

<b>ASSESSMENT SHEET (V 03.03.2023)</b>
<b>Film Education / Swiss MEDIA Compensating Measures</b>

<b>Name of the Organisation:</b>	
<b>Title of the proposal:</b>	
<b>Expert name:</b>	

### The Film Education scheme - Targeted projects

The aim of the funding line is to bring film to a young audience, usually not over 19 years old (exceptions are possible). Swiss organisations should be strengthened through European knowledge exchange and networking cooperations. The networking support comes with two different options. It's possible to either

- a) **dock to a Creative Europe MEDIA co-financed network** or to
- b) **create a new international network with at least 2 partners from 2 different MEDIA countries.** The offered programs must be available in at least three European languages, including at least one national language of Switzerland (German, French, Italian).

In terms of content, there are three options:

- Film education activities that use **innovative or digital tools**. This option targets an audience not over 19 years old.
- The preparation of a film catalogue of existing predominantly European films for use in **out-of-school** film education.
- The **exchange of knowledge** regarding material or methods of film education with the aim of exploiting synergies.

Only the Swiss part of the network is funded.

The production of films or the organisation of film festivals cannot be funded.

The application can be made for a single year or for multi-year-actions – up to a maximum of three years. If the application is made for more than one year, it must show an overarching theme in the case of actions which basically repeat the same structure every year.

### Assessment

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

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.

As **horizontal priorities**, we ask you to take into account the strategies to ensure a **more sustainable industry and diversity**, either in the project/content or in the way of managing the activities (if applicable).

At the end of the assessment, give us 5 to 7 positive and / or negative comments on the application as a whole, highlighting its relative strengths and weaknesses.

<b>1. Relevance and European added value</b>	<b>Max.</b>
<p><b>This criterion assesses the relevance of the content of the action vis-à-vis the objectives of the Call for proposals.</b>  <b>It will assess in particular the European dimension of the project and the capacity of the project to reach the targeted audiences.</b></p>	<b>30</b>
<p><b>1.1 Relevance</b>  The potential of the project to promote and increase audience's interest in, awareness and knowledge of European films, including non-national and heritage films, in particular among young audiences.  Evaluation of the project's capacity to increase the overall educational contribution of existing European films and audiovisual works.</p> <p><u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the project's potential to promote and increase audiences' knowledge of, and interest in, European films, including non-national and/or heritage movies?</li> <li>• Does the project provide mechanisms to increase the contribution of films and audiovisual works to education?</li> </ul>	
...	<b>.../15</b>
<p><b>1.2 The European dimension/European added value</b>  Assessment of the European dimension of the project in terms of partnership, content, geographic and cultural diversity of European films / the European added value of the project compared to the core activities of the applicants and their partners.</p> <p><u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How does the project improve the efficiency and European dimension of the concerned film education initiative in terms of partnership, content, languages covered and diversity of European films?</li> <li>• What is the European added value of the project compared to the core activities of the applicant and their partners' and compared to already existing practices?</li> <li>• Is the grouping/partnership presenting a new project or just the sum of their usual activities?</li> </ul>	
...	<b>.../15</b>
<b>2. Quality of the content and activities</b>	<b>Max.</b>
<p><b>Assess the overall quality of the project, including its format, its methodology, the films' selection process, its target group, its educational and pedagogical methods, feasibility, cost-efficiency and innovative aspects, including the strategic use of digital technology and different distribution platforms.</b></p>	<b>40</b>
<p><b>2.1 Overall quality of the project</b>  Overall methodology of the project, including the format, the coherence, the needs' analysis and the evaluation of the desired outputs. Assessment of the target groups/territories, film selection and pedagogical methods.</p>	

