problems.

### **2.3.1 Identification of Intervention Communities**

The initial seven communities selected for CYPEP were those that had been identified by the UNMIL Peace Keeping Forces as ‘potential hot spots’ of urban violence in Monrovia. Priority was given to Monrovia since the October 2004 violence first erupted in Monrovia. Other urban areas such as Kakata, Tubmanburg, Ganta, and Gbnaga were also identified at this time and later incorporated in the CYPEP program.

In Phase II, additional communities were selected in Monrovia as well as Buchanan in Grand Bassa County. In Phase III, potential cities have been identified using slightly different criteria: locations should have some role to play in improving economic opportunities for youths, for example, the presence of a rubber plantation or other industry. Furthermore, attention is being focused on those Liberian cities that border Guinea and Cote D’Ivoire, especially in the wake of reported recruitment of Liberian youth and children to participate in the current Ivorian civil war.

### **2.3.2 Local Partnership Selection Procedure**

At the same time that potential intervention areas were selected, potential partners were identified through a survey conducted by LTI staff. Selection criteria were as follows:

- Evidence of a current program or proven experience implementing a program
- Should be a community based NGO without any political affiliation
- Should be based in the target community (should be physically based and have knowledge and experience of working within the community)
- Should have a focus on or interest in working with youth/children
- Proven experience in managing grant funds
- Officially registered organization

Every potential partner was asked to submit proof of incorporation with the Liberian Government, and provided detailed information on their staffing, resources, and past experiences with relevant youth programming, and financial management and reporting systems. Participating partners are summarized in Table 1.

Upon selection of local partners, contracts were prepared and signed, and a two-day briefing session held to explain and clarify the program and the modalities of reporting and

reimbursement. Expectations and milestones were established to facilitate effective implementation and timely progress monitoring. A basic monitoring system was developed to track daily participant attendance.

By and large, local partners selected to date have been appropriate and capable of implementing the program. Partners are contracted for a relatively short period of time to carry out community sensitization campaigns, identification of local facilitators and participants, and to participate in Master Training/Local Facilitator training, and then ultimately to conduct the CYPEP participant training. The period of the contracts are typically 5-6 months and are discrete contracts for one Phase of training (one Phase is typically made up of two training cycles or offerings). To date, any partner who has been given a second contract, conducts the training in a different community from the first phase.

Table 1. List of Partners by Phase

Phase	Organization Name	City	County	# Communities	# Graduates
<b>Phase I</b> (2/05- 8/05)	YMCA/Monrovia	Monrovia	Montserrado	5	443
	FLY	Monrovia	Montserrado	2	169
	Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	Monrovia	Montserrado	2	128
	GRACELAND	Tubmanburg	Montserrado	10	527
	YMCA/Kakata	Kakata	Bomi	13	635
	DEN-L	Gbarnga	Bong	6	331
	Agriculture Relief Services (ARS)	Ganta	Nimba	15	529
<b>Phase II</b> (9/05-2/06 estimated)	YMCA/Monrovia	Monrovia	Monserrado	10	509
	OLMY	Monrovia	Montserrado	3	212
	BUCCOBAC	Buchanan	Grand Bassa	30	1319
<b>Actual Sub-Total for Phases I and II:</b>				<b>96</b>	<b>4802</b>
<b>Phase III</b> <i>Proposed for (2/06 – 6/06)</i> <i>Illustrative list of partners listed; final selection of partners is pending.</i>	YMCA/Monrovia	Monrovia	Montserrado	13	1560
	OLMY	Monrovia	Montserrado		
	YELL	Monrovia	Montserrado		
	FLY	Monrovia	Montserrado		
	OG Scholarship	Monrovia	Montserrado		
	Lofa Youth for Progressive Action	Voinjama	Lofa	8	960
	REFOUND	Zorzor	Lofa	4	480
	ARS	Sanniquellie	Nimba	7	840
	ARS	Saclepea	Nimba	7	840
	KL Foundation	Tappita	Nimba	8	940
	United Family for Reconciliation (UFAR)	Zwedru	Gedeh	7	840
Youth Development Corps	Greenville	Sinoe	7	840	
<b>Proposed Sub-Total for Phase III:</b>				<b>61</b>	<b>7876</b>
<b>Provisional Total for Life of Project:</b>				<b>157</b>	<b>12,678</b>

**Problems:** During Phase I, FLY leadership was not strong as LTI had anticipated, and therefore, YMCA assumed responsibilities for conducting training in the FLY communities. Subsequently, FLY has changed its leadership and it is anticipated that should Phase III be authorized, FLY would be reconsidered to implement the program in Monrovia. Some difficulties were reported with DEN-L in Gbanga as well. Originally LTI understood that DEN-L would contract out the training services to other local NGOs in the specific intervention zones, while DEN-L would provide oversight and direction. This arrangement was made in recognition of the fact that DEN-L had several prior commitments and was busy with other programs that demanded significant attention. However, DEN-L ultimately decided to implement the program itself rather than contract it out. This resulted in weak supervision and oversight of the program. Participant attendance was low for the training, and while they made efforts to correct the situation, the



contact with DEN-L was still considered problematic. In both of these cases LTI successfully negotiated a resolution to the problems with minimal interference to the program.

**Recommendation:** Continued monitoring of the local partners is critical. The development of monitoring indicators may improve partner accountability and the early detection of problems. As more new partner are brought on board in a potential third Phase, local partners must be carefully scrutinized to ensure accountability and performance.

### 2.3.3 Local Partner Staffing

Since LTI covers the cost of one Program Coordinator and Master Trainers for each of the partners, the partner is responsible for fielding these full-time positions shortly after the contract is signed. Partners either recruit new program staff and/or reassign existing staff for the CYPEP. In some cases, partners have found it difficult to recruit staff with the necessary experience. CYPEP must then work with the available staff but provide additional support to build their capacity so they can effectively implement the program. This is largely the case in areas outside of Monrovia.

The minimum qualifications for the Program Coordinator are:

- University graduate or equivalent training and experience
- Previous experience working with an NGO (local or international)
- Proven supervisory and management skills
- Strong written and oral language skills in English
- Proven financial management experience (budgeting, financial reporting, etc.)

Partners also employ Master Trainers to support the Local Facilitators in technical and process aspects of the training, as well as follow up on monitoring and record keeping from the daily sessions. The number of Master Trainers to be employed by a partner will depend on the number of communities or zones being covered by the partner. On average, Master Trainers cover 2-3 communities, whereby overseeing 6-9 Local Facilitators. In some cases a Local Facilitator has been promoted to Master Trainer because of their proven level of competence, as demonstrated during CYPEP training sessions.

The minimum qualifications for a Master Trainer are:

- High school graduate (although higher education is preferred)
- Proven supervisory skills
- Demonstrated record keeping ability
- Effective Interpersonal Skills (communication skills)

Master Trainers attend the same CYPEP Training of Trainers as the Local Facilitator. During this time, Master Trainers are expected to master the subject material, facilitation techniques, and develop a rapport with the Local Facilitators that will set the foundation for a strong and supportive working relationship.

**Problems Raised:** While the Program Coordinator and Master Trainers are fully funded by LTI (100% of their work week should be dedicated to CYPEP work), they are periodically asked by their organizations to work on non-CYPEP related activities. In these instances, CYPEP funds are not being used as contracted. In some cases, CYPEP work is delegated to junior staff, but the contract calls for the Program Coordinator or the Master Trainer to be available 100% of the time,

not a junior staff person. LTI has reported some delays in reporting which could be caused by the unavailability of CYPEP program partner staff.

**Recommendation:** Now that partners and LTI have experience in the typical CYPEP workload, future contracts should be refined. LTI and partner staff should sit together to discuss which functions require the full attention of the CYPEP staff and those activities that could be completed by a subordinate staff member. Budgets should then be revised accordingly, if necessary.

### **2.3.4 Community Sensitization**

Once partners were contracted, they entered their respective communities to sensitize community leaders and youth about the program. Partners were given some flexibility on how best to achieve this. For example, YMCA/Monrovia found that if they called a meeting, typically only a few people came. However, by utilizing a local cultural troupe that walked through the community with a drum, then periodically stopping to talk with the group of people assembled around the drum, they were able to inform more community members about CYPEP. Other partners called a meeting of the elders, or through schools, or their pre-established youth programs etc. Detailed program information shared with community members included program length, approach, participant criteria, facilitator criteria, funding source and structure, etc.

One important aspect of the sensitization is clarification the issue of participant compensation. Since LTI does not provide “incentives” for participation, the policy of no compensation was made clear from the beginning of the program. Some partners experienced high levels of interest at the initial time of contact with a community. However many participants still believed that compensation would be provided, and when they started the sessions, they dropped out or even before the actual training started. This has led to some difficulties for the partners as they seek to meet the participant target number, but they find themselves short.

Several discussions have been held over this non-payment policy. It is agreed that by paying participants an “incentive” the program could increase the number of attendees. However, it is acknowledge by partners and local facilitators that the quality of participation would most certainly decline. Partners reported the satisfaction with the policy of non-payment, as they could see that after participants graduated from the course, those same youth that had dropped-out initially because of the policy, later come back and want to take the course because they have witnessed the personal transformation of their friends. This supports the claim that the training, in and of itself, is a valuable benefit to participants, not a cash payment.

**Problems Raised:** In some cases sensitization may be done too early, before everything is in place to start the training. For example, YMCA indicated that in Phase II there was a significant period of time (close to a month elapsed between the sensitization and training because of holidays, etc.) from the time that the community was first sensitized and participants signed up, to the start date of the training. When the training course started, many of the participants had taken up other activities.

**Recommendation:** Sensitization should be broken into two stages. The first stage is to introduce the concept of CYPEP to the community and to identify local facilitators. The second phase of the sensitization should be to explain the program to youth and register those interested in the training. Two stages for sensitization gives time for the local facilitators to be trained and all logistical details worked out.

### 2.3.5 Identification of Local Facilitators

Local facilitators were nominated and/or identified by the communities themselves. As noted above, through the sensitization process, individuals from the respective communities were recommended to serve as local facilitators. Partners typically identified the following criteria as needed to serve as a local facilitator:

- High School student (above 10<sup>th</sup> grade education)
- Good language skills (able to communicate effectively)
- From the respective community
- 15 – 35 years of age
- Influential in the community (good standing in the community)
- Good interpersonal relationships (relates well to others)
- Seek gender balance (men and women both represented in facilitator teams; typically 2 men and 1 woman)

**Problems Raised:** The community doesn't in all cases identify strong candidates for local facilitators. During the survey, two sessions were observed, and it was noted that the capacity of facilitator's vary greatly. Women facilitators in general seemed to be shy and lack the confidence to present. They are typically relegated to hanging posters. In one session observed, a graduate from Cycle 1 was taking on a lead facilitation role while the paid female facilitator never said a word. Individuals surveyed during the mid-term evaluation noted the problem and some participants felt that they themselves were better suited to being a local facilitator than those leading their sessions.

**Recommendation:** When soliciting nominations from the community for local facilitators, it should be made clear that the partner will make a selection from those nominees, and that not all nominees will be selected. Therefore, more facilitators should be nominated than are actually needed and the partner should conduct their own screening process for the final compliment of local facilitators. Women facilitators need to be encouraged to actively participant and demonstrate stronger leadership skills during the Master Trainer/Local Facilitator two-week Training of Trainers. Any gender imbalances should be discussed in the context of both Training of Trainers and Master Trainer supervision, to identify possible solutions to assist women facilitators to take a more active role. Regardless of gender however, local facilitator skills need to be strengthened with the support of the Master Trainers, not just monitored.

### 2.3.6 Identification of Suitable Training Sites

Local partners were charged with identifying suitable buildings to serve as training sites. Partners typically identify schools or church/mosque buildings for training. Training facilities must be large enough to hold up to approximately 40 participants with seating in a large circle so everyone can see each other. Chairs and/or benches must be available, the room should be well lit and ventilated, and have a leak free roof. In the event that sessions are to be held at night, a generator is provided by LTI to ensure participants can see each other and any work that is done on the flipcharts. The generator can also be used to operate a VCR and television to show movies that are in line with the CYPEP training. Survey data indicates that overall, the training sites selected in both Phases were satisfactory to very good.

