

INTRAC

BRIDGING RELIGIONS IN MACEDONIA (PRM) 2003-2004

A PILOT PROGRAMME OF MCIC

The Macedonian Centre for International Cooperation

FINAL REPORT

of the

EXTERNAL EVALUATION

November, 2004

John Beauclerk – Neda Maleska-Sacmaroska – Milan Gjorgjevik

INTRAC

PO Box 563

Oxford OX2 6RZ

United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0) 1865 201851

Fax +44 (0) 1865 201852

Website: <http://www.intrac.org>

INTRAC is a company limited by guarantee No: 2663769

And a registered charity no: 1015860

List of Contents

Summary	3
1. Purpose of the Evaluation	5
2. Methodology	5
3. Review of Outputs	6
3.1 Exposure	6
Outputs	6
Outcomes	8
Issues Arising	8
Recommendations	9
3.2 Capacity Building	9
Outputs	9
Outcomes	10
Issues Arising	11
Recommendations	12
3.3 Information	12
Outputs	12
Outcomes	13
Issues Arising	13
Recommendations	14
4. Review of Methods	14
4.1 Communication at Lower Levels	14
Recommendation	15
4.2 Many Project Activities	15
Recommendations	15
4.3 Stakeholder Ownership Through Governing Bodies	15
Recommendations	16
5. Assessment of Results	17
6. Conclusions	17
<u>Annexes</u>	
i. Terms of Reference	
ii. List of persons interviewed	
iii. Days of the Religious Communities: Questionnaire for the visitors	
iv. Tables: Analysis of Activities and Results	

Acronyms Used in the Text

MOC – Macedonian Orthodox Church

OF – Orthodox Faculty

IRU – Islamic Religious Union

FIN – Faculty for Islamic Science

CC – Catholic Church

JC – Jewish Community

UMC – Evangelist Methodist Church

MCIC – Macedonian Centre for International Cooperation

Summary

The overall programme objective is to improve mutual trust and understanding between different religious and ethnic groups. The programme has made an important start in this direction, by focusing on a significant but often neglected target group: the students of theology who will be the opinion-forming clergy, activists and church members of the future, and the religious and academic staff that train them. Winning the confidence of these faculties and their young people is a major achievement that needs to be built upon and consolidated.

The most important result of the programme is that it has systematically introduced dialogue within important institutions of the two largest religious communities in Macedonia. It has demonstrated that there is goodwill on which to build broader ambitions of tolerance and co-existence. It has provided the activities around which this goodwill can appear and grow. Furthermore it has provided a forum in which the representatives of five religions can regularly sit to plan and guide collaborative work. This forum sets an important precedent of religious cooperation in Macedonia and the region.

It is too early to speak of the sustainability of the new structures established at the faculties. They will need careful nurturing, both by their communities and by MCIC.

Too many activities were foreseen for such a short pilot period, especially taking into account the need to establish new infrastructure at the same time (for example the public Info-Centre and the project offices in the two Faculties). As a result not all planned activities could be implemented and then only then with difficulty. The project has however generated good experience regarding the practical complications of coordinating inter-faith dialogue and it should be possible to implement a reduced and amended portfolio of products in 2005.

There is little evidence that the programme has yet had much effect upon the broader target group, the members and activists of the religious communities in Macedonia. It is possible that this is over-ambitious within the scope of the programme, which may need to set itself priorities in the second phase and acknowledge that reaching a broader target group is a longer term challenge.

The Bridging Religions programme is itself based upon the lesson that lower levels than the religious leadership are more effective in developing inter-faith and inter-ethnic dialogue. A new lesson arising from the implementation of this programme is the need to be precise and realistic about targeting the different lower levels. The programme has worked best where it is more tightly focused on a particular target group: in this case the faculties.

Diaconia and social-humanitarian work of the religious communities is an important subject of inter-faith understanding. But it has its own levels and structures, which need their own focus and systematic attention. The current programme cannot do them justice in full, but may be able to prepare the way for their future development, by for example, encouraging improved management in religious organisations.

Recommendations

- Rationalise and regroup the portfolio of products In the interest of smooth implementation, reducing the number of activities wherever possible.
- Divide responsibilities appropriately between MCIC and the faculties with, for example, the faculties leading on Exposure and Information and MCIC leading on capacity building.
- Build upon the foundation for inter-faith dialogue laid by the exposure activities to date and encourage the faculties to institutionalise the various forms of exchange.
- Redefine the format of the Days of Religious Communities, ensuring that the main message is greater understanding between religions in Macedonia and the means of achieving it.
- Clarify the primary objective and primary target group for capacity building and readjust the instrument accordingly.
- Make better use of the students at the Faculty Centres and the young women who staff the Info-Centre by, for example, providing small grants on inter-faith subjects and events by interested young people from within and beyond the faculties.
- Seek to establish and maintain a collegial relationship between the MCIC and Faculty project officers, with mutual respect and understanding of their organisation's cultures
- The Steering committee should consider the means of enhancing the representation of the smaller religious groups in the programme without creating too large a body. As an alternative membership of sub-groups can provide an opportunity for broader participation, for example in drafting a new law of religions and religious groups.
- There should be a discussion about possible new structures and products to take into account the enthusiasm of young people, especially for diaconal work.
- There is a need for a continuing intermediary role of MCIC in managing the programme, but MCIC should take appropriate steps to further capacitate and empower the Steering Committee.
- The Steering committee should reassess for itself the outcomes of the programme to date and develop strategic goals for strengthening inter-faith collaboration and understanding in the medium and long term.
- Management in the religious organisations should be strengthened with a view to a smooth transition of programme leadership in the medium term.

1. Purpose of the Evaluation

1.1 The overall purpose of the Bridging Religions Programme is to increase mutual understanding between religious communities and understanding of them by the Macedonian public in general. This is expected to lead to improved inter-ethnic relations.

1.2 The programme started in April 2003 but was delayed until October when MCIC appointed its project officer. At the end of 2004 MCIC engaged three evaluators to assess the 2 year pilot programme. The purpose of MCIC was to identify lessons by assessing what had gone well with the programme and which aspects had proved problematic. The intention was to apply the learning by building upon the successes and correcting the weaknesses. MCIC's Terms of Reference (see Annex 1) therefore asked recommendations that it could put into practice during the second phase.

1.3 In terms of the evaluation, the main issues to be addressed concern the outputs; the methodology for achieving them; and the results of the programme.

1.4 The outputs consist of 17 activities (referred to sometimes by MCIC as a "palette of products") under the 3 objectives of Exposure, Capacities and Information. The methodology refers to the management and governance structures for their implementation, with special attention to the two Steering Committees representing the 5 main religions¹. In terms of programme results the evaluation was expected to explore any direct and observable effects, capacities developed or indications of sustainability.

2. Methodology

2.1 The evaluation took place during the first week of December in order to coincide with the Macedonian NGO Fair and the separate Days of Religion which preceded it. Carrying out the evaluation during these major public events had both advantages and disadvantages. On the positive side, the event was an opportunity for the religious communities to demonstrate how far they had come in their cooperation. Less positively for the evaluation exercise, MCIC staff and partners were fully engaged in the events and so opportunities for detailed interviews were therefore scarce.

