

1ST PART: BASIC DATA

Title of the experience: Schools Participatory budget			
Name of the city/region: Paris			
Country: France			
Institution presenting th			
Paris City Hall - Cabine	t of local democracy, community life and youth		
Start date of the experience: 2016			
End date of the experience:			
Type of candidacy	New experience	X	
	Innovation on an existing experience		
Type of experience	Participatory budgeting	X	
	Urban planning		
	Council		
	Workshop/meeting for diagnose, monitoring,		
	etc.		
	Audience/forum		
	Poll/referendum		
	Citizen jury		
	E-government/open government		
	Citizen initiative		
	Others (say which one):		
Objective of the experience	To achieve higher levels of equality in terms of participation and to incorporate diversity as a criteria for inclusion	Х	
	Community empowerment		
	To empower non-organised citizens		
	To increase citizen's rights in terms of political participation	X	
	To connect different tools of participation within a participatory democracy "ecosystem"		
	To improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the mechanisms of participatory democracy		
	To improve the quality of public decision making through the mechanisms of participatory democracy	X	
	To improve the evaluation and accountability of the mechanisms of participatory democracy		



Territorial area	All the territory	X
	District	
	Neighbourhood	
Thematic area	Governance	
	Education	X
	Transport	
	Urban management	
	Health	
	Security	
	Environment and/or urban agriculture	
	New social movements and associationism	
	Culture	X
	Housing	
	Job creation	
	Decentralization	
	Local development	
	Training/learning	X
	Economy and/or finances	
	Legal regulations	
	Social inclusion	
	All	
	Others	

2ND PART:DESCRIPTION OF THE EXPERIENCE (4 pages maximum)

Objectives

Main objective of the innovative experience:

Choose one of the objectives mentioned in part 1, the one that you think is the most important Like any tool for expression and participation in public affairs, participatory budgets face the challenge of broad and equal ownership. In our opinion, developing a participatory budget in



schools makes it possible to meet this objective of spreading participation to all social profiles by offering citizenship training from an early age through the exercise of debate and voting. The educational dimension of the device thus makes it a tool for sustainable participation, inscribed in the culture of all and egalitarian.

How have you achieved this objective?

This goal was achieved by encouraging the practice of debate and voting in schools, 83% of which adopted the participatory budget. The schools send the city a document entitled "My participative budget" where they detail in written or video format (often made with children), the educational project that accompanied the implementation of the participatory budget. Thus, they are encouraged to reflect and experiment on citizenship training, which we believe is a key element of equality in political participation.

To what extent has this objective been achieved?

Citizenship training is a long-term and child-oriented one to build a more democratic and egalitarian culture. The short-term goal was the participation of a large number of schools: it was largely achieved with the participation each year of more than 80% of schools, or about 66,150 children.

Dimensions of the experience

Which is the most innovative aspect of the experience?

Explain what you think that is the most innovative aspect of the practice. It is not necessary for you to repeat what you have already presented in the initial candidacy through the PARTICIPATE OIDP platform (the jury will have direct access to that proposal). It is not enough to explain that it is the first time which this kind of practice is implemented in your city, village or region. However, it will be considered innovative if this involves a significant adaptation of this kind of practice to the particular context.

Participatory budgets are spreading around the world and all face the question of uneven and often weak ownership of the system. Creating a participatory school budget is an innovative practice in this respect because it mixes the tool with a pedagogical dimension and an institution (the school) which makes it very widely available. Giving children a real responsibility with a budget and visible achievements of their decisions is an innovative way to raise awareness of the issues of democracy. The process of debate that accompanies this empowerment also makes it possible to train them in listening and argumentation as well as in the idea of a general interest that should serve as a principle for democratic decisions. Targeting children as actors in a participatory system is innovative and promising because it finally makes it possible to sustainably embed a culture of participation in society.



To what extent is the procedure transferable?

Explain to what extent the experience has the capacity to allow the repetition of the essential elements which constitutes it in a different context to that of its creation, with a great chance of success. Which elements do you think that are replicable? How can other institutions access to these elements?

Our catalog of projects, our charter, our posters are available so that other institutions can be inspired by them. In addition, important freedom is left to schools so that this device is easily replicable in countries with various pedagogical functions.

Why do you consider that the experience is feasible?

Explain how the economical, technical, organizational and socio-political context were taken into account when designing the experience and how this improved the chances of success of the experience. Which measures were taken when considering the context?

Our previous experience of the participative budget, already established in Paris since 2014 allowed us to adapt this project to the particular environment of the school. From a technical point of view, the duration of the instruction of projects created from scratch seemed to us too long compared to the schooling of the children, hence the decision not to make them invent the projects themselves. The projects co-constructed with the City's services, the Paris Academy and the teaching teams were thus conceived with the technical and organizational context of the school and the schooling of the children. They are thus achievable in the architectural and educational environment of each institution so that their implementation is possible quickly so that children see the impact of their vote.

How has the experience been coordinated with other actors and processes?

Explain how the experience has been coordinated with simultaneous or pre-existing actors and processes. Explain the success rate of this coordination.

The experience was conceived as part of a global conception of active citizenship, embodied in particular by the participative budget of the City. Through the idea that participation is learned, that we become citizens through habits of dialogue and participation in collective projects, it seemed to us that extending the device to children was a good way to promote this teaching. Participatory budgeting is therefore articulated with all other participatory processes in that it trains children in their proper use and teaches them how to use them. It is also a way to make known the participative budget of the City in all families through children.

Finally, as we have already noted, the system was conceived in consultation with all the actors concerned: the teaching teams, teachers of national education, the Academy of Paris, and the Directorate of School Affairs of the City. The device is also part of the current transformations of the school, where extracurricular time has been established to introduce



diversified activities (music, sport, culture ..). Participatory budget projects in schools can be as much a part of class time as of extracurricular activity.

Which has been the level of co-responsibility?

Explain the kind of implication of other political or technical actors and citizens (organised and non-organised). Which roles did these participants undertake?

Several actors have been associated at different levels. First, as for the entire participatory budget, the Cabinet worked in close collaboration with the City's technical departments, particularly the School Affairs Department, but also all the services involved in the projects. The catalog is then produced through working groups with City officials, Rectorate officials, teachers and extracurricular activity managers. The four themes (a digital school, a school of experimentation, a sports school and a pleasant school) have been defined jointly, as well as all the projects that are declining.

Which evaluation and accountability mechanisms were used?

Explain the kind of evaluation and accountability which are part of the planning of the experience and how they have worked in practice. You can mention some results for exemplify it. How has the information been disseminated to the citizens? How was the feedback done once the procedure had finished? Which have been the conclusions of the evaluation (if they currently exist and, if not: when are they planned to be disclosed?)?

Schools must provide the City with a document titled "My Participatory Budget" at the end of the process. This document (audio, written, or video) details the implementation of the device, the educational project that accompanied it, the organization of the debates (number, form ...) and the vote and the selected project. The City can thus evaluate the most selected projects, the most suitable methods for children, and use these documents to help other schools to set up the participatory budget and thus increase the number of participants (currently 83%). The information is disseminated each year through the principals and the Rectorate. The results and the follow-up of the projects are analyzed by the services of the City and the Cabinet. For example, we have been able to develop the catalog to bring out new projects and correct those whose implementation was too long. We were also able to change the calendar by noting that the deadlines were too long: at the beginning the vote of the children took place at the end of the year then the projects were validated at the Council of Paris in December and the projects delivered only in February of the year after. Now we ask teachers to vote in April so that the projects are delivered in September, a temporality more suited to the schooling of children.