### 2.3.7 Training Curriculum

In order to get started quickly and respond to the pressing needs of the urban youth, LTI used the curriculum developed by the YES Program in August 2004. While the YES Program was to be carried out over a five-month period of time, the CYPEP program was to be a shorter course with a specific focus on peace building and conflict resolution. LTI staff therefore developed an abridged version of the five-month course, taking what they considered to be the most important sessions. This curriculum was used for all Phase I training.

By June 2005, the YES curriculum had been thoroughly reviewed and revised in response to the experience gained from the YES program pilot phase. The YES experience revealed that the language in the modules was too complex or advance for the typical local facilitator. Furthermore, the modules contained too much detail on various topics and the exercises outlined in the session plans were too many. The revised YES modules used simple language and local terminology or vernacular (i.e. instead of conflict, module refers to “palava,” or instead of sexual intercourse, “man-woman business”) when possible. The session plans were restructured to focus on one topic per session, with a clear and specific message emerging from the session.

At the same time, response from the Phase I CYPEP training was coming back and similar problems with the modules were evident. Therefore, during a review session in August, LTI, Partner staff and Master Trainers, the decision was made to revise the CYPEP modules utilizing the work already done on the revised YES modules. Initially the revision workshop participants were instructed to use “the promotion of a peaceful co-existence” as the key criterion for selecting which YES sessions should be included in the CYPEP modules. However after careful thought, workshop participants felt that there were other pressing issues affecting urban youth that must be addressed as well, such as HIV/AIDS and Sexually Transmitted Infections (STIs). The result of the revision was therefore an abbreviated set of four training modules. To make it easier for facilitators to use the modules, they were broken down into separate module documents rather than one bulky training document.

**Problems Raised:** Throughout the revised modules, references are made to a “five-month” training period, which is just a matter of a thorough edit. Other such references to the YES training should be removed since they create confusion for the Local Facilitators. In other cases, the content and exercises designed to illustrate a point during the session should be critically reviewed. For example, the session on the Gap between the Rich and the Poor was considered to be one of the more important sessions by participants. While the concept is good, the exercises do not effectively lead to the intended conclusion. In particular, if left as is, this session could leave participants with an ambiguous message regarding how to redress inequality (one conclusion could be that they should use violent means). As currently laid out, the local facilitator needs to be very skilled to move the group around to the message that the youth and the poor of the country will use peaceful means to seek greater justice. The consultant had the opportunity to observe this session being conducted and it was clear that the Local Facilitator had left the message ambiguous, but the Master Trainer concluded the session by saying “We will no longer allow anyone to use the youth to bear arms against our country.” This effective conclusion made it clear that violence is not the solution and that just as the poor are exploited, so have the Liberian youth.

**Recommendation:** The curriculum needs to be reviewed one more time for editing. The session on the Gap Between Rich and Poor should be reviewed for content and process to ensure that this important session leaves participants with a positive and clear message, which is consistent with the CYPEP message of conflict resolution through nonviolence and peaceful co-existence.

### 2.3.8 Local Facilitator Training of Trainers

At the same time that implementing partners were identified, LTI started discussions with various training entities that could assist in training Master Trainers and Local Facilitators in the CYPEP approach and curriculum. In Monrovia, LTI contracted Search for Common Ground/Talking Drum Studios. They carried out the initial training in Monrovia and trained Master Trainers and Local Facilitators in the CYPEP curriculum and participatory learning techniques. The course was conducted over a two-week period at the Baptist Seminary campus just outside of Monrovia. Participants and Facilitators were resident at the site for the duration of the course in order to encourage an *esprit de corps* among facilitators and Master Trainers. The CYPEP Training of Trainers course was offered twice in Monrovia: first in Phase I using the original curriculum, then a second time in Phase II using the revised curriculum. The general training agenda and schedule for the CYPEP Training of Trainers is attached as Appendix F.

For other localities, LTI staff conducted the training themselves with support from other training specialists and partner staff. Facilities located near the respective locality were used for the two-week training. Local facilitators reported that the trainers were highly effective and competent in their subject areas. Some local facilitators indicated they would like to have basic amenities available during their stay (i.e. body and laundry soap) to make the experience more comfortable, as well as ensuring that the generator is in proper working order for the duration of the training.

Table 2 provides a summary of the number of local facilitators trained, by partner and by gender.

Table 2. Number of Facilitators Trained, by Partner and by Gender

Partner	Total Facilitators Trained	# Facilitators Trained by Gender			
		Male		Female	
YMCA/Monrovia	65	38	58%	27	42%
FLY	12	8	67%	4	33%
Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	30	25	83%	5	17%
GRACELAND	24	18	75%	6	25%
YMCA/Kakata	24	14	58%	10	42%
DEN-L	33	28	85%	5	15%
Agriculture Relief Services (ARS)	27	19	70%	8	30%
BUCCOBAC	54	38	70%	16	30%
<b>Total</b>	<b>269</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>70%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>30%</b>

**Problems Raised:** Those partners interviewed indicated that the training was every effective, however, using the original curriculum, facilitators felt they were not given adequate time to fully comprehend all of the sessions. Since the curriculum has been revised this should not be as significant of a problem.

**Recommendations:** Efforts should be made to give participants (in this case, the Local Facilitators and Master Trainers) the opportunity to experience each and every session.

### 2.3.9 Participant Training

During the second stage of the community sensitization, potential participants typically register for the program. Class size is usually limited to 40 participants, as this has proven to be the most manageable size. Furthermore, it is difficult to find a training site that can comfortably accommodate more than 40 participants. Each participant should have a seat and the seating is in

a circle, to show that everyone in the room is equal and it is easy to make eye contact and to listen to each other. Participants in each training group are ideally of mixed religions and ethnic groups, as well as having as much gender balance as possible. Local facilitators decide along with participants the best meeting days and times for the group.

Each session follows a standardized procedure, including a welcome period to relax and focus attention on the training, followed by a review designed to highlight the key message from the previous session. The topic for the session is then presented and various exercises carried out to examine the topic, allowing participants to express their opinions and to come to conclusions on their own. The facilitator ends the session by highlighting the key message for the day and then the group ends the session with another closing exercise, usually a song of unity. Facilitators are encouraged to make the sessions interesting. If participants appear tired or bored, they introduce an “energizer” to let them refocus their attention on the activities of the session.

The three facilitators should work as a team, rotating responsibilities for leading sessions, writing on the newsprint, and posting the newsprint on the walls for participations to review during the session. One facilitator is usually responsible for taking attendance at each session. Facilitators are instructed to arrive at the training site 30 minutes prior to the scheduled start time. During this time, they are instructed to make sure that the room is clean, chairs are arranged in a circle, and to prepare any training materials needed for the day. In addition, they should use this time to review their lesson plan and make sure they are prepared for the session.

**Problems Raised:** Participants and facilitators from Phase I indicated that the material could not be completed in the allotted two hours each session. Another problem noted by partners was the resistance of some participants to cooperate with the training program in the absence of a sitting fee or some compensation of their time. While some other training programs in Liberia do concede to such demands, LTI and USAID/OTI have remained consistent on the principle of nonpayment of sitting fees. While the issue was raised repeatedly, the partners, master trainers, and facilitators uniformly responded that if a sitting fee were paid, participants would not benefit as much from the course. Furthermore, it was noted that while some participants who refuse to accept the policy may be disruptive during the first few sessions, usually within the first week they start to see the relevance of the training and they then participate in a constructive manner for the rest of the training. In other cases, other participants have asked the disruptive participant to leave the training so others may focus their attention on the subject matter. Participants raised the issue of weak facilitators in some cases. While typically one or two of the three are capability, the third facilitator often sits back and has little involvement in the facilitation process. In the majority of cases when this issue was raised, the facilitator in question was a woman.

**Recommendations:** The mid-course curriculum revisions have largely taken care of the curriculum problem, as participants surveyed from Phase II did not have the same criticism.

Continue to apply the non-payment policy in order to empower youth to see the value of the program. If a participant continues to complain during the sessions, they should be encouraged to reconsider their interest in the training. In many cases, pressure applied by the other participants will resolve the situation. Efforts to improve the initial sensitization should be reinforced to ensure all potential participants fully understand the terms of the training.

Master trainers should follow-up with local facilitators to improve and upgrade the quality of facilitation skills. Special efforts should be made to improve the quality of female facilitators, given that Liberian women have traditionally taken a backseat to men in public settings.

## **2.4 LTI Management Structures**

Since CYPEP was developed after the original LTI project design, dedicated staff was not originally envisioned. CYPEP however was exactly the type of quick response solution to a problem that its designers intended. LTI has successfully managed the existing staff to implement the program. Leading the effort is a Program Manager who is also responsible for LTI's contribution to the YES Program. He provides guidance and leadership to the LTI staff, as well as local partner staff. He directly manages four staff: a Training and Curriculum Advisor, a Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist, a Youth Advisor, and an Administrative and Finance Assistant. For CYPEP Phase I community projects, the LTI Grants Engineer and the Grants Development Officers (GDOs) support CYPEP community projects by reviewing architectural and physical plans, and ensuring that estimates for materials and technical requirements are appropriate. They also monitor construction and installation of any materials that are purchased under the CYPEP to ensure they are properly implemented. The GDOs prepare procedural and contractual documentation and help to monitor the implementation of the grants. The LTI Chief of Party supports CYPEP efforts with leadership and support. Administrative, logistical support, and data base management are also provided to CYPEP through LTI general office staff.

## **2.5 Project Monitoring and Evaluation**

Since the CYPEP was not an activity originally envisioned under LTI, no baseline survey was conducted for the program. Impact evaluation of participants is seen as highly sensitive as any indication that they are being tested creates a negative impression and discourages participation. Data forms were developed for the program by LTI and local facilitators are responsible for documenting participant attendance for each session. Master Trainers are charged with collecting and reviewing the data. The Program Coordinators from each partner then submit monthly reports to LTI providing analysis of the data collected, highlighting the problems encountered, and proposing solutions as appropriate. The LTI Monitoring and Evaluation specialist enters data into a database and provides reports to LTI and USAID/OTI leadership as necessary. LTI has the capacity to increase the level of reporting on CYPEP. Partner staff on the other hand, may require additional training in order to collect additional data in a timely and consistent manner and then analyze the data. At present, data includes the following:

- Number of participants targeted by partner, by gender
- Number of participants graduated by partner, by gender

In order to get a more comprehensive picture of CYPEP activity, some additional indicators may include:

- Number of trainings held by partner (one cycle of training equals one training; one training is conducted at one site; if two separate classes are run concurrently at one site, that would count as two trainings) LTI would then present the total number of training courses completed.
- Number of hours of participant training completed (number of sessions times 2 hours each times number of participants) (each partner would submit their total which would then be added up for a total LTI figure).
- Percentage of participants completing the course. (Drop out rates)
- Number of facilitators/Master trainers trained in CYPEP approach and curriculum
- Number of hours of volunteer activity (total number of participants times # of hours per volunteer activity)

Impact is difficult to measure for the reasons cited above. In the final evaluation, in addition to increasing the sample size to include all training areas and partners, some of the respondents contacted during this mid-term evaluation should be re-interviewed, to assess the longer-term impact on them from the training.

### 3.0 Achievements to Date

Achievements are separated into two categories: quantitative and qualitative. Section 3.1 attempts to draw a picture through statistical analysis of data collected through routine monitoring and the mid-term evaluation participant survey. Qualitative data was collected through interviews and observations and is then presented in Section 3.2.