2.2 According to the good practice established by MCIC the evaluation team of three consisted of both external and internal individuals. The international "outsider" was from INTRAC while his national counterpart was a graduate of the Orthodox Faculty of Theology. The "insider" was a member of the MCIC training department, with responsibility for gender issues.

2.3 Although time was short, the team succeeded in carrying out sufficient interviews to identify a number of key issues affecting programme performance. The team explored these issues more fully through individual interviews, the results of which were reported back to the team at the start of the day. The team also made two visits: one to the Orthodox faculty and the other to the Info-Centre. Unfortunately it was not possible to carry out a visit to the Islamic faculty owing to the Dean's ill health.

¹ In Macedonia, 25 religious communities and groups are registered. The major 5 (stated in the Constitution) are Orthodox, Muslim, Methodist-Evangelist, Catholic and Jewish.

2.4 On December 4th, 2004 the team made a presentation of its initial findings to the MCIC member of the programme Steering Committee and to the representative of one of the donors, Norwegian Church Aid. The final report was then prepared in the light of comments and observations made during this discussion and further reflection.

3. Review of Outputs

This section assesses the objectives and activities of MCIC and its partners in the sequence in which they are presented in the original programme document. Further details of the implementation of activities can be found in the Table: “Analysis of Activities and Results” (see Annex III). Here we present the team’s findings and the issues that arise from them.

3.1 Exposure

The result expected from this output is : shared experiences and inter-faith dialogue, through educational approach.

3.1.1 The underlying assumption of the programme is that the moral authority of the religious communities in Macedonia gives them a key role to play in preventing inter-ethnic conflict. The reason is that although ethnicity and religion go hand in hand for the majority of the population, the religious communities and their leaders have generally shown themselves to be on the side of tolerance and restraint. This is unusual in former Yugoslavia, where politicians have often used religion for nationalist aims.

3.1.2 This does not necessarily mean that stereotyping between the religious communities in Macedonia does not exist. MCIC believes that ignorance of each other’s religion and culture signifies a lost opportunity for improved relations. The programme therefore sets about systematically building religious understanding across the faith communities. This primarily – but not exclusively - means addressing the Orthodox and Muslim communities, which together account for more than 98% of the country’s believers².

3.1.3 The programme translates theory into practice for this objective through 6 activities which target the pupils, students and professors of the Orthodox and Muslim high schools and theological faculties. The programme describes these correctly as “relatively simple” interventions, which are not necessarily innovative in themselves, but which the programme addresses for the first time in a logical and consistent manner. The activities involve exchanges of lecturers and students between each other’s educational establishments; visits to each other’s religious sites and services; a summer camp; an international visit to a positive example; and the Days of Religious Communities.

Outputs

3.1.4 Judging by the monitoring forms, the exchange-related activities were especially well received by the target group. The lecturers appreciated the opportunity to engage

² Of 2,022,547 believers, 64.78% are Orthodox, 33.33% are Muslim, and the remaining 38,348 adhere to a further 25 confessions and religions. Source: the MCIC Programme Yearbook, November 2004

with their counterparts and the students welcomed being taught other faiths by experts in them. The exchange of lecturers began between the Orthodox and Islamic faculties. Early success gave rise to a broadening of the activity and a member of the Jewish community was subsequently invited to lecture at the Orthodox faculty. In 2004 the Islamic faculty will host the Jewish lecturer.

Selected Participant Assessments of the Exposure Activities

This type of cooperation is useful for building confidence in these transitional times... For bringing closer certain positions on some issues and for creating toleration among religious communities... Our work together should get started primarily through dialogue, since dialogue is the most common motivation... The establishment of friendly relations is the first step, then comes the work... One has to learn that life together is inevitable, regardless of the different religions...

Visits to Religious Objects and Services

Ahead of the visit I had butterflies in the stomach... (but)... the fact that I have learnt more about the religion and culture of the other people enriches my spiritual and cultural life... It also helps to draw the people closer and raise the level of understanding and communication... It is especially useful for our country, since we should get to know ourselves better so as to respect each other and live together...

Visit to Theological Faculties

I find the attempt by the two far apart religions to find common ground very encouraging... We may have somewhat eased up the hatred between the Macedonians and Albanians and we learnt something about their laws... No Christian would go to the Faculty of Islamic Studies or the Islamic High School if there were no visits of this type... They would continue to have the wrong idea about them... Both schools should cooperate, because we could learn a lot from each other, thus become conscious that we could become friends, not antagonists... With the help of our friendship, the multi-ethnic relations would improve, thus the hatred would cease to exist between the Macedonians and the Albanians... Not only us students, but every citizen should visit the schools and all together we could build a country void of inter-ethnic hatred...

Summer Camp

The summer camp was the right thing for bringing people belonging to different religions closer... It was very good, with a high degree of mutual understanding and respect. (However...) we still retain our positions of attacking the person belonging to another religious community by sub-questions.... With the experience gained at this summer camp I could help in changing the mentality and eliminating fanaticism... It can help to change the mentality present for many years in the area of religious beliefs which may be the main problem that causes permanent conflicts in the Balkans... In the future I would keep the same manner of work and would promote it first regionally and then wider....

3.1.5 Although MCIC staff were nervous about the exchange visits to religious sites and services, these also were highly valued. Participants in the Summer Camp at Struga near Lake Ohrid praised the combination of learning (through visiting speakers) and the rare opportunity for making friendships across religious divides.

3.1.6 The fifth activity, a planned visit to a positive example of bridging religious divides, was postponed until 2005– although the decision to go to Northern Ireland has been made.

3.1.7 The organisation of the Days of Religious Communities completes the inter-faith activities for the pilot programme. The event took place just before the NGO Fair, Macedonia's annual coming together of civil society organisations. The full effect of this event – which had taken a great deal of planning – was reduced by the withdrawal of the Orthodox community. The walk-out was a protest against the presence of un-invited schismatics, with whom the hierarchy is in dispute.

Outcomes

3.1.8 Active participation by the Deans assured that the initiatives would be successful. The steady extension of the exchange lectures to the five main religions is a positive sign of acceptance of the initiative. Furthermore, with the exposure activities the programme has demonstrated relevance and effectiveness by identifying an acceptable and popular entry point to inter-faith dialogue.

3.1.9 The main beneficiaries of the lecture programmes are the students of comparative religion, who can now learn directly from practitioners of the faiths that they study. The decision by the Orthodox faculty to establish a separate degree in comparative religious studies is also an encouraging sign of looking outwards.

3.1.10 The evaluators find that apart from some delays in implementation (for reasons see section 3.2, Capacity Building, below) the balance of the exposure activities are largely positive. Many of the participants would agree with the former Dean of the Orthodox faculty that these “ice-breaking” activities were necessary to establish the ways and means of dialogue. As will be seen in the following section on methodology and governance structures (section 4), MCIC needs to encourage the faculties to be more proactive in institutionalising the activities.

