

| |
|--|
| ASSESSMENT SHEET (V 15.06.2026) |
|--|

| |
|---|
| Film Education / Swiss MEDIA Compensating Measures |
|---|

| | |
|----------------------------------|--|
| Name of the Organisation: | |
| Title of the proposal: | |
| Expert name: | |

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 must reflect and justify the score given for it.

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.

Please note that, due to copyright and confidentiality issues, experts are **not allowed to use AI tools** (e.g. for translation or evaluation) on parts of or entire texts belonging to the application. They may, however, use AI tools for research purposes. Upon request by MEDIA Desk Suisse, the expert shall provide reasonable information about the nature and extent of any usage of AI tools.

| 1. Relevance, Partnerships, Sustainability, Diversity | Max. |
|---|--------|
| <p>This criterion assesses the relevance of the content of the action vis-à-vis the objectives of the Call for proposals. It will assess in particular the European dimension of the project and the capacity of the project to reach the targeted audiences.</p> | 35 |
| <p>1.1 Increase audience's interest in European films What is the project's potential to promote, stimulate and increase audience's interest in European films and audiovisual works, including non-national films?</p> | |
| ... | .../10 |
| <p>1.2 Promotion of heritage films, address new and young audiences What is the potential of the project to promote awareness and knowledge of heritage films, and to increase interest of European films and audiovisual works among new and young audiences?</p> | |
| ... | .../5 |
| <p>1.3 The European dimension/European added value What is the European dimension and added value of the project in terms of: - partnerships, including grass-roots organizations, level of pan-European cooperation and exchange of knowledge, geographic coverage (including efforts to broaden participation), - content and cultural diversity of European films and audiovisual works - the European added value of the project compared to the core activities of the applicants and partners shall also be taken into account.</p> | |
| ... | .../10 |
| <p>1.4 Sustainability Adequacy of the strategies presented to ensure a more sustainable and environmentally respectful industry within the project implementation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific sustainability plan, including awareness in transport, food, infrastructure, etc. • Degree to which environmental objectives are integrated into decisions • Use of indicators and measurement tools (e.g. carbon calculator) • Certification planned • Consultant involved | |
| ... | .../5 |

| | |
|--|-------------|
| | |
| <p>1.5 Diversity Adequacy of the strategies to ensure gender equality and social diversity, either in the project/content or in the way of managing the activity, or both.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategy to ensure equal rights, opportunities, and treatment, allowing everyone to reach their full potential • Creation of an environment where everyone feels respected and able to participate • Regarding content, setting, team, decision makers, tutors, etc. | |
| ... | .../5 |
| 2. Quality of the content and activities | Max. |
| 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. | 40 |
| <p>2.1 Overall quality of the project What is the overall quality of the project including its format, methodology, selection process, target groups/territories, educational and pedagogical methods (if applicable), coherence of needs' analysis and evaluation of the aimed outputs in terms of pan-European audience reach?</p> | |
| ... | .../15 |
| <p>2.2 Feasibility and Cost-efficiency What is the feasibility and cost-efficiency in relation to the pan-European objectives to be reached?</p> | |
| ... | .../5 |
| <p>2.3 Innovation What are innovative activities and methods in terms of cross-border film education initiatives and/or use of technology and new tools?</p> | |

| | |
|-----|--------|
| ... | .../20 |
|-----|--------|

| | |
|--|----------------|
| 3. Dissemination of project results, impact and sustainability | Max. |
| 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. | 15 |
| 3.1 Dissemination of knowledge and impact What is the impact of the strategy for promoting the project and for the dissemination of its results, in particular in relation with pan-European exchange of knowledge and best practices? | |
| ... | .../10 |
| 3.2 Sustainability and strategies for collecting data and analysing the results obtained What are strategies and sustainable methods for collecting and analysing quantitative and qualitative data on the project's results and impact in terms of pan-European audience reach? | |
| ... | .../5 |
| 4. Organisation of the project team and the grouping | Max. |
| Consider 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. | 10 |
| 4.1 Organisation of the project team and the grouping How is the distribution of the roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis the objectives of the action? | |
| ... | .../10 |
| TOTAL Points | .../100 |
| An application must reach a minimum of 70 points 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 | |
| Recommendation for selection for a shorter period of time (please specify) | |

If you recommend the selection:

| | |
|--|--|
| Amount of support recommended by the expert 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 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).