### 3.1 Quantitative Results

Routine monitoring by partners provides data on facilitators and trainees. Given CYPEP has been operation for roughly only one year, the number of participants trained is considerable and impressive. A total of 269 local facilitators have been identified and trained in participatory facilitation techniques. Over 4,800 participants in 96 communities throughout Liberia have received the CYPEP training. Efforts have been made to encourage female facilitators and participants to be a part of the CYPEP training. Thirty percent of local facilitators have been women, while 39% of participants are female.

Table 3. Number of Participants by Partner by Gender, by Phase

Phase I Partner	Participants Trained	# of Participants Trained by Gender			
		Male		Female	
YMCA/Monrovia	443	248	56%	195	44%
FLY	169	122	72%	47	28%
Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	128	100	78%	28	22%
GRACELAND	527	332	63%	195	37%
YMCA/Kakata	635	362	57%	273	43%
DEN-L	331	184	56%	147	44%
Agriculture Relief Services (ARS)	529	262	50%	267	50%
<b>Phase I Sub-Total</b>	<b>2762</b>	<b>1610</b>	<b>58%</b>	<b>1152</b>	<b>42%</b>
Phase II Partner	Participants Trained	# of Participants Trained by Gender			
		Male		Female	
YMCA/Monrovia	509*	285	56%	224	44%
Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	212*	144	68%	68	32%
BUCCOBAC	1,319	778	59%	541	41%
Phase II Sub-Total	2,040	1,207	60%	833	40%
<b>Total</b>	<b>4802</b>	<b>2817</b>	<b>59%</b>	<b>1985</b>	<b>41%</b>

\* Partner has completed only One Cycle of training and has not yet submitted numbers for participants in Cycle 2. Number is anticipated to be higher after Cycle 2 results are submitted.

After partners were selected, the partners surveyed the communities identified by LTI and they developed a targeted number of participants. This target was then agreed upon between the partner and LTI, and partners went out to meet their targets. After the initial sensitization was carried out, participants were registered and training initiated. Partners and LTI set a minimum number of required classes in order to receive a certificate (participants must be present for 13 of the 16 CYPEP sessions). In the event a participant does not meet the required attendance, s/he is



asked to repeat those sessions in the next cycle. During the first Phase, partners gained an understanding of reasons for participant “drop-outs” and therefore the level of completion among participants in Phase II was higher than in Phase I. Given that participants do not receive compensation for their participation, and in most cases, no refreshments or other “incentives” are provided, the attendance rates are considered impressive. Table 4 highlights the completion rates by partner and phase.

Table 4. Participant Targets vs. Actual CYPEP Graduates by Partners

<b>Phase I Partners</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>% Achievement</b>
YMCA/Monrovia	480	443	92%
GRACELAND	640	527	82%
FLY (Federation of Liberian Youth)	360	169	47%
Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	360	128	36%
YMCA/Kakata	640	635	99%
DEN-L	1080	331	31%
Agriculture Relief Services (ARS)	800	529	66%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3640</b>	<b>2762</b>	<b>76%</b>
<b>Phase II Partners</b>	<b>Target</b>	<b>Achievement</b>	<b>% Achievement</b>
YMCA/Monrovia	840	509	61%*
Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	260	212	82%*
BUCCOBAC	1260	1319	105%**
<b>Total</b>	<b>2360</b>	<b>2040</b>	<b>86%</b>

\* Percent achievement is based on number of trainees completing cycle 1 and cycle 2

\*\* Percent achievement is based on trainees completing only cycle 1

The Seeds of Peace volunteer activity provided a unique opportunity for CYPEP graduates to participate in the voter information campaign in Liberia in August/September 2005. While the program was not limited to CYPEP graduates, a considerable number of CYPEP graduates were involved. Table 5 summarizes CYPEP graduate involvement in Seeds of Peace. Of the total number of CYPEP graduates in Phase I (2,762), 55% volunteered their time for the Seeds of Peace Program. The majority of CYPEP graduates therefore felt compelled to give freely of their time and energy to support a national goal of a peaceful and sound election process. A similar number of CYPEP graduates volunteered for the Youth in Action – Monrovia Clean-up program as well, however volunteers were not registered as they were in Seeds of Peace. It is estimated that 50% of Youth in Action participants were also CYPEP graduates.

Table 5. Number of CYPEP Graduates in Seeds of Peace Program

<b>Partner</b>	<b>CYPEP Volunteers</b>	<b># of Participants Trained by Gender</b>	
		<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>
YMCA/Monrovia	406	283	123
Organization of Muslim Youth (OLMY)	128	90	38
GRACELAND	115	65	49
YMCA/Kakata	431	285	146
Agriculture Relief Services (ARS)	450	235	215
<b>Total</b>	<b>1530</b>	<b>958</b>	<b>571</b>

### 3.2 Survey Results

The mid-term evaluation utilized a simple survey tool to ask CYPEP graduates about their experience with the training. The responses to the survey provide insights into the types of

changes observed by participants themselves. Open-ended responses were grouped by theme and are presented below for analysis.

### 3.2.1 Key Findings

A total of 57 participants were surveyed, of which 61% were male and 39 % female. The survey sample reflects the gender participation in the course, where approximately 60% of participants are male and 40% are female. The following table summarizes the survey respondents by CYPEP partner.

Table 6. Survey Respondent Summary

Partner/Phase	Male	%	Female	%	Total
<b>YMCA/Monrovia</b>					
<b>Phase I</b>	16	70 %	7	30 %	23
<b>Phase II</b>	6	55 %	5	45 %	11
<b>Subtotal</b>	22	65 %	12	35 %	34
<b>YMCA/Kakata</b>					
<b>Phase I</b>	9	53 %	8	47 %	17
<b>Phase II</b>	0	0 %	0	0 %	0
<b>Subtotal</b>	9	53 %	8	47 %	17
<b>OLMY</b>					
<b>Phase I</b>	1	100 %	0	100 %	1
<b>Phase II</b>	3	60 %	2	40 %	5
<b>Subtotal</b>	4	67%	2	33 %	6
<b>Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>61 %</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>39 %</b>	<b>57</b>

Forty-one of the survey respondents or 72% participated in Phase I training, while 16 respondents (28%) participated in Phase II CYPEP training. Tracking respondents by Phase is important as issues raised during Phase I have subsequently been addressed and changes should be reflected in Phase II participant responses.

Table 7. Participant Expectations

Level to Which Expectations Were Met	Training Partner						Total	%
	YMCA/ Monrovia	%	YMCA/ Kakata	%	OLMY	%		
<b>None (0 – 19%)</b>	1	3 %	2	12 %	0	0 %	3	5 %
<b>Few (20%-25%)</b>	4	12 %	1	6 %	1	17 %	6	11 %
<b>About Half (46-55%)</b>	9	26 %	3	18 %	1	17 %	13	23 %
<b>Majority (56-90%)</b>	8	24 %	3	18 %	3	50 %	14	25 %
<b>All (91-100%)</b>	12	35 %	8	47 %	1	17 %	21	37 %
<b>Total</b>	34	100%	17	100%	6	100%	57	100%

Analysis of the data indicates that the overwhelming majority of participants in the program felt that their expectations for the training were met. Thirty-seven percent of respondents felt all of their expectations were met, and 25% felt that the majority of their expectations were met. In combination, 62% of survey respondents indicated the majority of their expectations were met. One can therefore conclude that the majority of participants were satisfied with the training

course. While sensitization sessions are carried out before the training commences, partners indicated that some participants had unrealistic expectations for the training, which included employment, vocational training, and compensation.

### 3.2.2 Relevance of Training Sessions

Survey respondents were asked which sessions they considered the most important or relevant to them (maximum of five sessions). Based on the frequency of responses, the ranking of importance of the top five topics is then noted by Phase. Even with revisions to the curriculum, the top five sessions remained the same across Phases. The five most important responses are presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Frequency of Most Important Topics Listed by Participants

Training Topics	Phase I		Phase II		Total	
	Freq.	Rank	Freq.	Rank	Freq.	Rank
<b>Peace/Conflict Resolution</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>HIV/AIDS/STIs</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>My Skills and Abilities (My Identity)</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Good Governance</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Personal Health and Hygiene</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>5</b>
Gap Between Rich and Poor	3		5		8	
Community Sanitation/Environment	7		0		7	
Self Employment	3		3		6	
Leadership	2		2		4	
Voting	2		2		4	
Human Rights	4		0		4	
Gender and Peace	2		0		2	
Community Development	2		0		2	
Other	18		1		19	

Similarly, participants were asked which sessions were the least important to them. Two of the 57 participants surveyed identified “Making a Living” as an irrelevant session. All other survey respondents said all sessions were relevant.

Given the restructuring of the CYPEP curriculum for Phase II, Phase II graduates were then probed further on specific session topics. The most memorable sessions from Phase II was on HIV/AIDS, followed by “Who am I?” then “How to Fix Palava.”

Table 9. Session Ranking

Session Title (Phase II)	Frequency	Ranking
<b>Who am I?</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>2<sup>nd</sup></b>
What is important to me?	2	
Palava and the Changes it Brings	3	
We are different people but one community	4	
<b>How to fix palavas in our community</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup></b>
<b>Things I am Good at doing and How I make a living</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4<sup>th</sup></b>
Keeping my body clean	2	
Sexual Illnesses	2	
<b>HIV/AIDS</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup></b>

Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco	2	
<b>Gap Between Rich and Poor</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5<sup>th</sup></b>
Leadership	2	
Citizenship	1	
Voting in Elections	2	

### 3.2.3 Training Facilitation and Logistics

Participants were asked to assess the quality of the local facilitators. They were asked to comment on four aspects of the facilitators' performance, and their responses were then put into one of three options: very well, somewhat, and not at all. Across all four criteria, local facilitators uniformly performed very well, with 94% of respondents indicating the local facilitators did a very good job across the four areas.

Table 10. Facilitator Effectiveness

Criteria for Facilitator Evaluation	Very Well		Somewhat		Not at All	
	<i>Freq</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Freq</i>	<i>%</i>	<i>Freq</i>	<i>%</i>
<b>Facilitator mastered the subject matter</b>	51	91	4	7	1	2
<b>Facilitator encourages participation</b>	53	95	3	5	0	0
<b>Facilitator makes sessions interesting/exciting</b>	52	93	3	5	0	0
<b>Facilitator ended each session with a clear message</b>	54	96	1	2	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>52.5</b>	<b>94%</b>	<b>2.75</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>1%</b>

The most frequent comment regarding facilitators was that they presented the material in a clear fashion so that the participant understood the material (53 comments). Respondents also noted that facilitators encouraged participants to talk and ask questions (26 comments). They made the sessions interesting by singing songs (20 responses), told jokes and stories (13 responses), followed by ice breakers (12 responses) and dramas (8 responses). Participants surveyed also felt that facilitators respected participants' ideas/inputs/opinions (26 responses). It was noted in only a few cases that facilitators had weak presentation/speaking skills (3 responses), limited discussion (1 response), and/or showed anger toward participants (1 response). Based on these comments, it can be said that the local facilitators are well trained and do an effective job at creating an atmosphere conducive to learning and personal growth.

Survey results show that overall, participants felt at ease and confident in the local facilitators' abilities. As a cautionary note, given that this is most likely the participants' first exposure to this style of participatory learning, as such careful attention must be paid to the continual refining of local facilitator skills. Furthermore, as peers from their community, some respondents may not feel at liberty to criticize their peer's facilitation skills, and thus the survey finding may be uncharacteristically positive. Based on direct observations of training sessions, there is clearly room for improvement by local facilitators.

The survey asked whether the length of the training was appropriate. Broken down by Phase, it is clear that in Phase I, the material could not be adequately covered during the six-week training period, and the majority of participants thought the training should be longer. However, in Phase II, using a revised, abbreviated curriculum, the overwhelming majority of respondents felt that the length of the training was just right.

