A Project that Delivers, Not Just Displays



مدارج



Tariq, Ziyad, Fahad and Mazen were all seventeen, teammates at a boys' school. The title was larger than the stage: “Future Skills Platform.” In the promotional video, words flashed by at speed—learning, service, impact, one hundred opportunities in a week. The student team stood behind the screen in matching shirts and waited for the applause.

The original idea had been simple. Some students had skills they could teach, while others needed help with a specific skill. Tariq proposed a booking board where a student could offer thirty minutes to explain a spreadsheet, review a résumé, or practice a presentation. But the idea grew every time someone joined the planning.

“We need a complete visual identity,” Ziyad said.

“Let’s add points and badges,” Fahad suggested.

“We need a major launch,” Mazen insisted, “or no one will hear about us.”

Over three weeks, they designed a logo, a video, cards, and a counter displaying the number of registrations. They did not test a single appointment between a learner and a volunteer.

On launch day, 137 students opened the page. The team cheered when the counter crossed one hundred. An hour later, the first message arrived: “I registered to learn spreadsheets, but I did not receive an appointment.” A second message followed: “I registered as a trainer. Who am I training?” A third student asked, “Does the badge mean the trainer is certified?”

The team had no clear answers. Their form collected names and skills, but it did not match available times, define the boundaries of help, or state that the trainers were student volunteers rather than certified experts. The badges counted clicks, not completed service.

At the end of the day, the counter looked excellent in photographs: 137 registrations. The number of completed appointments was zero.



At the next meeting, Fahad suggested another campaign. “We need more reach. With more people, we will find better matches.”

“Matches between what and what?” Tariq asked. “We never built a matching process.”

“We don’t want the launch to look like a failure,” Ziyad said.

“If the service has not begun, our image is not the first problem,” Tariq replied. “We have people’s names and promises we sent them. We should pause registration, tell the registrants what happened, and repair the process.”

The proposal was uncomfortable. Pausing the counter after a major event felt like a public admission. Then Mazen opened the inbox and found twenty-nine unanswered messages.

“Delay does not become less real because we do not mention it,” he said.

They paused registration and sent a direct notice: “We launched before testing the appointment process. We will not add new requests while we review the current list. You may delete your data or wait for a specific appointment.” They also removed the badges that could be mistaken for certification.



When they reviewed the form, they discovered that they had requested a phone number, date of birth, and personal social profile even though a school email was enough. Nobody had asked why the project needed those details. The fields had been copied from an old form and kept because they looked “professional.”

“We now hold information we do not need,” Mazen said. “Promising to protect it is not enough. We should delete what we have no reason to keep.”

They removed the fields and asked the male activity supervisor to help them correctly delete the old copies. Then they sent a correction to registrants: “We collected more data than this service requires and have begun deleting it. We will keep only your school email and selected skill while your request remains active.” The admission was embarrassing. Embarrassment was not a reason to preserve information they had no right to keep.



Next they cleared the planning board and wrote four questions: Who is the first beneficiary? What need or right are we promising to serve? What is the smallest delivery we can inspect? Who is responsible if it does not happen?

From the list, they chose ten students who needed résumé feedback before an upcoming application date. They did not choose résumé review because it looked attractive in an advertisement, but because the

need and deadline were clear. They found four student volunteers with previous experience and asked a qualified male teacher to review the session template and its boundaries.

They wrote a description that was less impressive and more accurate: “A twenty-five-minute review session. The student volunteer reads the résumé and asks about clarity, order, and visible errors. The volunteer does not write it for the owner, guarantee acceptance, or request data that is unnecessary for the review.”

They created a manual schedule for only ten sessions. Every appointment had a time, place, responsible person, and cancellation method. Before opening the sessions, they tested one with one learner and one reviewer. The schedule said twenty-five minutes, but the test required forty because the form demanded long explanations of every skill.

They did not declare the test a success because the student thanked them. Instead, they asked: Did he leave with a change he could make? Was his information protected? Was the timing clear? Could the reviewer follow the template? They found three repeated questions and a “career objective” field that pushed the student to share information unnecessary for the review.

