



MediaFutures

Deliverable 1.2

Summary of evaluations

Tara Lee (ODI) & Darren Temple (ODI)



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 951962.

Disclaimer

This report was written as part of the MediaFutures project under EC grant agreement 951962. The information, documentation and figures available in this deliverable were written by the MediaFutures project consortium and do not necessarily reflect the views of the European Commission. The European Commission is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.

Statement of originality

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

How to quote this document

Lee T & Temple D. (2022) MediaFutures, Call documentation.



This deliverable is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0).

Table of Contents

1 Executive Summary	5
2 Summary of evaluation and selection process	7
2.1 Open Call 1	7
Eligibility check	7
Written evaluations	7
Jury panels	7
Artist Interviews	7
2.2 Open Call 2	7
Eligibility check	7
Written evaluations	8
Jury panels	8
Artist Interviews	8
2.3 Open call 3	8
Eligibility check	8
Written evaluations	8
Jury panels	9
Artist interviews	9
3 Learning and Changes from the First to the Third Open Calls	9
3.1 Learning implemented from the first and second open calls	9
3.2 Evolution of evaluation stages	11
3.2.1 Process, guidelines and selection of evaluators	11
Process	11
Guidelines	11
Evaluator selection criteria	11
3.2.2 Briefing of evaluators, and code of conduct	13
3.2.3 Conflicts of interest, and eligibility check	13
Conflict of Interest:	13
Eligibility criteria:	13
3.2.4 Application reviews and shortlisting	14
3.2.5 Jury panels	14
3.2.6 Artist interviews (AfM only)	15
3.2.7 Evaluation summaries, and notification of applicants	15
4 Evaluator Feedback	15
4.1 Process changes between open calls	16
OC1 → OC2	16
OC2 → OC3	16
4.2 Overall process	16
Comments	16
4.3 Written evaluations	16
Overall process	16
Instructions	16
Criteria	16
	3

Scoring spreadsheet	17
Duration of written evaluation period	17
Number of proposals per evaluator	17
Time spent on evaluation per proposal	17
Comments	17
General	17
Instructions	17
Criteria	17
Score sheet	18
4.4 Jury panels	18
Instructions	18
Duration of sessions	18
Number of breaks	18
Input from chair	18
Method	18
Comments	18
4.5 Artist interviews	19
Instructions	19
Duration of sessions	19
Input from chair	19
Comments	19
5 More Information about this Document	20

List of Tables

Table 1. Evaluation Dates	5
Table 2. No. Applications per call, track and stage	6

1 Executive Summary

This document – D1.2 Summary of evaluations - is part of the Work Package 1 (WP1 – Open Calls) and summarises the evaluation processes and results of the three MediaFutures open calls. This deliverable does not provide the individual results of the evaluation of the open call. These results are published on the MediaFutures website after conclusion of the subgrantee agreements with each applicant.

For each open call, there were four stages to the evaluation process. The process began with an eligibility assessment for each application submitted, to ensure that applications were valid and that applicants were eligible for MediaFutures. The validity of an application depended on whether they had submitted an application by the open call deadline, if they had submitted the required materials, and if they had followed the application template as well as it being written in English language. Applicant eligibility was determined by country of residence or country of registration if applying as a company. These eligibility checks were followed by independent scoring of each application by three separate evaluators. Scores were then collated and applications shortlisted and taken forward into a jury panel for each track of the project, Artists for Media (AfM), Startups for Citizens (SfC) and Startup meets Artist (SmA). Within these jury panels, the top teams to progress to the START phase were decided for SmA and SfC. For AfM, applications were shortlisted further to a top ten, and these applicants were then interviewed by a panel of judges, before the final teams selected to progress to the BUILD phase were chosen (there was no START phase for AfM).

All teams who progressed to START for SfC and SmA, and BUILD for AfM received funding from the project. SfC and SmA teams pitched to a jury panel at the end of the START phase to determine which of these would join the AfM teams in the BUILD phase and receive further funding. All teams, on completion of the BUILD phase, then presented again to a jury panel to determine the winning team per track, per open call.