Table 11. Appropriateness of the Training Period

Length of the Training	Phase I		Phase II		Total	
	Responses	%	Responses	%	Responses	%
<b>Too Short</b>	17	44	2	13	19	35
<b>Too Long</b>	4	10	1	6	5	9
<b>Just Right</b>	18	46	13	81	31	56
Total	39	100	16	100	55	100

In an effort to determine the appropriateness of the logistical arrangements provided by LTI to implement the CYPEP training, participants surveyed were asked to rate different logistical aspects of the training sites. These included room site, cleanliness, seating availability, and lighting. Based on the survey responses presented in Table 12, training facilities used for the CYPEP training are good in 58% of the cases, and 35% of respondents said that the facilities were excellent. Only 7% of survey respondents indicated that the CYPEP training facilities were poor or problematic. The CYPEP partners are doing a good job of finding suitable training sites. The conditions of the training rooms helps to keep the participants focused on the subject at hand.

Table 12. Training Site Facilities

Factor	Rating Scales					
	<i>Too Small</i>		<i>Too large</i>		<i>Just Right</i>	
<b>Room Size</b>	7	13%	6	10%	43	77%
<b>Cleanliness</b>	<i>Dirty</i>		<i>Very Clean</i>		<i>Fine/Acceptable</i>	
	3	5%	21	38%	32	57%
<b>Seating</b>	<i>No Seating</i>		<i>Chairs for each</i>		<i>Benches/Acceptable</i>	
	5	9%	35	62%	16	29%
<b>Lighting</b>	<i>Poorly Lit</i>		<i>Well Lit</i>		<i>Enough Light</i>	
	0	0%	17	31%	37	69%
<b>Average Rating</b>	<i>Poor Facilities</i>	7%	<i>Excellent Facilities</i>	35%	<i>Good Facilities</i>	58%

### 3.2.4 Impact on Participants

A key factor in determining whether the CYPEP is effective, is tracking behavior changes associated with the training. However, since a baseline behavior study was not done it is not possible to determine whether changes have in fact taken place. Furthermore, given the sensitivity of working with war-affected youth in Liberia, it is not advisable to conduct any kind of survey, which may seem like testing. In order to capture changes in behavior, participants were asked a series of questions to determine in which ways, if any, they believe that they behave differently because of the training.

Table 13 highlights the frequency of responses to the question “How have you changed as a result of CYPEP?” The most frequent response was that participants had changed from “being bad to good.” When pressed for an example of this, respondents indicated that they had been violent in the past, and now they are not. The second most frequently cited change attributed to CYPEP, was that participants are now willing to intervene to stop a fight or resolve a conflict. Many stories were shared with how participants now feel empowered and skilled at convincing others that conflict, and physical violence towards others, is not the best solution. Respondents were proud that they had gained a sense of respect for others and they are now more polite (13 responses). The fourth most frequent reported change was that youth now practice safe sex. This

includes limiting sexual contact to one partner, using condoms, practicing abstinence, and no longer having sex with prostitutes.

Table 13. Frequency of Reported Changes in Behavior

<b>Reported Changes in Behavior</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
I was a bad person (violent); now I'm good	24
I try to resolve conflict; try to bring people together	16
I am more polite and respectful to others	13
I practice safe sex	9
I don't discriminate against others	4
I keep my surroundings clean	3
I have better personal hygiene	2
I stay away from bad practices	2
I am willing to volunteer	2
I love myself and have good self esteem	1
Other	13
Total	89

Survey respondents were asked the same general question in a slightly different way in an attempt to filter out any “stock” answers. Comparison of their description of changed behavior and examples of changed behavior yielded similar results.

Table 14. Examples of Changed Behavior

<b>Description of Behavior</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Total</b>
Intervene to resolve conflict	19	9	28
Do the “right” things rather than causing trouble	5	7	12
Practice safe sex	6	5	11
Speak openly with others	2	3	5
Talk with others about CYPEP	2	1	3
Joined a youth group	1	2	3
Take better care of myself	1	2	3
Clean my environment	1	1	2
Participated in voter education	2	0	2
Analyze the root causes of problems	1	0	1
Other	4	4	8

Based on the survey data, the top five ways that participants have been changed as a result of the CYPEP training are as follows:

- Intervene to resolve conflict
- Do the right thing; avoid being a bad person
- Practice safe sex
- Show more respect to others
- Have confidence to speak openly with others.

### 3.2.5 Suggestions for Improving CYPEP Training

Participants felt overwhelmingly that the training was good and did not need improvement. Instead, the most frequent suggestion for CYPEP was that it be expanded and spread to other communities. Given that CYPEP provides only two cycles of training in one community and then moves on to a different community, participants are keen to suggest that the same training be made available to others in their communities. The second most frequently made suggestion was that some compensation be made to participants. Given that out of 57 survey respondents, only 9 or 8% of respondents requested financial compensation, the suggestion must be viewed as “nice to have” but not “essential for the success of CYPEP”. While the suggestion is noted, the current USAID/OTI/LTI policy of not paying for participation in the program need not be revised.

Table 15. Suggestions for Improving CYPEP

<b>Suggestion</b>	<b>Phase I</b>	<b>Phase II</b>	<b>Total</b>
Extend the training to other communities/youth	17	9	26
Compensate participants with financial incentives	7	2	9
Extend the length of the training	3	0	3
Include a community development project	2	0	2
Provide refreshments during sessions	0	2	2
Encourage participants to share CYPEP with others	1	1	2
No response	2	0	2
Provide recreational activities along side training	0	1	1
Other	12	0	12

### 3.3 Qualitative Data

In addition to statistical and survey data, a series of focus group discussions and individual interviews were held with partners, Master Trainers and Local Facilitators, and participants from Phases I and II. The quotes and comments made during these sessions also provide an insight into the personal stories of transformation.

#### 3.3.1 Selected Quotes from Survey Respondents and Interviews

Notable quotes from the mid-term evaluation include:

“Now if someone slaps me, instead of slapping back, I ask them why did they do that rather than hitting back. Nonviolence is in my heart now.”

“When I see palava (conflict) I stop it, because a small fight can end up being a big fight.”

“It made me know how important I am and to have high esteem for myself. It made me know good from bad.”

“It taught me how to live with my neighbor, and not be aggressive.”

“One day I saw two children fighting and I separated them. Others walking past asked me why I separated the two children and I said because I am a graduate of LTI and I know that fight is not good; violent acts are not good.”

### **3.3.2 Community Observations**

Implementing partners shared examples of impact in the community. They are summarized below:

#### **YMCA/Kakata:**

- The elders of the community are now selecting CYPEP graduates to represent them in county government meetings. Due to a lack of trust between the generations, where youth were disrespectful of the elders and youth were seen as trouble makers, after the CYPEP program, the two groups have learned to work together and respect that each side has a right to their position, and that they can learn from each other – the combination of both of their view points will make the community stronger.
- CYPEP participants instituted the practice whereby CYPEP sessions are opened and closed with either a Christian and Muslim prayer. Through the training they have gained recognition of the need to respect different practices and to appreciate the differences rather than to fight over them. Thus the CYPEP training has had an impact on increased religious tolerance.
- The sanitation of the community has improved, as youth now see their role in keeping their surroundings clean instead of it being the sole responsibility of government.
- As a result of CYPEP, there is more dialogue and an open and frank discussion between the elders and youth on HIV/AIDS.
- Each participant in the program signed a non-violence pledge. During the course of the training, and even afterwards, youth held each other accountable to that pledge.

#### **GRACELAND/Tubmanburg:**

- During the election process, due to Seeds of Peace and CYPEP efforts, youths in Tubmanburg did not deface political posters, and at one point two opposing political party candidates were campaigning in the city simultaneously, yet there were no reports of clashes or violence. The city was pleased to see a calm acceptance of the rights of others to express their opinions and willingness to stay peaceful during this period.
- Graduates of the CYPEP Program and participants in the Seeds of Peace program were later identified by the Election Commission to serve as paid Electoral Observers. This speaks to the level of professionalism and maturity displayed by participations during these programs.
- The process of participatory project identification at the end of the Phase I training brought the community together and demonstrated an improved level of cooperation and peaceful co-existence in the community. For example, in the past, a similar project would have been problematic with materials being stolen or groups acting out violently if there were project delays. After CYPEP, all elements of the community were patient and trusting.

#### **Organization of Liberian Muslim Youth (OLMY):**

- After the CYPEP training, OLMY facilitators have encouraged the development of youth groups to carry on the positive momentum and service to their communities. One such



group has been formed in Old Road Community. The Old Road Youth Development Association currently has over 350 members and they meet twice each week. This group was formed first to identify a community need for funding under the CYPEP Small Grant fund. Over 100 of the association's members have completed the CYPEP training and they remain active in recruiting new members. The organization was just formed in July 2005, and they have plans to draft a constitution and then register the group with the Liberian government that will allow them to raise funds to support community development projects. The membership has already identified improved drainage as pressing community need that requires attention. The goals of the group are to work together to settle conflict, create a sense of unity from which joint action can be taken to support the community and to promote an understanding of people from different ethnic or religious backgrounds.

#### **YMCA/Monrovia:**

- In addition to a reduced level of crime rates in communities with CYPEP, YMCA reflected on an increase of youth volunteering. Both through Seeds of Peace and Youth in Action, CYPEP graduates are willing to participate and continue to share the messages of peace and cooperation during these volunteer activities. The impact of volunteerism on the community is significant. When the community sees that the youth are now agents of positive development for the community rather than a destructive and divisive force, the communities is more willing to embrace the youth and to promote them and give them positive feedback. The community starts to value the youth for the contribution they are making for the community and the sacrifices they are making to ensure that the community is a healthier, safer, and violence free environment.
- The CYPEP program facilitated the YMCA's efforts to bring youth together through sports and recreation by supporting sports days, whereby youths from different backgrounds and religions can come together, play football together, and practice the principles of peaceful co-existent on the field as well as in the training room.

### **3.4 Testimonies: In their Own Words**

During the course of the mid-term evaluation several participants were interviewed. Some of the personal stories are presented here to highlight the impact that CYPEP has had on their lives and what they think it means for their futures.

#### **3.4.1 Elizabeth Newton, Participants' Mother, Soul Clinic, Monrovia**

Ms. Newton has five children of her own and is also taking care of her brother's daughter. Since joining the CYPEP program she has noticed a positive change in both the community youth, and happily, her own children. Her boys used to stay out all night long, getting into fights. They would talk back to her and were overall disrespectful. Since CYPEP, they interact differently with friends. She has seen a change in their lifestyle – no fighting, no abusing others.

*“Because of the war everything has put off the youth. People are busy trying to make ends meet or stay safe, and no one has taught the youth how to be good citizens – good people. The Local Facilitators encourage the youth to attend. They learn about how to go about their daily life, and they know that the financial benefits will come in the future. Now our children can grow up to be good citizens.”*

*Elizabeth Newton, Soul Clinic, Monrovia*

“As for my girls,” she says with a sigh, “they are difficult. They are always thinking about boys, and they used to go with the boys.” She then explains, “One of my girls has a baby, but now she knows the danger of HIV/AIDS.” Elizabeth reports that her daughter isn’t sneaking out at night anymore and she now wants to be a good girl because she knows that it involves her future.

As a community leader, Mrs. Newton has noticed how the community has changed. At first, the youth were not so sure about the training, but since the first group has graduated, their positive behavior has shown the other youth the benefits of the program. Now so many other youth are interested in attending the training. As a community, they would like to see how they could incorporate or include the local schools in the program. YMCA is the local partner for the Soul Clinic training.

### **3.4.2 Mr. F. David Nebra, Community Leader, Old Road, Monrovia**

Mr. Nebra is a teacher and a political party activist in his community. His house is right across from the Old Road CYPEP training site, being implemented by the Organization for Liberian

*“I was so happy to see the youth wearing the Seeds of Peace t-shirts – happy to see our youth doing this sort of work to bring peace in our country. Our lives were in disarray because of the war . . . but Liberians are quick to adjust. In the future we will talk about legal justice and we won’t take the violent route again.”*

*Mr. F. David Nebra, Teacher, Old Town Road, Monrovia*

Muslim Youth (OLMY). As the training has progressed, he could see changes in the participants’ behavior. He notes that many of the youth in the community were his students, and they used to be rude and undisciplined. As a participant in the political process, he noted that the youth used to be very aggressive towards him because he was supporting one political party. They would yell cruel things and disrespect him -- some youth even threatened his life. He was so surprised when after the CYPEP training, those same youth came to apologize to him for having been rude.

