

## **Theory-based evaluation of Public Policies and Programmes**

*1<sup>st</sup> Training School of the  
PROFEEDBACK (PlatfoRm OF policy Evaluation community for improvED EU policies and Better ACKnowledgement) Cost Action*

*Istanbul, Turkey, 5-7<sup>th</sup> of July 2023*

### **Phase II. SELECTION ASSESMENT (quality assessment of applications)**

#### **Selection Committee members:**

- Professor Albena Vutsova, Sofia University, Bulgaria
- Scientific Director, Klaus Schuch, Centre for Social Innovation, Austria
- Professor Jaroslav Dvorak, Klaipeda University, Lithuania
- Professor Eriona Shtembari, University of New York Tirana, Albania
- Professor Hanife Akar, Middle East Technical University, Turkey

The following **selection criteria** were applied to the eligible applicants (based on the detailed Selection procedure):

- Experience related with public policy area: This specific experience should be highlighted in the applicant's CV.
- Motivation: The motivation of the applicant as shown in a short motivation letter (2 pages). The motivation should show a personal and specific interest of the applicant to participate in the training school. It should link the training school to previous experience and expertise.
- Reflection and anticipation: The applicant should reflect the "evaluation business", its virtues, but also its challenging aspects.
- Potential use: The potential use as shown in the motivation letter. The expected use of the training school should be linked to future professional activities. These might be academic (e.g. a PhD-thesis) or applied (e.g. coming evaluation projects).

Scores received by applicants after the finalization of the quality assessment phase:

APPLICANT'S CODE	ELIGIBILITY ASSESSMENT CRITERIA	Committee member 1 POINTS	Committee member 2 POINTS	Committee member 3 POINTS	Committee member 4 POINTS	Committee member 5 POINTS	Average by criterion	TOTAL SCORE
1	Experience	1	1	2	2	3	1,8	7,8
	Motivation	2	2	2	2	3	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	1	2	2	3	1,8	
	Proven potential use	2	2	2	1	3	2,0	
2	Experience	1	1	3	1	3	1,8	6,6
	Motivation	1	3	2	2	1	1,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	2	2	2	1	1,4	
	Proven potential use	1	2	3	1	1	1,6	
3	Experience	1	1	2	2	3	1,8	8,4
	Motivation	3	2	1	2	3	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	3	2	2	2	3	2,4	
	Proven potential use	2	2	1	2	3	2,0	
4	Experience	2	2	3	3	2	2,4	10,0
	Motivation	3	3	3	3	3	3,0	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	3	2	2	3	2,4	
	Proven potential use	1	2	3	3	2	2,2	
5	Experience	1	2	3	3	2	2,2	10,0
	Motivation	2	3	3	3	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	3	3	2	3	2,6	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	2	3	2,4	

6	Experience	0	2	3	2	1	1,6	7,6
	Motivation	1	0	3	2	3	1,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	3	2	1	3	2,0	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	1	3	2,2	
7	Experience	1	2	2	2	3	2,0	10,0
	Motivation	2	3	3	3	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	3	3	3	2	3	2,8	
	Proven potential use	3	2	2	2	3	2,4	
8	Experience	1	2	2	3	3	2,2	10,2
	Motivation	3	3	3	3	3	3,0	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	3	3	2	3	2,2	
	Proven potential use	3	2	3	3	3	2,8	
9	Experience	1	2	3	2	1	1,8	8,6
	Motivation	2	3	3	3	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	1	3	2	3	1,8	
	Proven potential use	2	1	3	2	3	2,2	
10	Experience	1	2	2	3	1	1,8	9,6
	Motivation	2	3	3	3	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	1	3	3	3	2,4	
	Proven potential use	3	2	3	2	3	2,6	
11	Experience	1	1	2	1	0	1,0	6,8
	Motivation	2	2	3	2	3	2,4	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	1	3	1	2	1,8	
	Proven potential use	3	1	2	1	1	1,6	

