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### List of Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAQ</td>
<td>Brief Aggression Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAH</td>
<td>Community Action Hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASEL</td>
<td>Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCDO</td>
<td>Foreign, Commonwealth, and Development Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>Focus Group Discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JDC</td>
<td>Juvenile Detention Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
<td>Key Informant Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNT</td>
<td>Leave No Trace Principles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Mercy Corps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHPSS</td>
<td>Mental Health and Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoSD</td>
<td>Ministry of Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSA</td>
<td>Profound Stress and Attunement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSS</td>
<td>Psychosocial Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>Social and Emotional Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRYJ I</td>
<td>Nubader: Supporting Resilient Youth and Communities in Jordan Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRYJ II</td>
<td>Nubader: Supporting Resilient Youth and Communities in Jordan Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YDN</td>
<td>Youth Developmental Needs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Activity Background and Project Description

Building on the lessons and best practices acquired from the SRYJ I Nubader model, Mercy Corps continued to work with at-risk youth, their families, and surrounding communities under “Nubader: Supporting Resilient Youth and Communities in Jordan - Phase II” with a few minor adaptations. SRYJ II focuses on adolescents and youth aged 12 to 18 including at-risk youth outreached from targeted communities, as well as new target groups including youth referred to community action hubs (CAHs) by judicial courts to serve non-incarcerative sentences, and youth released from juvenile detention centres (JDCs). The project also works on supporting structures surrounding youth including parents and/or caregivers and the wider community. Nubader focuses on establishing community centres that work with youth, in cooperation with CAHs, whereby needs related to rehabilitating and equipping training rooms and creative spaces at these organisations are provided.

The project team trains a team of youth workers, technical and managerial personnel from the local communities on the psychosocial support (PSS) model in order to ensure the delivery of relevant and practical training content to the targeted youth, given that their social behaviour, future relationships, and their decision making skills and values related to violence are formed during this critical age stage of adolescence. The application of these scientific approaches is covered through the creative facilitation training which equips the personnel with the practical skills to lead interventions with youth and parents/caregivers. The intervention includes a parenting programme for caregivers, in addition to community activities that include community initiatives and services, a network of supporting private and governmental entities, and referral services that are provided by the available organisations in the governorates.

Purpose of Evaluation

This impact evaluation report aims at assessing the SRYJ II project and covers the performance period of December 2019 until April 2021. The purpose is to provide both Mercy Corps and the Foreign, Commonwealth Development Office (FCDO) with strategic findings, conclusions and recommendations related to the effectiveness of project interventions and implementation approach for future programming. This report also covers a comparison between previous results from SRYJ I and current results from SRYJ II.

Evaluation Questions

Evaluation questions revolve around the direct outcomes of the project per the project’s logframe. The project tackled three key areas: 1) psychosocial support for at-risk, diverted and released youth, 2) parents and caregivers, and 3) Community Action Hub (CAH) partners and
community personnel. Those three areas have been translated into three key direct outcomes as follows:

- **Outcome 1**: Enhanced wellbeing of at-risk youth.
- **Outcome 2**: Caregivers form better relationships with their children.
- **Outcome 3**: Community Action Hubs are able to respond to protection needs.

Accordingly, evaluation questions around the effectiveness of the project in delivering intended outcomes were designed as follows:

- **Evaluation Question I**: How effective was the project in improving youth psychosocial wellbeing?
- **Evaluation Question II**: How effective was the parenting programme in helping parents improve their relationships with their children?
- **Evaluation Question III**: Is improved Profound Stress and Attunement (PSA) knowledge sufficient for CAHs partners and community personnel to respond to adolescent protection needs?

### Evaluation Methodology and Sampling

The evaluation process encompassed primary and secondary data collection. The secondary data collection incorporated a desk review of project documents, parenting programmes, and PSA training manuals. **The purpose of secondary data collection was to get better insight on the project’s different divisions/units’ (mental health and psychosocial support (MHPSS), training, civic engagement) intended direct outputs and outcomes**, in addition to the process and list of activities that they undertake in order to reach their intended outputs.

As for primary data collection, a mixed method of qualitative and quantitative data collection was selected. The quantitative data was collected through pre and post evaluation questionnaires that were collected prior to and post project interventions through the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) focal points at the CAHs. As for the **qualitative piece**, Mercy Corps team collected the data through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIs). In total, 16 FGDs and 3 KIs were conducted across all sites; Irbid, Ruseifeh, and Madaba. Primary data collection took place over four full days taking place between 7 March and 18 March 2021.
Quantitative Data

The primary quantitative data tool took the form of pre and post evaluation questionnaires that were designed and tailored for the three targeted beneficiaries falling under the project's onion model; youth, parents/caregivers and community personnel.

Youth Measures

Youth pre and post tool measures stress, aggression and social and emotional learning (SEL) levels among youth through two validated scales; Perceived Stress Scale, and Brief Aggression Questionnaire (BAQ), and one scale created by the team to capture the impact of the youth journeys; (SEL).

The Perceived Stress Scale is a global measure of perceived stress adopted from Cohen, Kamarck, & Mermelstein (1983) that entails questions about feelings and thoughts during the last month. The total score is calculated by finding the sum of 10 items, reverse coding questions 4, 5, 7, & 8. The Perceived Stress Scale has a range of scores between 0 and 40. A higher score indicates more stress. An adapted version of the scale was used to measure COVID-19 pandemic related stress (PSS-10-C).

BAQ scale is a short version adopted from the extended Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire that assesses physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. The 12-item scale was found to be valid and reliable in measuring self-reported aggression. The total score is calculated by finding the sum of the 12 items and has a range of scores between 12 and 48. A higher score indicates more aggression.

Finally, SEL scale measures an individual’s level of social and emotional learning through measuring self awareness, social awareness, self management, relationship skills, and responsible decision making. The scale was created by Nubader to measure the impact of the delivered content on social and emotional learning based on UNICEF MENA’s Civic Engagement and Life Skills framework and CASEL 5 competencies framework. The total score is calculated by finding the sum of the 14 items and has a range of scores between 27 and 108. A higher score indicates a higher level of social and emotional learning.

---


**Caregivers Measures**

Two caregivers’ questionnaires were designed by Mercy Corps’ MHPSS unit. The first tool measures participant caregivers’ communication skills, parent-child relationship and their application of positive parenting techniques through Likert scale questions. The total score is calculated by finding the sum of 14 questions and has a range of scores between 0 and 56, where a higher score indicates a better parent-child relationship. The second tool measures participant caregivers’ knowledge of youth developmental needs through a mixture of multiple choice questions and Likert scales. The total score is calculated by finding the sum of 14 questions and has a range of scores between 0 and 38. A higher score indicates a higher level of knowledge.

**Community Personnel Measures**

Community Personnel’ pre and post questionnaire was designed by the Nubader programme team to measure personnel’s enhanced knowledge in topics tackled in the foundation training. Those topics include the importance of community based interventions, contextual background on the juvenile justice system, the adolescence age stage, adolescent brain development, impact of stress on adolescent brain development, and general attitudes towards adolescents. The questionnaire includes multiple choice questions that address all aforementioned topics that test the knowledge of trained community personnel. The total score is calculated by finding the sum of the 21 items and has a range score between 0 and 38. A higher score indicates a higher level of knowledge.

SEL, PSS and BAQ scales have been utilised to answer evaluation question I mentioned above. While caregivers’ baseline/endline tool was utilised to answer question II and PSA baseline/endline questionnaire fed into evaluation question III.
Qualitative Data

Four different qualitative tools were developed to answer all three evaluation questions. All four tools were designed with the purpose of determining whether the project was effective in achieving its intended outputs and outcomes, as well as to complement quantitative data by focusing on the “hows” and “whys”. Please refer to Evaluation Annex I for further details on the tools.

The table below shows how each quantitative and qualitative tool was utilised to answer different evaluation questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Questions</th>
<th>Primary Quantitative Data</th>
<th>Primary Qualitative Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>FGD Youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>FGD Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEL</td>
<td>FGD Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caregivers’ baseline/end line</td>
<td>KII head of CAH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PSA Baseline/end line</td>
<td>FGD CAH Personnel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How effective was the project in improving youth psychosocial wellbeing?

2. How effective was the parenting programme in helping parents improve their relationships with their children?
3. Is improved PSA knowledge sufficient for CAH partners and community personnel to respond to adolescent protection needs?

Table 1: Evaluation Questions Informed by Quantitative and Qualitative Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

For a representative sample, participants were categorized into three groups of beneficiaries per each evaluation question, making sure that the population included participants who possess pre and post values before selecting the sample. Sample size was then decided based on a calculated formula with a confidence level of 95% and 7% margin of error. Subsequently, a random selection process was followed to extract the sample from the entire set of participants (population) who possess both; pre and post scores. As a result, the evaluation team planned for 16 FGDs and 3 KIIs disaggregated as follows.

16 FGDs were conducted to answer evaluation questions I, II, and III, the sample is divided as follows:

- Male youth aged between 12-14 and 15-17 years old (theatre and sports streams) - Ruseifeh - Zarqa Governorate
- Female youth aged between 12-14 years old (art stream) - Ruseifeh - Zarqa Governorate
- Released youth aged between 12-17 years (post care programme (nature club)) - Ruseifeh - Zarqa Governorate
- Mothers - Ruseifeh - Zarqa Governorate
- Fathers - Ruseifeh - Zarqa Governorate
- CAH personnel - Ruseifeh - Zarqa Governorate
- Male youth aged between 12-14 years old (photography and theatre streams) - Irbid Governorate
- Male youth aged between 12-14 years old (photography and theatre streams) - Irbid Governorate
- Male youth aged between 15-17 years old (content creation and whiteboard streams) - Irbid Governorate
- Mothers - Irbid Governorate
- Fathers - Irbid Governorate
- CAH personnel - Irbid Governorate
- Male youth aged between 15-17 years old (theatre and sports streams) - Madaba Governorate
- Male youth aged between 15-17 years old (nature club stream) - Ma’in - Madaba Governorate
- Mothers - Madaba Governorate
- Fathers - Madaba Governorate
- CAH personnel - Madaba Governorate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FGD</th>
<th>Ruseifeh</th>
<th>Irbid</th>
<th>Madaba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth workers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 2: FGDs Sample</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
KII sample is divided as follows, to answer evaluation question III:

- Head of CAH - Ruseifeh
- Head of CAH - Madaba
- Head of CAH - Irbid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KII</th>
<th>Irbid</th>
<th>Ruseifeh</th>
<th>Madaba</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heads of CAHs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3: KIIs Sample**

**Limitations**

Data collected under this evaluation encompassed a number of limitations which can be summarized as follows.

