



Making Peace Possible with Young Changemakers: An Impact and Evaluation Study

By Pallav Singh
Social Connectedness Fellow 2024
Samuel Centre for Social Connectedness
in Partnership with Seeds of Peace
www.socialconnectedness.org
September 2024



SAMUEL CENTRE
FOR SOCIAL
CONNECTEDNESS

**SEEDS
OF PEACE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	3
INTRODUCTION	4
Background	4
Objectives and Research Questions	6
Scope of the Study	7
LITERATURE REVIEW	8
The History of Peacebuilding Through Cross-Conflict Encounters	9
Approaches to Peacebuilding; Sustaining and Measuring Change	11
Impact Measurement for Thick Interventions	13
Conclusion	14
CHOICE OF TOOLS AND RATIONALE FOR DESIGN OF THE CEI	16
Considerations Regarding Analysis: Addressing Challenges and Limitations	18
A Note on my Positionality	19
EVIDENCE & KEY FINDINGS	20
IFHCs' Immediately Observed Impact: Studying Past Data from Camps	20
CEI: Insights on Camp Experience, Learnings, and Perceived Impact	22
A. IFHCs have facilitated intimate relationships with religion and faith	22
B. Lasting change perceived by stakeholders is inwards	24
C. Re-Entry and Transfer: Heightened Importance of Community and Support	26
D. Lack of Follow-Up Restricts IFHCs' Potential	28
E. Diversity in the Cohort: Diverse Socio-Economic Representation is Desired	29
F. Development of Alumni Engagement is Desired and Necessary	30
Conclusion	32
RECOMMENDATIONS	33
• IFHC Alumni engagement: SoP in collaboration with seeds	33
• Post-camp support: SoP and the alumni network	33
• Suggestions to improve IFHC: SoP	34
• Implementing MEL frameworks: SoP	34
• Finding allies: SoP and future partners	34
CONCLUSION	35
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This study focused on Seeds of Peace India's annual Interfaith Harmony Camp. It has the following aims: study the impact of the IFHCs; design stronger monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) frameworks; identify potential allies and partners for SoP to deliver on its vision; provide recommendations for SoP to deliver on the community's needs and demands. Through a participation-oriented approach to data collection, it used data from 87 surveys, 5 interviews, and a community meeting attended by 35 individuals from diverse stakeholder groups in the IFHC ecosystem. These included ex-participants, parents, ex-staff, and volunteers.

The findings indicate IFHC's success in facilitating lasting inward change in participants across the period of this study (2017-2023) with enhanced critical thinking skills and empathy reported by seeds. Seeds seldom took up post-camp initiatives pertinent to peacebuilding or interfaith harmony owing to the paucity of known opportunities. The historical lack of follow-up and alumni engagement by SoP, due to resource constraints, has restricted IFHCs' potential for lasting change and caused a sense of despondency in high performers who may be SoP's best bet to deliver on its vision. The diversification of camp cohorts and development of an alumni network is requested by the community.

The following recommendations encompass the researcher's suggestions and the community's demands:

- Revise existing survey tools to capture all programmed themes of camp, limit participant fatigue and optimize for participant amnesia.
- Introduce a camp module to guide seeds on after-camp opportunities and connect them with organizations in SoP's network space
- Facilitate intergenerational dialogue through alumni events, camp modules, or dialogue sessions.
- Design strategic follow-up and alumni engagement. Delegate responsibility to high performing and highly motivated seeds to offset resource constraints.
- Diversify the representation of socio-economic realities, religions and faith backgrounds in camp. Strategic recruitment, dominantly diversifying outreach to schools, is advised.
- Provide formal support to seeds during re-entry; tap into knowledge resources of alumni to facilitate the transition.
- Employ the MEL framework developed through this study.

Periodic communication with the community regarding key decisions and upcoming opportunities to develop a feedback loop and foster trust.

INTRODUCTION

Background

As the single, most important normative contribution to the ‘idea of India’, the Constitution of India highlights key rights of her citizens, as well as crucial limits on state power. For the purpose of this study, three key ideas invoked in the Preamble to the Constitution are of utmost importance: secularism, liberty of faith and worship, and fraternity. Further, Articles 25-28 in the Chapter on Fundamental Rights, describe the contours of the rights to religious freedoms in India, while protecting them from undue state interference.^{1, 2}

The rich tapestry of India’s social life, long predating the Constitution, is marked by historic coexistence of, and contestations amongst, numerous religious and faith groups and traditions. Even today, religion continues to be an important, visible part of everyday life and livelihoods in India. Within one’s waking hours, they may witness calls to *azaan*, langar services at a gurudwara, the resonance of temple bells, and proud displays of religious markers via media ranging from car stickers to clothing to body ink. The promise of freedom of religion and secularism by the modern legal system then assumes tremendous significance in ensuring harmonious coexistence of citizens, regardless of their beliefs.

However, most worryingly, since 2014, a Bharatiya Janata Party-led Union government has partaken in what has been called ‘Hindu nationalist statecraft’ by ensuring the legal codification of its Hindutva ideology.³ With religious majoritarianism

¹ Please refer to the Appendix (Note 1) for details.

² Text of the Indian Constitution. Accessed here: <https://www.constitutionofindia.net/articles/preamble/>

³ Nielsen, K. B., & Nilsen, A. G. (2021). Love jihad and the governance of gender and intimacy in Hindu nationalist statecraft. *Religions*, 12 (12), 1068.

providing direction to law-making, India has seen several critical moments of an eroding constitutional morality and an attack on minorities' rights which are crucial for any democracy.⁴

In his meticulously researched study on the state of religious freedoms in India since 2014, Dr. Irfan Engineer establishes several worrying trends^{5,6} which have led to simmering communal tensions while fostering fear, hate, suspicion and social segregation among neighbors, friends, and families. Inevitably, polarized views are absorbed by young people through dinner conversations as much as through propagandist news and social media. This engenders a crisis of isolation along all dimensions of one's relationship with the world: people, place, power, and purpose.^{7,8} Arguably, young people are disproportionately affected by these enforced structures of segregation as they are seldom given an opportunity to imagine a world without them.

In this context of hate and violence fueled by the politicization and legally sanctioned weaponization of religion, peacebuilding from the ground-up assumes great significance. Interventions aiming to do this must essentially be programs of intensive dialogue and learning. The theory of change adopted by programs of this nature hinges on the process of facilitated dialogue between members of groups which are in conflict,

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Engineer, I. (2024). The status of Freedom of Religion or Belief in India since 2014 - a Report. Centre for Study of Society and Secularism, Mumbai.

⁶ First, Union and State legislations, dominantly anti-cow slaughter and anti-conversion laws, among others, have severely undermined the freedoms of religious minorities. Secondly, the changing nature of communal incidents from large-scale riots to intra-day events of extreme physical violence and coercion is evident in increasing lynchings by vigilantes who are promptly sheltered by their political patrons. Third, instances of hate speeches by state actors, constitutional authorities, and influential leaders have increased, unchecked for the most part.

⁷ Please refer to Appendix (Note 2) for elaboration.