After the training, and during the Seeds of Peace Program, they changed he says. “They realized that they needed to be decent citizens. They would talk to people and say, “Liberia is for everyone – we need to avoid the old destructive ways”. Rather than being violent like before, now they are working hard to make a contribution to our community.” He was pleased to see that after the election most people accepted the results, and that the youth are thinking in a positive way. They are now empowered to discuss peace and conflict resolution with even the most disruptive elements in our community. The clean up effort in our community also brought the youth together and showed them how much they can accomplish when they work together.

### **3.4.3 Robert Gboluma, CYPEP Graduate, Old Road, Monrovia**

“I used to be rude to older people,” says Robert. As an 18 year old from a small family in Monrovia, Robert says he knew what he was doing was wrong, but that was the way all youth behaved. “My friends would encourage me to ignore people if they spoke to me.” He tells a story of an old woman on the street. She called to him one night when he was on the street, and told him that he was not behaving in the right way; “She knows my family and she wanted to counsel me on how to behave.” But because he wanted to impress his friends, he responded with cruel words to the old lady, and moved on without listening to her.

He heard about the CYPEP training when he saw a group of youths gathered on the street. He asked then what was going on and so he signed up for the training. During the training, he

realized that being rude and mean to others is not right. Never forgetting about that night and how he had been mean to the woman, he then went back to her and apologized for his bad behavior.

He goes on to tell about his family: “In my own home, I used to come and go from my house without talking to my parents. They would tell me that I was a bad son, and it made me feel bad so I’d just stay away. Now, I know that it is important to give respect to my parents, so I am talking to them and I even help them with chores around the house. My parents are so surprised now!”

He also reflects on how he used tribalism and religion to separate himself from others. He used to feel that he was better than others because of his ethnic background. His father used to say that we are proud people and don’t ever let others put you down. Robert says he used to be so boastful that others feared him. Now, Robert says that Liberians must come together in unity and we must leave tribalism behind. The session on conflict resolution had a great impact on Robert and he says that he now has skills to stop violence rather than starting it.

#### **3.4.4 Yvonne Clemens, CYPEP Graduate, Old Road, Monrovia**

Yvonne comes from a large family of 11 children. She is 25 years old and she left home to live with her boyfriend and two-year old son because there wasn’t enough room at her family home. She graduated from high school and stays at home with her small son. Her boyfriend works as a security guard at a local NGO. She has not completed the training but has participated in the Seeds of Peace program, because a friend of hers was a CYPEP graduate and told her about the training and then Seeds of Peace. She attended the Seeds of Peace workshop and was impressed with the approach of the program.

*“Seeds of Peace gave me confidence to talk to people – before I couldn’t express myself. But the way they taught us to talk to people really works! People couldn’t believe that we were doing this for free, without pay. When they realized that we were doing this from our hearts, they really started to listen,”*

*Yvonne Clemens, Seeds of Peace Participant, Old Town Road*

The Seeds of Peace experience has encouraged her to become more active in her community. She has joined the Old Road Youth Development Association and looks forward to working with others to improve her community. She also says that she would like to hear more about CYPEP and experience it herself.

#### **3.4.5 Joanne Freeman, CYPEP Graduate, Old Road, Monrovia**

Originally from Lofa County, Joanne, aged 25, and her family came to Monrovia in 1996 in search of a better life. Her father passed away a few years later and her mother is now left to care for Joanne, her brothers and sisters, and also Joanne’s 3-year old daughter. She graduated from high school in 2002 and she sells food and water on the streets to make money for her daughter.

*“Because I have seen how people can change, how we can settle conflict, and how by working together we can do more, we have formed our own group in my community called United Girls. Twelve of us have joined together to support each other and to help out each other when we have problems. Then the United Girls also joined up with the Old Road Youth Development Association so we can work with others to make our community better.”*

*Joanne Freeman, Old Road Community, Monrovia*

Joanne confesses that she used to make trouble and cause confusion for her mother. She would talk back to her mother and felt that her mother was not fair with her. This led to

fighting in the household between her and her mother, as well as her siblings. However, she says that the CYPEP training has changed her life. “Now I know how to love my brothers and sisters, and my mother is proud of me. I am respectful to my mother and my community,” she says.

On a personal note, Joanne explains how angry her mother was with her when she first got pregnant. Joanne says that she used to sneak out at night and then tried to hide the fact that she was pregnant. To this day, she feels that her mother is disappointed with her. For example, Joanne says that her mother said she had enough money to pay school fees for her younger sister to attend a computer-training course. Joanne was upset because she felt that she was older and should be given the opportunity to go to the course. Her mother replied that Joanne has a small child to take care of and that she should have thought about that before she got pregnant. In the past Joanne said that she would have been so mad at her mother and she would have said very mean things to her back. But since the CYPEP training, Joanne has realized that she can’t be discouraged and that she someday will achieve her goals. She says, “even though it is hard for me to hear sometimes, I now listen to my mother – she is only trying to make sure that I don’t repeat the same mistakes in the future. Now, I stick with only one partner, my baby’s daddy, and I always make him use a condom so I don’t get pregnant again. Even when my friends tell me negative stories about condoms and tell me not to use them, I know that CYPEP told me what to do and I will stick to that. I want to go to school and I have to make sure I do the right things to make that happen.”

She tells another story of how one day at the Youth in Action meeting, she ran into a girl who was talking about things that weren’t true and causing confusion. Joanne admits that they quarreled but instead of making it worse by becoming violent, Joanne just walked away because she knew it was wrong to fight. The next day she came back to the program and Joanne greeted the girl, to show her that there were no hard feelings and that we can still work together. “The girl was so surprised!” exclaimed Joanne with a big smile on her face. “The girl learned that we can forgive and forget. Now we have become real good friends.” Joanne says that CYPEP teaches us how to love and care for each other and it brings people together. “From the training I have developed skills to settle conflict and make peace instead of violence” she says with a sense of pride.

#### **3.4.6 Uku Bono, CYPEP Master Trainer/Facilitator, OLMY**

Reflecting on the program’s impact, Uku said, “Our community had a lot of disgruntled youth, and some were violent. But through CYPEP, they learned that they can be peaceful. The program really built their self-esteem. The emphasis of the program was placed on spreading the message of peaceful resolution of conflicts – dialogue is the best way to solve our problems.” He found the CYPEP message so interesting – all youth have something to contribute to our country, and the future rests in our own hands. He confesses however that at first the sensitization was not done too well. But after people have gone through the program, now they know the importance of the program. Uku felt that the volunteer activities (Seeds of Peace and Youth in Action) really helped to reinforce the messages from the training. “By putting aside our differences and working on something in unity, we can accomplish so much,” he says. Having been with the program since the beginning and having recruited other non-CYPEP youth to participate in Seeds of Peace and Youth in Action, he can really observe the differences in attitude among CYPEP graduates. He says they are more refined and self-confident. This is an indication to him that more CYPEP training is needed for the youth of his community.

### 3.4.7 Marcy Larmi, CYPEP Graduate, Soul Clinic, Monrovia

Marcy is a 24-year old student who hopes to complete high school in the next year. She lives with her mother and five brothers and sisters. She says that CYPEP has changes people from bad to good, and it has made her see that your life can change. For example, before the training she was rude, she says, “but CYPEP made me feel good about myself. And then I learned things like respecting others, think before you speak, and listen to my mom.”

For young girls, collecting water from the well is a major task each day. Because they spend so much time there, the well becomes the site for any arguments. Marcy tells of a day when she was at the well and another girl tried to cut in line. We started to push each other and fighting over the bucket. That night I remembered about the training and then I remembered that this palava would not bring about anything good. So the next day, I went and apologized to the other girl.”

### 3.4.8 Lusu Blame, CYPEP Graduate, Soul Clinic, Monrovia

Through CYPEP, Lusu, a 17- year old 10<sup>th</sup> grader in Soul Clinic, a community on the outskirts of Monrovia, says she learned how to behave with her friends and how to socialize with people. She says that she learned that people are different and that we must “keep anger out of it.” From the CYPEP training she now feels strongly that “we must find ways to be closer with people and teach them how to be polite and create unity between people.”

She recalls that even after just the first day of the training, she decided to be kind with her friends. In the past she would have started fights and say mean things to them. But on this day, after the training, she says, “I was really kind, and I was so proud of myself. At first, my friends didn’t believe me, and they would say that I wasn’t any different. But the more I talked, the more they could see that I’m different now. I used to think that I was better than other people, but now I know that we are all equal.”

*“Before the training I didn’t respect others; I thought that I knew better than they did. People used to get angry because of the way that I would talk to them, but I didn’t care. Now, people are starting to see me differently, and they believe that I have changed. Now they want to be with me, and that gives me a good feeling.”*

*Lusu Blame, CYPEP Participant, Soul Clinic,  
Monrovia*

She tells the story of another day at the market. “Someone that I don’t know stepped on me. I started to insult them, but then I remembered CYPEP, and I decided not to say anything, because I knew that no good would come from it.”

She says that the CYPEP topics were so interesting to me that I decided to keep it in me for the rest of my life. She wants to continue in school and wants to be a lawyer some day. She wants to represent people so that they will get satisfaction.

## 4.0 CYPEP Strengths and Weaknesses

From data gathered during the survey and interviews with partners and participants, the following strengths and weaknesses are outlined.

## 4.1 Strengths

Strengths identified include:

### Program Concept:

- Given the demographics of Liberia<sup>4</sup>, targeting youth is appropriate and necessary. Urban youth are a potential source of either negative or positive change. With many youth having gone to Internally Displaced Person (IDP) camps, and others living in refugee camps in neighboring countries, as peace and stability are returned to Liberia, more and more youth are expected to return to the urban centers. Thus training conducted to date has only scratched the surface of the potential beneficiary base.
- CYPEP training is a foundation for teaching youth how to be good citizens. With a highly transitory population over the past 15 years, Liberian youth have not known stability and permanency in their communities. The community's social fabric has been altered and the normal checks and balances that typically govern behavior have not been present for over a decade. CYPEP introduces concepts to youth that have been regrettably overlooked by their families and community.
- CYPEP touches on topics most relevant to youth, and allows them to think about who they are in total. The CYPEP training provides a focused yet comprehensive curriculum for youth to learn about themselves, their community, and their nation.
- Training is not done as a stand-alone activity – Youth Assemblies, volunteer events, etc. help to reinforce the themes/messages of the training. These activities also serve as a marketing tool for CYPEP to generate interest. The more youth see the impact the training has had on their peers, the more they want to participate.

*“The youth of our community used to be seen as agents of violence and destruction. Now they are seen as agents of peace and development.”*

*YMCA/Kakata, Local Facilitator*

### Program Structure and Approach

- The length of course (six weeks) allows for personal transformation to take place in short period of time. Participants are able to commit themselves to the training for this period. Furthermore, the short length allows for more training cycles to be conducted whereby allowing for a significant number of participants to benefit from the training.
- The use of peer counselors is an effective method of influencing youth behavior, as the traditional barriers of age and unbalanced levels of experience are removed. In addition to participants, local facilitators are likewise program beneficiaries. Facilitators learn important leadership skills and gain self-confidence, which allows them to stand before their peers and discuss important topics. There are numerous examples of participants who have been selected to serve as local facilitators in subsequent courses, and then to serve as master trainers. Opportunities for participants to explore greater leadership roles in the program are encouraged and realized.

---

<sup>4</sup> Various sources quote the Liberian youth population (15-35) is between 60-75% of the total population.