Firstly, the data collection process was carried by Mercy Corps staff and analyzed by Mercy Corps Monitoring and Evaluation unit. Even though the team made sure FGDs and KIIs are facilitated by MC staff who are not related to addressed components, the M&E unit was constantly present as an unbiased, external unit to ensure confidentiality of data collected and achieve reliability and validity. Nonetheless, there is potential that participants’ responses were biased simply because data was collected in the presence of MC staff.

Secondly, the limited timeframe provided to conduct the qualitative data collection for the impact evaluation introduced a limitation in relation to CAH personnel and youth’s ability to reflect on the entire intervention, given that the project had just ended.
Data Analysis

Demographics

All demographic information was collected in the registration survey that is also a part of the participants selection criteria. It is reasonable to assume that data will not have changed significantly. For example, nationality is extremely static. The following graph shows the demographic disaggregation:

At-risk, diverted and released youth:

### Table 4: Youth Nationalities per Site

80.4% of the respondents in the sample were Jordanians. The rest of the participants were Syrians and other nationalities. There were 60 participants in Irbid, 48 in Madaba and 55 in Ruseifeh.

### Table 5: Youth Sex per Site

The majority, 89%, of participants were males and 11% were females in Ruseifeh.
Table 6: Youth Parents Enrollment Status per Site

24.5% of youth participants' parents participated in the parenting programme with a higher percentage in Ruseifeh.

Parents/Caregivers

Table 7: Parents/Caregivers' Nationality per Site

Table 8: Parents/Caregivers' Sex per Site
Community Personnel

### Nationality * center Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>center</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irbid</td>
<td>Madaba</td>
<td>Russafeh</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordanian</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Community Personnel Nationality per Site

### demographics/sex * center Crosstabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>demographics/sex</th>
<th>center</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Irbid</td>
<td>Madaba</td>
<td>Russafeh</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Community Personnel Sex per Site

Quantitative Data Statistical Analysis

**Evaluation Question I**

How effective was the project in improving youth psychosocial wellbeing?

To answer this question, the previously mentioned three questionnaires resulted in three variables whose means were compared between pre and post scores through paired sample t-test. A paired sample t-test is a statistical procedure used to determine whether the mean difference between two related sets of observations is statistically significant. However, given that the data for the SEL variable was not normally distributed, a non parametric test was conducted alternatively that does not require conformity to normality yet, yields the same purpose.
### Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre_stress</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.7229</td>
<td>0.16974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post_stress</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.6500000000</td>
<td>0.2666644172</td>
<td>0.1538402666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre_covid_stress</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.2000000000</td>
<td>1.0000000000</td>
<td>0.6602760736</td>
<td>0.1927051188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post_covid_stress</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.0000000000</td>
<td>0.7000000000</td>
<td>0.3242331288</td>
<td>0.1773524276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre_SEL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>55.69</td>
<td>13.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post_SEL</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>84.66</td>
<td>9.822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre_aggression</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.3333333333</td>
<td>1.0000000000</td>
<td>.7260991820</td>
<td>.1298615883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>post_aggression</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>.2500000000</td>
<td>.9375000000</td>
<td>.1905419223</td>
<td>.1317453612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 11: Descriptive Frequencies for Youth Variables

### Paired Samples Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Variable1</th>
<th>Variable2</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>pre_stress</td>
<td>post_stress</td>
<td>.7229</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.16974</td>
<td>0.01330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post_stress</td>
<td>pre_stress</td>
<td>.2666644172</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.1538402666</td>
<td>0.0120496996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>pre_covid_stress</td>
<td>post_covid_stress</td>
<td>.6602760736</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.1927051188</td>
<td>0.0150938298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post_covid_stress</td>
<td>pre_covid_stress</td>
<td>.3242331288</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.1773524276</td>
<td>0.0138013142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>pre_aggression</td>
<td>post_aggression</td>
<td>.7260991820</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.1298615883</td>
<td>0.0101715446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>post_aggression</td>
<td>pre_aggression</td>
<td>.4905419223</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.1317453612</td>
<td>0.0103190923</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 12: Youth Aggression, Stress and COVID-19 Stress Pre/Post Means

### Paired Samples Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 pre_stress_total</td>
<td>4563436208</td>
<td>.2345453555</td>
<td>.0183710101</td>
<td>.4200660972</td>
<td>4926211444</td>
<td>24.840</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 2 pre_covid_stress_total</td>
<td>.3360429448</td>
<td>.2639780282</td>
<td>.0206763549</td>
<td>.2952130203</td>
<td>3768726892</td>
<td>16.253</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 3 pre_aggression_total</td>
<td>.2355572597</td>
<td>.1907628101</td>
<td>.0149416964</td>
<td>.2060516559</td>
<td>2650628836</td>
<td>15.765</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 13: Youth Aggression, Stress and COVID-19 Stress Paired Samples T-test
Per table 13, three variables were tested for youth enrolled in the stations provided by the project; stress, COVID-19 stress, and aggression. The average/mean score for the pre-data set was compared with the average score for the post-data set for each variable (N=163). **Results show that there is a significant difference (P value <=0.05) between pre and post scores for stress, COVID-19 stress, and aggression, meaning that the project intervention had a significant impact on decreasing stress, COVID-19 stress, and aggression levels among participant youth.**

**Table 14: Youth Non-Parametric Test**

As for SEL, a 2-Related Samples test, which is a non parametric test equivalent to a paired sample t-test, was conducted where the average/mean score for the pre data set was compared with the average score for the post data set for each variable (N=163). **Results show a significant difference between pre and post scores for all variables.**

To test whether there is a linear correlation between stress, COVID-19 stress, SEL, and aggression levels among participant youth, a bivariate Pearson correlation test was utilized. Pearson Correlation tests show whether there is a linkage and its strength between two variables. The $r$ value ranges between -1 and 1 where -1 is a perfect negative linear relationship, 1 is a perfect positive linear relationship and 0 indicates no linkage between the two tested variables. On this continuum, a positive $r$ value expresses a positive relationship and a negative one expresses a negative linear relationship.
There is evidence of correlation between the four variables, as illustrated in Table 15. Stress, aggression, and COVID-19 stress are positively correlated, whereas SEL is negatively correlated to stress, aggression, and COVID-19 stress, meaning that when SEL levels increase stress, aggression, and COVID-19 stress levels decrease, given that lower levels of stress, aggression, and COVID-19 stress indicate positive results whereas lower levels of SEL indicate negative results. Based on the aforementioned, regression tests were run to test the extent to which we can predict the value of one variable based on the value of another variable.

Stemming from correlation results, regression results show that when SEL is the dependent variable, increase in either aggression or stress predicts an increase in SEL. However, there is no regression between SEL and COVID-19 stress. These findings indicate that SEL is dependent on the stress and aggression levels and any decrease in both variables predicts an increase in SEL levels. On the other hand, any change in SEL levels will not significantly or evidently cause a change in COVID-19 stress levels and vice versa. Furthermore, regression results show that there is no regression between aggression and COVID-19 stress. However, the only variable with regression with COVID-19 stress is stress, in both cases when COVID-19 is the dependent variable and where stress is the dependent variable. This finding indicates that any increase or decrease in COVID-19 stress levels predicts an increase or decrease in stress level and vice versa.

### Table 15: Pearson Correlation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SEL_total</th>
<th>Stress_total</th>
<th>Aggression_total</th>
<th>COVID_Stress_total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SEL_total</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.665**</td>
<td>-0.610**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stress_total</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.665**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.668**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aggression_total</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.610**</td>
<td>0.668**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COVID_Stress_total</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.555**</td>
<td>0.723**</td>
<td>0.594**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
### Table 16: Regression Results when SEL is the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>9.998</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>5.491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggression_total</td>
<td>-25.788</td>
<td>7.116</td>
<td>-3.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress_total</td>
<td>-29.522</td>
<td>6.481</td>
<td>-4.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID_Stress_total</td>
<td>-6.020</td>
<td>5.538</td>
<td>-1.087</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: SEL_total

### Table 17: Regression Results when COVID-19 Stress is the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.023</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>-.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggression_total</td>
<td>.244</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress_total</td>
<td>.597</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>6.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID_Stress_total</td>
<td>-.001</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: COVID_Stress_total

### Table 18: Regression Results when Aggression is the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>-.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stress_total</td>
<td>.274</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>3.885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEL_total</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-3.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID_Stress_total</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>2.346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Aggression_total
## Evaluation Question II

*How effective was the parenting programme in helping parents improve their relationships with their children?*

A pre and post survey was administered prior and subsequent to the parenting programme which resulted in two variables that were tested under this evaluation question: **youth developmental needs, and parent-child relationships.** The first pair tested, parents' relationships with their children is normally distributed, so a parametric test was conducted. While the second pair tested, parents' knowledge of youth developmental needs was not normally distributed. For the latter, a series of nonparametric tests were conducted alternatively that do not require conformity to normality yet yield same purpose.

### Table 19: Regression Results when Stress is the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.050</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>-2.233</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SEL_total</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>-281</td>
<td>-4.555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COVID_Stress_total</td>
<td>.388</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>6.924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aggression_total</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>3.895</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Dependent Variable: Stress_total*

### Table 20: Descriptive Frequencies for Parents/Caregivers' Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>total_knowl_YDN_pre</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11.00000012</td>
<td>32.000000110</td>
<td>22.34081757</td>
<td>5.4031665109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total_knowl_YDN_post</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>13.000000310</td>
<td>40.000000111</td>
<td>28.22449133</td>
<td>4.514651014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total_relation_Pre</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>93.83</td>
<td>17.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total_relation_Post</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>113.36</td>
<td>11.781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 21: Parents/Caregivers’ Pre/Post Relationship Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 total_relation_Pre</td>
<td>93.83</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>17.421</td>
<td>1.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total_relation_Post</td>
<td>113.36</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>11.781</td>
<td>1.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Parents/Caregivers’ Relationship Paired Samples T-test

Per tables 21 and 22, one variable was tested for parents/caregivers enrolled in the parenting programme; the relationship between parents and children. The average/mean score for the pre- data set was compared with the average score for the post- data set (N=98). Results show that there is a significant difference (P value <=0.05) between pre and post scores for parents' relationship with their children, meaning that the intervention had a significant impact on them.