They removed the field, shortened the template, and tested again. The second session ended after twenty-eight minutes, and the student left with three written changes. It was not a “complete transformation.” It was a small delivery that could be seen and inspected.



The ten sessions began. At the third, the reviewer did not arrive. The team could have asked the student to wait while they searched for someone. Instead, they followed the failure plan they had written: the coordinator would contact one named substitute within five minutes; otherwise, the learner would receive two new appointment options and a clear apology. The substitute arrived. Later, they recorded the cause: the reviewer had not received a reminder.

They fixed the reminder without erasing the incident from the report. They wrote, “One session was disrupted. A substitute began after seven minutes.” That statement was more accurate than “a perfect success rate,”

and more useful for the next round.



By the end of the week, nine sessions had taken place and one had been cancelled by its owner. Eight learners left with specific revisions. One résumé was referred to the teacher because its owner asked a question beyond the volunteer’s boundaries. The team did not call the cancellation a failure or the referral a weakness. Both belonged to a service that understood its limits.

After each session, they sent only two questions: “Which revision is now clear to you? Which part remains unclear?” They did not ask for a five-star rating to use in publicity. Six learners understood how to shorten descriptions and lead with the most relevant experience. Two still did not know how to describe volunteer work.

It would have been easy to report “eight satisfied beneficiaries.” Tariq objected. “That does not tell us what they learned or what we failed to explain.” For the next version, they added two examples of how to describe volunteer work and kept the limitation in the report.

At the review meeting, the male activity supervisor asked, “Are you ready to add a second skill?”

Fahad looked at the schedule. “We could add one, but we still have not assigned who monitors reminders and cancellations. If we expand the headline before we secure the duty, we will return to the same problem.”

They agreed on two more weeks of the same service. They created a rota for messages, a maximum response time, and a handoff method for absences. Expansion was not a prize the team won. It was a responsibility that should not begin before they could carry it.

Then the team returned to the 137 registrations. Eleven people deleted their data. Some chose to wait. The team answered every late message, one by one. Only then did they reopen registration—for twenty new requests, not another hundred.

Ziyad proposed a new video. “This time, we can show the schedule, the steps, and what went wrong. We do not need to claim we changed the future of the school.”

“And we should not say the project is complete,” Mazen added. “We have one service working at a small scale. Three other skill areas remain untested.”

They removed the huge title above the stage. In its place, they put up a smaller sign: “Résumé Review Appointments—Pilot Version.” It no longer promised one hundred opportunities. But a student who booked an appointment knew what would be delivered, when, by whom, and what to do if it did not arrive.

At the final meeting, Fahad opened the launch photograph, then the session log. “Here, we had the picture of a project,” he said. “Here, we have a project we can question: For whom? What did it deliver? What will it repair?”

The log was not beautiful in a photograph. It contained a cancelled appointment, a failure field, and notes about small mistakes. That was precisely why it was more honest than the shining counter. A project that serves people is not afraid of inspection, and it does not treat performance as a substitute for delivery.

Before leaving, Tariq closed the old presentation file and pinned one question above the board: “Which right or need will reach someone if we do our duty?” Under it, Fahad wrote, “Who will know that it arrived?” They were not new slogans. They were tests to use before every addition, after every failure, and before asking anyone to applaud.

Source of inspiration and its limits

This is contemporary fiction. Its characters, dialogue, numerical examples and project outcomes are invented narrative examples, not historical reports or empirical study results taken from the source.

Conceptual source: Madarej, Hatta Tastaqim, Volume Four, physical PDF pages 6, 12 and 139. These pages support beginning with a bounded commitment, testing actual practice instead of enthusiasm alone, and identifying a specific failure and repairing it without erasing what remains sound.

The educational cycle is a proposal, not a validated psychological measure, treatment or guarantee. Fictional session and waiting-time figures establish no universal service standard. The illustrations are symbolic arrangements of objects, not historical depictions of personal possessions.

Source PDF: https://madarej.org/wp-content/uploads/2026/10/Hatta_Tastaqim_Volume_04_v2.1-covers-r20261003.pdf