- By having a distinct topic for each session, participants are excited to come to each session. If they miss one session, they will miss out on something new.
- The participatory learning approach embraced by the training encourages self-discovery and recognizes that each individual has something to contribute. One of the key responses from participants is that they now know that they are important and others like them. The combination of the participatory active learning approach, led by local facilitators and the youth relevant subject matter, increase the effectiveness of the CYPEP.
- While literacy rates are higher in Monrovia than rural areas, in other urban centers approximately 40% of participants are believed to be illiterate. The participatory approach utilized by CYPEP is focused on different learning styles, and including different presentation techniques such as drama, small and large group discussion, brainstorming, and role-play. The variety of learning approaches increases the amount of learning possible for all different literacy levels.

**Partners:**

- Partners are community-based and have pre-existing clientele and relationships to the program beneficiaries.
- In most cases, they have a pre-existing youth sports or education program to which the CYPEP program can be attached. Partners are given some level of flexibility to fit the CYPEP into their program structure. An example of this are the YMCA sports activities and video club, which are supported by the training and provide opportunities for youth to interact and improve their social skills, being discussed during the training.
- To date, LTI has done an effective job of identifying suitable local partners. This is good for both building the capacity of local partners as well as the signal it sends to the Liberian youth who are encouraged by seeing Liberians serving in these community development positions rather than foreigners.
- In general, training sites identified by partners were appropriate and conducive to effective training.

**4.2 Weaknesses**

Weaknesses identified include:

**Program Concept:**

- The glamour period of CYPEP will run out quickly if graduates are left without follow-up, and particularly the need to have some employment opportunities in the near future.
- In the case of Liberia, it is clear to see that participants have been so traumatized and have so few other choices for education/employment that they are willing to keep to the training period for the full six weeks. In other settings, for example other countries, that have not undergone the same devastation, participation may not be as popular.

**Partners:**

- Capacity of partners to monitor the training is weak on average. They are fulfilling only the most basic data collection requirements (daily attendance), but other information

requested from them is not collected or collected irregularly. While partners were satisfied with the contracting mechanism and reporting system, LTI found their reports in general to be lacking. A review of reports submitted revealed a range of quality, going from very good to poor.

- The quality of supervision provided by Master Trainers/Partners is uneven. While Master Trainers appear to conduct periodic follow-up, they do not always take the necessary corrective action. If a facilitator is weak, the Master Trainer, if present, may assist by taking over the session to highlight the main points necessary for the session. However, it is left unclear to the facilitator that this is a point that he must make in future sessions – they are left to think that the master trainer made an interesting point, but not necessarily that s/he should adjust the presentation of materials or approach the next time.
- Some local facilitators are not well suited for training (they are too shy, unreliable, have poor language skills, etc.) yet it is unclear how the partners deal with this situation. While it is understood that the facilitators are selected from the community, the partners need to retain a level of control over the process so that all facilitators are as effective as possible.
- Better sensitization for the program should be done. In the early stages of the program (Phase I), poor sensitization led to a large number of participants registering, then dropping-out when they learned that no sitting fees or other incentives would be paid by the program. While sensitization has improved in those partners who have participated in more than one phase, this could continue to be a weakness as new partners are contracted for different communities in subsequent phases.

#### **Topic Content:**

- While training topics overall seem to be relevant to the participants, there are a few areas which could benefit from further review. In particular, survey respondents indicate that the session on the Gap between Rich and Poor is one of the most meaningful to them. However, the intended message from this session does not emerge when survey respondents were asked to recall the message. In order to ensure that the participants understand that inequalities should be addressed through peaceful, legal means rather than violence, session exercises should be reviewed. Many respondents are left with an ambiguous message on this topic. Two additional topics were also raised as relevant to youth: Teen Aged Pregnancy and Reconciliation.

## **5.0 Recommendations**

The following recommendations are made for the current program and future CYPEP related efforts:

### **Overall Program Implementation**

- Finish Phase II training in Monrovia and Buchanan.
- Pursue opportunity for Phase III training, but LTI must ensure that the high quality is maintained; given the nearing conclusion of the LTI project, and the transition to regular USAID programming, the proposed Phase III activities may be too ambitious. LTI and OTI should evaluate availability of staff time to adequately plan, implement, monitor,



and report on Phase III in all five proposed locations. The proposed sites should be ranked in order of priority and implementation carried out in stages, based on priorities.

- With an eye to future program close out, encourage partners to explore ways to incorporate CYPEP (participatory approach, content, volunteerism) into their on-going activities. Since no one partner is guaranteed continuation, there needs to be a plan for the partner to explore additional work in this area. Given the positive impact, it would be unfortunate if partners just stopped doing it because of the funding. Rather than leaving partners with the hope and anticipation that additional funds will be coming for additional phases, it would be better to have a plan for and/or list of possible future activities without LTI support. For example if hosting a football match, during the breaks have special sessions to discuss specific topics such as HIV/AIDs, conflict resolution, What makes a good citizen, etc. They can also hold rallies, or promote radio messages using the CYPEP messages as the foundation. Building on their established programs, some partners such as the YMCA could build on its school programs such as the High Y Leadership Clubs to incorporate its curriculum into their leadership program.

### **Partners**

- Attention needs to be paid to strengthening of master trainers skills to support local facilitators. Local facilitators in turn need to receive feedback and additional coaching from master trainers to better guide the CYPEP training sessions.
- Partners need to strengthen their data collection and analysis capacity to provide input into programming and evaluation. LTI should work with the partners to establish monitoring indicators and develop a plan on how partners will collect data to support those indicators.
- As new partners join the CYPEP team, clear guidance needs to be provided to partners on how to conduct community sensitization campaigns. An effective sensitization campaign will yield a better pool of local facilitators, as well as ensuring that participants have a clear understanding of the CYPEP program and they can come to the training ready to participate.

### **Training Curriculum**

- Continue to use the Revised Modules for additional phases. The modules should be reviewed to ensure that references to YES are removed (i.e. CYPEP is a six week training program, not a five month program), and that other minor editorial changes are made.
- Additional review of the session on the Gap Between Rich and Poor should be conducted to improve the clarity of the session.
- Explore adding additional sessions on Teenaged Pregnancy and Reconciliation. While the addition will likely increase the overall training time, the importance of these topics may justify the extended time frame.

## **Training Logistics**

- Conduct a survey to ascertain whether the current rates paid to Master Trainers and Facilitators are realistic and appropriate. While partners and staff complained across the board of low fees paid to Facilitators, partners indicated they had lost only a few facilitators due to low compensation (when facilitators were faced with better opportunities).
- In order to reinforce the participatory processes employed by facilitators, LTI should provide facilitators with additional support materials to reinforce their understanding and build their skills. A Facilitation Process Guide was developed for the YES Program, and should be duplicated and distributed to CYPEP Local Facilitators. This guide might serve as a foundation to provide additional support to upgrade their skills. (Recommend selection of back up facilitators be trained so that if the partner is clear by the end of the training that they are not up to the task, the alternative is used. Alternatively, the Master Trainers must provide better coaching and refresher training to bring the sub-standard performers up to standard.)
- Participants indicated in some cases that they would like to have hand-outs to bring back to share with their families. The training budget should accommodate some materials that participants can take home to continue the discussions there.

## **Future USAID Programming**

- For the next generation of USAID/Monrovia programming, the CYPEP training should be included as the foundation upon which other types of training are built: vocational, literacy, community health, environmental training. For example, after a participant completes CYPEP they would be well prepared for taking full advantage of vocational training, group formation and organizational development, literacy training, etc. The value of CYPEP is that participants will be able to be more focused on future endeavors.
- Volunteerism should also continue to be incorporated into future activities. Along with CYPEP training, then vocational or literacy (or other identified training needs), a continuation program should also incorporate practical volunteer activities.
- While CYPEP was developed in response to a need addressing urban youth, the value of CYPEP extends beyond urban youth to rural multi-aged populations. CYPEP should continue for both urban and rural populations, as the most important messages and impact coming from the training is increased self-esteem and confidence.

## **6.0 Key Findings and Lessons Learned**

The following items represent the key findings from the mid-term evaluation of CYPEP:

- Creative Associates was successful in identifying a pressing, unforeseen need and then developing an appropriate response in a timely fashion. USAID/OTI has been likewise instrumental in supporting this quick response.
- The CYPEP concept, approach, and partnership arrangements employed by Creative Associates to implement the program are effective.

- While behavior change is difficult to track, surveys conducted and personal interviews confirm that participants genuinely feel that their lives have been improved and a positive and lasting change has occurred as a result of the training.
- The value of CYPEP goes beyond peace education and conflict resolution. It serves as a foundation to re-build the shattered lives of a whole generation of Liberian youth who have missed out on the normalcy of growing-up. The vicious cycle of violence, abuse, and disrespect will be repeated if youth don't feel empowered to be positive factors in their communities.
- While the results of the program to date are impressive, there is a need for follow up activities. For participants who have completed the original training, the "positive glow" from the training will wear off within a year, and they could have little long-lasting impact from the training. With follow up, such as support to clubs, on-going community development activities, including vocational training, literacy, health education, etc. participants are likely to continue the positive feelings, and feel that they must continue to live in a responsible and peaceful fashion.
- The emphasis to date has been on broad exposure of areas to the CYPEP training. However, the training itself serves as a marketing tool; others become more interested in participating when they see the impact it has had on their friends. Old sites should be revisited in the future.
- In addition to the spread of word creating more demand for the training, resettlement of communities will have new youth returning. These new members of these communities will also need CYPEP training.
- As USAID/Monrovia prepares for the handover from the USAID/OTI, the next phase of programming would be well served to incorporate the strides made by CYPEP in creating an environment for positive behavior and increasing the potential for other programs to succeed. CYPEP can be utilized by USAID in several ways:
  - As an entry point for participants in vocational and skills training (after completing CYPEP, participants will be better prepared to operate under the structure of a skill training)
  - As an additional element for over aged student school programming (i.e. after school clubs for LTI's Accelerated Learning Program (ALP))
  - As a model for other types of programs, including health education, environmental education, literacy, etc.
- More attention needs to be given to routine progress monitoring of the program. A few key progress and impact indicators should be agreed upon between OTI, LTI, and the partners in order to be able to set targets and to measure progress. Given that this program evolved out of a crisis situation, it is understandable that a baseline was not conducted. Furthermore, it is understood that attempting to measure behavior before the training would have likely resulted in failure of the program, due to the culture of distrust developed over the years of war in Liberia. As the USAID program moves out of the transition mode and into a development mode, impact indicators should be explored. If direct testing of participants is too sensitive, proxy indicators may be used to estimate impact on behavior.

## **7.0 Conclusions**

With the majority of Liberians being under the age of 35, the CYPEP is an effective vehicle to target the needs of urban youth, and ultimately to promote a more peaceful society. Graduates of the CYPEP training indicate that they have undergone a personal transformation as a result of CYPEP. By using local facilitators to lead participants through sixteen focused topics, participants are encouraged to actively share their ideas and together, they learn from each other, sending the message that they are an important person in the training and in their community. The program has made a positive contribution to the successful transition in Liberia, as complimentary voluntary activities helped to reinforce the training themes of voter education and environmental sanitation. The program has potential in a post-transition Liberia, as future vocational and skills training, health education, and literacy training for example could benefit from participants having undergone the CYPEP training in advance.

## **Appendices**

## **Appendix A: Scope of Work**

### **Scope of Work Consultant**

#### **Mid Term Program Evaluation Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP)**

##### **Youth Education for life Skills (YES)**

USAID Office of Transition Initiatives, through Creative Associates International, Inc., is implementing a non-formal education program for Liberian youth entitled Youth Education for life Skills (YES). The program is intended to engage 30,000 youth throughout Liberia in a five-month life skills curriculum over a two year period. This program (YES) is a community based post-conflict intervention for war-affected youth with the sole objective of “assisting war-affected young Liberians to become productive members of their communities through community-based life-skills education...” This program will be implemented in over 600 communities in all of Liberia, 300 of which are currently being reached in a first cycle of training, targeting some 9000 participants.