Table 23: Parents/Caregivers’ Non-Parametric Test

A 2-Related Samples test, which is a non parametric test equivalent to a paired sample t-test, was conducted where the average/mean score for the pre- data set was compared with the average score for the post- data set for (N=98). Results show a significant increase in knowledge levels, meaning that on average parents are reporting higher knowledge levels in the post, in comparison to pre results.
Table 24: Pearson Correlation Results

Results from the correlation test show a significant correlation between knowledge of youth developmental needs and parents’ relationships with their children. All results are skewed to positive, indicating a positive correlation amongst the two variables. This means that the higher the knowledge of youth developmental needs, the better the parent-child relationship.

Evaluation Question III

Is improved PSA knowledge sufficient for CAH partners and youth workers to respond to adolescent protection needs?

Table 25: Descriptive Frequencies for Community Personnel Variables

A pre/post questionnaire was administered prior and subsequent to conducting the foundation training to measure community personnel’s PSA knowledge. The questionnaire encompassed questions on topics covered during the training including questions on safe spaces, the brain, injustice, child protection, psychosocial support, attunement, self-awareness, and gender. A related non-parametric T-test was conducted where the means of pre and post total scores were compared.
Two variables were tested for participants who attended the foundation training provided by the project; total pre scores and total post scores. The score of each variable represents the total score of pre and post surveys with a maximum score of 13 and a minimum of 0. The average/mean score for the pre data set was compared with the average score for the post data set for each variable (N=58). Results show that there is a significant difference (P value $\leq 0.05$) between pre and post scores, proving that the project’s intervention had a significant impact on enhancing community personnel’s PSA knowledge.

### SRYJ I and SRYJ II Comparison

#### Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>center</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Man</td>
<td>Russafah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 27: Youth Sex per Site (SRYJ I)*
Table 28: Youth Sex per Site (SRYJ II)

To this comparative analysis, the tools used in both interventions were used to compare the pre and post means for two variables through paired sample t-test. However, it should be noted that the sample sizes for each of the projects differ; SRYJ I (N=133) SRYJII (N=163).

Table 29: Descriptive Frequencies for Youth Variables (SRYJ I)

Table 29 illustrates the average stress levels of youth participants before and after implementing SRYJ I and SRYJ II. The mean baseline scores of 133 youth participants on the assessment under T1 is 0.637, while 163 youth participants under T2 scored an average of 0.6388. Under both projects, high stress levels prevalent in youth which could be attributed to the context in which the programme was implemented and overall environmental risks. As per the table both projects had a positive impact on youth stress levels, the difference in baseline and endline stress levels under SRYJ II was 0.372.

Although both interventions had a positive impact on youth stress levels, the difference in the average baseline and endline stress levels under SRYJ II was 0.372, in comparison to only 0.335 difference under SRYJ I. Therefore it can be concluded that under SRYJ II the intervention received by T2 was more successful at impacting enrolled youth’s stress levels.
Table 30: Descriptive Frequencies for Youth Variables (SRYJ II)

Table 30 illustrates the average aggression levels of youth participants before and after implementing SRYJ I and SRYJ II. The endline scores of 133 youth participants on the assessment under T1 is 0.76, while 163 youth participants under T2 scored an average of 0.726. Under both projects, high aggression levels are prevalent in youth, with levels of aggression slightly higher for youth under SRYJ I. As per the table, **both projects had a positive impact on youth aggression levels**, the difference in baseline and endline aggression levels under SRYJ II was slightly higher (0.23).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRYJI_pre_aggression_total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRYJI_post_aggression_total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRYJII_pre_aggression_total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRYJII_post_aggression_total</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 31: Non-Parametric Test (SRYJ I)**

A 2-Related Samples test, which is a non parametric test equivalent to a paired sample t-test, was conducted where the average/mean score for the pre data set was compared with the average score for the post data set for stress variable under SRYJ I (N=133). Notably, results show a significant difference between pre and post scores for this variable. In reference to table 13 (page 15), **results show a significant difference between pre and post scores for the stress variable under SRYJ II**.
Table 32: Youth Aggression Pre/Post Paired Samples T-test

Per table 32, the aggression variable was tested for youth participants under SRYJ I. The average/mean score for the pre-data set was compared with the average score for the post-data set for each variable (N=133). Results show that there is a significant difference (P value <=0.05) between pre and post scores for aggression, meaning that the project’s intervention had a significant impact on decreasing aggression levels among participant youth. In reference to table 32, results show a significant difference between pre and post scores for the aggression variable under SRYJ II.

To test whether there is a linear correlation between stress and aggression levels among participant youth under SRYJ I, a bivariate Pearson correlation test was utilized.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>SRYJI_stress_total</th>
<th>SRYJI_aggression_total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SRYJI_stress_total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.336**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRYJI_aggression_total</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.336**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 33: Pearson Correlation Results (SRYJ I)

There is evidence of correlation between the aggression and stress, as illustrated in table 33 stress and aggression are positively correlated, meaning that when aggression levels increase stress levels increase and vice versa. Based on the aforementioned, regression tests were run to test the extent to which we can predict the value of one variable based on the value of another variable. Notably a similar correlation was noted under SRYJ II.
Stemming from correlation results, regression results show that when stress is the dependent variable, increase in aggression predicts an increase in stress. The same was noted when aggression is the dependent variable.

### Qualitative Data Key Findings

**Evaluation Question I**

*How effective was the project in improving youth psychosocial wellbeing?*

The youth journey encompasses a total of 6 stations that aim to address the needs of enrolled at-risk and diverted youth and engage them in various activities. With the exception of the support group station that adopts a separate framework, the skills camp, self-expression, community service, career exposure stations and the youth civic engagement club are based on the four dimensions of learning that underpin the definition of lifeskills. The four dimensions of learning include the ‘Learning to Know’ or cognitive dimension, the ‘Learning to Do’ or instrumental dimension, the ‘Learning to Be’ or individual dimension, and the ‘Learning to Live Together’ or the social dimension. The lifeskills have been furthermore broken down to adopt UNICEF’s 12 lifeskills that include creativity, critical thinking, problem-solving, cooperation,
negotiation, decision-making, self-management, resilience, communication, respect for diversity, empathy and participation. In that sense, each of the stations addressed a number of the lifeskills in a complementary way that builds on the previous station.

The project reportedly had a positive impact on youth’s general well being and thinking patterns. Youth expressed that their participation in the programme provided them with the skills to cope with stress and regulate their emotions when faced with challenging situations. Additionally, the interpersonal, self-expression, and life skills acquired through their engagement in the stations further enhanced their social and emotional awareness towards themselves and others around them, thereby encouraging them to be more proactive in their communities as well as changing their perception in relation to their future paths. The majority of respondents perceived the CAH as a safe space, which played a huge role in strengthening their relationships with family and friends.

At-risk and diverted youth:

Findings in relation to stations model effectiveness:

- **The stations’ approach kept youth excited.** The different stations meant that youth were always looking forward to learning new skills through new activities, respondents reported that they did not want to miss any sessions and even went to the CAH when there were no sessions.
- **Support group sessions developed youth’s social emotional awareness.** Respondents reported developing skills to identify their emotions and regulate them through the “How are you doing?” round table discussion and the feelings wheel. Additionally, youth expressed that the stress-coping mechanisms including the breathing exercises helped them deal with any anxiety or negative energy and not let it affect them.
- **The camp station enhanced youth’s interpersonal and life skills.** Participants reported that the practical activities they engaged in during the camp station enhanced their teamwork, concentration, decision making and problem solving skills. Being outdoors provided youth with the space to listen to their thoughts, think things through, and consult others when making a decision.
- **Different streams in the self-expression station allowed youth to release their energy and gave them an outlet to express their feelings.** The learning by doing activities covered under this station, such as drawing mandalas/drawing using Nescafe, breathing exercises, and meditating, gave youth a healthy medium of self expression.
- **The community service station made youth more empathetic towards others.** Youth expressed that throughout the community service station, they noticed becoming more empathetic towards those they were helping, and developed their social emotional awareness, and helped them understand people’s feelings and behaviours. The community service also instilled in them a sense of pride and accomplishment, to be able to help members of their community.
- **The career exposure station introduced youth to a variety of potential career paths.** Visiting colleges, municipalities, companies and factories introduced youth to non-traditional occupations and career options, as well as the steps they need to take to reach their desired goals. It also gave youth an opportunity to ask questions about the challenges employees face on a daily basis, and instilled in them the motivation and determination to plan for their future and set future goals.
• **The career exposure station also challenged socially set gender-specific jobs.** Female youth specifically reported being introduced to new career prospects that they had previously not considered because they thought they were designated for men. This station showed them that no occupation is gender-specific, and that they are free to choose their paths and explore all options. It also equipped them with some practical skills like phone and car maintenance which enhanced their confidence and self-reliance.

• **Youth civic engagement club allowed youth the opportunity to become active members of their communities.** Youth expressed their feelings of pride and happiness to be helping their community and implementing initiatives that aim to improve their neighbourhoods.

• **Not all youth were involved in the civic engagement club.** Given that the community project station was transformed into a club due to the project’s compressed timeline, some respondents were disappointed to not have been given the opportunity to participate in the civic engagement club.

**Findings in relation to youth’s wellbeing:**

• **The programme promoted youth wellbeing during COVID-19.** Respondents expressed that the programme gave them a purpose and helped them through difficult times, especially considering the pandemic, shutting down schools and minimal social interactions. Having something to look forward to meant that they were waking up earlier, had more energy and did not spend as much time on their phones.

• **The programme had a great impact on youth relationships.** In addition to introducing enrolled youth to new people and forming strong friendships, the programme also strengthened youth’s existing relationships with family and friends. Respondents expressed that becoming more in touch with their feelings meant that they no longer had superficial relationships, and instead learned how to build healthy relationships based on open communication, respect and trust.

• **Workshops instilled a sense of self-confidence and self-reliance in youth.** The programme provided participants with a safe space to express their feelings without judgment, this enhanced their self-confidence and public speaking skills. Participants reported that they were more likely to speak out and justify their opinions now. Youth enrolled in the theatre programme specifically reported that it helped them overcome stage fright, and talking in front of people in general.

• **The programme enhanced youth’s social emotional awareness.** Respondents expressed that becoming more empathetic and understanding people’s behaviours, coupled with learning new stress coping mechanisms meant that they developed their anger management skills, as such they were better able to deal with difficult situations with their parents, and are generally closer to them.

• **Youth with parents enrolled in the parenting programme reported stronger relationships with them.** Youth reported a positive change in their relationships with their parents, where parents are more open and accepting of their children, and spend more time with them.

**Findings in relation to continuity and sustainability:**
● **Youth are sharing knowledge with their families and social circles.** Respondents continue to share the knowledge and skills acquired to siblings, cousins and friends. Youth expressed that the skills they learned will have a long-term impact on them as it changed their key behaviours and thought processes.