⁸ Samuel, K. (2022). *On belonging: Finding connection in an age of isolation*. Abrams.

performed outside the scope of everyday interactions.^{9,10} Such interventions transform mutual perceptions from “adversarial to potentially cooperative, thereby enabling mitigation... of previously intractable issues”.¹¹

In reflection of this spirit of enabling cross-conflict encounters as a means of peacebuilding, Seeds of Peace India conducts an annual Interfaith Harmony Camp. This is the culminating part of its 4-module Core Leadership Programme. The camp invites up to 60 participants from schools in and around Mumbai for a 5-6 day residential camp. The camp aims to promote coexistence, facilitate peaceful exchange of ideas, and to break the cycle of hate pertaining to religions and faiths.¹² The camp consists of a series of dialogue, leadership, and team building sessions and activities. The programmed themes are faith in relationship with identity, religion, caste, gender, politics, peace, and governance. So, the camp delivers on crucial pedagogic values fundamental to transformative encounters: empowerment, leadership, peacebuilding.¹³

Objectives and Research Questions

This study has the following aims: study the impact of the IFHCs as perceived by the community; design stronger monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) frameworks with a participatory orientation; identify potential allies and partners for SoP to deliver on its vision; provide recommendations to elevate the community’s needs and demands. It has been fundamentally guided by the following questions:

⁹ Lazarus studied the impact of Seeds of Peace, longitudinally, from 1993-2010. This long period of observation and his effort at impact measurement provide useful insights for this study. It is important to note that SoP India’s IFHCs are a relatively young program for which we have access to complete data only after 2017.

¹⁰ Lazarus, N. (2011). *Evaluating peace education in the Oslo-Intifada generation: A long-term impact study of Seeds of Peace 1993–2010*. American University.

¹¹ Ibid.

¹² As specified in camp reports from 2022 and 2023

¹³ Lazarus prescribes a fourth value i.e. serving a political function, which the IFHCs view as a sequential, long-term outcome.

1. What has been the impact of IFHC so far?
 - a. What impact does the program have on participants?
 - b. In what ways are alumni using their learnings in their daily lives?
 - c. What has worked well and what needs to be improved?
2. Who can be SoP's potential allies and partner organisations?
3. How can SoP improve its impact measurement and evaluation?
4. What role does interfaith work play in building belonging, within and between communities?

Scope of the Study

This inquiry mandated a sequential effort. First, to review and understand the existing data on impact recorded by SoP. Further, to use theoretical guidance in the fields of peace education, belongingness and impact assessment to lay a foundation for the upcoming steps. Next, to invite the stakeholders in the IFHC community to share their experience with the camp and sustained learnings. Third, to analyse the information received from the community, thematically, and use the vital insights to craft recommendations for SoP. Lastly, to use these learnings to develop a robust MEL framework and design resources for the initiation of alumni engagement.¹⁴

The IFHC ecosystem is dominantly occupied by the organizers i.e. permanent staff at SoP, the participants themselves, the validators, the guardians of participants, and contractually hired camp staff.¹⁵ Up till 2019, the camp staff consisted of some ex-participants returning as facilitator-volunteers. To gain insights regarding IFHC from

¹⁴ This paper documents the first three steps as discussed here. The MEL framework and network resource are presented as addendums fundamentally relying on insights unraveled by this study.

¹⁵ SoP leadership, international and Indian.

programmatic, experiential, and facilitative perspectives, the researcher targeted the aforementioned groups, excluding validators, to collect data for the study.

The data collection involved multiple steps.¹⁶ First, I sent out surveys to ex-participants, their parents, professional ex-staff, and ex-facilitator-volunteers. It was observed that the 87 survey responses highlighted post-camp initiative by seeds¹⁷ in peacebuilding and re-entry are important themes. Next, I held 5 in-depth interviews with ex-participants from different cohorts to explore these dimensions further. Lastly, to achieve the twin aims of initiating systematic alumni engagement for SoP and observing community dynamics, I helped organize an in-person alumni meet-up in Mumbai. This was attended by 35 community members: a mix of seeds, parents and ex-staff.¹⁸

The following sections of this report cover the following: a literature review on themes pertinent to the impact assessment and MEL exercise; a note on methodology; discussion on the key findings of my community engagement initiative; recommendations for SoP to implement in collaboration with its alumni and potential partner organisations. Lastly, I present a concluding note, convey my gratitude to individuals who made this study possible, and the bibliography.

LITERATURE REVIEW

This study is a programme review and impact assessment for SoP's IFHCs. As such, it doesn't seek to fill gaps in literature. Rather, it borrows insights from existing literature to support the impact exercise and conduct MEL framework review and design. First, I referred to the internal documentation of SoP, processed raw data where

¹⁶ I use 'data collection' and 'community engagement initiative' interchangeably.

¹⁷ I use 'seeds' and 'ex-participants' interchangeably.

¹⁸ Developing ethical considerations, a systematic research plan, and planning for the community engagement initiative (the 3-step data collection) happened in close collaboration and dialogue with SCSC and SoP. These will be discussed, in detail, in the section on methodology.

it existed, and studied the work done by past impact assessors and report-takers.¹⁹ Second, I explored theoretical and practical work done in the space of belongingness, MEAL for thick interventions, and peace education as a tool for peacebuilding.²⁰ This section provides an exploration of academic literature on these themes.

The History of Peacebuilding Through Cross-Conflict Encounters

The history of facilitated cross-conflict encounters, globally, is rich, and contributes much to the pedagogic values and philosophy of SoP's interventions. Here, I briefly discuss this history and the evolution of the thinking pertaining to such encounters. This background lays the foundation for investigating the IFHC model and developing an understanding of its 'impact'.

This field's observed and documented roots may be found in the development of the 'transformative encounter model' adopted by John Burton and Herbert Kelman through their controlled communication workshops, which emphasised the close association between psychology and international relations.²¹ Their work highlighted the importance of a 'collective identity' in international disputes. This changed the unit of analysis in conflict resolution from 'state' to 'identity groups'.²² This was grounded in the need for a collective human identity; this fuels the "needs for identity, security, recognition, autonomy and justice," the deprivation of which forms the roots of conflict.²³

¹⁹ This is analysis of secondary data sources. I have presented this in the 'Evidence and key findings' section. I use the 'Literature review' section strictly for review of academic literature pertinent to the mentioned themes.

²⁰ These are characterized by heavy people-to-people interfacing at the intervention site. This places significant discretion in the hands of the program executing agent. For example, in the case of IFHC, the facilitators and dialogue moderators have to practice discretion while implementing the pre-planned camp syllabus.

²¹ Lazarus, N. (2011). *Evaluating peace education in the Oslo-Intifada generation: A long-term impact study of Seeds of Peace 1993–2010*. American University.

²² Azar, E. E. (1985). Protracted international conflicts: Ten propositions. *International Interactions*, 12(1), 59-70.

²³ Samuel, K. (2022). *On belonging: Finding connection in an age of isolation*. Abrams.

