Submission

Applicant Name: Slovak Republic Team
Normalized Scores 65.5

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
Showed no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims	*Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims*	*Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims.*	*Demonstrated compelling mechanisms for consulting others in nominating an initiative; was not jointly implemented but shows convincing validation of claims*	*Shows strong evidence of consulting others in nominating an initiative; jointly implemented with a partner agency and strong validation of claims*

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 3.4
Comment: There is evidence of the initiative being endorsed by civil society actors but the application does not provide information is a selection procedure was employed involving a choice of more than one nomination

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.1
Comment: The applicant provided sufficient evidence of partnering with other non-government organizations with quite high collaboration presented. The applicant has also partnered with a NGO to present the idea.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 2.6
Comment: The submission does not provide much credible evidence of meaningful consultations on the nomination process.

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 2.6
Comment: The initiative does not show a sufficient consultation process. Validation of claims are convincing.

4.8 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.8
Comment: The natural community around education and the need for open data for education is the foundation for this partnership and fuels the direction that Open Education Slovakia is taking.

JUDGING CRITERION # 2: **STRENGTH AND INNOVATION IN OPEN GOVERNMENT APPROACHES** (0-5)

Does the initiative make a compelling case of using open government approaches [e.g. increasing access to information, civic participation, public accountability and/or technology for transparency] to improve public service delivery?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
Exhibits a centralized, top-down approach to improving public services rather than public-facing approach; Target population largely have a passive role	*Somewhat articulates the importance of using open government approaches but these are sporadic, not well-thought out; Needs of the target population is unclear*	*Makes a convincing case of the need to use open government approaches and addresses a need of the target population for improved public services*	*Establishes strong rationale for using open government approaches which are somewhat innovative; targets a large number of the population and clearly identifies a need*	*Employs innovative open government approaches given the country context; targets an ambitious number of the population and is responding to a real need or demand*

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 3.3
Comment: Education is clearly an area affecting a large number of people and the initiative clearly identifies the existing challenges and needs. It is not clear however what practical solutions are put in place to date to address the needs.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 4.3
Comment: The Open Education initiative make a compelling case of using open government approaches where it, among others, aims to "open up" education materials especially those sourced or developed using public funds.

3 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.0
Comment: The initiative aims to boost openness in the education sector but the problem definition does not scream urgency. The applicants should have made the submission a bit more tangible.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.8
Comment: The initiative wants to use the open government approaches in a crucial sector of the educational services. Slovakis is in the fore front in this. The initiave allows users of education and research activities to better access documents.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.7
Comment: The initiative is clearly focused on education and knows it target population both from data and content providers as well as data and content users. The need for open access to educational material is clear and the goal of enabling public access to publicly-funded research and educational materials is clear.

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

Is there any evidence of the initiative achieving the four initiative outcomes listed in the application and/or concrete improvements in public services or access to services?

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
Shows little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; target population has barely been reached	*Shows some signs of achieving outcomes but the evidence is unconvincing; change in public service is incremental and has reached some of the target population*	*Demonstrates achieving one or more of the outcomes, but it is unclear whether the quality of the public service or access to the service has improved*	*Uses clear indicators to prove that one or more of the outcomes were achieved; initiative has widened access or improved the quality of a public service for more than half of the target population*	*Achieved two or more of the outcomes to ultimately expand access or improve service quality for a majority of the target population; set new standards for the relationship between government and citizens*

2.6 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 2.6
Comment: According to the application this is still a work-in-progress and thus it is difficult to assess the actual outcomes at this stage.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.4
Comment: The applicant, through changing the default state of how education information is produced has the potential to change educational outcomes.

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 2.7
Comment: There is more information on the international recognition the initiative attracted, as opposed to evidence on the outcome of the efforts in Slovakia proper.

3.2 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.2
Comment: There are not convincing signs that the initiative has reached outcomes, yet. But is putting the base for a possible change. The initiave appears to be still in its strating phase

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.5
Comment: The trajectory of the initiative is clear. Whether there has been a change in the level of access or the quality of materials used for education has not yet been established. It will be good to see these in the coming months and years as the potential of this innovation is demonstrated

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

2.7 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 2.7
Comment: Somewhat insufficient evidence is given as to how the engagement of the relevant ministries will be ensured and how they will be motivated to consistently support the effort.

2.9 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.9
Comment: The applicant might be able to scale the initiative, but not enough information is provided on how this would be done. Promising that a development partner (OSF) is interested in funding this, and they've assigned a person in a Ministry to support this.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 3.0
Comment: The plans to scale up and mitigate risks along the way are somewhat vague.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 3.3
Comment: The initiative doesn't address challenges and threats. However, all the actors involved in both civil society and government seem to be committed to go ahead with the implementation also considering that the initiative is in the OGP Action Plan.

3.6 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.6
Comment: The key interest in this initiative has been international - as the submission articulates. A broad support for this direction can be the sustaining driver. It would be also good to complement this international recognition with broad citizen and government support from within Slovakia. The Open Education Coalition sounds like a promising driver if and when it is formed.

JUDGING CRITERION # 5: **SPECIAL RECOGNITION** (0-5)

Does this open government initiative demonstrate that it successfully improved service delivery access and/or outcomes for a vulnerable population (e.g. poor, elderly, minorities, women), thereby promoting more inclusive development? *Please note that this criterion will not be used in the overall score.

0 - 1	1 - 2	2 - 3	3 - 4	4 - 5
Select this range for No	*Do Not Select*	*Do Not Select*	*Do Not Select*	*Select this range for Yes*

0 / 5

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 0.0
Comment: There is no special focus on improving access to services for a vulnerable population

0 / 5

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 0.0
Comment: Doesn't present any evidence that marginalized persons are a specific and targeted population.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Marija Novkovic
Score: 0.0
Comment: There is very little mention of the vulnerable groups.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Stefano Pizzicannella
Score: 0.0
Comment: The target population is general and not specific to vulnerable sectors.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 0.0
Comment: The focus on access to education materials does not specifically target vulnerable populations. Later on though, this initiative may have the potential of serving vulnerable populations with specific access to Open Education Slovakia. The potential is there, it is still unarticulated or unexplored.