● **Sustaining support group network.** Enrolled youth continue to be in contact with each other and ask for advice through social media platforms and WhatsApp groups.

● **Youth applied the skills acquired through the self expression station even after the end of the project.** Engaging in programmes like content creation and photography using tools that are available to youth meant that they could continue expressing themselves through these newly acquired skills.

**Post Care Programme (Nature club):**

Across the sample, the nature club programme has been perceived and collectively reported to be very effective in terms of enhancing skills, engagement, and a sense of belonging among participant youth. This can be justified by two main reasons per the qualitative data; the experiential learning approach utilized in the implementation of the programme, and the interpersonal relationships encouraged and developed during the programme.

Firstly, the nature club programme is based on experience and reflecting upon these experiences. Participant youth go through an experience that is controlled to a certain extent to teach a certain skill which is immediately followed by a reflection session where rooting this gained skill takes place, widening their learning experience by learning from each other.

Secondly, the nature club programme puts a major focus on relationships and creating a community for participants where they feel safe and supported. This is achieved through the indoor sessions and is done gradually through experiential learning as well. Additionally, these relationships are instilled and deepened as they move towards the outdoor sessions where, as a team, participants go through different experiences together where they learn and grow individually as well as a team.

Notably, the design and nature of this programme, given the above modalities of outdoor and indoor sessions, was found to be effective in allowing it to achieve a profound outcome.

**Findings in relation to the implementation approach:**

- **The experiential learning approach proved to be very effective in teaching skills that are practiced on a daily basis.** The programme is designed in a way that provides a balance between challenge and capability among participants to create the right amount of motivation and engagement (flow) which are proven to have a direct link to learning. This is further emphasised through proceeding reflection sessions.

- **Building trust between youth workers and participants is key to individual and team development.** The “how are you doing?” round table discussion in the beginning of each session, reflection sessions, and personal one to one relationships have all contributed to creating a safe community for participants where trust and support
compliment each other. This directly impacted their commitment levels in the programme.

Findings in relation to skills learned and youth wellbeing:

- **The programme was effective in teaching life skills and social skills.** Participants are practicing nature friendly behaviors in their daily lives by internalizing Leave No Trace (LNT) principles and becoming more disciplined. By learning how to prioritize their duties, they have learned how to listen to each other without interrupting, accept each other’s differences and capabilities without being judgemental, what actions to follow in case of emergencies, how to plan and mitigate risk, how to take risks and give your best in a certain task.

- **The programme provided a safe, judgement-free space for youth.** Respondents expressed that in addition to giving them a purpose, the nature club was a safe space for them to disconnect from their difficult environments and kept them occupied, thereby breaking some of their bad habits and staying out of trouble.

- **The programme developed both youth’s physical and mental wellbeing.** The outdoor activities conducted including hiking, climbing, and camping allowed them to challenge themselves, improve their physical fitness, and overcome their fears of climbing. Youth also expressed that being outdoors gave them peace of mind, patience, and the ability to adapt to new environments. Engaging in the programme’s activities also enhanced their collaboration and teamwork skills, and respondents expressed that they learned to seek help when needed.

- **Youth reported having stronger existing relationships and forming healthy new friendships.** Respondents stated that the skills they developed throughout the programme changed the way they perceive themselves and their relationships. They also stressed that the programme changed their thought processes and behaviours, thereby changing their relationships with their parents, “I respect my father more, and he depends on me now.”

- **The programme’s activities and coaches’ support were crucial in instilling determination to set future plans in youth.** Respondents explained that the “Plan, Execute, Review” approach applied to the outdoor activities conducted became something they reflected on every aspect of their lives. They also expressed that being surrounded by people who have dreams and aspirations, as well as having accomplished coaches as role models gave them hope and the motivation to become better versions of themselves, and to set goals for the future. Some respondents were considering dropping out of high school to start working, others did not think learning English would be important, but after speaking to their coaches they became more career-driven and committed to setting goals and achieving them.

Findings in relation to continuity and sustainability:

- **Transferring knowledge and skills to family and friends.** Youth reported transferring knowledge gained on leave no trace principles to friends and family when going on trips, as well as cleaning up after people who litter in their neighbourhoods.
Evaluation Question II

How effective was the parenting programme in helping parents improve their relationships with their children?

Informed by multiple neuroscience principles and theoretical frameworks, the parents/caregivers' programme aims to inform parents on youth developmental needs in relation to four main pillars: cognitive developmental needs, social developmental needs, physical developmental needs, and emotional developmental needs. The programme also places emphasis on enhancing stress coping skills and emotional regulation mechanisms amongst participants, and instilling healthy and positive parenting techniques in aim of improving and strengthening parent-child relationships.

Participants enrolled in the parenting programme reported a common thread of responses related to a deeper understanding of youth developmental needs, an acquired set of parenting skills that enhanced their relationships with their children, and techniques to cope with stress. The programme enabled parents to adopt parenting techniques that they employed as alternatives to violence and abuse. Furthermore, parents reported that understanding youth developmental needs coupled with learning healthy stress coping mechanisms enabled them to be more patient with their children, listen more often, and build healthy and open communication channels with their children. Participants found that when healthy communication channels were constructed, their children were more responsive and were able to openly share personal details about their lives.

Nonetheless, the programme was found to be more effective with mothers who demonstrated a deeper understanding of youth developmental needs and reported on the level of effectiveness in applying the acquired skills and knowledge. While enrolled fathers discussed brain development in youth, the importance of employing effective communication skills with youth instead of violence, mothers discussed a newly developed sense of emotional awareness and expressed their ability to identify their emotions and have a stronger grip over how their emotions impact their daily life and perspective. Additionally, mothers demonstrated an understanding of the topics covered by the programme, specifically on youth's cognitive developmental needs. They discussed the importance of adopting positive parenting approaches in shaping the trajectories that their children take. They placed emphasis on aggressive and violent behavior and took note of ways to limit that through leading by example and employing effective communication techniques.

Findings in relation to parenting skills:

- **Parents/caregivers apply positive reinforcement to build healthy relationships.**
  Respondents reported that the programme enabled them to adopt a positive and patient communication approach with their children, as such positively impacting their relationship. Children opened up and grew more comfortable during conversations with their parents, proving to be an effective technique in building healthy relationships with their children, where children now listen to their parents out of love and respect, rather than fear.
Parents/caregivers understand the impact of their negative attitudes on youth. Respondents expressed that the programme made them more aware of the impact of their stress and anger on their children’s mental health and behaviours, as children tend to mirror their parents. This drove mothers to practice stress coping mechanisms and self-care, including breathing exercises, cleaning, and meditating, which helped instill positive attitudes in their children. Fathers also recognised the importance of being a better example for their children to follow, and became more aware of the impact of taking out their anger on their children regardless of whether it is done verbally or physically.

Findings in relation to youth developmental needs:

- Parents/caregivers’ understanding of youth developmental needs resulted in supporting their children in healthy decision making processes. Parents expressed their ability to support their children in decision making processes, engage in healthy discussions and provide them with multiple solutions instead of forcing any decisions on them, which proved to be effective in strengthening their relationship with their children.

- Parents/caregivers’ understanding of youth developmental needs cultivated healthier communication skills. Respondents reported that the programme enabled them to adopt a patient and open communication approach with their children, allowing children to express themselves in a safe space without criticism or fear of punishment, which helped build open communication channels between them. Once parents were informed with YDNs, they started to notice their children’s changing behaviours depending on whether their needs were met. Additionally, when breaking the barriers between parent and child, children resorted to their parents instead of strangers for help.

- Parents/caregivers’ understanding of youth developmental needs led to addressing socially assigned gender roles. Mothers expressed that the programme really shed a light on the commonality of sexism in their communities, and the extent to which girls are treated differently. Some respondents mentioned that they previously did not address socially assigned gender roles in the household, but have since been actively empowering their daughters and standing up for their rights. Respondents also reported that they have been more open about their children’s physical needs as they age, something they previously avoided due to the culture of shame.

- Parents/caregivers’ understanding of youth’s cognitive development led to healthier relationships. The programme made parents more aware of the different mental capacities that each child possesses. Instead of constantly comparing and criticising their children, they now appreciate those differences and support them regardless of their abilities, thereby strengthening their relationship. Additionally, parents previously gave their children more responsibility than they can bear, but understanding youth’s cognitive development emphasised that youth at this stage are still creating their identities and do not have a fully developed prefrontal cortex. This highlighted the importance of taking into consideration every child’s age and developmental needs when dealing with them, and spending more time with them instead of spending all their time on their phones.
Findings in relation to programme effectiveness:

- **The programme was effective in teaching theoretical knowledge as well as practical skills.** Parents demonstrated an understanding of the topics covered in the programme by discussing examples of youth’s cognitive, emotional, physical, and social developmental needs - the main pillars on which the parenting programme rests upon. One respondent who had completed their higher education in child behaviour expressed that the programme was particularly helpful in providing not only theoretical knowledge, but also the practical skills and solutions for everyday challenges.

- **Support group approach reported to be effective.** Parents expressed that the programme gave them support in direct and indirect ways. The programme provided mothers with a safe space to build trusting support networks where knowledge, practical skills, and experiences were openly shared. Additionally, some mothers expressed the importance of the indirect support they received through the sessions. Conversations revolved around the significance of not only sharing their experiences, but also hearing about other mothers’ experiences and challenges. This created a healthy environment where mothers were able to relate to each other, and allowed for self-reflection, which reportedly motivated them to change their perspective on life.

- **The programme did not effectively address spousal needs.** The majority of respondents agreed that the programme met their needs in relation to their children, the programme did not address the relationship between husband and wife which is reportedly a source of stress that would be reflected on their children.

- **The programme lacked self expression activities.** Respondents reported that the programme did not include self expression activities that could have been useful to them for stress relief and developing healthy means of self expression.

Findings in relation to continuity and sustainability:

- **Sharing knowledge with families and social circles.** Respondents’ reported sharing the knowledge acquired from participating in the programme with family, friends and neighbours, as well as conducting sessions in their houses.

- **Sustaining support group network.** One factor that has been reportedly sustained is the support component of the programme. Mothers are still in contact with each other and still provide support to one another.

**Evaluation Question III**

Is improved PSA knowledge sufficient for CAH partners and community personnel to respond to adolescent protection needs?

