

Applicant Name: South Africa Team
Normalized Scores 66.0

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: Showed no consultation in nominating an initiative; may have been jointly implemented but shows very weak validation of claims
1 - 2: Some effort in consulting with other partners in nominating an initiative; initiative was not jointly implemented but provided minimal validation of claims
2 - 3: Provided sufficient evidence of consulting with other partners to nominate an initiative, was jointly implemented and presented somewhat convincing validation of claims. [2.5 / 5]

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.0
Comment: The selection was decided based on the result of an awards programme organised by a government agency. This cannot be considered equivalent to a consultation. Partnerships were mostly for sponsorship; few indications that engagement on design and implementation with monitoring and evaluation happened. [2.8 / 5]

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 2.8
Comment: Could have provided more information on how many projects submitted and how many selected. As it is, we have no way of knowing how competitive is this project compared with others. Could have provided more evidence of partnership. [4.6 / 5]

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.6
Comment: The application contains sufficient information about the consultation process. A specific consultation format is provided - Annual Public Sector Innovation Awards Programme. [3.5 / 5]

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 3.5
Comment: Applicant provides evidence that this was a collaborative nomination process through the "Annual Public Sector Innovation Awards" however, there is not much information provided on the openness of the process. The nomination is a joint application between Government- the CPSI, which sits in the Ministry of Public Service and Administration, and a CSO, the Ligon e-Learning group so proof of NGO-Government implementation is provided. Project has in the past been supported by a mix of Public, Private Sector, and Civil society organizations including public broadcasting corporations, private sector (mining companies); and foundations/ trusts. Not much information provided on how inclusive the design of the project was. While the project was started by three schools, the project doesn't state how much collaboration went into the design of this project by entities involved. [3 / 5]

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.0
Comment: The initiative is a winner in a competitive process adjudicated by a selected panel. Implementation is mainly with private sector sponsors and involved teachers and schools from challenged areas

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: Exhibits a centralized, top-down approach to improving public services rather than public-facing approach; Target population largely have a passive role
1 - 2: Somewhat articulates the importance of using open government approaches but these are sporadic, not well-thought out; Needs of the target population is unclear
2 - 3: Makes a convincing case of the need to use open government approaches and addresses a need of the target population for improved public services [2.6 / 5]

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 2.6
Comment: The initiative appears to be strong on the provision of infrastructure for learning. It is very innovative relative to the local setting, but it needs to articulate clearly the civic spirit of participation, sharing of information and accountability in the project to align with OGP. The students and teachers are clearly the project beneficiaries, but it seems to have stopped there. [2.7 / 5]

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 2.7
Comment: Is a good project that seeks to address the shortage of teachers in math and science. More could have been said about how this helps to improve governance. It appears to address a specific problem, but lacks the wider impact on governance. [4.7 / 5]

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.7
Comment: The initiative is context-specific and provides working, practical, innovative solution to a clearly identified problem. [2 / 5]

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.0
Comment: The initiative is a very clear and targeted programme where it provides a solution to an identified educational problem by improving pedagogical standards through transmission of math and science lessons and products (e.g exam papers) via video conferencing and desktop sharing. While this provides a technological fix to an identified problem, it does not provide evidence or information on how this initiative actually seeks to improve the underlying public service delivery pathologies that prevent the provision of good science/ math teaching in the first place. [3 / 5]

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.0
Comment: The focus of the initiative is on math and science education in underserved schools. The leverage of technology is clearly innovative. It is not yet so apparent if this constitutes an open government initiative or a technology innovation.

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: Shows little evidence of achieving any of the outcomes or of an improvement in public services; target population has barely been reached
1 - 2: 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
2 - 3: 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 [3 / 5]

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.0
Comment: There had been good improvements in the education services through the technology, which also provided means to check the process of delivery. However, the mechanisms to facilitate participation through information provision and feedback, must be sharpened. It's somewhat a case of an over-attribution of an outcome to the use of technology. Because of the technology, relevant information and participation were also assumed to have been present as well. [3.7 / 5]

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.7
Comment: Results are shown but not a wide enough impact. Benefited a selected group who access the online class. Some indication of teachers improving their learning along with their students. However, the larger issue of addressing the needs of improving the system of education was not addressed. [4.5 / 5]

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.5
Comment: There is ample evidence, including statistical data, that the initiative achieved all its outcomes and evolved into a reliable service expanding the access and improving the quality of school education. [2.8 / 5]

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.8
Comment: The project has demonstrated that video conferencing and provision of e-learning modules can improve grades and teachers' skills. However, the application does not provide evidence that the educational system itself has undergone changes in terms of its ability to provide improved public service. [4.2 / 5]

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 4.2
Comment: The focus on specific school networks and clusters makes the initiative able to measure its impact on passing and completion scores. It will be good to see if this innovation will impact on broader math and science passing rates as well as state policy and access to education in South Africa

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: Demonstrates few plans in moving the initiative beyond the pilot stage; does not address any potential threats or challenges to the initiative
1 - 2: Shows some commitment to institutionalizing the initiative; but presents unrealistic ways of managing challenges faced by the initiative
2 - 3: Lists activities to institutionalize the initiative; but only somewhat addresses how challenges will be addressed [3 / 5]

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 3.0
Comment: The continuity of the project since 2008 shows practical reasons that it is getting sustained. However, its long experience should have surfaced serious issues of policy support, funding and other technical/operational requirements. [3.6 / 5]

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 3.6
Comment: Funding sustainability is a problem as the project currently fund raises and find partners to run its project. Need to address frequent electricity outages as well. [4.3 / 5]

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 4.3
Comment: As a pilot project in 5 schools which has proven its efficiency and effectiveness the initiative holds promise of becoming a nation-wide effort. Additional information is needed on the specific scaling-up steps to be taken in the future. [2.9 / 5]

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 2.9
Comment: The project shows commitment to institutionalizing the initiative in the four pilot cases. However, the project does not provide enough information on how it plans to change the public service delivery systemic issues or challenges that this project seeks to address. [3.1 / 5]

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 3.1
Comment: The model for innovation is there, the out-reach to private sponsors is presented as a solution to the sustainability costs. It would be good to see deeper state support and adoption of this innovation so as to institutionalize the practice

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: Select this range for No
1 - 2: Do Not Select
2 - 3: Do Not Select
3 - 4: Do Not Select
4 - 5: Select this range for Yes [5 / 5]

Judge Name: Don Don Parafina
Score: 5.0
Comment: It has provided an effective learning platform for students and teachers in rural areas and under performing schools. [0 / 5]

Judge Name: Haidy Ear-Dupuy
Score: 0.0
Comment: Innovative ways to reach remote areas that are in need to expertise to teach math and science. Project has element of inclusion. [5 / 5]

Judge Name: Milena Nedeva
Score: 5.0
Comment: The initiative is being implemented in remote and under-performing schools and hence has a focus on disadvantaged population groups. [0 / 5]

Judge Name: Mendi Njonjo
Score: 0.0
Comment: This project is potentially a good illustration of innovations in education, but is not a compelling example of innovation in public service delivery. [0 / 5]

Judge Name: Maxine Tanya Hamada
Score: 0.0
Comment: The scale at which the initiative is implemented shows a potential if scaled up to broader vulnerable schools and populations. It will be good to see this in the scaling up of the initiative