In October 2004 there was an outbreak of violence in Monrovia and other cities growing out of a land dispute between people of two different ethnic groups which led to death, destruction of private properties and the burning down of mosques and churches. This violence itself was part of a spate of urban violence such as mob justice and the rise in armed robbery that had hit Monrovia and its suburbs.

In consultation with a host of local and international NGOs involved in peace building, LTI designed an abridged urban version of the YES program, titled the “Community Youth Peace Education Program (CYPEP)”. The CYPEP has as its goal promoting peaceful co – existence among multi – ethnic and religious communities. The strategy is to empower peer youth educators who will in turn work with other youth in a participatory 6 weeks training program, aimed at transforming youth and giving them a new role as peace agents in their communities.

CYPEP program has gone through a first phase implemented in Monrovia, Kakata, Gbarnga, Ganta and Tubmanburg and engaged close to 4000 youth, with over 50% of these youth completing the full training program. A second phase of the CYPEP is currently on going in Monrovia and Buchanan cities, targeting some 2600 youth. Delivery of the training is being carried out by two local NGOs, while two other NGOs are responsible for monitoring and the training of trainers.

A consultant is being hired to review the concept and approach of the program, document lessons learned highlighting the successes and challenges and make recommendations for future programs of this nature and or for organizations that would be interested in adopting the CYPEP training program.

## **CYPEP Mid term Consultant**

### ***A. Purpose of the Task***

The main purpose of this consultant is to review the concept and approach of the current CYPEP program, offer an in depth documentation of the program achievements and challenges to date, document lessons learned and make recommendations for the future.

The objectives for this consultancy are:

- a) To determine whether the concept and approach of the CYPEP made any observable changes in the life of individuals in making sound life decisions, promoting peaceful co-existence and religious tolerance in communities.
- b) To provide lessons learned to support future transition programming design.

### ***B. Responsibilities and Task***

The CYPEP consultant will be responsible to:

1. Visit the program areas of CYPEP and hold discussions with all partners and participants of the program, during which the consultant will:
  - Review the existing concept, goal and objectives of the CYPEP
  - Document the extent to which the initial outcome from the training is contributing towards the program goal.
  - Review the implementation arrangements of the program between LTI and the implementing partners and document strength and weaknesses of these arrangements;
  - Document participants' understanding and grasp of the revised CYPEP curriculum and any changes they would like to see.
  - Document personal life stories and testimonies of participants that are attributed to the program.
2. Based on the review of the CYPEP, Produce a comprehensive report of the program to date, using a reporting format to be agreed with LTI.

### ***C. Organizational Relationship***

The CYPEP Consultant will be answerable to the Chief of Party (CoP) of LTI, and will work in close coordination with the following groups or individuals:

- ❖ USAID/OTI
- ❖ YES Program Manager-LTI, M&E Specialist and other members of the Program Liaison Unit (PLU)
- ❖ Implementing partners of the CYPEP Program and CYPEP graduates and current participants.

### ***E. Deliverables***

The aforementioned responsibilities / task will be conducted over a 14 working day period beginning January 8, 2006 and ending February 6, 2006. The CYPEP Consultant will be responsible for the final products:

1. A work plan and data collection methodology developed at the beginning of the first week outlining work activities for the length of the consultancy and what methods will be

- used to determine Implementing Partners/communities, individuals to be interview and how will data be collected.
2. Questionnaire developed to gather basic facts on CYPEP
  3. A draft report which should be forwarded to LTI for comments prior to completion.
  4. A final comprehensive report incorporating inputs from LTI

***F. Period and Terms of Performance***

The consultant will work from January 8 to February 6, 2006, travel inclusive for 14 working days.

The consultant will receive per diem at the US Government established rate for up country visits. Transportation and visa costs, if incurred, will be reimbursed. The consultant is responsible for providing receipts for lodging, transportation and visa fees. Transportation in Monrovia will be provided.

Consultant fees can be paid to a US bank account, or by a check as requested by the consultant. If paid by a wire transfer to a bank account in the US, please note that it is Creative's policy to deduct the \$30 wire transfer fee from the payment or reimbursement. A check may be sent to a US address if one is provided.



## **Appendix B: List of Persons Contacted**

OTI: Program Manager, Musu Clemens  
M&E Specialist, Ernest Gaie  
Program Manager, Elizabeth Callender

LTI: Chief of Party, Shannon Fischer  
YES Coordinator, James Yarsiah  
Curriculum and Training Specialist, Albert Colee  
M&E Manager, Jonathan Enders  
Youth Advisor, Julia Moore  
Data Manager, Leonard Green

### **YMCA/Monrovia:**

Program Coordinator, Sianeh Bedell  
Master Trainer, Sidney Williams  
Master Trainer, Joe Kerkula  
Community Member, Soul Clinic, Elizabeth Newton  
CYPEP Participant, Soul Clinic, Marci Larmi  
CYPEP Participant, Soul Clinic, Lusu Blame  
CYPEP Participant, Soul Clinic, Wiesimah Abdulah  
CYPEP Participant, Soul Clinic, Vincent Thee

### **OLMY/Monrovia:**

Master Trainer, Ibrahima Dukuly  
Master Trainer, Varney Kamara  
Master Trainer, Uku Bono  
Community Member, Old Road, F. David Nebra  
CYPEP Participant, Old Road, Robert Gboluma  
CYPEP Participant, Old Road, Ellen Kortu  
CYPEP Participant, Old Road, Joanne Freeman  
CYPEP Participant, Old Road, Nancy Palmer  
Seeds of Peace and Youth in Action Volunteer, Old Road, Elijah Keh  
Seeds of Peace and Youth in Action Volunteer, Old Road, Yvonne Clemens  
Seeds of Peace and Youth in Action Volunteer, Old Road, Tamba Aron

### **Old Road Youth Development Association/Monrovia:**

Vice President, Uku Bono  
Committee Member, M. Keita  
Association members (large group, names not recorded)

### **GRACELAND:**

Executive Director, Amos M. Cooper  
Program Coordinator Abraham B. Combay  
Master Trainer, A. Ballah Dwana  
Local Facilitator, Brima P. Sesay  
Local Facilitator, Henry M. Sirleaf  
Local Facilitator, A. Garrison Nyantee  
Local Facilitator, G. Kelvin Ledlum  
Local Facilitator, J. Musa Davis  
Local Facilitator, Cooper C. Goll

YMCA/Kakata:

Program Coordinator, James Wakoro

Master Trainer, Francis Senkpanie

Master Trainer, Stephen Kafi

Local Facilitators (Names not Recorded)



3. Do you know the main reasons for which the CYPEP program was organized? Yes / No (circle one). If yes, can you explain it in your own words?

---

---

4. Did you graduate from the CYPEP Training? Yes / No (circle one)

5. If no, why not? Please describe the circumstances or reasons why you did not complete the training

---

**CYPEP Content (Subject Matter Covered by the Training)**

1. In general, what topics do you remember most from the training? (Please list up to five topics below)

a. \_\_\_\_\_

b. \_\_\_\_\_

c. \_\_\_\_\_

d. \_\_\_\_\_

e. \_\_\_\_\_

2. Why were/are these modules so important for you?

---

---

3. Were/Are there any topics which were not important for you? (If yes, list up to five topics you considered unimportant)

a. \_\_\_\_\_

b. \_\_\_\_\_

c. \_\_\_\_\_

d. \_\_\_\_\_

e. \_\_\_\_\_

4. Why weren't/aren't these topics or modules important to you?

---

---

5. How could these modules be changed in future to make them more important to you?

---

---

**Enumerator’s Note: Complete Question 6. for Phase II participants only**

6. Within each of the modules/topics, there were a number of sessions. Can you try to identify which sessions you found most interesting and why. Please complete the table below.

*Identify one session in each Topic area that you remember the best and learned the most from (place an “X” next to the session respective session title? What made this session so good? If you felt that none of the sessions in this module were any good, indicate this by leaving the box blank. If the session was not conducted, indicate this by crossing out the session title.)*

Module Topic	Session Title	X	What made this session best in the module?
Introduction :	1. Getting Started		
Module I: Who am I	1. Who am I?		
	2. What is important to me?		
Module II: Peace & Conflict	1. Palava and the Changes it Brings		
	2. We are Different People but One Community		
	3. How we Fix Palavas in our Community		
Module III: Making a living	1. Things I am Good at Doing and How I Make My Living		
Module IV: Keeping the body well	1. Keeping my Body Clean		
	2. Sexual illness		
	3. HIV/AIDS		
	4. Drugs, Alcohol, and Tobacco		
Module V: Good Governance	1. Gap between Rich and Poor		
	2. Leadership		
	3. Citizenship		
	4. Voting in elections		
Conclusion looking back, looking ahead	What we have learned and the Changes the CYPEP training has brought to us		

7. Do you have suggestions on how the curriculum could be improved upon? Yes / No (circle one)

8. If yes, what are your suggestions? *(list as many suggestions you like)* \_\_\_\_\_

---

---

### **Training Facilitation**

1. How would you describe the way the Facilitator mastered the subject matter in the modules?  
Very Well / Somewhat / Not at All *(circle one)*

2. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

3. How would you describe the way the Facilitator encouraged everyone in the group to participate? Very Well / Somewhat / Not at All *(circle one)*

4. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

5. How would you describe the way the Facilitator made each session interesting/exciting? Very Well / Somewhat / Not at All *(circle one)*

6. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

7. How would you describe the things you learned after each session (did you feel you left with a clear message)? Very Well / Somewhat / Not at All *(circle all)*

8. Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

---

9. Other comments regarding facilitation: \_\_\_\_\_

---

### **Training Logistics**

1. How many weeks did the training program take to complete? \_\_\_\_\_

2. How would you describe the length of the program? *(circle one, and fill in details if appropriate)*

Too Short \_\_\_\_\_ Too Long \_\_\_\_\_ Just Right

*(if too short, what would you suggest?)*

*(if too long, what would you suggest?)*

3. How many times per week did you meet for the training? \_\_\_\_\_

4. How would you describe the meeting schedule (Number of meetings per week)? *(circle one, and fill in details if appropriate)*

Too many \_\_\_\_\_ Too few \_\_\_\_\_ Just Right  
*(if too many, what would you suggest?) (if too few, what would you suggest?)*

5. How would you describe the meeting space? *(circle one from each row)*

Size of Room	Too Large	Too Small	Just Right
Cleanliness	Very Clean	Dirty	Fine/Acceptable
Furnishings	Chairs for each participant	No comfortable seating	Benches/Acceptable
Lighting	Well lit Lighting	No Lighting	Enough

**Overall Program Impact**

1. Do you feel that you have been changed as a result of the CYPEP training? Yes / No *(circle one)*

2. If yes, how have you changed? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

3. Can you give an example of how you've done something differently now because of the training? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

4. Have you started to take actions to change your situation as a result of CYPEP? Yes/No *(circle 1)*

5. If yes, please describe your plans \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

6. If you were to describe the CYPEP program to a friend, what would you tell them? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

7. What suggestions would you make to improve the program for others? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Thank you for your participation.

## **Appendix D: CYPEP Mid-Term Evaluation Interview Guide**

### **Questions for USAID/OTI:**

- What is your vision for CYPEP?
- Are there any special needs/focus you wish to see in the evaluation?
- What are your perceived strengths/weaknesses of the program?
- How does the CYPEP program support the transition program for Liberia? Do you see a direct impact of the program on strengthening the transition?
- What should be changed if the CYPEP were to be expanded?
- What is required for continuation of the program?
- How does CYPEP fit into other donor/NGO efforts underway in Liberia?