Community personnel working with Nubader in general have reported great professional and personal benefit as a result of working in this project. The project has provided these community personnel with both the knowledge and experience to equip them and enrich their career paths and future endeavors. The foundation training has been reported to be a very rich training workshop that enhanced community personnel’s awareness on tackled topics (stress coping mechanisms and brain development), significantly benefiting them personally and professionally.
The training helped them develop essential skills such as communication, decision making, prioritising, anger management, and interpersonal skills.

Nevertheless, it was reported that the compressed timeline impacted stations, specifically the self expression and community project stations. Furthermore, specifically for youth workers in Madaba, the limited timeframe resulted in a lack of time allocated for preparations for youth sessions.

Moreover, it was reported that the technical support provided by Mercy Corps to youth workers in Irbid was not sufficient for them to reflect on their roles, responsibilities, and general performance.

Key Findings in relation to Implementation Approach:

- **The new project approach was reportedly more effective in comparison to the approach adopted under SRYJ I and other previous Nubader projects (24 sessions vs youth journey).** Respondents that have taken part in previous Nubader projects highlighted that the approach of the project was more effective and beneficial for youth, as per their observations. They specifically highlighted that the new design of stations, as opposed to 24 self expression and life skills sessions, ensured that all youth participants benefited from different components that the journey covers, resulting in higher levels of exposure to different activities and skills.

- **Closure and reflection activities are crucial to achieve project outcomes.** Respondents identified closure and reflection activities conducted towards the end of each session as an important part of the sessions and project approach that effectively ensure positive outcomes of youth journeys.

- **Some of the stations were not given enough implementation time to reach their full potential.** Respondents highlighted that some stations, namely the community project and self expression stations, were compressed and did not get enough implementation time.

- **Being perceived as non-adult role models made youth workers more proactive and empathetic towards youth.**

- **Pairing youth workers to lead stations created room for collaboration, and knowledge and skills exchange.** As part of the programme youth workers were paired to lead stations for a group of youth. It was reported that this was very beneficial to youth as they were able to exchange experiences, knowledge, and skills.

Given the different implementation approach adopted in Madaba, the findings reported by CAH personnel in Madaba are summarised below:

- **The integration of a cross cutting civic engagement component ensured that youth workers leading different activities acquired knowledge on youth civic engagement.** Youth workers in Madaba reported that the integration of a youth civic engagement component ensured that youth workers leading different activities acquired knowledge on youth civic engagement.
engagement component in the youth sessions provided them with room to learn about designing, leading, and implementing youth led initiatives.

- **The compressed timeframe limited the extent of benefit that youth workers and youth could pertain from the civic engagement component.** Youth workers in Madaba reported that working with a limited timeframe impacted the extent to which they and youth benefitted from the experience.

- **The limited timeframe affected youth workers’ ability to review and prepare for providing the sessions to youth.** Youth workers reported that the limited timeframe resulted in having to lead sessions with youth immediately after the foundation training. This gave them limited time with the training kits and tools to be utilised in designing and leading sessions with youth.

- **The check in visits were effective reflection tools for youth workers.** Youth workers expressed that the check in visits conducted whereby they sat with training unit members from Mercy Corps were very helpful for them to reflect on their professional development and the manner through which they implemented sessions with youth.

- **Supportive CAH management is a very important component of efficiently implementing programmes.** Youth workers reported that the leadership skills of the CAH manager played a crucial role in ensuring that the project achieved its set targets. Furthermore, they highlighted that the support received during implementation helped them better deal with one another and the challenges faced as the project progressed into the implementation phase.

- **Running trainings simultaneously at the CAH introduced challenges.** Respondents reported that at times the coordination for the training halls was not as organised as it should be, which was challenging for youth workers sometimes.

**Key Findings in relation to the Effectiveness of the Technical Trainings offered:**

**Foundation Training:**

- **Conducting the foundation training remotely was challenging for community personnel.** Respondents reported that conducting the training over Zoom was challenging due to some technical issues, lack of experience in using the platform, and the nature of the training that required group work and activities. However, the follow up face to face refresher on the training was very important to solidify the information acquired through the Zoom sessions.

- **The foundation training enabled community personnel to connect, collaborate, and get to know each other prior to the implementation phase.** Respondents reported that the foundation training and the refresher conducted subsequent to it enabled them to build trust and relationships with one another which positively impacted the results and outcomes of the project.

- **Learning circles conducted prior to the start of each station were very effective in equipping youth workers with the knowledge and skills to lead the stations.** Respondents reported that having station specific learning circles prior to the implementation of each station equipped them with the skills and knowledge to lead
each station. Furthermore, it was found to be effective given the content that was
covered in the circles, and given that the knowledge acquired in the learning circles was
immediately utilised in the stations.

- **The foundation training was more comprehensive and effective for community
personnel who previously worked with Nubader.** Respondents that have taken the
foundation training under SRYJ I and other previous Nubader projects expressed that
the training conducted under SRYJ II was more comprehensive and effective,
specifically in relation to their understanding of the juvenile justice system.

- **The content covered as part of the foundation training requires more time.** The
heavy scientific content covered as part of the foundation training requires longer time as
reported by community personnel. It was highlighted that the amount of hours per day
should be decreased and the days extended as the training requires a high level of
focus.

- **Not informing community personnel about the role they will be taking prior to the
foundation training negatively impacted them.** Community personnel reported that
they did not know what their role encompassed until they actually started the
implementation. This caused confusion and uncertainty amongst them.

- **Youth workers were not provided with the sufficient knowledge on the technical
aspect of the self expression component.** Youth workers highlighted that leading the
self expression component of the youth journey requires further knowledge on the
specific stream they will be leading, which was not covered under the foundation training
or any other specialised training. It was reported that leading theatre, art, and/or any
other type of stream requires knowledge on the technical aspect.

- **Having behaviour monitors attend the foundation training was very important for
community personnel to understand the alternative sentencing system.** Including
behaviour monitors was important for community personnel to understand juvenile laws,
alternative sentencing laws and systems, and court procedures.

**Specialised Trainings:**

- **The time allocated for the parenting programme training was not sufficient to
equip trainers with the required knowledge and skills to lead the programme.** Parenting
programme trainers reported that the length of the specialised training received was not sufficient for them to acquire the knowledge and skills to lead the
sessions with participants. Furthermore, they highlighted that the availability of a training
manual did not cover this gap.

- **Specialised trainings effectively equipped youth workers with the skills and
knowledge to lead stations.** Youth workers reported that specialised trainings
effectively built on one another and delved deeper into role specific tasks and content
covered in the foundation training which was helpful for them to carry out their tasks and
lead their session.

- **The nature club specialised training was effective in equipping youth workers with
the knowledge and skills to lead outdoor activities.** Youth workers reported that the
nature club training equipped them with the knowledge and skills to design, plan, and co-
lead the outdoor sessions with youth that included hiking, trekking, and climbing amongst other activities.

- **The technical training provided for youth workers to conduct the evaluations with youth was not sufficient to equip them with the skills to carry out the task.** The technical training provided on the tools measuring the impact on youth was not sufficient for youth workers to deal with the challenges that arose as they collected data from youth. However, youth workers mentioned that the support provided by MC staff upon sharing these challenges was effective in obtaining the required information from youth.
- **The monitoring and evaluation training was effective in equipping the focal points with a new set of skills to lead M&E activities in the site.**

### Key Findings in relation to Technical Support:

The following finding was identified in relation to the technical support for CAH personnel in Ruseifeh:

- **The technical support provided by Mercy Corps was effective in building a collaborative environment.** Respondents highlighted that the support received from Nubader team members resulted in an open and collaborative environment. This resulted in feeling comfortable to seek help in relation to their challenges and failures in aim to find solutions and best practices.

The following findings were identified in relation to the technical support for CAH personnel in Madaba:

- **The training kits provided to youth workers were not sufficient to design for the sessions conducted with youth.** Youth workers reported that the training kits provided to them in order to design training plans to be conducted with youth were not comprehensive in that it did not have enough activities that can be utilised by them.
- **The parenting programme manual does not comprehensively take literacy into account.** Parenting programme trainers reported that literacy was a challenge in implementing the activities in the parenting programme manual. It was reported that while the verbal activities were easy to implement with participants, other activities were difficult to implement due to some participants being illiterate.
- **The procurement processes under the CAH in Madaba were challenging.** Finance and procurement processes took an extended amount of time to be completed. Youth workers reported that at times this made their job challenging as they needed tools and materials to conduct the activities as part of their designed sessions.

The following finding was identified in relation to the technical support for CAH personnel in Irbid:

- **The technical support provided by Mercy Corps was not sufficient for youth workers to reflect on their roles, responsibilities, and performance.** It was reported
that more technical support is required for youth workers to effectively reflect on their roles, responsibilities, and performance. While check in visits were conducted they were not followed by reflection sessions to inform youth workers on strengths and areas of improvement.

**Key Findings in relation to skills gained by CAH Personnel:**

- **Youth workers gained skills that they practice in their day to day life as a result to their participation in the programme.** The programme equipped youth workers with skills that they applied in their daily lives, these include self reflection, emotional regulation, organized and rational thinking, and empathy/social awareness - which were applied with families and social circles.
- **CAH personnel developed the ability to identify and regulate their emotions.** Respondents highlighted the skills of self control and identifying emotions as the main skills acquired under this programme. It was reported that these skills were very important when dealing with at-risk and diverted youth from courts.
- **Youth workers gained skills from the self-expression stations and applied them in their day-to-day lives.** Youth workers reported that the self-expression station was beneficial to them too as they also acquired self expression skills and applied them when working with youth and their social circles.

**Key Findings in relation to Observed Impact on Youth:**

- **The stations had a direct impact on youth skills as observed by youth workers.** Youth workers noticed that the stations had a direct impact on participants’ confidence, their ability to speak in public specifically those who joined the theatre programme, and decision making through meditation. Furthermore, they noticed that youth pass on what they learn throughout their journeys to their friends, siblings, and relatives.
- **Workshops improved participants’ self expression, communication, public speaking, and decision making skills.** The programme effectively equipped youth with the skills including social awareness, self-confidence, public speaking, decision making, and emotional regulation amongst others. Furthermore, the programme enabled youth to be more accepting of each other’s differences.
- **Youth felt a sense of belonging towards the place.** Respondents reported that youth cultivated a sense of belonging to the space whereby they felt comfortable to be who they are. It was also highlighted that youth developed a readiness to give back and were ready to support the centre with whatever was needed.
- **Youth gained the skills to manage their impulsive reactions and reflect on their actions and their impact on others when faced with conflict.** Respondents noticed that while youth had conflict amongst each other towards the beginning of the programme, they developed the skills to manage their reactions and reflect on them when faced with conflict. Youth learned to apologize when they are wrong, regulate their emotions, and manage their anger.
• **The community service and self-expression stations were reportedly the most important stations.** Respondents reported that the community service and self-expression stations were the most important stations, given that the self-expression station taught youth how to express themselves in a healthy manner, reflect on their journeys, and have discussions with other youth and youth workers. As for the community service station, it gave youth the opportunity to interact with their communities on a broader scale. Furthermore, it enabled youth to express themselves within their communities and develop a sense of agency.