Issues Arising

3.1.11 The Days of Religious Communities offered an excellent opportunity to demonstrate throughout the country the willingness of large and small religious communities to share a common space. The media did not exploit the conflict arising within the Orthodox church at the event and the inter-faith governance structure emerged strengthened from the scandal affecting one of its members. The evaluators do not have a clear alternatives regarding this activity, however the dramatic incident on the day suggests that the activity would benefit from some re-formulation, for the following reasons:

- A different venue and time tends to highlight the separation of the religious communities and their institutions from other institutions and organisations of civil society;

- The event as currently organised can expose individual communities to unwelcome publicity from internal dissension;
- The Bridging Religions programme itself is affected by such problems yet it has no power over the situation;
- The much higher number of visitors makes participation in the main NGO Fair more attractive to the smaller religions;
- Part of the reason for the above is that religious communities use the event to showcase their own faith rather than their readiness to collaborate with each other;
- Some religious communities officials are concerned that participation in such expensive events alienates it from the poorer part of its membership.

Recommendations

- Build upon the foundation for inter-faith dialogue laid by the exposure activities to date and encourage the faculties to institutionalise the various forms of exchange
- Redefine the format of the Days of Religious Communities, ensuring that the main message is greater understanding between religions in Macedonia and the means of achieving it

3.2 Capacity Building

The result expected from this output is: strengthened capacities for diaconal and social-humanitarian services.

3.2.1 The programme's intention here was to improve the management of those religious institutions whose social services reach the public at large through their membership at local levels. There is general recognition in Macedonia, as in the broader region, that the capacities of faith-based social development organisations tend to be weaker than in other areas of civil society. In the interests of catching up with the general standard of organisational capacity, the programme developed 6 activities: technical support, training in inter-religious dialogue, management training, basic skills training, study trips and workshops and seminars.

Outputs

3.2.2 Under technical support, provision was made for each faculty to select and appoint a project officer. With the two project officers at MCIC, the successful candidates (both former theology students) took responsibility for implementing all the programme activities. A separate office for each faculty was equipped with furniture and computers, although telephone and internet connections have proved problematic in both cases. A small fund of 10 computers which were intended to be distributed to local religious organisations through a call for proposals was delayed.

3.2.3 Inter-religious dialogue training brought senior staff from the Danish Christian-Muslim Centre for a session with specialists from each faculty. Though well attended by the media, the evaluation reports suggest that this initiative was poorly attended by faculty and was not seen as particularly relevant to the lived situation in Macedonia. A further planned 3 day seminar on the historical crossroads of Christianity and Islam did not take place.

3.2.4 Management training was divided into two sessions. The first, for 17 participants in Krucevo, addressed Project Cycle Management. The course was popular as it equipped participants to develop project proposals. The second was a more challenging course in Institutional Development and Organisational Strengthening (ID/OS). However project officers report that 3 participants were able to draw up strategic plans for their organisations during the course.

3.2.5 Basic skills training was intended to provide 60 students from both faculties with English language and computer training. In the event mixed groups of theological students and activists were formed and are currently completing their second semester. The two project officers received advanced computer training under this activity, so that they could take over the preparation of the bulletin (see 3.3 below, Information).

3.2.6 Under the study trips a (female) Orthodox lecturer in comparative religion and an Orthodox Deacon attended a three month course in Tantur, Jerusalem. The same lecturer then visited the WCC college in Bose, Switzerland, this time with a graduate of the Orthodox faculty. Another two Orthodox candidates are currently preparing to attend the Tantur course.

3.2.7 Under the workshops and seminars activity, 1 workshop was held about reforms in Islamic education and a seminar on the Macedonian Law on Religion was integrated with the Days of Religion – as a public debate. This constitutes a rather low output compared to the original plans which provided for regular cooperative events of this nature.

Outcomes

3.2.8 Although the programme's approach to capacity building at three levels is sound, it is not easy to assess outcomes for the training events. For example, basic skills courses are clearly appropriate in order to prepare activists for more advanced managerial and organisational training at a later stage, but are faculty students (with access to university training) obvious candidates? Also there appears to be some duplication – at least with a similar programme run by the Orthodox Diaconia. There is also some doubt as to whether the right candidates attended the advanced training in strategic planning. Overall it appears that the project officers met great difficulty in identifying candidates for training.

3.2.9 The new found enthusiasm for comparative religious studies in the faculties is welcome and the decision mentioned earlier to open a degree course in the subject at the Orthodox Faculty is positive. The study trips by the lecturer to Tantur and Bose will make a useful contribution to the quality of this outcome. On the other hand the inter-religious dialogue training appears to have had little positive effect and the workshop and seminar activity was too little used.

3.2.10 Although hampered by communication problems of various sorts, the project officer posts appear to function, albeit within certain structural limitations. All four candidates (2 Muslim and 2 Christian) are knowledgeable, well trained and well integrated into their organisational environments. Improved team-work between them would improve their effectiveness, as would clearer links between them and their religious communities' diaconal and socio-humanitarian services.

Issues arising

3.2.11 The capacity building instrument combines programme technical support, personal skills and managerial training on the one hand with faith related subjects (inter-religious dialogue, study visits and public debates) on the other hand. This gives rise to a degree of confusion within the instrument regarding purpose, target group and means of implementation.

3.2.12 Regarding purpose it is not clear whether the priority is theological, in which case the relevant activities arguably belong more appropriately in the Exposure instrument; or whether the priority is diaconal and socio-humanitarian, as stated in the objective. In this second case issues of feasibility and location arise. Is it possible to achieve a broad ranging capacity building programme of faith-based organisations within a programme of this nature? Are the faculties the best places from which to manage such developmental capacity building? They do not necessarily have the contacts and may duplicate other diaconal services. For example the Archbishopric supervises diaconia and socio-humanitarian work. In the Muslim case, diaconal work was managed by El Hilal, until it broke away as an independent NGO.

3.2.13 Regarding target group it is not completely clear which groups are the priority for capacity building in diaconal and social-humanitarian work: theological students, or religious communities' members and activists³. Here the question is whether the capacity building instrument can effectively address both. It is not beyond a programme such as Bridging Religions to address the theological students, particularly since the faculties have appointed project officers which are in place. However for sustainability in the longer term the faculties would need to consider including diaconia and social-humanitarian subjects within the faculty curriculum. Currently this is not even under discussion.

3.2.14 Pressures to attend to a broader target group arise at least partly because of the needs of the smaller religious communities. Here also there is great need for capacity building in diaconal and social-humanitarian work, which also remains largely at the level of charitable welfare. Within the scope of the programme the question is whether it is the duty of the faculties to attend to this need, or whether they are equipped for it.

3.2.15 The issue of fair shares in programme benefits for all religious groups arises in relation to the way the Orthodox Church is the exclusive beneficiary of the study visits. This is explained by the particular isolation of this largest of all Macedonian churches, as a consequence of the refusal of the Patriarchate of Serbia to recognise its autonomy. While it is true that the other religions are in a position to benefit better from international support, it is important that the programme is seen to be even-handed in its distribution of benefits – especially considering the dominance (in terms of size) of the two biggest faith communities in the country.

³ See for example the rather ambiguous statement in Bulletin number 1: “The actual goal group is constituted of the members and activists of all the religious communities in Macedonia, with a focus on the students of the educational (theological) high schools and faculties as direct beneficiaries”.

Recommendations

Clarify the primary objective for the capacity building instrument.