12	Experience	1	1	2	2	3	1,8	7,8
	Motivation	1	2	3	2	3	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	1	3	1	2	1,4	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	2	3	2,4	
13	Experience	0	1	1	1	1	0,8	6,0
	Motivation	2	2	2	2	3	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	1	2	1	2	1,6	
	Proven potential use	2	1	1	1	2	1,4	
14	Experience	1	1	2	3	3	2,0	9,4
	Motivation	2	2	3	3	2	2,4	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	1	3	3	2	2,2	
	Proven potential use	3	2	3	3	3	2,8	
15	Experience	0	1	2	1	3	1,4	6,4
	Motivation	2	2	2	2	2	2,0	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	1	2	1	2	1,4	
	Proven potential use	2	1	2	1	2	1,6	
16	Experience	1	1	2	2	2	1,6	9,6
	Motivation	2	2	3	3	3	2,6	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	2	3	3	3	2,4	
	Proven potential use	3	3	3	3	3	3,0	
17	Experience	1	1	2	2	3	1,8	9,2
	Motivation	2	3	3	3	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	1	2	3	3	2,0	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	3	3	2,6	

18	Experience	2	2	3	3	3	2,6	10,4
	Motivation	2	3	3	3	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	3	3	3	2	2,4	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	3	3	2,6	
19	Experience	1	1	2	2	2	1,6	6,2
	Motivation	1	2	1	3	2	1,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	1	2	2	1	1,4	
	Proven potential use	1	1	1	3	1	1,4	
20	Experience	1	1	2	2	3	1,8	7,0
	Motivation	2	2	2	2	3	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	1	2	2	2	1,4	
	Proven potential use	1	1	2	1	3	1,6	
21	Experience	2	1	3	1	2	1,8	8,6
	Motivation	3	3	3	2	3	2,8	
	Reflection and anticipation	3	1	3	1	2	2,0	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	1	2	2,0	
22	Experience	0	1	2	2	3	1,6	7,0
	Motivation	1	2	2	2	3	2,0	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	1	2	2	3	1,6	
	Proven potential use	1	2	2	1	3	1,8	
23	Experience	1	1	2	3	3	2,0	7,4
	Motivation	2	1	2	3	3	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	1	2	2	2	1,6	
	Proven potential use	2	2	1	2	1	1,6	

24	Experience	1	1	3	3	2	2,0	8,4
	Motivation	2	2	3	2	2	2,2	
	Reflection and anticipation	1	2	3	2	2	2,0	
	Proven potential use	1	2	3	2	3	2,2	
25	Experience	1	2	2	3	3	2,2	8,8
	Motivation	1	2	3	3	3	2,4	
	Reflection and anticipation	0	2	3	3	2	2,0	
	Proven potential use	1	2	2	3	3	2,2	
26	Experience	1	2	3	3	3	2,4	10,0
	Motivation	2	2	2	3	3	2,4	
	Reflection and anticipation	2	2	3	3	3	2,6	
	Proven potential use	2	2	3	3	3	2,6	

### FINAL RESULTS OF THE SELECTION PROCESS

Ranking of applicants based on the received scores for their applications:

APPLICANT'S CODE	TOTAL SCORE
18	10,4
8	10,2
4	10,0
5	10,0
7	10,0
26	10,0
10	9,6
16	9,6
14	9,4

---

### ACCEPTED APPLICANTS

17	9,2
25	8,8
21*	8,6
9*	8,6
3	8,4
24	8,4
12	7,8
1	7,8
6	7,6
23	7,4
20	7,0
22	7,0
11	6,8
2	6,6
15	6,4
19	6,2
13	6,0

---

**WAITING LIST**

\* For the applicants that have received equal scores, being close to the threshold based on the ranking of all candidates, the Selection Committee applied the additional criterion: **Experience related to evaluation of public programmes and policies, such as: evaluation projects or academic research / papers or other courses, trainings in the area of related to evaluation of public interventions.** The detailed selection methodology mentions that

the additional criteria will be applied based on their priority, in the order listed in the document, experience related to the evaluation of public programmes and policies being the first criterion.