This same principle was adopted by other thinkers of peace. The transformative encounter model hence gave way to a 'contact hypothesis'. This hypothesis supposes that intergroup conflict may be successfully resolved through interpersonal encounters where hostility between groups is assumed to be a result of their social segregation.²⁴ However, simply bringing groups in contact does little unless, within that space, they have the following prerequisites: equalized status, social support, cooperative activity, and potential for acquaintanceship.²⁵

In response, Tajfel and Turner (1997) theorized on 'social identity' to suggest that intergroup contact, even if it meets the above-mentioned criteria, fails to account for collective identities. This may, as an unintended consequence, lead to dynamics which fundamentally emphasise 'ingroup similarity' and 'outgroup differences'.²⁶ As such, it is susceptible to becoming a dialogue between *identities* and not *individuals*.

So, certain principles must be adopted by facilitators of these encounters: confronting the reality of conflict, validating instead of repressing collective identities, and inspiring participants to collaboratively act towards social and collective change.²⁷ The development of the SoP camps, international and IFHC, facilitate the creation of such space and conditions for participants from all attending groups. This approach doesn't emphasise the creation of performatively 'equal' spaces. Rather, it facilitates the interaction between groups on issues which make them feel different from each other, while being unified by a super identity.

²⁴ Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. *Addison-Wesley google scholar*, 2, 59-82.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Abu-Nimer, M. (2001). Conflict resolution, culture, and religion: Toward a training model of interreligious peacebuilding. *Journal of Peace Research*, 38(6), 685-704.

Approaches to Peacebuilding; Sustaining and Measuring Change

With this background, Lazarus creates a typology for approaches to peacebuilding which are generated by the contact hypothesis and the social identity theory. 'Categorized' approaches emphasise collective identities and subsequently facilitate conflict analysis. 'Re-categorized' approaches aim for creation of super-identities shaped by the groups as a means to conflict resolution. Necessarily, each approach tries to mitigate elaborate social, political, and often legal infrastructures of separation.

The complex normative baggage to such encounters gives rise to further problems pertaining to sustained change post-encounter. Re-entry into one's daily life and community after the sanitised environment of facilitated encounters may be turbulent for most and this directly affects the realization of new values identified at camp. Kelman frames this as the 'problem of transfer' whereby designers or facilitators of cross-conflict encounters must confront the reality of participants' likelihood of maintaining individual changes in the home setting.²⁸ Further, Kelman poses a question which has been one of the strongest critiques of such encounters: what impact do they have on the policy processes which are often responsible for upholding the boundaries which separate the groups to begin with? Such critiques of peacebuilding initiatives correlate their success to macro-level changes.

This question is closely tied to the impact measurement of peace initiatives. Given the rich backdrop discussed above, it is imperative for the program's effectiveness to be evaluated in reference to the effects which it births. D'Estree emphasises that the nature of such programs is such that their impact can only be

²⁸ Kelman, H. C. (1997). Interactive problem solving. *Inactive Conflict Resolution*, 56-77.

measured longitudinally, evaluated at multiple analytic levels.²⁹ So, there are “multiple images and degrees of success” that arise from such encounters.³⁰

Going from the hitherto normative roots of peacebuilding initiatives, thinkers like D’Estree, Ross, and Lazarus operationalize their impact measurement. This is important for program improvement, relevance, accountability, and fidelity. As such, three levels of analysis for impact are propounded: micro changes realized by participants themselves, meso-level changes at the local, organizational or network levels, and macro changes at the socio-political level.³¹ Longitudinally, the change may be studied at the phases of promotion i.e. during the intervention, application i.e. in the immediate aftermath, and sustainability i.e. in the medium and long-run.

Given the discussion above, the popularly chosen method for impact measurement of peace initiatives, which is pre and post-surveys, taps into only the promotion phase of the process. It gives an incomplete and inadequate picture of program success while avoiding important questions of re-entry and transfer. In the absence of rigorous follow-up with the participating groups, the organizers lose out on valuable feedback loops and instead get restricted to repeated iterations of the facilitated encounters.

So, any comprehensive measurement of peace initiatives’ impact must answer 4 questions. First, what changes are observed in the participants’ *representation* of the conflict? Second, what are the observed changes in their *relations* towards the outgroup(s)? Third, has the program successfully laid the groundwork for *transfer* of

²⁹ D’Estree, T. P., Fast, L. A., Weiss, J. N., & Jakobsen, M. S. (2001). Changing the debate about “success” in conflict resolution efforts. *Negotiation Journal*, 17(2), 101-113

³⁰ Ross, M. H. (2000). Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis: Originally published in M. Lichbach and A. Zuckerman, Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure, 1997. *Culture and Politics: A Reader*, 39-70.

³¹ Ibid.

new attitudes and relationships to the larger community? Fourth, has the program sown the seeds for *implementing* changes at higher levels?.^{32, 33}

Impact Measurement for Thick Interventions

The above discussion highlights the nuanced and complex nature of peacebuilding initiatives which focus on cross-conflict encounters. As emphasised above, it entails use of complex impact measurement strategies which may not apply to other social interventions. Shifting the focus from programmed outputs to outcomes takes importance in such methods. This builds the case for holistic impact assessment which promotes the participation of a broad range of stakeholders beyond the participating groups themselves.³⁴

Monitoring and evaluation practices, as propounded by Markiewicz and Patrick form a part of a results-based management approach to programs.³⁵ I use this framework for impact assessment of SoP's IFHCs in light of the prior discussion on the complexity of such interventions. The use of strong feedback loops and continued program improvement are crucial to a program of this nature which seeks to challenge individual, social, and systemic barriers, longitudinally. It must then adapt to the dynamic realities of intergroup conflict.

The results-based management approach emphasises on a fundamental interdependence between monitoring and evaluation (M&E). It employs exploration of 5 key evaluation domains: impact i.e. assessment of change caused by the program; program quality in addressing the problem area; value i.e. effectiveness; importance i.e.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Ibid.

³⁵ Ibid.

efficiency; and fidelity i.e. sustainability of the program outcomes. With a focus on social interventions, Donaldson guides evaluators using a 3-step process driven by 'program theory' which is the inherent logic of change adopted by the organizers.³⁶ This involves: developing a program theory, designing and prioritizing questions based on this theory, and answering questions using suitable evaluation methods.

The ideal M&E framework for such interventions is cascading in nature such that M&E frameworks at different levels (the intervention, the program, and the system level) inform each other.³⁷ For SoP, this would mean that frameworks for all 4 components of the CLP and for SoP as an organizing system, would inform each other. However, given the mandate of this project, I restrict my effort to developing a comprehensive M&E framework for IFHC.

M&E for contextually rich, thick interventions like the IFHCs then serve several purposes. They establish coherence on program and intervention-level progress and results, inform the subsequent decision-making process, support accountability to the community and stakeholders, and facilitate organizational learning for program improvement.³⁸ Further, they have an evaluation-led focus informed by the program theory, with a participatory orientation.³⁹ I used these insights to drive my data collection and analysis in developing strong MEL frameworks for SoP's IFHCs.

Conclusion

This review of literature has been along the core themes of this study: peace education, belongingness, and MEAL for thick interventions. It explores the questions

³⁶ Donaldson, S. I. (2007). Program theory-driven evaluation science: Strategies and applications.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

surrounding isolation engendered by social segregation, evolution of thinking around cross-conflict encounters as a peacebuilding initiative, impact measurement for such initiatives, and practical insights into designing relevant M&E frameworks.