- If it is diaconia and socio-humanitarian work as stated then consider separating the diaconal and socio-humanitarian aspects of capacity building from the theological and inter-faith training aspects, with the latter (⁴) joining the Exposure outputs

Clarify the primary target group for the capacity building instrument:

- If it is the theological students, then consider developing specific trainings for the students and exchanges between faculties on diaconal and social-humanitarian work
- If it is also the church members and activists, then consider whether it is feasible for the faculty project officers to address this target group under current institutional mechanisms.

Adjust the capacity building products to the decisions reached in the options outlined above, bearing in mind the following specific recommendations:

- Consider closing the inter-religious dialogue training product until the faculties are ready to develop their own curricular materials in this field (in which case technical support may be desirable)
- Assess the level of duplication in basic skills training and clarify responsibilities for its provision
- Replace the PCM product with a subsidy for members of faith based organisations in MCIC's regular training schedule and ensure that the relevant organisations are aware of its availability
- Tailor the ID/OS product to the specific needs of senior strategists in faith based organisations, for example those serving on the governing boards.

3.3 Information

The result expected from this output is: improved availability of information about religious communities in the public

Outputs

3.3.1 This instrument employed a total of 5 products – all of which except one involve publications. They are a bulletin, a Yearbook, Religious Calendars and comparative studies. The exception is a centre which is staffed and provides information directly to the public.

3.3.2 Bulletin. With a print run of 500 in Macedonian and 300 in Albanian language per issue this is the main vehicle for disseminating the activities of the programme to religious community members and activists. It is mainly written by theology students. It is well edited and focuses closely on issues of dialogue between the different faiths. MCIC prepared the first four issues and the fifth will be jointly published by the faculty

⁴ B2 Inter-faith Dialogue Training (if it is to be retained at all); B5 Study Trips; and B6 Workshops & Seminars

project officers. The original estimate of 10 issues in the first two years was over-optimistic.

3.3.3 Yearbook. This directory is an innovation in the religious communities. It closely reflects MCIC's experience and expertise in producing the NGO Directory for Macedonia. Production of the Yearbook means that for the first time in Macedonia basic data and contact details for the country's religious groups were placed in the public domain.

3.3.4 Religious calendars. The task of producing a calendar with all the festivals and holy days of the religions proved demanding for MCIC, as this was another innovation. Now that it has been piloted it will be easier to reproduce in future years.

3.3.5 Comparative Studies. This product was utilised to the full, and not just by the principal religions. The series of 3 publications included a history of the Evangelist-Methodist Church, an introduction to Judaism, a study on the 10 commandments by the Orthodox church. Islamic and Catholic texts are scheduled for publication in 2005.

3.3.6 Information and Dialogue Centre. This library and information centre is based in central Skopje and staffed by a combination of part-timers and volunteers from the faculties. At present it is exclusively female. It is staffed by 1 graduate from the Orthodox faculty and 1 from the Islamic faculty. In addition 5 young employees work 1 day a week each. They represent the 5 religions - Catholic, Evangelist-Methodist, Jewish, Islamic and Orthodox.

Outcomes

3.3.7 The programme's publishing activities have proved especially popular with the faculty students, who write freely for their Bulletin and will hopefully continue to do so when the publication is jointly edited by the 2 faculties. Lecturers are also pleased at the opportunity to publish their work. For the first time also the other religions are involved in publications, contributing in some measure to balancing the distribution of benefits.

3.3.8 Unfortunately questionnaires included in the bulletins have generated a low response, so it is not possible to assess the degree to which they make a difference on life as local cultures and religions experience it. Contacts with individual religious communities outside Skopje are too weak to provide any firm indications of the outcomes.

3.3.9 MCIC and both faculties went to great lengths to start and keep going the information centre. It has the potential to attract the public and influence it positively but in order to do so will require yet more resources and effort.

Issues arising

3.3.10 Young people play a significant role in the instrument, both as suppliers and consumers of information. The project needs to harness more effectively the enthusiasm of young people, as their relationships, mutual understanding and joint initiatives will give the programme sustainability.

Recommendations

Make better use of the students at the Faculty Centres and the young women who staff the Info-Centre by, for example, providing small grants on inter-faith subjects and events by interested young people from within and beyond the faculties.

4. Review of Methods

The programme has used three main methods to achieve its purpose in bridging religions. These are based on MCIC's experience of what works in the religious domain in Macedonia. They are in turn, communicating at a lower level than the usual attempts at dialogue through the most senior clerics; undertaking many pilot activities with a view to focusing on success in the future; and promoting ownership by the different stakeholders through their active involvement in the programme's decision making structures.

4.1 Communication at lower level

4.1.1 MCIC has correctly applied to this programme the lesson learned from its previous attempts at brokering inter-religious dialogue at times of great stress, such as in 2001, when religious leaders took several months to agree a joint wording against ethnic violence. Instead MCIC developed a programme that would operate at a less political level. It chose to operate amongst the educational establishments and their staff, the sites of particular religious veneration and their ministers, and even completely new structures, such as the joint Info Centre and its part-time student staff.

4.1.2 In general this strategy has borne fruit. In selecting the educational system, the programme made the right choice when taking into account the possible risks and benefits. In the event there have been no major disagreements. The dialogue is well established at this level and the work of establishing enduring mechanisms of exchange and understanding can begin, at least between the 5 religions.

4.1.3 As we have seen above in the section on the capacity building instrument, new issues relating to the level of communication have arisen. These need attending to as the programme moves forward. In order to set itself realistic goals, the stakeholders should decide whether the current priority level for the programme is at the faculties, or more broadly with the faith-based organisations.

4.1.4 It is not the place of the evaluation team to make a firm recommendation on this issue, particularly after so short a period of research on the ground. However the indications are that the programme can have a successful outcome if it limits itself to the achievable within, say, a 2 year time-frame. This is not to say that broad communication with faith based development organisations is not a worthy objective. Only that it is a much larger subject that may be best addressed by a different, longer term programme.

4.1.5 The evaluation team does however feel able to make a firmer recommendation regarding management in the religious organisations, as weaknesses here have and will continue to have a direct bearing upon programme implementation and sustainability at any level.

Recommendation

Management in the religious organisations should be strengthened with a view to a smooth transition of programme leadership in the medium term.

4.2 Many pilot activities

4.2.1 A large number of practical activities can be a good way of trying out a new programme. But the strategy also has its costs. Bridging Religions made a late start, in October 2003, with the recruitment of the MCIC project officer and much time was taken up with setting up the structures and personnel in the faculties. This left little time for implementing a large number of activities through relatively new structures. As a result implementation was incomplete and rushed. The evaluation team agrees with MCIC that of the 17 planned activities, all but one was implemented. This is a sound record, but a closer analysis suggests that 11 activities were fully implemented, while the remaining 5 were only partially carried out – either through lack of funds or simply through lack of time.⁵

4.2.2 This has placed a strain on management systems – especially on the project officers and the relationships between them. Essentially the MCIC project officers function within a professional NGO that would not be out of place in any EU member state capital city. By contrast the religious community organisations, including the educational establishments, operate according to very different managerial criteria, which will take many years to modernise. These differences in organisational culture need to be taken into account because they give rise to tensions. In respect of the “many project activities” method we make the following recommendations:

Recommendations

Rationalise and regroup the portfolio of products In the interest of smooth implementation, reducing the number wherever possible

Divide responsibilities appropriately between MCIC and the faculties with, for example, the faculties leading on Exposure and Information and MCIC leading on capacity building

Seek to establish and maintain a collegial relationship between the MCIC and Faculty project officers, with mutual respect and understanding of their organisation’s cultures

4.3 Stakeholder ownership through governing bodies.

The programme is governed by two bodies. The first is a steering committee with one representative of each of the 5 main religions, the Deans of the 2 theological faculties, a member of MCIC and 2 international partners. The second body is the editorial board,

⁵ Fully implemented: A1, A3, A4, A6, B3, B4, B5, C2, C3, C4 C5
Partially implemented: A2, B1, B2, B6, C1
Postponed: A5

with a representative from each religion and from MCIC. Participation in these bodies provides a unique opportunity for the representatives of the religions and religious organisations to practise joint decision-making. The work of the governing boards constitutes a great strength of the programme. The evaluation has identified the following issues to be addressed.