• **The self expression station enhanced youth’s ability to communicate with their parents.** Respondents reported that the impact of this station was recognized by parents as they noticed that their children were able to have healthy conversations with them. Furthermore, it motivated youth to share information on their day-to-day lives with their parents, which contributed to improved relationships.

• **Not being enrolled in the programme from the initial stations impacts diverted youth’s commitment levels.** Respondents reported that diverted youth who attended the camp station were more likely to commit to the youth journey in comparison to youth who missed the first sessions of the programme.

• **Parents' engagement in working with cases of diverted youth and the type of case contribute to youth commitment to the programme.** It was reported that when parents are engaged in their children’s cases it increases the chances of diverted youth in committing to the programme’s activities. Furthermore, the severity of the case impacts the levels of commitment of youth, the more severe the case the less likely youth will commit.

• **The activities effectively absorbed youth’s anger and addressed their reactions to difficult circumstances.** The stations, specifically the self-expression station, are effective in providing youth with alternatives to expressing themselves in an aggressive or violent manner. Youth were using the tools provided to them to express themselves in a healthy manner.

• **The support group station created a safe space for youth to discuss their issues and practice respect towards each other.** The support group stations enabled youth to develop the ability to respect each other and ridicule each other in relation to their hardships or opinions.

**Key Findings in relation to Continuity and Sustainability:**

• **Youth workers expressed an intention to continue working with vulnerable youth and in the mental health sector.** Respondents expressed their intention to continue working in the centre and offer youth different sessions and opportunities. Furthermore, they stress on the fact that they are looking for ways to keep the centre open to be a safe space for youth to come to. While some of these intentions are grounded in set plans, others are not grounded in realistic set plans to continue supporting youth in these communities and no clear guidance is provided by MC units on how this might look like.
Beyond offering acquired knowledge to social circles and families, youth workers named funds and running workshops as important means to continue providing the offered services to youth in the community.

Key findings from KIIIs conducted with CAH management:

Programme effectiveness:

- **The project was reportedly successful at fostering youth’s sense of self value, belonging, and level of civic participation in their communities.** Youth enrolled in the programme felt respected, heard, and appreciated. Furthermore, they developed a strong sense of self value which fostered their abilities to develop their identities. This reflected well on their wellbeing and their level of participation in their communities.
- **The project needed to do more for diverted youth.** While the project effectively engaged youth whereby they learned stress coping mechanisms, healthy means for self expression, emotional regulation, goal setting, and alternatives to violence, Irbid’s CAH manager reported that projects should do more for diverted youth by working closely with the juvenile police department, extending the timeline of the project, increasing the amount of sessions provided, and increasing the number of youth in conflict with the law.
- **Engaging parents/caregivers in the intervention improved parent-child relationships.** Providing parents with the parenting programme raised their capacities in understanding and communicating with their children, which positively reflected on their relationships.
- **Project stations left a positive impact on youth.** The intervention was built to gradually engage youth in different stations. As new stations were gradually introduced, youth were given the opportunity to build relationships with youth workers and their peers, as such giving youth more time to be open and comfortable with their experience.
- **The CAHs were perceived as safe spaces by youth.** Youth perceived the CAHs as safe spaces that they can spend time in, particularly diverted youth who were visiting the centres on days that they do not have sessions.
- **Youth developed a sense of belonging to the CAHs.** Enrolled youth were offering help for the CAHs of their free days. They asked for additional activities and would constantly visit the centres to spend time together.
- **Youth formed healthy relationships with their parents and youth workers.** The respondents reported that an observed impact of the project is that youth were able to form healthier relationships with their parents and the youth workers in the CAHs. Furthermore, parents recognised the impact on youth and visited the centre to personally thank youth workers and CAH management.
- **Engaging fathers was initially challenging.** Engaging fathers and ensuring their commitment to the programme was difficult in the initial stages of implementation. However, as sessions progressed fathers committed to the sessions and reported being happy with the content as it was entirely new for them.
- **Youth workers developed a sense of belonging to the CAH.**
• Youth developed a sense of self value and expected to be treated with respect. This was observed by youth workers, parents, and CAHs management. Given that youth developed a sense of self value, youth demanded to be treated with respect from youth workers, parents, and CAHs management. Some parents reported that they do not use violence with their children given that their children’s behaviours demand respect from them. Youth workers and CAHs management also noticed the same shift in youth as well.

• The project was successful at providing diverted youth with the safe space to shed negative self perceptions and shame. It was reported that referred youth come in with a mindset that they are perceived as troublemakers by the community, and they try to maintain that image. However, upon engaging in the project’s different stations like community service and career exposure, they slowly start to come out of that headspace, reflect on their risky behaviours, and try to solve these issues. Furthermore, it was highlighted that the only thing that would allow youth to change, and get rid of a negative self perception is finding a safe and accepting environment that is free of judgement.

• The stations were not given enough time. It was expressed that the stations were not given appropriate time. Furthermore, the respondents highlighted that had the intervention been longer and had the implementation time not been cut short it could have achieved higher levels of impact. It was also highlighted that youth should have been given more time to reflect and more time to do more in the community service and career exposure stations.

• CAHs understand youth needs and how to meet them. CAHs developed a better understanding of ways to maximise the benefits of the project through understanding youth needs and how to address them. Specifically for diverted youth, personnel at CAHs stopped adopting labelling practices and negative stereotypes when it comes to youth in conflict with the law, they understand the external factors that contribute to their risky behaviours.

• There are external factors that are outside of the project’s reach. While youth are taught ways to cope with stress and reduce their propensity to violence, they are also exposed to external factors that are outside their reach and the project’s reach. In this case, some youth are able to successfully practice the skills acquired under the project and others will not be able to.

• The process of receiving diverted youth was taxing for the project. The process of acquiring necessary approvals from MoSD, communicating with judges, and receiving diverted youth took a very long time, as such the project activities had to start after the outreach for at-risk youth had been done for a considerable amount of time.

• Diverted youth who came from remote areas show a high level of commitment. Some of the diverted youth resided in very remote areas, meaning that they had to travel very long distances to get to the CAHs. Yet, diverted youth showed a great deal of interest and commitment to the project.

• The project’s limited timeframe introduced challenges in relation to implementation. Due to the project’s timeframe, youth sessions commenced
immediately upon the end of the foundation training in Madaba, this meant that the time given for preparations was insufficient.

- **Bureaucratic processes affected the flow of the project.** Given that the CAH in Madaba was an MoSD affiliated centre, the Ministry of Finance’s instructions needed to be followed in relation to any procured items. This resulted in delays and challenges in relation to procuring the items required for trainings.
- **People with disabilities need to be further considered in the project.** Despite the fact that the project was inclusive in hiring people with disabilities, it was highlighted that a role such as a youth worker takes a psychological toll on people with disabilities, given that tasks cannot be carried out as quickly or swiftly as others.
- **COVID-19 made processing paperwork with other governmental entities difficult.**
- **Restricted timeline was one of the most significant challenges.** It was reported that the restricted timeline was one of the main challenges faced by the project as it impacted both youth and CAHs.

**Sustainability:**

- **Irbid will continue to receive referred youth to serve non-incarcerative sentences.** Irbid will continue to receive referred youth to serve non-incarcerative sentences after the end of the project. Furthermore, CAH management expressed that some of the Nubader activities are planned to be sustained in the future.
- **Madaba has formed a youth committee that includes youth participants.** The CAH in Madaba has formed a youth committee that includes youth participants to ensure that youth still have access to their safe space and are still engaged in their communities.
- **Mother participants have joined the mothers committee in the Madaba CAH.** Enrolled mothers joined the mothers committee in the Madaba CAH to continue visiting the centre and taking part in its activities.
- **Passing on skills and knowledge in the community is the essence of sustainable impact.** The CAH manager in Madaba expressed that youth have passed on their knowledge and skills in their social circles, families, and the Madaba beggars centre. It was highlighted that it is a true form of sustainable impact.
- **Madaba will continue to receive referred youth to serve non-incarcerative sentences.** Madaba will continue to receive referred youth to serve non-incarcerative sentences after the end of the project where they will be taking part in community service activities. Furthermore, CAH management expressed that some of the Nubader activities are planned to be sustained in the future.
- **Lack of funding from NGOs and lack of funding from MoSD is a significant obstacle to offering continued support to at-risk youth in their communities.**

**Cross Cutting Conclusions**

- Engaging youth in community service activities develops their ability to be empathetic towards others.
- The programme was successful at decreasing COVID-19-related stress.
- The concept of a safe space for youth is linked to the relationships and trust built with youth workers and peers, which contributes to achieving a positive impact.
- Youth with parents enrolled in the parenting programme reported having stronger relationships with them, as there was a notable change in their parents approach and vice versa.
- The project has had a ripple effect in terms of youth, parents and youth workers sharing their acquired knowledge and skills with their communities.
- The post care programme (nature club) was effective in addressing released youth needs in relation to providing them with a safe space, a learning environment, forming healthy relationships and goal-setting.
- The post care programme (nature club) experiential learning method generates engagement and motivation necessary for learning.
- The programme was effective in improving youth developmental needs and cognitive development, leading to healthier parent-child relationships.
- The support group structure of the parenting programme sessions directly contributed to parents improved wellbeing, self-care, and relationships with their children.
- Partnerships with CAHs play a major role in ensuring the project’s success.
- The Nubader programme is a massive learning and growth opportunity for community personnel.
- The foundation training was effective in equipping community personnel with the knowledge and skills to effectively lead interventions with youth. However, conducting parts of the training remotely negatively impacts knowledge retention for community personnel.
- The community project and self-expression stations are crucial components to youth journeys.
- Compressing the timeline of the project limits the extent of benefit for youth, parents, and CAH personnel.