The ideas raised in this section have been at the heart of my CEI's design. After close interaction with SoP leadership and developing a robust understanding of the program, I developed the program's intended theory of change.⁴⁰ Subsequently, I designed the plan and tools for data collection hinging on participatory approaches. Hence, the above exploration of literature and identification of best practices for the purpose of my research have been crucial to the development of this study.

METHODOLOGY

This study is exploratory in nature and calls for the use of qualitative methods to tap into the complex, subjective pathways through which IFHCs' impact has been felt by various stakeholders. The data collected as part of my three-stage community engagement initiative (CEI) then serves three distinct purposes: assessing the impact of IFHCs on participants, facilitating design of an MEL framework for IFHCs, and discerning insights into the community's voice regarding the IFHCs' strengthening.

As a first step, I conducted a thorough review of the existing data on pre and post-surveys from IFHCs since 2017; this will be discussed in the following section. This entailed a review of internal program documentation, past studies on IFHC impact, raw data on attitudinal changes felt by participants in the camps' immediate aftermath, and a

⁴⁰ This effort was greatly aided by my frequent interactions with Anadjot Kaur Sachdev, a research intern at SoP who has been closely associated with the organization. She has been a repeated participant in all modules of the CLP and has rich insights into the various programs run by SoP.

close review of existing monitoring tools, i.e. questionnaires. Next, I explored theoretical frameworks to apply to an impact and MEL study for SoP's IFHCs. This was followed by a systematic design of my 3-stage CEI.

As discussed briefly in the Introduction to this report, I identified 4 stakeholder groups: ex-participants of IFHCs, their parents, facilitator-volunteers, and professional facilitators. Through the CEI, I sought to collect data from individual stakeholders as well as the community. Stage I involved inquiry into individual stakeholders' perceptions and experiences through surveys sent out to the population of identified stakeholders. Based on the insights uncovered through a thematic analysis of the survey findings, I invited a subset of the survey participants for in-depth interviews. Due to the limited responses to the survey within other stakeholder groups, I restricted the interviews to 5 ex-seeds from different cohorts.

In the culminating stage of the CEI, I helped SoP organise a first-ever alumni engagement activity in Mumbai. The invitation was proffered to all alumni and ex-staff for the 2017-2023 IFHCs. The aim of this exercise was to operationalize the remedy of a sore point for all cohorts: poor follow-up and alumni engagement by SoP. Direct, anonymous feedback was invited from the alumni and I made observations regarding the community dynamics during this event. Hence, the community members themselves were at the center-stage of data collection for this study at every component stage.

CHOICE OF TOOLS AND RATIONALE FOR DESIGN OF THE CEI

Survey questionnaires, designed separately for each stakeholder group and for different cohorts, were used as a preliminary data collection tool to get a broader range of responses. The voluntary nature of participation, low time demand, and absence of

human interfacing were key considerations for choosing this tool. I detailed an ethical considerations guide in close collaboration with SoP to ensure informed consent, confidentiality, and protection of respondents' privacy.⁴¹ Consent was duly recorded for each respondent before the surveys and interviews.⁴² These contained the following themes:

- **Seeds:** experience at IFHC, their reflections from the time they attended camp, any initiatives that they took post-IFHC, their re-entry experience, and their learnings from camp.
- **Parents:**⁴³ motivations for sending their child to IFHC and reflections from the time of camp, the place that religion holds in their life, household and community.
- **Facilitator-volunteers:**⁴⁴ experience and learnings at IFHC, reflections on camp, experiences as a facilitator, initiatives that they took post-IFHC.
- **Ex-staff:**⁴⁵ experience and reflections as staff at IFHC, programmatic insights, reflection on peace education as a tool for peacebuilding.

Once the surveys made it clear that re-entry and use of camp learnings to take up their own initiatives were important themes for seeds, I designed an interview guide. I tailored each interview to the interviewee's survey responses and used these spaces

⁴¹ This has been submitted to SoP as an internal document.

⁴² It was agreed that findings and quotes will not be used for any purpose outside the scope of this fellowship. Anonymized records of surveys and interviews would be made available to SoP for use in the future.

⁴³ The rationale behind reaching out to this group was to gauge the tolerance for pluralism in seeds' homes and communities as well as to learn about their re-entry experience.

⁴⁴ This group is indicative of an undocumented success of the IFHCs. Their motivation to return to camp as facilitators is a useful data point in studying the camps' impact.

⁴⁵ It was expected that nuanced technical and normative insights into the programming of the IFHCs could be explored with this group. However, their poor response, perhaps owing to the short-term nature of their employment, was found to be irrelevant to the study.

to gain deeper insights into the respondents' thought processes and lived experiences. Lastly, Stage III of the CEI was designed to honor the IFHC community. Component activities for the meet-up were designed to facilitate inter-cohort socialising, networking, and refresh the most favoured camp components. This included dialogue, group discussion, experience-sharing, and collaborative decision-making.

Considerations Regarding Analysis: Addressing Challenges and Limitations

In the absence of any systemic database of alumni and allied stakeholders, I compiled this from disparate sources during the conceptualisation of the CEI. The existing data in the form of pre- and post-surveys from past IFHCs was available only since the 2017 IFHCs. So, the time period for this study has been shaped by the availability of data. Further, these surveys had not been analysed. So, I conducted a systematic thematic analysis for each camp in addition to a quantitative analysis of the attitudinal changes. These survey records gave me static insights rather than any longitudinal perspective on camp impact. Regardless, they provided crucial insights into areas which I explored, in-depth, during my CEI.

The surveys were administered to all IFHC attendees (2017-2023). The contact details for parents were available only for 3 out of the 6 years of study. Accordingly, surveys were sent out to parents from only those years. All ex-staff and facilitator-volunteers were also contacted. The option to opt-in for interviews was provided to all survey respondents. However, due to the limited engagement by groups other than seeds, the interviews were aimed at ex-participants only, with 2 key themes.

Very few responses were received from seeds who went to earlier years of camp i.e. 2017-2019.⁴⁶ This is a direct result of the lack of follow-up with alumni, by SoP. This fact also explains the poor response rates from other stakeholder groups.⁴⁷ As such, it is important to highlight the fact that any conclusions made in the analysis portion are based on these numerically sparse responses and in no way generalizable to the larger community.

On the basis of the response rates for each cohort, I delineated a difference in participants' motivations given the lack of connectedness with the IFHC community. Accordingly, I clubbed my analysis into 3 periods to study IFHC impact: the short run (2 years), the medium run (3-5 years), and the long run (>5 years).⁴⁸

A Note on my Positionality

I am external to the program and organization ecosystem of SoP but I am located within the network space of the intervention, i.e. IFHC. I have formerly studied and researched inter-faith violence and religiously motivated hate crimes in India. I understand the burden of my responsibility as I make analytical decisions, which, although taken in light of imperfect data, may construct a picture of the truth of camp impact that may be different from what the individual members of this ecosystem perceive it to be. Where apt, I have given full disclosure of the limitations of data and my own analysis.