4.3.1 Representation. There are 25 registered religious groups in Macedonia. Only 5 are represented in the governing bodies. Of these 5, the concerns of the two largest religions set the agenda. The remainder feel excluded and are vocal about it. MCIC's presence on the Steering Committee is generally welcomed in order to ensure that all voices are heard. The issue is important because dissatisfaction in one group, however small, can affect all. The Adventists, for example, successfully challenged the Law on Religions and Religious Groups (1997) in the constitutional court. As a result there is no current law.

4.3.2 The Steering Committee is cautious about expressing ambitious visions, such as setting up permanent bodies to lead the programme. This may be problematic for MCIC's exit strategy, as there is no obvious inter-denominational structure to hand over to. However caution is realistic in the circumstances. The programme is experimental and the gains achieved so far could be endangered by trying to move too fast. The implication is that MCIC's difficult mediating role is still necessary here as well. There is however a danger of over-dependence on MCIC.

4.3.3 Limited space for strategic discussion. The meetings of the governing bodies are tightly focused upon the programme and its implementation. The advantage of such a practical focus is that there is little room for contentious debate on policy differences. The disadvantage is that the tight agenda gives little room for the religious communities representatives to develop their own methods. There is a perception in some quarters that MCIC's professional and secular methods do not always coincide with the values of the religious community.

4.3.4 There is also an issue about the sharing and control of project resources that needs to be discussed at the level of the Steering Committee. At least one member feels that MCIC takes too large a slice of the grant. This is an issue because there is little evidence yet in the religious communities of the managerial capacity to conduct such a complex and delicate programme. However this view needs to be taken into account and the Steering Committee needs to identify areas where the religious communities do have organisational capacities and can demonstrate them.

Recommendations Regarding the Governing Bodies

The Steering committee should consider the means of enhancing the participation of the smaller religious groups in the programme without creating too large a body. As an alternative membership of sub-groups can provide an opportunity for broader participation, for example in drafting a new law of religions and religious groups.

There should be a discussion about possible new structures and products to take into account the enthusiasm of young people, especially for diaconal work.

There is a need for a continuing intermediary role of MCIC in managing the programme, but MCIC should take appropriate steps to further capacitate and empower the Steering Committee.

The Steering committee should reassess for itself the outcomes of the programme to date and develop strategic goals for strengthening inter-faith collaboration and understanding in the medium and long term.

5. Assessment of Results

5.1 The overall programme objective is to improve mutual trust and understanding between different religious and ethnic groups. The programme has made an important start in this direction, by focusing on an important but often neglected target group: the students of theology who will be the opinion-forming clergy, activists and members of the future, and the religious and academic staff that train them. Winning the confidence of these faculties and their young people is a major achievement that needs to be built upon and consolidated.

5.2 It is too early to speak of the sustainability of the new structures established at the faculties. They will need careful nurturing, both by their religious communities and by MCIC.

5.3 There is less evidence that the programme has yet had much effect upon the broader target group, the members and activists of the religious communities in Macedonia. It is possible that this is over-ambitious within the scope of the programme, which may need to set itself clear priorities in the second phase and acknowledge that reaching a broader target group is a longer term challenge.

5.4 The most important result of the programme is that it has systematically introduced dialogue within important institutions of the two largest religious communities in Macedonia. It has demonstrated that there is goodwill on which to build broader ambitions of tolerance and co-existence. It has provided the activities around which this goodwill appear and grow. Furthermore it has provided a forum in which the representatives of five religions can regularly sit to plan and guide collaborative work. This is an important precedent.

6. Conclusions

On the basis of the evidence reviewed above and during the evaluation, we can conclude the following regarding the Bridging Religions programme:

6.1 This pilot project is relevant:

- In Macedonia's complex peace-building process, ethnicity is a key element and traditional religious affiliations largely mirror ethnic identity.
- Religion can be a positive force for reducing tensions in the Balkans. On the other hand it can also perpetuate divisions in society.
- The faith-based community is an important but neglected part of Macedonian civil society, which is largely secular in orientation and values.

6.2 It is timely:

- Implementation of the Ohrid Peace Agreement is often contentious and its provisions for decentralisation can pit communities against each other.
- There is a resurgence of religious activity in Macedonia. This extends beyond the traditional religions to a multiplicity of new groups.
- The religious communities in Macedonia are not discredited amongst the population by subservience to political causes.

6.3 It is innovative:

- There have been no previous systematic efforts to bring communities of believers together for the purpose of reducing tensions and preventing conflict.
- Previous efforts to reduce tensions by bringing religious leaders together have not prospered.
- As an alternative to such high level negotiations, the project has reached beyond the hierarchies to some other levels of the faith based community.

6.4 It is effective and demonstrates that :

- Understanding of other religions builds mutual respect and tolerance, especially amongst theologians and young men and women students.
- This target group is an effective complement to high level religious contacts, which are vulnerable to unpredictable political factors.
- The processes and mechanisms of civil society strengthening (structured participation and dialogue) as practised by MCIC can be adapted for purposes of mediation and consensus- building between different religious communities.

It is efficient:

- By its nature and context the intervention is exceptionally complex. It has however proved adaptable to circumstances and yet has remained orientated on task.
- In this the project is aided by a professional and logical formulation in the project proposal.
- There is a sound structure of implementation, including governance and executive bodies. The governance structures have proved especially useful.
- There is a consensus amongst the target group that MCIC serves as an efficient and effective implementer of the project. Amongst Macedonian civil society actors it is uniquely conscious of the potential and constraints facing the participation of faith-based organisations in mainstream civil society.

Annex I Terms of Reference



Macedonian Center for International Cooperation

Nikola Parapunov bb • P.O.box 55 • 1060 Skopje • Republic of Macedonia
Ph. ++ 389 2 365 381 • Fax ++ 389 2 365 298 • E-mail mcms@mcms.org.mk

MISSION FOR EXTERNAL EVALUATION of the Bridging Religions in Macedonia (PRM) Programme

TERMS OF REFERENCES (draft)

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

Macedonian Center for International Cooperation (MCIC) is non-governmental non-profit organisation, active in sustainable development, awareness building and social-humanitarian aid. It was established in 1993.

MCIC general objective is support and development of local and national initiatives for the sustainable development of human resources in Macedonia and abroad. MCIC strategic goals are: peace promotion, development of civil society, assistance for those in need.

