Submission

Applicant Name: Jordan Team
Normalized Scores 72.2

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*

4.2 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 4.2
Comment: The initiative was nominated through a process involving an open invitation to apply (the applicant writes that 21 applications were reviewed), and a public vote on a short list of three projects. As stated by the applicant, "this initiative does not involve civil society organizations, in the traditional sense". However, the initiative is built on local communities' participation.

4.5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.5
Comment: There are strong statements that solid and widespread consultations had been done and the stakeholders made testimonies as to their involvement in the initiative. However, my website searches at mop.gov.jo did not yield any information (reference or news article) about the result of cited public vote on the nomination.

3.8 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.8
Comment: There is clear demonstration of consultation on selection of projects. There is evidence of partnership with community and other development partner. No CSO participation was identified. It focuses more on community group.

1.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 1.6
Comment: Not jointly implemented and no validation of claims by civil society.

3.3 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.3
Comment: There is an good information about the process : open invitation to submit applications from government agencies and civil society, a multi-sectoral committee composed of government entities and civil society representation, public vote on a government website and a weighted score from the committee (60%) and the public voting (40%). We have no letter from students, teachers, supervisors... with their appreciation but we have an important study and evaluation.

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*

3.1 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.1
Comment: This initiative is "innovative" in the sense that citizens and local communities don't seem to be usually involved in public policy making or evaluation. However, it does not really involve new technologies and seems to be lagging a bit behind best practices.

4.1 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 4.1
Comment: The use of participation as a strategy to reverse centralised service delivery was very clear in terms of the role of the educational development councils. What needs to be clarified are types of information made accessible to the council members and what platforms made the information accessible. Does the council members' access to information necessarily translate into a broader public access to the information as well?

3 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.0
Comment: Does not articulate the open government approach but approach the issue via the community participation and inclusion of community in school management. Project allowed for transparency via community representation on the school committee. Though it could be improved through combining it with other method of engaging with the community through leveraging more students involvement.

2.8 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 2.8
Comment: Not a very innovative initiative, but appears to deliver significant public participation in education service governance.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 4.0
Comment: We can appreciate the open government approache given the country context (to improve the outcomes at the basic education system because the centralized approach did not match the actual needs of the schools and there are severe budgetary constraints). The initiative targets a large number of the population (85,000 teachers distributed over 3,650 public schools and all the students). The need is important. The feed back with more transparency for all is not clear (portal ? flyer ?....)

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*

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.4
Comment: The initiative seems to have created a positive momentum in empowering citizens (more access to information + channels to monitor and oversee public policies), in improving public services (public education). Success stories presented by the applicant seem to validate this claim. Even though the applicant claims that the initiative affects a majority of the target population, the evidence is weak that a big proportion of the target population has access to services that have actually improved.

3.4 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.4
Comment: There are signs that the initiative contributed to all four outcomes. The educational council is a good start to encourage broader participation, but it may not really be broad in the strict sense as it is only representative. The improvement in the public is evident in specific cited cases; it was demonstrated as an overall accomplishment.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.5
Comment: Has demonstrated some success in the community participation helping schools to raise funds and carry out some projects to improve schools but the baseline and results were not too clear.

4.6 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 4.6
Comment: Giving opportunities for feedback on education services, some evidence of improvements to public services as a result.

3.7 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 3.7
Comment: We have several documents with indicators (a big study and evaluation) and we can appreciate how actors feel with the initiative. But, we don't have any information about quality of lessons, about performances, about the level of education... Then it's not easy to appreciate if the initiative has improved the quality of the public service. Nevertheless, the intiative is a good way to work positively together and to developpe transparency.

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*

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 3.5
Comment: The initiative is supported and funded by Government and International Organisations, including the World Bank. The next step is to extend the initiative to cover all public schools (that means +10% in comparison with the current situation). Government organisations have been working to institutionalise the initiative.

3.5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.5
Comment: There appears to be a trajectory for the eventual institutionalisation of the initiative. Seven years, however, had not been enough to work on the Finance Ministry to ensure annual allocation for its implementation. Insights on what's preventing the Ministry from doing that would be helpful. Also, there's no mention of increasing public demand for it or at least some public appreciation of the contributions of the development councils, which helps galvanize support for the effort.

4 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 4.0
Comment: Demonstration of how project will be scaled up but as it is currently funded by donors, sustainability may be an issue. Stronger participation by parents and students may be needed to support sustainability of the project.

3.9 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 3.9
Comment: Initiative already operates at a wide scale, only a relatively small number of schools not yet included.

4.3 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 4.3
Comment: The initiative presents a durable model. Nevertheless, ve have no so much information about how we can appreciate the impact of the initiative on the students performances and we have no information about how the information about councils decision, data base information... can be consulted by the population.

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*

5 / 5

Judge Name: Mohamed Adnene Trojette
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative also affects disadvantaged areas in the country. The applicant claims that these areas gained financial support thanks to the project. Please note that the video shows that, in some of the meetings, men and women do not sit at the same side of the room. The local communities culture is probably responsible for this situation, in the sense that the success of the initiative might depend on respecting this custom.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 5.0
Comment: Specific tangible improvements in the education sector had been reported, but not very remarkable.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 0.0
Comment: Project has worked to strengthen schools in remote areas. But more evidence is needed on how it supports marginalized people.

5 / 5

Judge Name: Ben Taylor
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative has a particular focus on remote marginalised areas, and some of its biggest reported achievements are for poorer groups of people.

0 / 5

Judge Name: Florence Thibault
Score: 0.0
Comment: The project is for all the population of schools (teachers, supervisors, students...) and not only for a vulnerable population.