I have upheld my promise of ethical research in this process as I worked with individuals who are minors as per Indian law. I have tried my best to not cause any

⁴⁶ The total of 65 responses from seeds is broken down as: 2017: 4; 2018: 10; 2019: 4; 2021: 6; 2022: 21; 2023: 20

⁴⁷ 10 parents, 6 facilitator-volunteers, and 6 ex-staff.

⁴⁸ Short run: IFHCs 2023, 2022; Medium run: IFHCs 2021; Long run: IFHCs 2018, 2017, 2019.

harm to them and to hold conversations that accord their experiences the consideration which they deserve.

EVIDENCE & KEY FINDINGS

In this section, I present the following: core findings from a study of past IFHCs, findings from a thematic analysis of the surveys administered to IFHC stakeholders (Stage I), core insights from the interviews (Stage II), and observations from the community meet-up (Stage III).

IFHCs' Immediately Observed Impact: Studying Past Data from Camps

My study began with establishing coherence regarding the program and assessing its past efficacy based on available data from SoP. SoP's impact measurement tool, focused on immediate attitudinal changes, utilizes a pre-camp vs. post-camp survey format, incorporating a mix of open-ended, subjective questions and Likert-scale items. However, these surveys had not been systematically analyzed since IFHC 2017. I conducted thematic and content analyses of these surveys alongside other camp-related documents.⁴⁹ This allowed for a detailed understanding of past camps without the need for manual processing of each document in the future. Consequently, I provided SoP with comprehensive year-wise camp analyses to enhance internal coherence for future IFHC planning.

A key finding from this analysis was the significant year-on-year variation in IFHC programming, primarily due to resource constraints. Originally, IFHCs consisted of intra-day workshops rather than residential camps, deviating from the SoP International model. The facilitator-volunteer model ran until the 2019 IFHC, with no camp in 2020

⁴⁹ I reviewed course and camp documents, camp surveys, external reviews and reports as well as seeds' testimonies.

due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The 2021 and 2022 camps were non-residential, influenced by pandemic recovery and funding challenges. The first residential camp aligned with the SoP vision, with full funding and professional facilitators, occurred in 2023.⁵⁰ Thus, comparable data was limited across all IFHCs. Baseline-endline analysis was possible only for 2018, 2019, and 2023, given the completeness of datasets.

Due to these programming variations, rigorous comparison across camps was not feasible. Consequently, I analyzed each camp individually and established systems to enhance comparability in future iterations.^{51, 52}

Despite comparability issues, studying past camps yielded valuable insights. Participant learning and attitudinal changes were found to be highly sensitive to even minor programming adjustments. This sensitivity was evident in the evolving nature of participants' reflections, the significance of trauma-based introspection activities, and the camp's residential vs. nonresidential format, which influenced participants' critical reflection and engagement levels. Additionally, participants expressed a desire for greater cohort diversity, crucial for the program's effectiveness, highlighting the need for a closer examination of recruitment processes.⁵³

A review of the survey tools revealed limitations in assessing camp impact. The surveys did not fully capture all programming themes, providing only partial insights into

⁵⁰ In former camps, partly due to funding constraints, camp participants returned as camp facilitators on a voluntary basis for subsequent camps.

⁵¹ A report drafted on analysis of past camps, survey tools, and programmatic history was submitted to SoP.

⁵² To analyse the seeds' responses to the open-ended question sections of the pre and post-camp surveys, I codified the responses and analysed them thematically. To facilitate individuals who do this work after me, I have created a repository of the codes which may aid preliminary analysis. For the likert scale questions, I conducted a baseline-endline analysis. To make this effort easier for subsequent iterations, I created a worksheet template with the requisite formulas which can be used to run such analyses in the future.

⁵³ The present model of cross-subsidizing camp participation for seeds from less privileged socio-economic backgrounds must be revised and coupled with broader outreach to schools in Mumbai. This is discussed in the recommendations.

the camp's effects. While the questions partly addressed endline changes, they failed to adequately measure medium- or long-term postline changes.⁵⁴

My review of existing data underscored the need to establish follow-up evaluation systems and revise the survey tools to more comprehensively capture camp impact. These analyses informed my understanding of the IFHCs and facilitated the processing of raw data recorded by SoP since 2017, laying the groundwork for designing my CEI, the findings of which are discussed next.

CEI: Insights on Camp Experience, Learnings, and Perceived Impact

In this subsection, I present my findings with thematically arranged insights on various aspects of IFHC experience and impact as felt by various stakeholders. These include learnings from all 3 stages of the CEI. Where relevant, I divide my analysis into a short, medium, and long term frame for the seeds. In the long term, I consider 2017, 2018, and 2019 IFHCs which had a facilitator-volunteer component. For the medium term, I looked at 2021 IFHC, which was unique in its post-COVID adaptation with masking precautions and several virtual sessions. For the short run, with programmatic changes like content revision, I considered 2022 and 2023 IFHCs.

A. IFHCs have facilitated intimate relationships with religion and faith

As part of the survey, seeds were asked if IFHC inspired any change in their thoughts regarding their own as well as others' religious and faith identities. An overwhelming majority (~80%, across the period being studied) reported a positive change. Prior to IFHC, many respondents reported having a rigid view of what their own or others' religious identities meant. After camp, they reported: the ability to discern

⁵⁴ I provided SoP a systematic review, rework, and suggested wording revisions for their existing survey tools at this stage.

stereotypes, curiosity to learn about religious and faith practices different from their own, a heightened appreciation for the values enshrined in their religion, applying critical thinking faculties to popular representations of religious conflict, and acceptance and open-mindedness regarding others' beliefs.

This finding was immediately observable in the endline surveys administered to seeds on the last day of camp. The CEI helped confirm that this has been a lasting change for seeds even in the long-term. This exploration of one's relationship with their faith has been aided by IFHC in various ways. 3 interviewees highlighted their newfound appreciation for religious practices in their community which they had hitherto found challenging. They asserted that camp enabled them to reflect on faith beyond ritual practice of religion, and this helped them in trying to understand what their religion meant to them. As one Jain woman participant from the 2018 IFHC shared:

Before camp, I wasn't overly religious. Every time we had to go for religious events, I had to be forced to go... After camp, I successfully did all days of Paryushan.⁵⁵ I reconnected with myself and my faith, and my family were happy to see me talking to them about our religion.

This points towards seeds' ability to discern between their given and chosen beliefs, which facilitated an intimate, nuanced exploration of their own belief systems. A Hindu woman participant from the 2022 IFHC stood up to her community for a young Muslim child to offer prayers at the neighborhood Ganpati *aarti*.⁵⁶ Further, many seeds shared experiences of voicing their opinion during polarized conversations at home and in their friend circles.

⁵⁵ Paryushana is an annual, holy event for the Jain community. Community members seek to heighten their spiritual intensity through fasting, prayer, and meditation during this time.