MCIC operates in the following sectors: civil society and democratisation; rural development; water supply and sanitation; education; employment and income generation; emergency aid. MCIC accomplishes the activities by: projects financial support (grants); training and advices; information; advocacy.

MCIC mobilises and organises financial means, capital goods and human resources in the country and abroad to accomplish its objectives. MCIC provides funds for their activities from numerous agencies related to the World Council of Churches (structured as a Consortium for Macedonia) and other governmental and non-governmental organizations.

In its efforts to contribute to promotion and development of a democratic and civil society in Macedonia, MCIC has developed and implemented pilot-programme Bridging Religions in Macedonia (PRM) 2003-2004.

The aim of the project is to increase mutual understanding between religious communities and understanding about them in Macedonian public in general.

Target group is general public in Macedonia, as some of the outputs are intended for wider population. However, specific target group are members and activists of all religious communities in Macedonia, with focus on students of their educational institutions (theological high-schools and faculties) as direct beneficiaries.

In order to achieve the programme objective three types of activities were implemented

a) exposure: 5 visits to each-others educational institutions, with a total of 150 participants; 5 visits to religious objects and services, with around 100 participants; 8 exchange lectures with estimated around 150 students present on the lectures; 4 students on study trips abroad; 17 participants present on the Inter-religious Summer Camp;

b) capacity building: inter-religious dialogue seminar with around 50 participants; PCM and ID/OS trainings with a total of 30 participants; basic skills (English language and computers) trainings in which participated 48 representatives of religious communities; one workshop of the Islamic Community was held;

c) information: published 4 issues of the bulletin for inter-religious cooperation; prepared Directory of religious communities (to be issued by the end of November); printing of 8 different types of pocket, poster, table and wall calendars; prepared 3 comparative studies; established inter-religious info-dialogue center.

Up to the end of the programme (December 2004), one more bigger event is planned - Days of religious communities, while only one out of 17 different types of activities in this pilot-phase will not be implemented - exposure trip to a positive example in another country.

1.2. Background of the evaluation

Bridging Religions in Macedonia programme is currently being brought to the end of its implementation. MCIC planned final external evaluation that will bring objective view of experiences and achievements encountered in this pilot-programme. Lessons learned from this programme will be used for planning, designing and implementation of the future programmes.

2. GENERAL OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

General objective of the evaluation is to contribute to the improvement of the MCIC's approach and activities toward capacity building of partners in Macedonian society and to give directions for the further MCIC's activities.

3. OBJECTIVE OF THE EVALUATION

Objective of the evaluation is to analyse strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of the programme and recommend priorities for further activities.

4. RESULTS OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will result in review of the programme outputs, methodologies used and results of the programme in terms of the capacity of partners and sustainability of activities.

The evaluation should also give recommendations for the future programmes to build on the strengthens and the weaknesses and lessons learned of this programme.

4.1. Main issues and points

The evaluation should be focused on the following main issues and points:

- Programme outputs: palette of products (quantity and quality); performances of staff involved (both in MCIC and within partner organisations)
- Methodologies used: both in activities and management & coordination of the programme (work of Steering Group and Editorial Board)
- Programme results (direct effects, developed capacities and sustainability of partners and programme activities)

4.2. Main evaluation criteria

Main evaluation criteria are: relevance, effectiveness and sustainability.

Relevancy will be considered to examine whether the projects are seen as a useful and valuable contribution, from a beneficiaries' point of view.

Effectiveness will be considered to examine achievements and effects compared to planned and intended results and goals.

Sustainability should examine whether the intervention positive effects will continue after the completion of the programme.

4.3. Reporting

The external evaluators will provide following:

Description	When
Evaluation memo	Before returning from field trip
Draft evaluation report	Two weeks after the completion of the mission
Final report	One week after remarks on the draft report have been submitted

The report will be prepared in five copies in English and also in an electronic format.

The report will contain 15 pages maximum, not including the annexes, however including 2-3 pages of excerpt from the main conclusions and recommendations, which will be placed at the beginning of the report.

The report will be structured according to MCIC's standard format that will be given to the evaluator. The main part of the report should be prepared according to the objectives and issues of special interest.

The recommendations should be detailed whenever possible.

5. APPROACH

The external evaluator should make use of the following instruments:

- analysis of the context/ambient;
- analysis of documentation, quantitative and qualitative information;
- interview with the programme team within and out of MCIC;
- interviews with partner organisations and other organisations working in the same field:

- members of the Steering Committee;
- Deans of theological faculties;
- project officers at the faculties and also students;
- representatives of smaller religious communities;
- Helsinki Committee for Human Rights, etc.

6. ORGANISATION

6.1. Evaluation team

The mission will be carried out by a three team members: expatriate external evaluator (team leader), MCIC staff member (not related to the programme) and one local assistant. The team leader should have longer expertise in the field and carried out missions in Eastern Europe. MCIC will determine the team leader, based on the previous experience and related missions, stated in the evaluators CV's.

6.2. Time period (days)

Phase	Team Leader	MCIC member	Assistant	Total
Preparation	1	1	1	3
Field visit	6	5	5	16
Reporting	1	1	1	3
Total	8	7	7	22

* part of the reporting is planned to take place during field visit (which also includes travel).

Realisation period for the mission is December 2004.

7. SERVICES WHICH WILL BE PROVIDED BY MCIC

MCIC will provide the following conditions and human resources:

a) human resources

- programme coordinator and team member - available during the entire mission
- other staff involved in the programme – part time

b) Logistics

- translation (Macedonian – English and vice versa);
- office premises, computers (Word, Excel), printers, copy machines, DTP;
- transport – vehicle from MCIC if needed

c) finance

- accommodation and food – provided by MCIC during the entire stay;
- air ticket
- payment: 50% within 15 days after the contract will be concluded, and 50% within 15 days after the evaluation report will be submitted.

8. BIBLIOGRAPHY AND DOCUMENTATION

All documents from the archive will be available for the mission including:

- programme document
- progress reports (2003, May 2004, September 2004) - narrative and financial
- minutes of the Steering Committee and Editorial Board meetings
- monitoring reports from activities.

AKr/AKr

No. 10-565/1-2004

Skopje, 29.11.2004

Saso Klekovski

Executive Director

Annex ii List of Persons Interviewed

Prota Dragi Kostadinovski, Archpriest

Ratomir Grozdanovski, Secretary of the Holy Synod of Hierarchs of MOC

Jovan Belcevski, Dean of the Orthodox Faculty

Jovan Takovski, Vice dean of the Orthodox Faculty

Jakup Selimovski, Director of the Sector for Islamic Education in IRU

Marjan Ristov – Secretary of Bishop - Catholic Church

Zdravko Shami – President of the Jewish religious Community in Rep of Macedonia

Mihail Cehov, Superintendent of Evangelist Methodist Church

Viktor Mizrahi – Coordinator for the programs in Jewish Community

Hazan Avi Kozma, Jewish Community

Spase Spasov, Catholic Church

Aleksandar Krzalovski, Programme Coordinator, MCIC

Dervisha Hadzic, Project Officer, MCIC

Miodrag Kolic, Project Officer, MCIC

Dejan Dimitrijevi, Project, Officer Orthodox Faculty

Irsal Jakupi, Project Officer, Faculty for Islamic Science

Susana Trajkova - graduated theologian from OF, Nurten Nazim – student of FIN, Aneta Jovkovska graduated theologian from OF, Minever Lutviojava student from FIN, Violeta Spasova activist from CC, Milica Poprizova activist from UMC, employed in the Inter Religious Info Center