Table 1. Evaluation dates

Task	Open Call 1 (2020 - 2021)	Open Call 2 (2021 - 2022)	Open Call 3 (2022)
Agree on evaluation process with wider consortium & select evaluators	Oct - Dec	Oct - Dec	Jun - Jul
Share guidance, brief evaluators & ensure codes of conduct are signed	Jan	Dec - Jan	Aug
Open call closes	28 Jan	27 Jan	30 Aug
Eligibility checks	29 Jan - 1 Feb	31 Jan - 2 Feb	31 Aug - 2 Sep
Written application reviews	1 - 8 Feb	3 - 10 Feb	5 - 12 Sep
Shortlist applications	9 Feb	11 Feb	14 Sep

Jury panels (shortlist AfM for interviews, select SfC & SmA for START)	17 - 19 Feb	16 - 18 Feb	21 - 25 Sep
Organise artist interviews (after Afm jury panel)	17 Feb	16 Feb	21 Feb
Artist interviews (select AfM for BUILD)	22 - 25 Feb	21 - 25 Feb	27 - 30 Sep
Prepare evaluation summaries for applicants	26 Feb - 3 Mar	28 Feb - 4 Mar	3 - 7 Oct
Applicants informed of outcome & given written feedback	4 Mar	7 Mar	10 Oct

Table 2. No. Applications per call, track and stage

Stage of application	Open call 1				Open call 2				Open call 3			
	AfM	SmA	SfC	Total	AfM	SmA	SfC	Total	AfM	SmA	SfC	Total
Submitted	46	26	61	133	54	30	53	137	55	18	40	113
Eligible	43	21	57	121	44	30	53	127	49	14	36	99
Shortlisted for jury panel	21	14	26	61	15	15	17	47	16	12	16	44
Shortlisted for interview	9	-	-	-	10	-	-	-	10	-	-	-
Selected for START (SmA, SfC)/ BUILD (AfM)	5	7	7	19	5	10	8	23	5	10	9	24

Across the three open calls, areas for improvement were identified in the following areas:

- Evaluation criteria
- Diversity of evaluators, jury panellists and interviewers
- Evaluation mediums used
- Evaluator onboarding process
- Running of jury panels
- Timelines for the evaluation process
- Applicant feedback

2 Summary of evaluation and selection process

2.1 Open Call 1

Eligibility check

133 finalised applications were screened for eligibility between 28th of January and 1st of February. Following this check, 121 applications were deemed eligible and proceeded to the written evaluations stage.

Written evaluations

121 applications were reviewed by 25 evaluators from within the MediaFutures consortium, with a variety of art, business and technical experience. Evaluators came from the ODI (6), Zabala (4), KCL (4), IRCAM (3), NMA (3), LUH (2), EUT (2), and DEN (1). Each application was reviewed by at least 2 evaluators. These written evaluations took place between the 1st and the 8th of February. Following this stage, 61 applications were selected to proceed to the jury panels.

Jury panels

'Artist for Media' jury panel (17th February), with 4 internal panellists from EUT, KCL, ODI and IRCAM; 2 external panellists (however one of these was unwell and unable to attend); chaired by LUH with notes taken by the ODI. 21 applications were reviewed, and while it was anticipated that 10 applicants would proceed to Artist Interviews, only 9 were deemed of sufficient quality to proceed.

'Startup meets Artist' jury panel (18th February), 5 internal panellists from ODI, IRCAM (2), ZABALA and NMA; 2 external panellists; chaired by LUH with notes taken by the ODI. It was planned that of the 14 applicants discussed, 8 would proceed to the START phase, however only 7 were selected.

'Startup for Citizens' jury panel (19th February), with 4 internal panellists from ODI, NMA (2), and EUT; chaired by LUH with notes taken by the ODI. Of the 26 applicants discussed, 7 applicants were selected to proceed to the START phase, however 1 startup did have to refuse their offer due to the conditions of funding from another startup programme, so 1 applicant was promoted from the waitlist.

Artist Interviews

(22nd to 25th February), with 5 interviewers from IRCAM (2), DEN, KCL and ODI. From the 9 interviewed, 5 applicants were selected to join the BUILD phase.

External evaluators were publicised on the MediaFutures blog [here](#).

2.2 Open Call 2

Eligibility check

137 finalised applications were screened for eligibility between the 31st of January and the 2nd of February. Following this check, 127 applications were deemed eligible and proceeded to the written evaluations stage.

Written evaluations

127 applications were reviewed by 21 evaluators from within and outside of the MediaFutures consortium, with a variety of art, business and technical experience. Evaluators came from DEN (1), EUT (1), IRCAM (3), KCL (4), LUH (1), LUISS (2), NMA (5), ODI (1), and ZABALA (2). The external evaluator was from Central Academy of Fine Arts (CAFA) Beijing. Each application was reviewed by at least 3 evaluators. These written evaluations took place between the 3rd and the 10th of February. Following this stage, 47 applications were selected to proceed to the jury panels.

Jury panels

‘Artist for Media’ jury panel (16th February), with 1 internal panellist from IRCAM, and 2 external panellists who were independent artists and from the Mozilla Foundation. The ODI chaired and took notes, with LUH as observers. From the 15 discussed, 10 applicants proceeded to artist interviews.