⁵⁶ Prayer

B. Lasting change perceived by stakeholders is inwards

On the primary question of lasting change of IFHC on its participants, the findings indicate that this change is predominantly inwards i.e. micro-level. From the short to the long-term, a commonality between participants is that of heightened awareness, respect, and empathy for others along with the sustained use of critical thinking faculties. Very few seeds go on to take up peacebuilding work post-camp at the meso or macro levels but, unfailingly, all respondents report an inwards change which has helped them navigate interpersonal conflicts and be a moderating influence in their social circles. While intangible, this is a crucial insight into the strength of the IFHC programming and the program theory which sees peace as starting with inward change.⁵⁷

When asked about ‘post-camp initiatives’ they may have taken up, the responses covered the following areas: increasing awareness in one’s social circle, working on social causes,⁵⁸ discussing camp learnings in school assemblies,⁵⁹ taking up research projects, and starting dialogue initiatives. After talking to community members during the CEI, I identified only 5 individuals, who started their own dialogue circles, as directly implementing their IFHC learnings.⁶⁰ These 5 individuals extended IFHC learnings,

⁵⁷ A deeper understanding of this can be gained through the logic model I developed with SoP’s program manager, Urmi Chanda. I present this in the MEL addendum.

⁵⁸ As discussed subsequently, these were seldom related to peacebuilding or interfaith harmony.

⁵⁹ Some schools which are SoP’s partners compel all IFHC attendees from those schools to do this after camp. Talking about camp in school assemblies is unique to these institutions. The applications for IFHC are very competitive in such schools and, often, students are selected for camp by their teachers’ referrals.

⁶⁰ The IFHCs emphasise on the importance of dialogue and also train participants in meaningful ways of doing this.

systematically, to over 60 of their peers. This is a notable contribution at the meso-level.⁶¹

While *prima facie* unrelated to interfaith harmony work, taking up research and work in other social domains, as done by 6 of the respondents, is often one of the few ways known to seeds to implement their camp learnings. This is because opportunities for taking up peace or interfaith harmony-related work are seldom known to them. While it could not be confirmed during the CEI, it is plausible that parents might not be supportive of their children taking up work in a politically charged and highly contested domain of social work in India. So, less contested domains of social work and research may seem to be the natural progression for newly inspired seeds.

While the highest number of survey responses were received from participants of 2022 and 2023 IFHCs, these demonstrated the fewest instances of participants having taken up a project after camp (only 1 out of 41). The 2021 IFHC survey reflects that at least 2 individuals have taken up initiatives post-camp.⁶² Even though numerically few, the responses from the earlier camps (2017-19) show 4 out of the 18 respondents took up such projects. Assuming that there may be a self-selection bias in folks who have continued peacebuilding work to fill out the surveys, especially for the earlier camps, it may be said that more after-camp efforts were made by the earlier cohorts. While the reasons for this could not be confirmed, I believe that the average age of participants in

⁶¹ A seed who is a 2022 and 2023 alumni has started a dialogue group for peers in her school, which has been running for 6 months with 10 participants who haven't attended IFHC themselves. I surveyed these individuals and the positive influence of the dialogue arose in the following insights: heightened critical thinking, practicing active listening, a nuanced understanding of caste and gender, heightened appreciation for the fellow dialogue participants, and confidence in taking space inside and outside the group.

⁶² In this, I include the following meanings of 'impact': taking up research or advocacy in any social domain, or starting one's own dialogue initiative. Here, I emphasise on formalised, structured efforts at change and not mere sensitised interaction within social circles.

camp could be a contributing factor. Younger participants may be less likely to take meso-level initiatives post-camp.

Interestingly, there is an undocumented success story of the IFHC which provides crucial insights into post-camp initiative by seeds. Given the option, over 50% attendees of the 2018 IFHC indicated high motivations to return as facilitator-volunteers in subsequent iterations of camp. There were several challenges posed by this volunteership model which led to its discontinuation post-2019.⁶³ However, up till 2019, it provided a way for seeds to continue peace-related work in a safe environment explored by them previously.

C. Re-Entry and Transfer: Heightened Importance of Community and Support

A glaring issue related to transformative encounters like IFHCs, as discussed in the literature review, pertains to re-entry and the problem of transfer. By design, IFHC seeks to remove seeds from their daily contexts to facilitate dialogue and transform mutual perceptions towards cooperation. Returning to their homes and communities post-camp, with a newfound appreciation for arguably liberal virtues, often made for a turbulent experience for most seeds. In extreme cases, seeds experienced verbal abuse and severe admonishment at home for making friends across socially rigid religious borders. This is especially true in context of the rapid polarization of the Hindu-Muslim conflict in India.

Two women Hindu participants, one from 2018 IFHC and one from 2023, recounted their turbulent re-entry journeys during our interviews. For the first, she made

⁶³ Dominantly, as reported by 4 of the 6 facilitator-volunteers respondents in the survey, they were not provided adequate training or mental health support to deal with the themes brought up by participants in dialogue. Being teenagers themselves, they often found themselves struggling to offer support.

Muslim friends at camp which her family was vociferously against due to their lived experience of the 2002 Gujarat communal riots. Several wars of words and ideas ensued as she asserted her will to stay connected to her new friends. For the second, she shared her learnings from camp with her father who, according to her, is “conservative” and “old-school”. When she shared her learnings about Islam from peers at camp, he lashed out. She recounted the incident:

It created a huge ruckus. I cried, I yelled. Words were said [by both of us] which should never have been said. For weeks, I was on the verge of tears. Now, I just don't talk to him [about it].

In some instances, seeds reached out, informally, to the camp staff to get emotional support during this turbulent re-entry. This was readily provided. However, there is no formal system at SoP to facilitate smooth re-entry. Across the period of analysis, most seeds, especially in the short-run, report having a smooth re-entry where their learnings were received with curiosity by friends and family. However, roughly a third of the participants from these years (2022 and 2023) reported not having shared their learnings with family at all. Overall, participants felt more comfortable talking to friends than family members. Beyond ‘re-entry’, this points to the nuances of the ‘problem of transfer’ whereby attitudes and values learned as part of camp are at odds with the values at one’s home and in their community.

Reflecting on the IFHC, one respondent who was a parent said,

I was happy and disappointed by the program... when my child came back, *all the boundaries that were set previously had collapsed. She questioned everything which was fine by us...* she was completely uprooted after the program and *it took her a good 2-4 years to get rooted again into the value system inculcated at home.* [Emphasis added]

Read alongside the dominating theme of poor follow-up by SoP, this response points to a potential undoing of the camp’s strong short-term effects. This may leave

ex-participants more vulnerable and isolated after re-entry into their daily lives post-camp.

These insights point towards the importance of a support system for seeds in the form of community experienced at camp, formal support offered by SoP, or advice from past alumni. In the absence of such an infrastructure, the seeds may be opened up to unintended harm beyond gradually losing touch with camp learnings.

D. Lack of Follow-Up Restricts IFHCs' Potential

As discussed above, there is little evidence of seeds taking up interfaith harmony or peace-related initiatives after camp. Survey responses highlight the following as challenges: lack of tools to take initiatives, lack of follow-up or support from SoP, mounting pressures of academics and further studies. When asked whether SoP prepared them to be changemakers, an overwhelming majority (~80% across the period of study) of respondents said 'yes'. This assertion is at odds with the number of seeds who took structured initiatives to actually drive social change after camp.

The highest number of instances of respondents taking such efforts was observed in the group of facilitator-volunteers. Apart from returning as facilitators, 4 out of the 6 respondents reported having taken up other interfaith peace-related initiatives ranging from research to holding dialogue in their schools. When asked whether IFHC adequately prepared them to be changemakers, 3 respondents in the long term highlighted the weak follow-up model of SoP as a limitation to the impact the IFHCs are able to create.