Annex iii. Days of the Religious Communities: Questionnaire for Visitors

DAYS OF THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES Questionnaire for the visitors at the organised event

1. What does inter-religious cooperation mean for you?

Mutual acquaintance;

A way to get acquainted with other teachings;

Equality;

Dialogue on religious education;

Promotion of the positive and ethic values of each religion;

Acquaintance and socializing, while the cooperation is to certain extent realized in many concrete projects; Good start for coexistence. Through getting to know more about their religion, one can come to realization that we are all equal before God and that the Love of God watches over us and binds us together;

Above all, an opportunity to present to the public the views, opinions in comparative manner;

In my view the cooperation among the people is of great importance, however no cooperation can be realized among the people with different religious background;

I am not familiar with this;

I do not know;

Conversation, tolerance;

Open dialogue, mutual respect, common aspirations;

It means a lot to me;

Getting to know the religious communities and the diversity of their teachings;

Dialogue and open communication where the personal (often antagonist) standpoints are left aside;

Nothing, since the people and the religious communities are the ones capable of cooperating, not the religions. It reminds us of the Babylonian ecumenical heresy.

2. Why is it important to promote the inter-religious dialogue in Macedonia?

Mutual understanding;

One of the possible ways to develop coexistence;

To develop the coexistence, morale and ethics, also for better life of the people;

For the coexistence;

Getting to know the others better, to realize projects together, to work jointly on promotion of the good in the society;

Maybe because of prejudices and stereotypical perception of the others;

It is essential to recognize ourselves in the light of God. Unfortunately, it is a long-lasting process;

The believers to get to know the various teachings of the religions;

So as to get familiar with the others and to identify the cooperation points;

Not to allow mutual hatred to be developed;

I do not know;

So as to achieve tolerance and equality;

All the religious communities are intent on directing the believers towards spiritual development.. When actually they are doing the same thing, no space is left for divisions;

For the future of the humanity;

Opportunity for laying solid ground for inter-religious cooperation and development of unity and love among all the people;

The ignorance excludes the individual from the given religion and frustrates him;

Dialogue among the religious community is directed at overcoming the barriers and enhancing the mutual understanding.

3. What is the best way to promote tolerance and understanding among the religious communities?

- | | |
|--|---|
| a) through the Heads of the religious communities | 6 |
| b) through the local priests | 6 |
| c) through the local religious activities and volunteers | 3 |
| d) through the Theology students | 2 |
| e) the general public | 9 |
| f) other | 2 |

Explain your choice

No priority, since all of them together should contribute to promoting tolerance and dialogue.

As most appropriate method for drawing the mutual teachings and ideas closer to the people

Lowering the cooperation level among the believers

Anyone who sincerely believes in God has no problems with tolerance and understanding

Complex process covering cooperation not only at higher level, but also among the wide circles of the churches

Less people will more easily come to an agreement

Since, the tolerance and understanding would be best demonstrated in this way

They would most capable discussion partners

They represent the viewpoint of the believers

The promotion of tolerance cannot depend on one factor only. All of them have to participate

They are closer to the people

The people (i.e. the general public) are to make decisions, they are predisposed to promote tolerance and understanding

All the indicated parties should participate in the dialogue since in that way large part of the societal segments will be covered

The public is susceptible to prejudices and various propaganda and manipulations.

4. In your view, what was the most successful and least successful activity within the Inter-religious cooperation program in Macedonia?

Most successful

Debate about the legal regulations

Discussion about the religious teachings

Panel discussions on both topics

Law on religious communities

Address Book

In general, we are on the right track

Address Book and discussion about the law

Macedonian Orthodox Community (MOC)

Orthodox religion

Panel discussion about the new law on the religious communities

I did not attend the forums, however I think that all of the booths have been well equipped and presented

Inter-religious camp

Booths (exposition)

Least successful

The boycott by MOC

The opening (2)

The incident with the turnout of Jovan at the opening

In my opinion the date was not properly chosen, which resulted in small turnout. Last year was better, when the event was organized together with the nongovernmental organizations in the Fair halls.

The date, the location the promotion

Seventh Day Adventist Church in RM

The reaction on the part of the MOC

I did not like the incident with Jovan/Zoran

Low promotion of the event

Date, location and low marketing

Forum discussions

Religious affiliation of the participants		
MOC	EMC	Christians
7	2	9

Ethnic background of the participants	
Macedonians	Roma
17	1

Gender structure of the participants	
Men	Women
11	7

Annex iv Tables: Analysis of Activities and Results

Table 1 Analysis of Activities and Results: Exposure

A. Shared experiences and inter-faith dialogue, through educational approach			
ACTIVITIES PLANNED	OUTPUT: ACTIVITIES EXECUTED TO DATE	OUTCOME: PROGRESS AGAINST EXPECTATIONS	COMMENT
<p>A.1 Exchange of Lecturers</p> <p>Implementation Months 1,2,6,8</p>	<p>Started as an exchange between 2 faculties.</p> <p>In the light of progress, the Steering Committee extended the activity to the Jewish community.</p> <p>A Jewish lecturer visited the Orthodox faculty and will visit the Islamic faculty.</p>	<p>In 2005 the Catholic and Evangelist-Methodists will also lecture in the faculties</p> <p>Access to experts serves to increase knowledge and dispel prejudice</p> <p>From 2004 the Orthodox faculty has a separate degree in comparative studies</p>	<p>Success assured by the active participation of the Deans of the 2 faculties</p>
<p>A.2 Exchange of Students</p> <p>Implementation will be started in Month 1 and will be carried out every month throughout the entire project period.</p>	<p>5 exchange visits involving high schools and the 2 theological faculties</p> <p>Project officers have instituted monitoring questionnaires</p>	<p>Especially popular with the Islamic community. But both faculties and schools visit each other and establish positive relationships.</p>	<p>Some hesitation by students to register themselves for visits and to identify themselves on monitoring forms.</p> <p>Suggests some resistance to institutionalising the exchanges (informality is the preferred mode – but difficult to monitor results and sustain)</p>

<p>A.3 Visits of Religious Objects and Services</p> <p>Implementation Months 1, 5, 7, 10, 12</p>		<p>This is the main means of overcoming stereotypes, according to the MCIC project officer</p> <p>Open to the faculties, the 5 religions and the public</p>	<p>This was an activity that MCIC dreaded because of the possible sensitivities (eg Orthodox church would not allow attendance at its services)</p> <p>Evaluations show that the visits were very highly valued by those taking part</p>
<p>A.4 Summer Camps</p> <p>Preparation Month 3</p> <p>Implementation Month 4</p>	<p>Held for 5 days in July in Struga, near Ohrid. 22 participants from 3 religions and several smaller organisations.</p> <p>Included 3 lecturers: Orthodox, Muslim and Evangelist-Methodist</p>	<p>Coincided with many other religious summer camps, so the Catholics, for example, were too busy to come and lecture</p>	<p>Better coordination with the other camps and possible exchange visits between them</p>
<p>A.5 Visit to Positive Examples</p> <p>Preparation Month 3</p> <p>Implementation Month 4</p>	<p>Postponed until 2005</p> <p>To Northern Ireland</p>		
<p>A.6 Days of Religious Communities</p> <p>Preparation Month 5</p> <p>Implementation Month 6</p>	<p>In 2003 was combined with the NGO Fair, but without the stands of the religions</p>	<p>One of the few activities in which the smaller religious groups can participate</p> <p>They prefer combining with the NGO Fair</p>	<p>Schismatics within the Orthodox Church influences the success of the project but project has no power over the situation</p>

