

Paragraph 3.3.3.1 for details), in order to “mitigate” the impact of the subjectivity (implicit in each research activity) in the assessment carried out by the country partners. All this procedure was firstly developed by the INRCA team (WP2 leader), shared/refined with the Coordinator and discussed/refined/agreed with all the partners.

### 3.3.3. Results

#### 3.3.3.1. Aggregate results of the selected good practices

As mentioned, the dataset includes 253 practices, 20 of which, during the process of application of selection criteria, were classified as not relevant for the purposes of the project. The analysed dataset therefore consists of 233 relevant practices, which have undergone an evaluation process (Tab. 3).

After the assessment, 170 practices were classified as “good practices”; this result confirms the effectiveness of the selection process followed in the first phase of the project (e.g. the search in 8 different scientific databases for the SLR, and the GLR search). In addition, this finding also offers a wide range of options among which to draw from for the subsequent development of solution prototypes in WP3. It is notable that the share of good practices is higher in the GLR than in the SLR; in particular, in the GLR the General and Core criteria are less satisfied and the Qualifier criteria are more satisfied.

Furthermore, more than 90% of the good practices (74 out of 81) show a potential to foster care partnerships.

**Table 3. Main results of the evaluation process**

Practices	SLR	GLR	Total
Total	134	119	253
Not relevant	5	15	20
Relevant	129	104	233
Good Practices (GP)	80	90	170
Fostering Care Partnerships (FCP)	30	51	81
GP & FCP	28	46	74

Differing results were noted among partners after the application of criteria to the allocated practices, showing that subjectivity, as usual in research, played a role in the evaluation process. For example, by taking the highest and lowest ratios of good practices (GP on total) within the sample we noted the following: all the practices assessed by Slovenia resulted in being assessed as good practices, whereas Sweden had much lower percentages. Such results stem from strong differences in some responses, e.g. collaboration or participation sub-criteria (Tab. 4).

**Table 4. Evaluation of a good practice, by partner**

Country Partner	SLR				GLR			
	GP	Not GP	Total	GP/total	GP	Not GP	Total	GP/total
Germany	14	8	22	0.64	17	2	19	0.89
Italy	25	5	30	0.83	20	1	21	0.95
Netherlands	9	7	16	0.56	12	2	14	0.86