Interacting with alumni during the community meet-up, I learned that some seeds have been experiencing dejection and alienation from SoP's work and programs. This

sentiment is echoed dominantly in *high-performing seeds*.⁶⁴ At the same time, they feel directionless with regards to what they could do next. SoP can tap into the potential of these seeds to deliver on its intended long-term outcomes. In light of resource constraints, collaborating with potential partner organisations and creating roles of responsibility for alumni are expected to be useful. I highlight this in the following point on alumni engagement.

E. Diversity in the Cohort: Diverse Socio-Economic Representation is Desired

An important revelation reiterated at all stages of the CEI by various stakeholders has been the community's demand for diverse socio-economic representation in the cohort. The recruitment model of IFHC dominantly brings in students from the partnering schools, most of which are reported to represent a narrow section of the population in terms of religion and class. Further, the process for students to participate in camp is skewed as teachers select who 'represents' the school at camp. Community members emphasise that this restricts their learnings. An allied concern is the long-term impact of the IFHCs as many students from the partner schools who attend camp move abroad for higher studies.

Through interviews, it was observed that seeds from SoP-partner schools, who attended camp, came in groups bigger than 2-3. This enabled continued discussions in the school space even when these seeds fell out of touch with others whom they met at camp. Further, there have been repeated instances of such seeds coordinating with their schoolmates to initiate dialogue and projects related to social causes. In an

⁶⁴ I use this phrase to refer to ex-participants who have participated in peace-related work by leading initiatives in their schools, attending different modules of CLP, repeated participation in IFHC, and participation in international camps. Having gone through these experiences, they now no longer feel challenged or stimulated by the offerings of SoP.

interview, one respondent pointed out that it becomes difficult for students who can't apply for camp through their school to make it to IFHC; this may lead to SoP missing out on strong candidates. So, a wider recruitment net has multiple benefits.

This fact is not entirely unknown to SoP, where the leadership has had to navigate recruitment efficiency given its existing cross-subsidising model of camp fees. Historically, some schools with dominant populations of students from socially underrepresented communities have been trusted partners of SoP. With religious polarization in India in the past decade, changes in administration at these schools made them opt out of sending their students to IFHC. Managing cost concerns, it became difficult for SoP to diversify recruitment.

Beyond diverse socio-economic representation, an idea raised by stakeholders during the CEI was to conduct IFHC for parents too. Broadening the ambit of the programming this way, it is believed, will enable the creation of a larger support system for seeds to meaningfully drive social change. The operationalization of this recommendation may be difficult as SoP programming, globally, has focused on young persons in a specific age bracket. SoP India may think about making IFHC for older generations an additional offering. In line with the organisation's vision, my recommendation is to hold shorter, intraday dialogue sessions and workshops with parents being invited to the discussions. I elaborate on this in the following section.

F. Development of Alumni Engagement is Desired and Necessary

A dominant theme, overlapping with the points discussed above, is the vociferous demand of the community for continued alumni engagement. This is expected to provide a support system which may mitigate the burden of SoP regarding

questions on re-entry and the problem of transfer. Older alumni and ex-staff who opt into this provide an extensive knowledge resource which may help newly graduating seeds in profound ways while facilitating the continued sense of community and belongingness felt by seeds. Additionally, this is expected to mitigate the feelings of dejection and futility voiced by some seeds, especially among the high performers.

On this point, several insights were received during the alumni meet-up. Anonymous feedback was invited from participants which revealed ideas shared by multiple community members. These suggestions surrounded facilitation of alumni engagement by SoP, post-camp support for seeds, and suggestions to strengthen the IFHC programming. A detailed list of these suggestions has been provided to SoP in the form of an event report. The most pertinent points are highlighted in the subsequent section on recommendations.

During the meet, while some attendees shined during the structured sessions, others were found taking initiative in the unstructured spaces, for instance, during the tea and lunch breaks. This is corroborated by the earlier surveys and interview findings which revealed that some ex-participants need structure to help them in sustaining communication with others. Seeds seldom reported successful, active engagement with friends made at camp, after camp.

Here, it is important to consider the relevance of the alumni meet-up in Mumbai. The immediate outcome of this event was the fostering of a sense of community among ex-participants of IFHC. Alongside being a refresher of camp, it facilitated inter-cohort networking and bonding over peacebuilding which the alumni reported seldom finding space for. It served as an opportunity for SoP leadership to share other avenues of

continuing peace-related work post-camp while also inviting suggestions from the community. Sharing information regarding SoP's upcoming plans and ideas for change also fostered trust with the attendees. It is expected that more such activities, frequently, would encourage bigger turnouts and evoke more ideas, progressing as a positive feedback loop. This would significantly aid SoP's MEL efforts.

Conclusion

The findings of the CEI reveal several strengths of the IFHCs, dominantly lasting self-perceived inward impact on seeds. At the same time, the voice of the community has been crucial in unearthing opportunities for SoP to provide support to its alumni and deliver, collaboratively, on its long-term outcomes. Key of these being the formation of a community of young people who are keyed into the challenges of interfaith peace. The process also revealed key areas where the lack of follow-up from SoP and the absence of an alumni network opened up IFHC graduates to unintended harm, the impact of which could not be accurately gauged given the numerically sparse survey responses and poor interest in interviews.

The CEI gave the IFHC community a voice in decisions pertaining to them, which have been welcomed by SoP. The alumni meet-up further revealed insights into the community dynamics that may be crucially valuable for SoP in designing formal and informal avenues for the community to stay in touch and learn collaboratively, continuously. The recommendations in the following section aim to operationalize this strength of the driven members who form part of the IFHC space.

Given the historical inaccuracy of SoP's survey tools to capture longitudinal impact, this broad-based, participatory, qualitative impact assessment revealed crucial

information using which I built the MEL framework for SoP along with revised survey tools to adequately capture its programmed themes while incorporating amenability to postline testing.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- ***IFHC Alumni engagement: SoP in collaboration with seeds***
 - Organize refresher courses for alumni which are more challenging than IFHC syllabus. These may also facilitate mingling across cohorts.
 - Encourage community-led meet-ups like a potluck for alumni and families. This would cut any venue and food costs & facilitate frequent interactions.
 - Tap into e-events like guest lectures, book discussions, moderated discussions, and idea-sharing sessions. These can be organized and facilitated by highly motivated seeds who desire more responsibility while easing the staff's load.
 - Sharing alumni's work/projects/initiatives on the SoP Instagram page to engage more alumni and offer them a chance to collaborate.⁶⁵
- ***Post-camp support: SoP and the alumni network***
 - Provide formal re-entry support to seeds in terms of counseling/ post-care. Alumni communication channels may provide informal support to peers.
 - Introduce a camp module about initiatives alumni could take up post-camp; follow-up with periodic calls to action and opportunities.

⁶⁵ On this front, I collated a resource base of over 100 organisations working with youth in the interfaith space in India. This, along with use guides of the resource, have been shared with the alumni.

