



JUSTICEMAKERS ASIA EXPLANATION OF THE JUDGING CRITERIA

International Bridges to Justice (IBJ) is seeking applications for the 2010 JusticeMakers Fellowship. JusticeMakers Fellows introduce novel methods of collaborating with police, legal aid communities, and governments to ensure competent legal counsel for ordinary people. Winning applicants earn \$5,000, training in Singapore, and a global network of support to help them implement their proposal. **Here is an explanation of the qualities winning proposals will exemplify.**

Innovation:

The project idea exhibits a creative and relatively new idea that will improve the protection of legal rights of accused people within the applicant's respective country or local community.

Further Explanation:

An innovative project is one that demonstrates a novel and original approach to improving the legal rights of accused people. This includes projects that incorporate cutting edge ideas and bring a fresh perspective to their legal environment. Importantly, the project needs to demonstrate an excellent assessment of the root causes of the problem at hand, and the ability to set standards and benchmarks on the right to personal liberty, human resources, and administration of justice.

This could include a new way to assess the problem at hand, and/or a new method of solving legal problems. Projects that have good overall strategies, have considered many angles to achieving the goal and have focused on the best approach.

Projects that scored highly in innovation exhibit these qualities:

Projects that stood out demonstrated why their project idea/ method is new and has an element of inventive thought and lateral thinking.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

1) Using untapped resources, such as training inmates to be paralegals offers an economically viable solution to overcrowding in prisons and lack of legal representation. This approach is different from others trying to reach the same goal. 2) Using mobile telephones to coordinate volunteers with legal aid lawyers uses information technology in an innovative way to stop secret imprisonments. 3) A project to abolish the Holding Charge in Nigeria challenges the legal instrument that holds inmates without trial through litigation. This demonstrates a new assessment of the fundamental problem to the lack of rights for accused people.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

Projects that lack innovation are incapable of showing that they are doing something different than other organisations already in existence. Furthermore, projects that demonstrated a poor assessment of the root causes of the lack of legal rights in their community.

This includes projects that lacked research into whether/ how the problem is being addressed by other groups, and cannot demonstrate how their project will add merit to the existing legal environment.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

Project that purported to raise consciousness for the accused of their rights by stationing volunteers in court did not clearly explain any additional value than other groups trying to solve the same problem.

Relevance:

The project idea offers solutions to problems/challenges in respective legal systems in terms of implementation of the legal rights of accused people.

Further explanation:

The project's goal is relevant to IBJ's mission: protecting the legal rights of every man, woman and child accused of a crime, ensuring fair legal representation, and preventing torture and abuse in the criminal justice system. The project is also applicable to the current legal and political climate of the project's region, and addresses largely ignored issues in that region.

Projects that scored highly exhibit these qualities:

Projects that scored highly clearly target the legal rights of accused people. Projects that also focus on an issue that is largely ignored the local authorities, and projects that understand the areas of improvement within a criminal justice sector.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

1) Project which aims to prevent torture in detention areas and raise awareness on torture victims by conducting seminars and workshops. 2) The establishment of a legal aid clinic on women's abuse in prison and monitoring arbitrary detention 3) Promoting rights of juveniles in prisons, and aiming to improve juvenile legislative, which addresses a missing component in Pakistan's legal justice system.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

The project is not focused on one of the above elements of IBJ's mission, and/or is inappropriate given the current local conditions. The project has vague goals, or an unclear link between the project goal and the rights of accused people.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

Women's foundation, which focuses on income generation and credit schemes, with only vague references to women in prisons.

Urgency:

The project idea seeks to address problems that demand immediate attention.

Further Explanation:

The problems are severe, compelling and imperative. The applicant can demonstrate that the problem is serious, imminent, and necessary to solve.