### **Questions for LTI/CYPEP staff:**

- Are there any other objectives for the evaluation other than those listed in the SOW?
- Where should the relative emphasis be for the evaluation?
- What do you hope to accomplish with the mid-term evaluation?
- Can you give a brief overview of the program – how it was originally conceived and any subsequent changes/modifications that have already been made.
- How does the CYPEP program support the overall transition initiative in Liberia? Does the rationale for CYPEP hold up?
- What are the key constraints to the existing program?
- What are the opportunities to improve the program?
- What are the opportunities for expansion of the program? With USAID funding? Other other funding? Would additional partners be organized through other donor/sponsors? i.e. UNICEF? Other NGOs?
- Are there potential partners who could be added to the current program organization?
- How are partners identified?
- What training/introduction does a partner receive before they start working with CYPEP?
- What are the key responsibilities of the partners involved in CYPEP?
- What does LTI provide to each of the CYPEP partners?
- How is the training quality ensured across all partners?
- Is there a set of standard practices that must be followed by all partners? Are facilitators monitored?
- How can partnership relationships be improved?
- How does the program track impact, in particular, behavior change?
- Is there anyway to track secondary impact, or unintended impact?
- How do low literacy levels among participants affect the training?
- How was the length of the training determined (six weeks)?
- How was the subject content selected?
- Is there a maximum class size? Number of participants? How was this size determined?
- How are training sites identified? Are rental/use fees paid for the space?
- Who trains the facilitators?

### **Questions for Partners :**

#### *General Program Information*

- Can you provide information on the number of hours of training conducted; Locations, # of Participants etc. (Expansion of table provided)



- How many of the participants who start the training, actually graduate from the program? What is the drop out rate? In general, what are the causes for participants dropping out?
- Is this program sustainable without USAID funding?

#### *Facilitator Section and Training*

- How do you identify facilitators?
- What is the ideal qualifications/background for facilitators? What are the minimum requirements for an effective facilitator?
- Do you have any problems with facilitators dropping out of the program? If yes, what are the reasons they leave?
- Who conducts training for the facilitators?
- How can the training of facilitators be improved?
- Are facilitator's paid? How much and by whom? Is this the appropriate amount to pay facilitators?

#### *Participant Selection*

- How are participants identified? Do you have specific selection criteria? What are they?
- Do you currently have a waiting list? Have Were people been denied entrance into the program?
- What would be a cause for denial of participation in the program?
- Did the selection process of participants work well?
- Can this be improved in the future? If yes, how?
- How do you identify the training site?
- What do you think motivates participants who get no incentive/pay to attend the training?
- What is the average education level of the current participants?
- Is functional literacy a requirement for participation?
- Are participants engaged in literacy training as well as life skills training under CYPEP?
- Are participants channeled into further educational programs? i.e. ALP, skill training, literacy?

#### *Program Effectiveness*

- What works well with the program?
- What would you say are the greatest challenges to the program? Areas in need of improvement?
- Do you have specific suggestions to improve the program?

#### *Partner Communication/Information Sharing*

- How is the communication within the partnership (both between you and LTI/CAII and with the other partners)?
- What contractual arrangement do you have with LTI/CAII?
- Does this arrangement function smoothly? If no, what are the problems?
- Do you know of other organizations that would be suitable to support a CYPEP training program in the event that the program were expanded?

#### *Impact*

- Can you share any stories of impact – behavior change?
- How would you measure impact?

#### **Questions for Master Trainers and Facilitators :**

- I am interested in learning about your experience of facilitating the CYPEP program. – can you share some of your experiences? For example:
- How well do you think the program works?
- How well suited is the curriculum to the needs of the participants?
- How effectively are the participants identified?

- How many participants are in each training? Too many? Too few?
- What training did you receive prior to conducting the training? (Master Trainers? Facilitators)
- What was most effective about the facilitator training? What was the least effective?
- Would you like to see the training changed? If yes, do you have suggestions on how to make it more effective?
- Do you feel that you receive effective support to when carrying out the training? (from the partner)
- Describe the supervision you receive from your partner? Is it effective?
- How do you communicate your needs to the partner?
- What is the biggest challenge you face while implementing the CYPEP training?
- What suggestions could you give to improve the program?
- Did this selection process work well?

**Questions for Community Leaders:** (or individuals that would be able to evaluate changes in youth behavior?)

- Have there been any visible impacts of the CYPEP training? Have you noticed a difference in participant behavior?
- Are youth that have participated in CYPEP more tolerant of others?
- Has there been a concrete demonstration or change in behavior that can be attributed to the training? Can you share examples of this?

**Questions for Participants:** (follow up to questionnaires – or evaluator to administer questionnaire)

- What would you say you've learned from the CYPEP training?
- How will you use the training in your life?
- Can you give an example of how you've used it already?
- Can you make any suggestions on how to improve the program?

## Appendix E: List of Phase I CYPEP Small Grants

No	Community Name	County	Project Description	Amount	Status
1	Joseph Town	Bomi	Market hall rehabilitation	\$5,706.00	Completed
2	Vai Town I & III;	Bomi	Latrine Construction	\$ 5,809.00	Completed dedication pending
3	Kondeh	Bomi	Multi-purpose hall	\$ 6,502.00	Cancelled
4	Vai Town II/ Valley	Bomi	Latrine	\$ 5,809.00	In progress
5	Glory Island	Montserrado	Road Rehabilitation	\$ 6,344.00	100% community contribution available
6	Jacob Town	Montserrado	Pit Latrine	\$ 4,053.00	Grant package signed and returned to LTI
7	Kakata	Margibi	Youth Library	\$ 11,345.00	In progress 30% completed
8	72 <sup>nd</sup>	Montserrado	Hand Pump construction	\$ 4,702.00	Grant received by community
9	Red-light	Montserrado	Youth Center	\$ 6,802.00	Cancelled
10	Old-road	Montserrado	Pit Latrine	\$ 4,236.66	Cancelled
11	New port Street	Montserrado	Alley Bridge	\$2,901.00	Completed & dedicated
12	Glenyeelue	Nimba	Hand Pump	\$ 2,718.00	Installation of hand pump and chlorination ongoing
13	Small Ganta	Nimba	Hand Pump	\$ 2,718.00	Grant cancelled
14	LPMC Cluster	Nimba	Youth Center	\$ 2,718.00	Materials from LTI delivered
15	Guinea Road	Nimba	Hand Pump	\$ 2,718.00	Installation of culvert ongoing
16	Blegay Town	Nimba	Hand Pump	\$ 2,718.00	Culvert fabrication completed; dry digging ongoing
17	Pipeline	Montserrado	Bridge construction	\$ 8,147.00	Completed & dedicated
18	Deanville	Bong	Hand Pump	\$ 3,134.00	Grant document prepared
19	Barworrer Quarter	Bong	Hand Pump	\$ 3,134.00	Grant document prepared
20	Lehkpalayea	Bong	Community Hall	\$6,303.00	Grant document signed
21	Buchanan	Grand Bassa	Youth Center-Library	\$7,871.00	Grant document prepared
<b>Total Authorized</b>				<b>\$106,388.66</b>	
<b>Total Cancelled</b>				<b>\$ 20,258.66</b>	
<b>Total Completed/Pending</b>				<b>\$ 86,130.00</b>	

## Appendix F: Sample Schedule for Training of Trainers

### Timetable For Training Of Trainers Workshop – CYPEP Phase II

DAY	DATE	TIME	ACTIVITIES
<b>Sunday</b>	<b>September 4, 2005</b>	<b>4:00 p.m.</b>	<b>Arrival</b>
<b>Monday</b>	<b>September 5, 2005</b>		
		8:30- 10:00	Breakfast, registration and formal opening
BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	BREAK
		10:15 A.M.- 12:30 P.M.	Setting the learning environment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Introductory exercise</li> <li>➤ Workshop objectives</li> <li>➤ Expectations</li> <li>➤ Formation of working groups (welfare, sports and entertainment, posting etc.)</li> <li>➤ Listening exercise</li> <li>➤ Ground rules</li> </ul>
BREAK	BREAK	BREAK	BREAK
		3:15-3:35 3:35- 4:20 4:20-4:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reflection</li> <li>➤ Team building exercise</li> <li>➤ Evaluation and closing</li> </ul>
<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>September 6, 2005</b>		
		8:00-8:30 8:30-9:00 9:00 a.m.-12:30p.m.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, reflection and announcement</li> <li>➤ Team formation and assignment of modules</li> <li>➤ Accessing past training experience</li> </ul>
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1:30-4:20 4:20-4:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The Difference Between Teaching &amp; Facilitation</li> <li>➤ Training techniques: Code</li> <li>➤ Evaluation and closing</li> </ul>
<b>Wednesd ay</b>	<b>September 7, 2005</b>		
		8:00-8:30 8:30-9:15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcements</li> <li>➤ Training Techniques: Role Play</li> </ul>

		9:15-12:30	➤ Training Techniques: Brainstorming
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1:30- 4: 20 4: 20- 4: 30	➤ Training Techniques: Case Study ➤ Training Techniques: Skit ➤ Evaluation and closing
<b>Thursday</b>	<b>September 8, 2005</b>		
		8: 00- 8: 30 8: 30- 9:15 9:15- 12:30	➤ Breakfast ➤ Recap, announcements, reflection ➤ Overview of module ➤ Seating Arrangements & Different Group Discussions ➤ Qualities of a Good Facilitator
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1:30- 4: 20 4:20- 4: 30	➤ Over View of the YES Modules ➤ Practice Facilitation I ➤ Practice Facilitation II ➤ Evaluation and closing
<b>Friday</b>	<b>September 9, 2005</b>		
		8: 00- 8: 30 8:30- 9: 15 9: 15- 12: 30	➤ Breakfast ➤ Recap, announcement ➤ Practice Facilitation III ➤ Practice Facilitation IV
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1: 30- 4: 20 4: 20- 4:30	➤ Practice Facilitation V ➤ Practice Facilitation VI ➤ Evaluation and closing
<b>Saturday</b>	<b>September 10, 2005</b>		
		8:00-8:30 8:30- 9:15 9: 15- 12: 30 12: 30- 1: 00	➤ Breakfast ➤ Recap announcement ➤ Practice Facilitation VII ➤ Practice Facilitation VIII ➤ Evaluation and closing

LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
Monday	September 12, 2005	8: 00- 8: 30 8:30- 9: 15 9:15- 12: 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcement, reflection</li> <li>➤ Practice Facilitation IX</li> <li>➤ Practice Facilitation X</li> </ul>
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1: 30- 4:20 4: 20- 4: 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Overview of module</li> <li>➤ Giving and Receiving Feedback</li> <li>➤ Evaluation and closing</li> </ul>
<b>Tuesday</b>	<b>September 13, 2005.</b>		
		8: 00- 8: 30 8: 30- 9:15 9: 15- 12: 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcement</li> <li>➤ Review of training Techniques</li> </ul>
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1:30- 4:20 4:20- 4:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Review of Training Techniques</li> <li>➤ Evaluation and closing</li> </ul>
<b>Wednesd ay</b>	<b>September 14, 2005</b>		
		8:00- 8:30 8: 30- 9: 15 9: 15- 12:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcement and reflection</li> <li>➤ Maslow Ladder of Human Needs</li> <li>➤ Who Identifies Community Needs?</li> </ul>
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		1:30-4: 20 4: 20- 4: 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Reflection 'Development is the New Name for Peace'</li> </ul>
<b>Thursday</b>	<b>September 15, 2005</b>		
		8: 00- 8: 30 8:30- 9:15 9:15- 1:00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcement</li> <li>➤ Over View of YES Small Grants</li> <li>➤ Participatory Project Identification Training</li> </ul>
LUNCH	LUN CH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		2:00-4: 30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Participatory Project Identification Training</li> </ul>
<b>Friday</b>	<b>September 16,</b>		

	<b>2005</b>		
		8: 00- 8: 30 8: 30- 9: 15 9:15- 1: 00	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcement</li> <li>➤ Participatory Project Identification Training</li> </ul>
LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH	LUNCH
		2: 00-4:30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Participatory Project Identification Training</li> <li>➤ Closing</li> </ul>
<b>Saturday</b>	<b>September 17</b>		
		8: 00- 8: 30 8: 30- 9: 20 9: 20-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Breakfast</li> <li>➤ Recap, announcement, final reflection</li> <li>➤ Final evaluation</li> <li>➤ Closing program</li> </ul>