Conclusions on the Comparison between SRYJ I and SRYJ II

The quantitative analysis conducted to draw these comparisons was youth centric, meaning that the analysis was conducted for scales that have been used for youth under both SRYJ I and SRYJ II. It is important to note here that both interventions were conducted in considerably different contexts, one of which was conducted during the pandemic. Furthermore, while the quantitative analysis submitted under SRYJ I was not as statistically advanced compared to SRYJ II, upon running the same statistical tests for the sample under SRYJ I it can be concluded that both interventions worked at varying degrees.
Quantitative findings point to significant differences between pre and post results under both interventions, meaning that the impact under each of the programmes showed statistically significant results in relation to stress and aggression levels among youth participants. Notably, results have shown that SRYJ II has impacted aggression and stress at slightly higher rates. Yet, it should be noted that the dependent relationship between COVID-19 stress and stress found in the regression analysis indicates that a possible increase in COVID-19 stress predicts an increase in stress levels amongst youth. This should be considered as an external factor that directly impacts stress levels observed in youth under SRYJ II that was non-existent under SRYJ I.

As for qualitative findings, it can also be concluded that both interventions were successful at impacting youth in relation to targeted knowledge and various skill sets. As per the findings under SRYJ I (refer to the SRYJ I Submission Package 2019), SRYJ II was successful at achieving the same results that included general excitement and commitment towards the intervention, as well as the ability to develop an improved perspective towards themselves and the communities around them. Moreover, both interventions were successful at equipping youth with the tools to develop healthy stress coping mechanisms and use alternatives to violence. However, given that the intervention under SRYJ II had a stronger focus on components such as social and emotional learning, empathy, and goal setting amongst other components, qualitative results show that youth have gained additional skills sets that have not been reported on under SRYJ I. This could be attributed to the variety of stations that youth were exposed to solely under SRYJ II (community service, career exposure, and the camp station). As such it can be concluded that SRYJ II effectively fostered youth’s ability to develop a wider set of skills in comparison to SRYJ I.

**Recommendations**

**Recommendations from youth:**
- Extend the length of the intervention to ensure that youth have enough time to reflect on each station before moving on to the next one and capture the maximum learning from them.
- Extend the length of the community service and career exposure sessions to increase youth’s exposure to multiple external learnings, interaction in their communities, and new and healthy networks.
- Introduce a wider variety of streams in all sites.
- Continue implementing the stations approach to maximise youth’s benefit from the project.

**Recommendations from Parents:**
- Extend the length of the intervention to include more practical courses and content on early marriage, spouse relationships, and how to deal with the sexual needs of youth after puberty.
● Ensure the availability of joint parents-child activities to increase the impact on family relationships.
● Provide a larger amount of trainings for at-risk girls.
● Introduce self expression sessions to the parenting manual to cover topics such as art, nutrition, handicrafts, and sport such as meditation and yoga.

Recommendations from CAH personnel and CAH management:

● Tailor the youth intervention to account for enrolled youth’s familial relationships and friendships to ensure that these youth are not enrolled in the same sessions.
● When working with MoSD affiliated CAH prepare a list of items to be procured for trainings ahead of time to ensure that trainings run smoothly.
● Provide youth workers with sufficient time to design their sessions and activities to be conducted with youth.
● Collaborate with CAHs that have limited training halls to create trainings schedule to ensure that no challenges arise from running sessions simultaneously.
● Develop activities that take literacy levels into consideration to be added in the parenting manual.
● Provide youth workers with a specialised training on the technical aspects of self expression through art, with a specific focus on the theatre component.
● Provide extensive support to youth workers during the first two to three sessions with youth to ensure that challenges are addressed immediately.
● Extend the duration of the parenting training provided for the parenting trainers and the parenting programme.
● Extend the duration of each station to ensure maximised benefit by youth.
● Conduct an extended training for community personnel on the tools to be used with youth that includes roleplays, activities, and extensive explanations of possible challenges faced when filling data with youth, and follow up closely with required support.
● Ensure that the project’s implementation phase is not compressed to ensure that youth, youth workers, and CAH management are given enough time to reflect and prepare.
● When hiring people with disabilities, consider their capabilities in relation to their roles they take within the project.
● Engage fathers in activities towards the initial sessions of the parenting programme in aim of motivating them to commit to the programme.
● In future projects work with the juvenile police department to ensure that youth diverted from remote areas are referred to more proximate centres.
● Ensure that diverted youth’s parents are engaged in the programme to ensure higher levels of commitment and impact.
● Engage diverted youth in the initial sessions of the programme, specifically the camp station.
**Success Story**

**From being at-risk to a youth worker:**

26-year-old Ata Al-Haj worked at a high-risk industrial area in 2017, back then he did not have a strong sense of who he was as a person, nor a strong sense of identity. The challenges he was facing revolved around the lack of opportunities for young people to express themselves, the lack of safe spaces for youth, the continuously rising price of education, lack of employment opportunities, and the risky environment he resided in.

In 2018, Ata joined the nature club programme under SRYJ I project as an at-risk young person. Upon joining the programme he was able to understand his emotions and his capabilities, his self confidence increased, and his ability to adapt and accept his peers was fostered. Furthermore, he cultivated a passion for self development to further build the knowledge and skills he acquired as part of his participation in SRYJ I. As a result, he quit his old job and continued to look for training and self development opportunities in his community. Subsequently, he decided to continue his education.

A year later, Ata joined the Nubader team in Ruseifeh as a youth worker under the nature club component. As part of the trainings, he acquired “attunement skills, skills to lead nature club outdoor and indoor activities, first aid, communication skills, coaching skills, decision making skills, and civic engagement principles and ways to apply them.” Upon receiving the required trainings, he was leading sessions with at-risk youth, who he was able to connect with and understand given that he was in the same position, “I understood youth and their needs because I was a participant just like them.”

According to Ata, his experience with Nubader changed his personality; “I became someone who knows how to set priorities for my life, I know how to set my goals and I now know where I’m heading with my future.” Furthermore, Ata became more patient and developed a passion for humanitarian work and helping others. He expressed that his life would have been considerably different had he not taken part in Nubader, “had I not taken part in Nubader, I wouldn’t have continued my education, I would have been violent and aggressive given the area that I live in. The chances of me using illegal substances would have been high because I was working in an area that was very risky.”

In the future, Ata wants to continue to work in the humanitarian sector by leading projects that are inclusive of individuals who are not accepted and embraced by their communities.
Annex I
Assessment Tools.

Annex II

Youth (intensive sessions) FGDs

المقدمة

"شكراً لحضوركم وموافقتكم للتحدث معنا، واعطاءكم من وقتكم لمقابلتنا، إسمي __________، زميلي __________ سوف يقوم بمساعدتي في أخذ الملاحظات) نحن موظفين من منظمة ميرسي كور، نعمل في مشروع نبادر مع شركاءنا..................

ميرسي كور هي منظمة دولية لها مكتب في الأردن تعمل على تقديم الخدمات الإنسانية والتنموية من خلال عدة مشاريع في الأردن مثل مشاريع معنية بالشباب وإدماج ذوي الإعاقة والتعمية وغيرها.

الهدف من هذا الاجتماع هو عمل تقييم للتدريبات والأنشطة التي شاركتم فيها خلال ال5 شهور الماضية بالإضافة إلى اهتمامنا بسماع قصص تغيير حصلت معكم أو مع غيركم نتيجة لمشاركتكم في البرنامج.

خلال هذا الاجتماع سأقوم بسؤالكم أسئلة إما مباشرة أو من خلال مجموعات أو نشاط وسويق زميلي بتدوين الأجوبة لذلك ستستخدم الاسم الأول فقط أثناء التعريف. ليس هناك إجابة صحيحة أو خاطئة لأن الاستمتاع بالتدريبات التي سنتشرحها هي عن تجارب فردية كل تجربة تختلف عن الأخرى. وتأكدوا تماما أنتم تزحب بالنقاط السلبية مثل الإيجابية لأن الهدف من التقييم هو التحسين.

قبل أن أبدأ أحب أن أذكر أن الأسئلة ستتراوح منه الساعة والنصف.

1. أسئلة عامة/ مقدمة

1.1. يمكنك توصيفي جمعية (ملاحظة للميسر: لو اجى من مكان، كيف رح توصفه) (ملاحظة للميسر: لو اجى من مكان، كيف رح توصفه) xxxxx (ملاحظة للميسر: لو اجى من مكان، كيف رح توصفه) شو هاد المكان بالنسبة إلك؟، ما هو التدريب الذي شاركت فيه؟... كنا تعملوا بالتدريب؟ ما هي الأنشطة التي تفضلها أكثر (ملاحظة للميسر: إن كنت تفضل ما كنا عملنا، التعبير عن الذات، الخدمة المجتمعية، التعرض الوظيفي، وفي منظم شاركك بادي المشاركة المدنية) أي منهم كان المفضل لكم؟ لذا حاسم النشاطة هو المفضل لدي؟ (ملاحظة للميسر: شو أكثر جزء مفضل بالنسبة الللك)

1.2. هل يمكن توصيفي شو بحث لما تشارك بالأنشطة المتعددة في التدريب؟

1.2.1. ماذا تعلمتم من خلال مشاركتكم بالتدريب؟ (ملاحظة للميسر: هل تعلمتم ماذا تعلمتم من خلال مشاركتكم بالتدريب؟ (ملاحظة للميسر: هل تعلمتم ماذا تعلمتم من خلال مشاركتكم بالتدريب؟)

1.2.2. هل يمكن ممكن توصيفي الأشياء التي تعلمتها من الأنشطة المختلفة اللي شاركت فيها؟ هل تعلمتم من خلال هذه الدروس في أي مكان آخر؟ ما يجعلني معيزًا برايلك / نبادر / اسم المركز
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1.2.3. هل استخدمت ما تعلمتته من خلال مشاركتك في الأنشطة، خارج المركز؟ احكي مثال؟
(مثال: التحدث مع أطفال آخرين، في المدرسة، أو مع عائلتك أو أشائتك؟)

1.3.1. هل فكرت يوماً أن القدم إلى هنا ربما لا يساعدك أو ليس منتجًا؟ إذا نعم، لماذا؟ ماهو؟ هل هناك نشاط آخر تفضل القيام به لا يمكن منذاً
1.3.2. هنا؟

هل استخدامت ما تعلمته من خلال مشاركتك في الأنشطة، خارج المركز؟ احكي مثال؟
(مثال: التحدث مع أطفال آخرين، في المدرسة، أو مع عائلتك أو أشائتك؟)

1.3. هل مكننا تحولنا عن أشياء ما حبيتها بالأنشطة اللي شاركت بها؟ حاول أن تكون محددًا. هل حصل أي شيء يجعلك غاضبًا أم محبوبًا أم حزينًا؟ (وذكر أنه لا توجد إجابات خاطئة)

1.4. هل تشارك عائلتك في هذه الأنشطة؟ هل تمكنت من تكوين صداقات هنا في المركز؟ هل تلتقيون/تستمر خارج المركز؟ هل كان تكوين صداقات خارج المركز صعبًا؟ لماذا؟ (بناء على ما تعلمتهم)

2.1. هل تعلمتك نجاحًا على ما تعلمتهم؟ وهل تعلمته وماذا فعلت لتكون صداقات جديدة في مكان جديد؟

3.1. سألت في وقت سابق ما إذا كان والديك مشاركين في نشاطات المركز. سواء كانوا مشاركين هنا أم لا، هل تحدثت إليهم عن شعورك أو آمالك أو أهدافيك أو تجاربك هناك? هل الذي تتحدث عنه وهل هم مستمعون جيدون؟ هل تغيرت علاقتك معهم في آخر 6 أشهر؟ كيف ذلك؟

3.2. مع من تحدث أيضاً؟ هل المدرسين من الأشخاص الذين تتحدث معهم؟ هل سبق لك أن قمت بزيارة المركز للتحدث إلى شخص ما أو قضاء الوقت؟ (إذا كان الأمر كذلك ، صف لي ما فعلت (تحدثت مع أحد المدرسين، قضيت بعض الوقت مع الأصدقاء، الخ ...)