Projects that scored highly exhibit these qualities:

The applicant demonstrates an excellent understanding of the problems that face their legal system, and have undergone rigorous research into the effects and extent of that problem.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

Projects that hold surveys, or have access to other reliable and up to date data that illustrates the extent of the problem. A project that sets out a strong case for supporting the provision of legal aid to juveniles that describes that: hundreds of children are languishing in various jails of Pakistan where they are exposed to malnutrition, poor medication, with little concept of education and without legal aid; due to poor systems including Juvenile Justice System.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

The project fails to address the most critical problems in the criminal justice system. Projects have a poor assessment of the fundamental causes of the weak judicial system. Projects that do not address a specific problem, or fail to explain the problem also scored poorly.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

Project that seeks to improve access to justice, but failed to answer who the project was intended to help in any detail, and included no indication of the urgency of the problem.

Practicability:

The implementation of the project idea is feasible and training support from Singapore will be a major factor in its sustained impact.

Further explanation:

An application with strong practicability is one that clearly outlines how it is capable of reaching its goals within the available means. This entails 1) an excellent understanding of the mechanisms available to the applicant 2) awareness of the main challenges to their project 3) what they will need to accomplish as a team leader, and how support from Singapore can help them in this regard.

Projects that scored highly exhibit these qualities:

Applicants that scored highly on practicability outlined a clear set of goals, and an understandable step by step approach to how they will accomplish those goals. In particular applicants specified the mechanisms available to them (including resources such as budget limitations, staff, other organisations they will coordinate with, as well as knowledge of the legal framework of their project, and opportunities to implement the project), and outlined how they will reasonably use these mechanisms to implement their project. Applicants should show awareness of what the main challenges to their project are, and how they will realistically overcome these challenges. Applicants who scored highly also have an awareness of the challenges of being a project leader, and know which skills they would particularly like to develop through training support from Singapore.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

1) The application described the development of a juvenile justice system by isolating the issues and targeting the best approach for each one (for example: gathering statistics and developing databases before establishing training institutions) 2) Organising a pool of inmate paralegals by: meeting with the Bureau of Jail Management and signing an agreement with them, selecting the inmates to be paralegals with their help and training the paralegals for three months. 3) A project that is supported by the local bar association and includes public education and legal aid.

Projects that scored poorly exhibited these shortcomings:

Projects that tried to accomplish too many goals at once, with an obscure or impractical procedure plan.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

Project to assist marginalised populations receive aid, but the activities are not well explained and lack focus. The applicant uses vague language for example: “ a criminal justice system should be the underpinning of society, and create equality for all.” *not an exact quote

Efficacy:

The project idea is focused and designed to produce the desired impact within a one-year time frame.

Further Explanation:

Projects that clearly articulate how the action plan will address the fundamental root causes of the problem. Efficacy entails explaining clear project activities and planning out an effective way to evaluate the success rate of those activities. Efficacy also means there must be a clear explanation of the link between the project activities and how they will address this problem.

Projects that scored highly exhibit these qualities:

The project showed clear methods for assessing the success rate of their activities, and measuring the effectiveness of each activity in reaching the overall goal. This entails a good assessment of how to achieve the goal. Proponent has good understanding of how their proposal will work within its environment.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

Campaign project to strengthen community justice, and create a common network between activists, listed numerous activities that are clearly linked to the project goal such as creating workshops, raising media awareness and regular monitoring of the district court.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

The project description is too vague and the proposed activities are not well explained. The project lacks focus in terms of how the activities will lead to the outcomes. Although the objective may be a good one, the project's action plan may be too complicated, or has not considered all the variables. Projects that have scored poorly have an obscure link between the project's activities and goals. Alternatively the project may have included no procedure to measure the success of its activities.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

Project that aimed to raise consciousness for the accused of their rights as the only objective that did not address how they will evaluate their activities.

Collaboration:

The project idea works jointly with domestic groups, institutions, legal workers, judges, prosecutors, police, prison officials, prison guards, and other individuals, etc. in accomplishing its goals.

Further Explanation:

The applicant has approached other organisations with similar goals and can produce complimentary work. The applicant demonstrates an excellent understanding of the legal framework, policies and procedures and ability to work well within it. The applicant is able to discuss and work in unison with other participants in the legal system including government and non government. The overall project does not conflict with the legal environment, and conforms with the law.