<p><u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>You are requested to assess the adequacy of the projects' methodology to its objectives, including its format and participatory features.</li> <li>You are also requested to assess the adequacy of the projects' pedagogical methods: is for instance the selection of films, or the accessibility of the catalogue for targeted public, coherent with the content and objectives of the project?</li> <li>How well the pedagogical contents of the catalogue have been identified?</li> <li>How well are they likely to be met?</li> <li>Does the project foresee self evaluation mechanisms?</li> </ul>	
...	.../25
<p><b>2.2 Feasibility and Cost-efficiency</b></p> <p><u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What is the overall feasibility of the project? Is it realistic?</li> <li>Is it cost-efficient in relation to the scope of the action and the objectives to be reached?</li> <li>Are the costs well detailed and justified to reach the objectives of the project?</li> </ul>	
...	.../5
<p><b>2.3 Innovation</b></p> <p>Innovative aspects of the project, in particular the strategic use of digital technology</p> <p><u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does the project present innovative approaches to film education?</li> <li>To which extent does it tap into digital technologies?</li> <li>What are the innovative aspects of the proposed consumption models?</li> </ul>	
...	.../10

<b>3. Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability</b>	<b>Max.</b>
<b>Assess the impact of the dissemination of the project's results and the impact of the project on the promotion, circulation and interest in European audiovisual works.</b>	<b>20</b>
<p><b>3.1 Dissemination of knowledge and impact</b></p> <p>Strategy for promoting the project and for the dissemination of its results, in particular the exchange of knowledge and best practices. Assessment of the project's impact and capacity to raise the overall interest in European films and to inform policy and practice within the film education sector.</p> <p><u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How does the project foresee to disseminate the results in order to strengthen film education at European level?</li> <li>Have the right stakeholders been involved so as to maximise the project's impact and eventually inform policy and practice?</li> <li>Does the project have the potential to continue and use its results beyond the end of the funding period and become an example of best practices?</li> <li>What is the potential impact of the project on the promotion of, and interest in, European</li> </ul>	

audiovisual works?	
...	.../15
<b>3.2 Sustainability and strategies for collecting data and analysing the results obtained</b> The methods for collecting and analysing data on the project's results and strategies to ensure the sustainability of the project.  <u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does the project present methodologies to collect data and analyse its results?</li> <li>• How effective are they likely to be?</li> <li>• Is there a strategy to ensure the sustainability of the project?</li> </ul>	
...	.../5
<b>4. Organisation of the project team and the grouping</b>	<b>Max.</b>
<b>Take into account the extent of the partnership and the exchange of knowledge within the partnership, as well as the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the objectives of the action.</b>	<b>10</b>
<u>Indicative questions to be answered:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the international, technical and managerial expertise of the team members appropriate to the objectives pursued by the action?</li> <li>• Does the partnership create synergies, including in exchange of knowledge, tasks division and allocation of resources?</li> <li>• How are roles and responsibilities distributed between the different members of the team?</li> <li>• The ability of the team to execute the project has already been assessed at the Selection stage. It should not be called into question when assessing this criteria.</li> </ul>	
	.../10
<b>TOTAL Points</b>	<b>.../100</b>
An application must reach a <b>minimum of 70 points</b> to be eligible for support (depending on availability of budget).	

#### Evaluation summary / Reasons for recommendation

Please give us five to seven positive and/or negative arguments which support the selection or rejection. These arguments should be in a form that can be given to the applicants as a justification of the decision. In a rejection obviously the negative arguments should prevail, but you may (and should) as well give positive aspects.

As an indication, would you recommend the rejection or the selection of the project? (please note that projects must reach the threshold of minimum 70 point out of 100 to be supported)

Recommendation for selection	
Recommendation for rejection	

**For multi-year projects only:** If you recommend the selection, is it for the whole multi-year project, or for a shorter period of time (e.g. single edition/year)?

Recommendation for selection for the whole multi-year project	
---	--

<b>Recommendation for selection for a shorter period of time (please specify)</b>	
---	--

**If you recommend the selection:**

<b>Amount of support recommended by the expert</b> The support recommended by the expert cannot be higher than the support requested by the applicant company. A reduced amount must be justified, for example on the basis of the budget (please indicate which items you consider overestimated).	
--	--

## Scores

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. Although indicated on the scoring scale, experts should avoid "0" which relates to "no evidence". For obvious particular case, experts should contact MEDIA Desk Suisse.

N.B. Some criteria are to be rated on a **scale of 15 points or 25 points**. In those cases, you may find useful to use the standard scale and then multiply the score by the corresponding factor, further refine to the next whole number (if applicable). For example: 8/10 points in the standard scale corresponds to 12/15 (factor: x1.5) or 20/25 (factor: x2.5).