4.1. فكر في نفسك قبل مشاركتك بالأنشطة... فكر بهلا:

4.1.1. هل يمكنك وصف كيف كنت تشعر، وكيف تغير؟ هل أي شيء ادي ان لا يغير؟ هل أنظر المركز أو أفراد أنشطتهم على هذه العملية؟ كيف؟
7. أي أفكار أو تعليقات.

.parents intensive sessions FGDs

شكرًا لحضوركم وموافقتكم للتحدث معنا، وأعتذارًا عن وقتكم لمقابلتنا، اسمي ____________، زميلي ____________ سوف يقوم بمساعدتي في أخذ الملاحظات) نحن موظفون من منظمة ميرسي كور نعمل في مشروع نبادر مع شركائنا...نتمنى أن تكون هذه الندوة نوعًا من هذه اللحظات أكثر أو أقل مثيرة.

الهدف من هذا الاجتماع هو عمل تقييم للتدريبات والأنشطة التي شاركت فيها خلال الشهر الماضي بالإضافة إلى اهتمامنا بسماع قصص تغيير حصلت معكم أو مع غيركم نتيجة لمشاركتكم في البرنامج.

خلال هذا الاجتماع سنقوم بسؤالكم ____________، اسألنا ____________، فلنستخدم الاسم الأول فقط أثناء التعريف. ليس هناك إجابة صحيحة أو خاطئة لأن الأسئلة التي سنطرحها هي عن تجارب فردية كل تجربة مختلفة عن الأخرى. وتؤكدنا تماما أننا نرغب بالنقاط السلبية مثل الإيجابية لأن الهدف من التقييم هو التحسين.

قبل أنبدأ أحب أن ألاشي أن أنواع هذا الاجتماع ستتراوح مدته الساعة والنصف.

المهارات الوالدية

1. على الصعيد الشخصي، شيء تعلمتته من مشاركتكم بتدريب الرعاية الوالدية؟
   a. كيف قدرتم تطبيقها؟
   b. كيف Interricedكم؟
   c. كيف كانت هذه المعلومة؟
   d. كيف كانت سهلة أو سهلة؟
   e. إذا كان الجواب نعمًا، كيف كان آثرًا؟
   f. إذا كان الجواب نعمًا، فعلى أولادكم؟
   g. إذا لم يكنًا، كيف كان مثلًا؟
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كيف أثرى التطبيق بعض المهارات التي تعرّفت عليها أثناء مشاركتكم في البرنامج على علاقاتكم مع أولادكم آيجابيًا؟

امثلة تودون مشاركتها؟

● حاجات اليافعين النمائية

(2) كيف تبتكروا نشأة علاقتكم بالحاجات النمائية للمراهقين والشباب؟ ما الذي تعلموه من البرنامج عن الحاجات النمائية لأولادكم ويبقى؟ هل تعلمتم شرح محدد من البرنامج ساعدكم وخلاكم قادرين تتعاملوا مع حاجات الشباب المتغيرة عند أولادكم؟ هل تستطيعون ذكر أمثلة؟

(3) إذا كان الجواب نعم، ما الذي تعلمتموه من البرنامج عن الحاجات النمائية لأولادكم؟ أو أحلامكم النمائية?

● فعالية البرنامج

(4) كيف تشعرن اتجاه الرضا من مشاركتكم بهذا البرنامج؟

(5) ممكن توصفولي أكثر شو اللي جعلكم تشعروا بهذا النوع من المشاعر تحديدا تجاه مشاركتكم بهذا البرنامج؟

(6) هل قام البرنامج بتلبية احتياجاتكم ببناء علاقات مع أمهات تانيات؟ (إذا كان الجواب نعم)، هل لحد الآن العلاقات التي بنتوها؟ موعد؟ هل نسيت تتواصلوا وتبنيت؟

● الاستدامة

(7) هل قام البرنامج بتلبية احتياجاتكم؟ إذا نعم، كيف؟

(8) هل قام البرنامج بتلبية احتياجاتكم؟ إذا نعم، كيف؟

(9) هل قام البرنامج بتلبية احتياجاتكم؟ إذا نعم، كيف؟

(10) هل قام البرنامج بتلبية احتياجاتكم؟ إذا نعم، كيف؟

● CARM

(11) هل تعرف عن آلية الاقتراحات والشكاوي؟

(12) إذا فكرتم بعمركم تقترح اشي على هذه الآلية، برأيك ما هي الاقتراحات التي بتعهدها أن نتمكن من أن نستخدموها الآلية الاقتراحات؟

(13) ما هي الطرق التي تفضل استخدامها لتقديم اقتراح أو شكوى؟ (تلفون، مسج على واتس آب، أو تستخدم الصندوق في الجمعية)

(14) هل تحب أن تشارك أي اقتراح أو شكوى؟

HEAD OF CAH KII

(1) هل قام المشروع بتنبئ احتياجات ال_DECLARATIONS OF CONFIDENCE المجتمعي؟ كيف؟ ممكن تعطينا مثال؟

(2) هل تعتقد أن أهداف المشروع تعتمة من خلال إشرافك على فريق المشروع هل كان هناك أي خلافات بين الشباب أو غير متوقعه واجهها المشروع أثناء التنفيذ؟ مثل شو؟

(3) هل تعتقد أن أهداف المشروع تعتمة من خلال إشرافك على فريق المشروع هل كان هناك أي خلافات بين الشباب أو غير متوقعه واجهها المشروع أثناء التنفيذ؟ مثل شو؟
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Objective 4: Build the capacity of CBO partners and community volunteer coaches to respond to adolescent protection needs

1) How did you hear about the organization?

The facilitation:

1. Introduction of the session: How effective was the introduction?

2. Have you noticed a difference between the old and new trainings? How did the new training help you perform your role?

3. How can the training be improved?
التدريبات المتخصصة

احكولنا عن التدريبات المتخصصة وكيف مكنتكم من القيام بدوركم؟
كيف يمكن تحسين التدريبات؟

حلقات التعلم

احكولنا عن حلقات التعلم وكيف مكنتكم من القيام بدوركم؟
كيف يمكن تحسينها؟

(check in visits and constant technical support)

ما هو الدعم التقني الذي حصلت عليه؟
ما رأيك بالدعم التقني الذي حصلت عليه من فريق التقني في ميرسي كور؟
ما رأيك بالدعم التقني الذي حصلت عليه من الجمعية (خصوصاً من منشأ المدربين)؟
ما مدى فعاليته لمكانتكم من القيام بدوركم بشكل فعال؟ كيف؟
كيف يمكن تحسين هذا النوع من الدعم؟

أثر المشروع على اليافعين

من وجهة نظرك، ما هو الأثر الذي لاحظه على اليافعين خلال مشاركتهم في البرنامج؟

المهارات

ما هي المعارف/المهارات التي تعلمتها ووظفتها حسب دورك في المشروع؟ أعط أمثلة
ما هو أكبر تعلم اكتسبته في نبادر والذي ستحمله معك خلال السنوات القادمة (سواء عن نفسك على الصعيد الشخصي والمهني، عن الحياة، عن مجتمعك، الشباب، ...)؟

المشاريع

ما هي خططك العملية بعد انتهاء المشروع؟
هل من خططك الاستمرار بتمديد الدعم للشباب بعد انتهاء المشروع؟
إذا نعم، كيف يمكن أن تستمر بتقديم الدعم للشباب بعد انتهاء المشروع؟ ماذا تحتاج؟
ما هي الأشياء التي من الممكن أن تستعيد / تحفزكم على الاستمرار في تقديم الخدمات في المراكز/المؤسسات حتى بعد انتهاء التمويل؟
ما الذي يعتبر ضرورياً لضمان استمرار المشروع داخل المراكز المجتمعية؟

التوصيات:

ما هي التدريبات أو الأنشطة التي تقترح ت博彩 على فريق نبادر في أن ينفذه في المستقبل؟
ما هي التوصيات التي ترغب أن تشاركنا بها فيما يخص فريق الدعم التقني التابع لمنظمة ميرسي كور؟
ما هي التوصيات التي ترغب أن تشاركنا بها فيما يخص الجمعية؟
ما هي التغييرات التي ستوصي بها لمشاريع مماثلة في المستقبل؟ (اقتراح ان يتم الإجابة على هذا السؤال من خلال عمل مجموعات حسب الدور)

برأيكم، ما هي الممارسات الفضيل لمشروع يعمل مع الشباب الأكثر عرضة للخطر والشباب المحولين من المحاكم؟

هل يمكنك تتبع كيفية تعريفك لشباب الأحداث في بداية البرنامج بالمقارنة بالواقع؟

هل لديك أي معلومات أخرى تود مشاركتنا بها؟

ماذا حققنا برأيكم؟ (يرجى التركيز على الحقائق بدل الآراء)

ما هي الأشياء التي تم بشكل جيد؟ (يرجى التركيز على الحقائق). لماذا تمت بشكل جيد؟ (يرجى مقارنة الخطة بالواقع)

ما الذي كان يمكن أن يكون أفضل؟ قارن الخطة بالواقع. ما منعنا من فعل المزيد

هل تعرف عن آلية الاقتراحات والشكاوى؟

ما هي الطرق التي تفضل استخدامها لتقديم اقتراح أو شكوى؟ (تلفون، مسج على واتس آب، أو تستخدم الصندوق في الجمعية)

هل تحب أن تشارك أي اقتراح أو شكوى؟