

Applicant Name: Ireland Team
Normalized Scores 74.3

JUDGING CRITERION # 1: CREDIBILITY OF PARTNERSHIPS (0-5)

Did the applicant provide sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations in either nominating, validating and/or jointly implementing the initiative?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Shows no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims</i>	<i>Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims</i>	<i>Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims</i>	<i>Demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating an initiative; was not jointly implemented but shows convincing validation of claims</i>	<i>Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims</i>

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 2.6
Comment: (1) The applicant showed no or limited consultation in nominating an initiative. it was selected by the applicant directly, and supported by some of education background bodies. Even the validation of the claims was not signed or properly explained,(was only email stating that the executive director of the organization will send documents). (2) The validation is produced from the The Irish Primary Principals Network and all other contacts made in the email were from the same sector "Education". (3) No evidence of partnership while implementation was provided by the applicant.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 3.5
Comment: It is not clear there was any consultation in nominating this initiative or if it was just selected by the government. If the citizen engagement area in question is seeking to get parental involvement in national policy decisions, then it appears the NPC has partnered very effectively with the Dep of Education to create numerous opportunities for that engagement. The validation of claims is weak. There is a promise to submit a validation, but the validation is not provided. Given the mixed success in meeting these judging criteria, I'll assign a 1 for consultation, a 5 for joint implementation, and a 3 for validation of claims. This averages out to a "3" for this group.

1.9 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 1.9
Comment: Although the initiative is very engaging it seems that in selecting it there was not very much consultations/engagement.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.9
Comment: It is not clear whether there has been a broader consultation with partners in nominating it as an initiative.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 2.9
Comment:

JUDGING CRITERION # 2: DEPTH OF ENGAGEMENT (0-5)

Does the initiative provide incentives for the participation of citizens and offer direct, innovative channels for citizens to engage with government?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Offered no incentives for participation; provides basic information to citizens but no avenues for real engagement to influence policy/service design or implementation; doesn't define a target population</i>	<i>Provided few incentives for participation; obtained basic feedback from some of its target population; however, did not indicate how feedback would be used</i>	<i>Demonstrated sufficient incentives for participation; created indirect ways to solicit citizens' aspirations; strived to exceed the intended level of engagement of its target population</i>	<i>Created reliable ways to incentivize participation; used direct and innovative ways to get citizen feedback; secured participation of at least half of target population</i>	<i>Employed compelling measures to incentivize participation; used direct and innovative methods to partner with citizens in decision-making; reached an ambitious level of engagement with its target population</i>

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 3.2
Comment: (1) The applicant provided only few of the incentives represented by voicing the parents' opinions and concerns. So more efforts could be done in this field. (2) The applicant obtain feedback from the target population and use their feedback to voice their opinions and concerns with limited efforts to engage as much as possible of its target group.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.6
Comment: Incentives: 4. they don't detail incentives they provide to parents other than the influence in their child's education--which may be enough for some parents, but not all. They also demonstrate they are able to influence policy as a result of the participation, which may be enough of an incentive for some. Means for Soliciting Feedback: 3 They use primarily surveys and the assembly to seek feedback on specific policy issues and allow representatives to raise other issues. These are pretty traditional tools. Unclear if they're using any online forums to solicit feedback and encourage discussion as well. Level of Engagement: 3 They seems to reach pretty wide with the assembly. The survey responses are on the order of 500 to 1500 per issue, which is not even one response per school. Unclear if this response rate is statistically significant. Also, unclear if other stakeholder groups in education policy are being consulted or if it's just the parents. Other groups (like tax payers without children) would certainly also have opinions about how their tax dollars are used.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 3.7
Comment:

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.3
Comment: The initiative seeks to explore different channels to gather feedback from participants, thus increasing the inclusiveness of the process as a whole. The extent to which the target population is fully engaged, however, remains unclear.

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 3.1
Comment: Demonstrated sufficient incentives for participation; created indirect ways to solicit citizens' aspirations... Specifically, this initiative is well oriented towards the targeted public, and address the chances that involves generating opportunities for citizen participation to improve the quality of primary education

JUDGING CRITERION # 3: EVIDENCE OF RESULTS (0-5)

Did citizen engagement influence the design or delivery of government policy and services? Is there any evidence of concrete benefits to citizens and the government as a result?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Shows that citizens may be informed but provided little to no evidence of change in public policy or service</i>	<i>Nominally influenced a public policy or service; and shows some benefits to citizens as a result</i>	<i>Sufficiently changed a public policy or service; and demonstrated reliable benefits to citizens as a result</i>	<i>Significantly influenced a public policy or service; resulted in compelling benefits to citizens and the government</i>	<i>Transformed a public policy or service; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens; resulted in concrete benefits for both</i>

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 3.7
Comment: The applicant made significant influence on education policies, which benefited the students parents and education atmosphere and also benefited the Ministry of Education to proceed with better policies that suites citizens.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.6
Comment: This method clearly creates an opportunity for parents to have their voices heard and considered in the education policy making process on a national level. Would be interested to see how satisfied parents are with this process. That's the only piece of information keeping this from being a "5".

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.2
Comment:

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 4.1
Comment: The submissions present two clear cases where citizen feedback seems to have impacted policies in a positive manner. The extent to which these are anecdotal accounts or if a systematic participation / responsiveness cycle can be identified remains an open question.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 3.3
Comment: The evidence given on the results achieved in the improvement of educational policies is insufficient

JUDGING CRITERION # 4: SUSTAINABILITY (0-5)

Does the applicant make a compelling case that the initiative will be institutionalized or scaled-up over time?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
<i>Demonstrates few plans in moving the initiative beyond the pilot stage; does not address any potential threats or challenges to the initiative</i>	<i>Shows some commitment to institutionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative</i>	<i>Lists activities to institutionalize the initiative; but only somewhat addresses how challenges will be addressed</i>	<i>Outlines a clear path to either institutionalize or scale-up the initiative; makes a good case on how potential challenges will be addressed</i>	<i>Presents a durable model that can be institutionalized and/or scaled-up; makes a compelling case for how challenges will be managed</i>

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ma'i Elimat
Score: 4.6
Comment: The applicant set clear path to sustain the initiative. The applicant clearly provided the challenges and outlined steps to overcome these challenges.

4.9 / 5

Judge Name: Jennifer Gustetic
Score: 4.9
Comment: The initiative has a strategic plan, and infrastructure in place to keep the basic consultation pieces running. There is some funding uncertainty and some uncertainty around the capacity to manage volunteers in the future but on the most part it seems this organization has a good grasp on a path forward to continue to have parents involved in the education and education policy process.

4.4 / 5

Judge Name: Katju Holkeri
Score: 4.4
Comment:

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Tiago Peixoto
Score: 3.9
Comment: The initiative is dependent on government funding. However, recognizing the role of volunteers, the initiative takes specific steps to address it. While the challenges are acknowledged (e.g. economic circumstances), it is not clear how these challenges are dealt with.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Alvaro Ramirez Alujas
Score: 2.9
Comment: Apparently, this is an initiative that has been developed systematically over time, so it is assumed to have sufficient information/evidence to be institutionalized and sustainable