- Starting peace clubs in partner schools to facilitate dialogue and creation of a culture of peacemaking beyond the few students who attend IFHC. A ‘peace fellowship’ program for young leaders may also be explored.
- Provide advanced peacemaking training for alumni with adults.
- ***Suggestions to improve IFHC: SoP***
 - Introduce a component of intergenerational dialogue in camp or organise workshops for the same.
 - Diversify the cohort, increase representation in camp from folks representing different socio-economic profiles; perform strategic outreach to a wider base of schools. Revise recruitment strategies accordingly.
- ***Implementing MEL frameworks: SoP***
 - Employ robust MEL frameworks which prioritise participatory methods.⁶⁶
 - Ensure regular out-bound communication with stakeholders (including the community) regarding the performance of SoP’s programs.
 - Develop documents pertaining to SoP’s theory of change and make these available to allies, staff, and community.⁶⁷
- ***Finding allies: SoP and future partners***
 - Launch information drives, story sharing, and joint sessions with other CSOs working with young people in the space of interfaith harmony.

⁶⁶ I have provided SoP with a fully fleshed out MEL plan including operationalisation of such strategies that will aid robust monitoring, sustainably.

⁶⁷ I developed this document after close discussion with the various stakeholders of the IFHC. The same has been submitted for SoP’s internal or external use.

- Find SoP's space in the larger network of the peace and interfaith harmony sector in India.⁶⁸

CONCLUSION

“Together, we may be able to plan a less painful future. Separate, we can only anticipate further ruptures and deeper loneliness.” ~ Maya Angelou

Operational since 2014, the IFHCs have trained hundreds of young people to become changemakers. Through this study, I have performed content analysis of historical data, thematic and quantitative analyses of hitherto unprocessed camp data, designed and implemented a qualitative impact assessment, generated recommendations for SoP to strengthen its programming, & contributed to the initiation of alumni engagement. Beyond this, I generated reports to aid various decision-making processes at SoP and designed a robust MEL framework along with tools which automate and simplify the time taken to analyse monitoring data. Lastly, I produced a verified list of potential partners for SoP.⁶⁹

Close engagement with the community through surveys, interviews, and in-person interaction have enabled the discovery of perceptions, values and experiences held closely by the various stakeholders. The IFHCs have enabled seeds to discover and nurture intimate relationships with their own religious and faith identities. This, in addition to the pedagogic values at camp, has fostered lasting inwards change which has made seeds empathetic critical thinkers. Both these findings speak closely to a sense of higher purpose felt by seeds, which drives peace from inwards-out.

⁶⁸ My resource mapping efforts may provide SoP a good starting point in identifying potential allies and partners.

⁶⁹ This report dominantly focuses on the learnings from my 3-stage CEI and review of SoP's internal data. The other products generated by me have been attached as addendums or submitted internally to SoP.

Re-entry and problems of transfer are found to be significant opportunities for SoP to formally support the transition of seeds into everyday life and sustaining their learnings from camp. For this, development of alumni engagement programs is both desired by the community and needed for the realization of SoP's intended outcomes. It also highlights the importance of representation of diverse socio-economic, religious and faith identities at camp, which community members desire highly.

As highlighted in the recommendations, this study is of importance to SoP in delivering on the community members' needs and expectations while also achieving its long-term vision. The programming for IFHC is strong and with these supporting additions, it is expected that SoP will be able to tap into the power of its community's immense knowledge resource and potential. This would be pivotal in nurturing a network of driven changemakers who can influence their communities and subsequently, the policy processes in mitigating hate along the lines of religion in India. The motto taught in Indian schools, 'Unity in diversity', may then slowly but surely find its realization. It is our shared hope that a revival of the constitutional vision will eventually follow.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research and the fellowship have been a thoroughly rewarding experience. Regardless of the challenges that emerged, I have become a fan of the work being done by SoP and the sheer determination of the few hands which run this operation. I would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to SoP's leadership, Sagar and Urmi, for their unwavering support and patience as I tried to understand the IFHC ecosystem. The more I engaged with the community and explored the programming, the more my respect for them swelled.

Olivia Smith-Rodrigues, Sammi Bennett, and Julia Pinchuk at SCSC offered tremendous support and guidance to me every step of the way. Their timely, critical insights into my work and meticulous administrative and logistical support ensured that everything happened on time. I am extremely grateful to them for this and more.

Anadjot Kaur Sachdev, a research intern at SoP, extended herself to provide useful support on research and the network mapping addendum. She openly shared her insights and passion pertaining to IFHC and interfaith work, which were fundamental in me developing an intimate understanding of this program. I am grateful to her for this, and for our weekly interactions which ran the gamut.

I am sincerely thankful also to the IFHC community i.e. everyone who took time to respond to the surveys, participate in interviews, and those who showed up for the alumni meet. Their insights and experiences added great texture and value to this study which I hope aids their future with SoP.

Lastly, to my friends, family, and mentors: thank you! I couldn't have asked for a more supportive group of people to encourage me leading up to, and during this fellowship. Mrs. Pragati Singh, Col. Narendra Singh, Patish, Zeba Khan, Rahul Singh, Vardhan Gupta, Prof. Dr. Awanish Kumar, Prof. Srikrishna Ayyangar, and Harsh Mander Sir: you have inspired me to push myself and work towards something bigger than myself. I am grateful. I hope I live up to the standards of excellence you have set for me.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Nimer, M. (2001). Conflict resolution, culture, and religion: Toward a training model of interreligious peacebuilding. *Journal of Peace Research*, 38(6), 685-704.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. *Addison-Wesley google scholar*, 2, 59-82.
- Azar, E. E. (1985). Protracted international conflicts: Ten propositions. *International Interactions*, 12(1), 59-70.
- D'Estree, T. P., Fast, L. A., Weiss, J. N., & Jakobsen, M. S. (2001). Changing the debate about "success" in conflict resolution efforts. *Negotiation Journal*, 17(2), 101-113
- Donaldson, S. I. (2007). Program theory-driven evaluation science: Strategies and applications.
- Engineer, I. (2024). The status of Freedom of Religion or Belief in India since 2014 - a Report. Centre for Study of Society and Secularism, Mumbai.
- Kelman, H. C. (1997). Interactive problem solving. *Inactive Conflict Resolution*, 56-77.
- Lazarus, N. (2011). Evaluating peace education in the Oslo-Intifada generation: A long-term impact study of Seeds of Peace 1993–2010. American University.
- Markiewicz, A., & Patrick, I. (2015). Developing monitoring and evaluation frameworks. Sage Publications.
- Nielsen, K. B., & Nilsen, A. G. (2021). Love jihad and the governance of gender and intimacy in Hindu nationalist statecraft. *Religions*, 12(12), 1068.
- Ross, M. H. (2000). Culture and Identity in Comparative Political Analysis: Originally published in M. Lichbach and A. Zuckerman, *Comparative Politics: Rationality, Culture, and Structure*, 1997. *Culture and Politics: A Reader*, 39-70.
- Samuel, K. (2022). On belonging: Finding connection in an age of isolation. Abrams.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (2003). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. *Social psychology*, 4, 73-98.
- Webel, C., & Galtung, J. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of peace and conflict studies* (Vol. 7). London: Routledge.