Table 2 Analysis of Activities and Results: Capacity Building

B. Strengthened capacities for diaconal and socio-humanitarian services			
ACTIVITIES PLANNED	OUTPUT: ACTIVITIES EXECUTED TO DATE	OUTCOME: PROGRESS AGAINST EXPECTATIONS	COMMENT
<p>B.1 Technical Support</p> <p>Implementation Month 2:</p> <p>-Separate office for each faculty; equipped & running</p> <p>-Project Officers appointed</p> <p>-Small fund of 10 computers distribute through call for proposals</p>	<p>2 offices equipped – problems with communication</p> <p>2 project officers in place</p> <p>Not implemented</p> <p>Shortage of budget</p>	<p>Project officers in the faculties have relatively little room for manoeuvre. They operate within strict hierarchies.</p> <p>Doubts whether faculties are the right place for capacity building in the socio-humanitarian work of the religious communities– their contacts are limited and they duplicate others (el Hilal, Milosrdie)</p>	<p>Need for more and better contacts between the MCIC and faculty project officers</p> <p>Long term solution to project officer creativity is improved management in religious organisations.</p> <p>Potential benefits for small religious groups lost with non-implementation</p>
<p>B.2 Inter-religious Dialogue Training</p> <p>Preparation Month 2 Implementation Month 3</p> <p>-3 day seminar by Danish Orthodox-Muslim Centre</p> <p>-3 day seminar on historical/crossroads of Christianity & Islam</p>	<p>One day event divided between the 2 faculties</p> <p>Not undertaken</p>	<p>Little to be expected from such a short input.</p>	<p>Low interest suggests that this activity should be dropped in the interest of reducing the palette of products</p> <p>Instead consider combining with A1 if and when the faculties develop their own courses in this specialisation</p>

<p>B.3 PCM and ID/OS Training</p> <p>Preparation Months 3,5</p> <p>Implementation Months 4,6</p>	<p>17 participants in PCM course in Krucevo in 2004</p> <p>3 day ID/OS course held in Skopje</p>	<p>Appreciated by participants because it gives useful proposal writing skills</p> <p>Project officers report that participants, working in 3 working groups, prepare strategic plans for their social-humanitarian work.</p> <p>Uncertain whether right candidates attended</p>	<p>Difficulty in recruiting trainees suggests marketing required amongst the faith-based community</p> <p>Consider providing subsidies for candidates to attend MCIC open training – candidates from religious communities would benefit from meeting their NGO colleagues</p> <p>Improve targeting</p>
<p>B.4 Basic Skills Training</p> <p>Implementation starts in Month 2 and is carried out throughout the project period</p> <p>-60 students from both faculties attend English language and computer training</p>	<p>Mixed groups of students and religious community activists were formed and are now finishing their second semester</p>	<p>Advanced training in power point provided for the faculty project officers so that they can edit the Bulletin</p>	<p>Considered the right level for most religious communities</p> <p>Some duplication with similar schemes provided by the socio-humanitarian services of the religious communities</p>
<p>B.5 Study Trips</p> <p>Preparation Month 2</p> <p>Implementation Month 3</p> <p>-2 scholarships per year</p>	<p>3 month course in Tatur attended by Orthodox lecturer & Deacon</p> <p>Same lecturer and a faculty graduate visit WCC centre in Bose, Switzerland</p>	<p>The lecturer will work on the Orthodox faculty's new course in comparative religion.</p>	<p>Limited target group: issues around equal distribution of project resources; but Orthodox does not have other study visit opportunities</p>

<p>B.6 Workshops, Seminars</p> <p>Preparation Month 1</p> <p>Implementation Month 2 and thereafter every second month throughout the project</p> <p>-1 x 3 day seminar Years 1 & 2</p> <p>-2 x3 day preparatory workshops</p>	<p>Only 1 workshop about reforms in Islamic education</p> <p>Seminar on the Law on Religion combined with the Days of Religion</p>		<p>Belongs more logically with A1</p>
---	--	--	---------------------------------------

Table 3 - Analysis of Activities and Results: Information

C. Improved availability of information about religious communities in the public			
ACTIVITIES PLANNED	OUTPUT: ACTIVITIES EXECUTED TO DATE	OUTCOME: PROGRESS AGAINST EXPECTATIONS	COMMENT
<p>C.1 Bulletin</p> <p>Implementation from Month 3</p> <p>-4 issues Year 1</p> <p>-6 issues Year 2</p>	<p>4 issued</p> <p>5th is the responsibility of the project officers from the faculties</p>	<p>Includes glossaries to help people understand each other's religions</p> <p>Print run of 500 distributed according to a list</p>	<p>This is the main vehicle of dissemination to the church activists</p> <p>Main authors are the students</p> <p>Few responses to monitoring questionnaire</p>
<p>C.2 Yearbook</p> <p>Preparation Month 4</p>	<p>Published late 2004 – a major achievement</p>	<p>For the first time basic date and contact details of the religions and religious groups assembled and put in the public domain</p>	<p>Brings religions closer to good practice in other civil society organisations</p>

<p>C.3 Religious Calendars Preparation Month 3 Implementation Month 6 -10,000 pocket - 1,000 posters - 2,000 wall posters</p>		<p>Poster calendar and desk calendar especially successful Labour intensive to prepare the first calendar (dates, meanings, messages, pictures...) Will be easier for the second time</p>	<p>For the first time all the religious feasts and holidays included in a single calendar</p>
<p>C.4 Comparative Studies Preparation Month 4 -Up to 4 studies Implementation from Month 5 throughout the project period</p>	<p>1. 120 years of the EMC of Macedonia 2. The 10 Commandments - MOC 3. Intro to Judaism 4. The 2003-2004 Lecture Programme</p>	<p>Published in Macedonian & Albanian Published in Macedonian Published in Macedonian and Albanian</p>	<p>Islamic and Catholic texts to be published in 2005 A well-used activity – not quite comparative, at least individually</p>
<p>C.5 Information Office and Dialogue Centre Preparation Month 5 Implementation Month 6 and throughout the next 18 months</p>	<p>Staffed by 1 graduate from the Orthodox community and 1 student from the Islamic faculty. Plus 5 young employees from each of the 5 religions, who work 1 day a week</p>		<p>Needs a great deal of effort to start and keep functioning Currently appears under-utilised Great potential interest – especially amongst youth Needs encouraging</p>
<p>Sources: - Grant Application, EAR Inter-Ethnic Relations Call, Bridging Relations in Macedonia, DanChurchAid (DCA) 2002 - Project Logframe - Interviews with Dervisa Hadzic, Miodrag Kolic, Dejan Dimitrijevi, Irsal Jakupi, Aleksandar Krzalovski</p>			