

Assessment Sheet (V 29.11.2021)
--

Film Festivals

Swiss MEDIA Compensating Measures
--

INDIVIDUAL ASSESSMENT

Title of the proposal:	
Expert name:	

Targeted projects

The programme encourages Swiss audiovisual festivals which:

- demonstrate strong efficiency in audience development (especially toward young audience) by implementing activities before, during or after the event including such as: year-long activities and/or decentralisation to other cities (with smaller partner festivals nationally and/or cross-border) and/or any efficient outreach activities towards non-core film festival audience;
- demonstrate a commitment to innovative actions especially in the areas of outreach and audience development using the latest digital technologies and tools such as social media and online activities in order to create a permanent community, amplify innovative approaches beyond expanding their reach (for instance cross-platform programmes etc),
- organize initiatives for film literacy (for example film education) in close cooperation with schools and other institutions throughout the year,
- place strong emphasis on European films in general and especially films from countries of low audiovisual production capacity,
- place strong emphasis on non-national European programming and geographic diversity of non-national European programming,
- demonstrate interest to initiate and further develop collaboration and partnerships with other European film festivals across borders to increase resource efficiency including sharing of subtitling/dubbing, online viewing platforms etc.

Please answer the following questions **if possible in the language of the application** (German, French or Italian). However, if this is not your mother tongue, you may also write in English.

Assessment

1. Relevance	Max.	
Activity towards the audience and in particular outreach mechanisms, including online activities, the use of the latest digital technologies and tools such as social media, and film literacy actions of the project.	30	...
1a) How consistent is the quality of activities towards the audience taking into account the applicant's definition of existing/potential audience? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact of the actions towards the audience (Q&As, Conferences, Live events, Open-air screenings, nbr of screens); • Inclusion of satellite events, year-long activities and/or decentralisation to other cities (with smaller partner festivals) 	10	
...		
1b) How efficient are the festival's communication activities (including the use of the latest digital technologies and tools such as social media)? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adequacy of targeted Communication & adapted tools; • Partnerships with local/regional institutions; • Strategy and innovative approaches to reach new audiences/non-attendees • Extent of the use of the latest digital technologies and tools such as social media 	10	
1c) How effective are the film education initiatives and actions for young audience? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality, scale/variety, adequacy of film literacy initiatives, including particular attention paid to young audience; • Level of cooperation with schools/institutions throughout the year • Relevance of educational material (if provided) 	10	

2. Quality of the content and activities	Max.	
European dimension of the programming including its cultural and geographic diversity as well as the quality of the collaboration and partnerships with other European film festivals across borders.	35	
<p>2a) How do you evaluate the quality and impact of actions put in place towards collaboration and partnerships with other European film festivals across borders?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The quality and added value of the actions carried out within festivals networks and/or concrete actions to be put in place through collaboration with other festivals (beyond standard exchanges) 	20	
<p>2b) How do you assess the European dimension and the festival's strategy to put forward/ highlight the programming devoted to European non-national films?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The European dimension in particular taking into account the evolution and the proportion of programming devoted to European non-national films and the proportion of programming originating from countries with low audiovisual production capacity 	10	
<p>2c) How do you assess the geographic diversity and the festival's strategy to extend the number of eligible countries represented?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The level of geographic diversity of the programming The strategy in terms of extending the number of eligible European countries 	5	

3. Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability	Max.	
Size of the audience and impact on the promotion and circulation of European audiovisual works (mechanisms to facilitate commercial or alternative distribution)	30	
<p>3a) Please evaluate the size of the audience taking into account the overall size of the festival and the potential audiences?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall size of the festival • Potential new audiences and the evolution over last editions 	10	
<p>3b) How do you assess the activities geared towards the professional community and the mechanisms facilitating commercial or alternative circulation of the featured European films and the use of digital technologies?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Level of participation of the professional community • Quality of activities geared towards the professional community • Efficiency of the mechanisms facilitating commercial/alternative circulation • Use of digital technologies (event's own streaming VOD platform, etc.) 	10	
<p>3c) How efficient and relevant are the actions implemented to promote the European programming and the European talents beyond the event?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Efficiency and relevance of the measures for promotion and showcasing of European non-national films and talents. 	10	

--	--	--

4. Organisation of the team	Max.	
Distribution of the roles and responsibilities of the team vis-à-vis the specific objectives of the proposed action	5	
<p>4a) Are the festival's organisation structure and the roles and responsibilities of the team relevant to the activities described in the application?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management and technical involvement of the key members to implement the foreseen activities • Clarity of the structure of the organisation and the experience of key team members (director, artistic director/programmer, general coordinator, responsible for audience activities, etc.) 	5	

TOTAL Points	100	
---------------------	------------	--

Evaluation summary / Reasons for recommendation

--

As an indication, would you recommend the rejection or the selection of the project? (mark with an “X” the appropriate answer; please note that only projects with a minimum of 70/100 points may be recommended for selection)

Recommendation for selection	
Recommendation for rejection	

Within the maximum number of points per award criterion, ranges of scores are defined that correspond to a fixed definition of the expected quality standard so that an as coherent approach as possible is implemented, across experts as well as across actions. The standards on a 10 points scale are as follows:

- 9-10 Very good – the application addresses all relevant aspects of the criterion in question convincingly and successfully. The answer provides all the information and evidence needed and there are no concerns or areas of weakness.
- 7-8 Good – the application addresses the criterion well, although some small improvements could be made. The answer gives clear information on all or nearly all of the evidence needed.
- 5-6 Acceptable – the application broadly addresses the criterion, but there are some weaknesses. The answer gives some relevant information, but there are areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.
- 3-4 Fair – the application addresses the criterion, but there are many weaknesses. The answer gives some relevant information, but there are several areas where detail is lacking or the information is unclear.
- 1-2 Very weak – the application fails to address the criterion or cannot be judged due to missing or incomplete information. The answer does not address the question asked, or gives very little relevant information.
- 0 No evidence – the application fails to include a minimum amount of evidence to enable the criterion to be evaluated.

N.B. Although indicated on the scoring scale, experts should avoid "0" which relates to "no evidence". For obvious particular case, experts should contact the Agency staff a priori.

Experts are expected to give comments on each award criterion and, in their comments, refer explicitly to the elements of analysis under the relevant criterion. The comments on each award criterion have to reflect and justify the score given for it.

At the end of the assessment, experts give overall comments on the application as a whole. In the comments, experts must provide a thorough analysis of the application highlighting its relative strengths and weaknesses.