Projects that scored highly exhibited these qualities:

Applicants that showed the ability to work with other groups, particularly those that have already approached and have a good working relation with other activist groups.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

1) Project that proposes justice for juveniles with linked support from the national Bar Association and public education 2) paralegal inmate project that works in agreement with the Bureau of Jail Management and Penology and extensive collaboration with jail officials.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

Projects that work in conflict with other legal workers, have an inability to coordinate goals with other players, and a poor understanding of the legal framework. Projects that did not explain how they will coordinate with other members in the legal system, or have shown no initiative in contacting other groups with the same goals.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

A project to fight arbitrary detention but the application shows no evidence of negotiating support from organisations needed for success.

Repeatable:

The project idea shows a potential for being repeated and expanded.

Further Explanation:

The underlying model of the project has the potential for growth. The project can be repeated in other legal systems, has the potential to work on a larger scale, and impact more people. The methods will continue to work in different environments, even if the size of the problem gets bigger.

Projects that scored highly exhibit these qualities:

The ability to be replicated, the ability to partner with organisations in other communities with similar goals,

Examples of projects that scored highly:

1) Inmate paralegal training can be replicated in other jails that are administered by the same bureau, and potentially in all jails that have similar structures. As a result training sessions can occur anywhere. Furthermore, the project seeks to improve the system from the bottom up. It seeks to educate prisoners who can thereafter help other prisoners. In such a way – it reaches a higher number of people and maximizes the impact of the program, thereby increasing the effectiveness of the proposal. 2) Proposal seeks to build regional offices which will increase the sustainability of the proposal and paves the road for a potential nationwide network, hopefully translating into a nationwide movement.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

The project's methods are focused on one-off events, or a unique set of circumstances. Projects that are focused on a particular legal system that could not be linked to other systems or are overly costly. [Please note: in certain circumstances projects that are focused on a particular legal system may score well in this category if they create well thought out mechanisms that could potentially be used on a grander scale.] The ability to broaden the project's scope is particular to one immediate area.

Examples of projects that scored poorly:

Project to abolish Holding Charge through litigation is costly, based on a one-off decision and is specific to a particular legal system.

Sustainability:

The project presents funding and resource suggestions to allow the program to continue after the end of the initial award

Further Explanation:

Projects with high sustainability are able to show that it has the ability to endure, and explain how it will support itself in the long term. Particularly the project should be able to explain how it will be able to maintain funding after the \$5000 prize has expired.

Projects that scored highly exhibit these qualities:

Projects with a well constructed budget, a thought out plan to find other funding sources, and/or projects that are efficient and do not require a lot of extra funds to work.

Examples of projects that scored highly:

Project that seeks to submit proposals to funding agencies with similar goals, and have included a comprehensive list of those agencies.

Projects that scored poorly exhibit these shortcomings:

Projects that rely heavily on staff and/or volunteers without explaining how they will be compensated or projects that have limited human resources. Inefficient projects that are unlikely to continue as a result of poor planning, lack of resources, and poor foresight.

Inspiration:

The project idea includes methods that inspire change that continue to improve legal systems even after the JusticeMakers award period ends.

Further explanation:

The project idea is sound, and likely to influence and propel change in its community and elsewhere. The project is one that stands up for legal rights, and combats disillusionment. The project clearly articulates how it plans to overcome its obstacles against the odds. Projects that show inspiration have the ability to engage and encourage others in the community, and increase involvement in the issue at hand. This includes having the ability to create awareness of the problem. The project is likely to foster debate and thought and on how to best solve the problem.

Projects that scored highly exhibited these qualities:

This is a new judging category, however projects that judges had mentioned as potentially inspirational were ones likely to impact many people, projects that seemed likely to overcome major challenges, and projects that seemed well organised and efficiently managed.

Projects that scored poorly exhibited these shortcomings:

The project idea is unlikely to raise awareness, or stand out in its community and on an international level.

Projects that are likely to score poorly in this category are ones that are unlikely to be successful in the long term and unable to publicise its accomplishments, and ones that are unlikely to reach out to other organisations. The project is also unlikely to impress upon a wide audience.