‘Startup meets Artist’ jury panel (17th February), with 2 internal panellists from IRCAM and NMA, and 1 external panellist from the Mozilla Foundation, who also sat on the AfM panel. The ODI chaired and took notes, with LUH as observers. 10 applicants were selected for the START phase from the 15 discussed.

‘Startup for Citizens’ jury panel (18th February), with 3 internal panellists from NMA, KCL and ZABALA. The ODI chaired and took notes, with LUH as observers. 8 applicants were selected for the START phase from the 17 discussed.

Artist Interviews

(21st to 25th February) with 3 interviewers from the ODI, IRCAM and an independent external interviewer. However the external interviewer became unavailable at short notice, so their position was filled by an interview from EUT. From the 10 interviewed, 5 applicants were selected to join the BUILD phase.

External evaluators were publicised on the MediaFutures blog [here](#)

2.3 Open call 3

Eligibility check

113 finalised applications were screened for eligibility between 30th August and 2nd September. Following this check, 99 applications were deemed eligible and proceeded to the written evaluations stage.

Written evaluations

99 applications were reviewed by 15 evaluators within the consortium; ZABALA (2), EUT (2), LUH (1), IRCAM (3), ODI (3), KCL (1), and NMA (3); and 7 external evaluators from Bosch, LexisNexis, Central Academy of Fine Arts (CAFA) Beijing, OpenCorporates, and 3 independent. The written evaluations took place between 5th and 12th September. Each application was reviewed by at least 3 evaluators. Following this stage, 44 applications passed through to the jury panels.

Jury panels

‘Artist for Media’ jury panel (September 21st), with one internal panellist from IRCAM and two external panellists (Bosch and Independent). The ODI chaired and took notes, with LUH as observers. 10 artists were selected for interview from a shortlist of 16.

‘Startup meets Artist’ jury panel (September 22nd), with two internal panellists from IRCAM and NMA, and one external panellist from Bosch, who also sat on the AfM panel. The ODI chaired and took notes, with LUH as observers. 10 projects were selected for the START phase from the 12 discussed.

‘Startup for Citizens’ jury panel (September 23rd), with two internal panellists from KCL and NMA and one external panellist from Mesh Consulting. The ODI chaired and took notes, with LUH as observers. 9 projects were selected for the START phase from the 16 discussed.

Artist interviews

(September 27th to 30th), with 2 internal interviewers from EUT and IRCAM and 1 external interviewer from Surfing Light Beams. From the 10 interviewed, 5 artists were selected to join the BUILD phase.

External evaluators were publicised on the MediaFutures blog [here](#).

3 Learning and Changes from the First to the Third Open Calls

3.1 Learning implemented from the first and second open calls

- **Host evaluator briefings before applications are shared for each stage of the review process - up to 2 weeks before each stage, at a minimum.**
These meetings helped to clarify and agree the process at each stage, for example: who took which role during the panels, the balance of using scores vs. discussion to make decisions during the panels and interviews, and also helped highlighting any uncertainties around the scoring criteria. We also recorded these briefings for any evaluators to watch back at their own convenience if they needed a refresher or weren’t able to attend the briefing.
- **Use jury panels to discuss the ‘edge cases’.**
To make the best use of time for jury panels and avoid duplicating decisions, jury panels should focus on those that only just reached the benchmark to go forward to the second stage, or where there were significant areas of weakness/ concerns flagged by the first round of reviews. This included applications that were less polished, but had very promising ideas, who could have benefited from enhanced monitoring during the START phase, or that offered new approaches to support underrepresented groups.
- **Increase the number of evaluators per application to mitigate inconsistencies in how each evaluator scores.**
Given the volume of applications and time restrictions, it was impossible for each application to be reviewed by the same evaluator. By ensuring that each application was scored by at least three evaluators, with varying expertise, this helped to mitigate

inconsistencies between evaluators. This was also managed using a ‘promise vs polish’ indicator, so on reviewing evaluations, we could see if a particular evaluator had scored more severely than others, but still felt an application was worth considering.

- **Plan for diversity and inclusion from before the launch of the challenge.**

Strengthening the diversity, equity & inclusion guidelines ensured that all consortium partners understood what this meant in the MediaFutures context, and how to evaluate it. This included considering if we should track DEI metrics in the application, how we could increase the diversity of our evaluators, and where and how the open call was promoted. Planning for this before the open call was launched ensured that it was communicated clearly to applicants.

- **Capture evaluators’ scores using spreadsheets.**

While some evaluators liked the F6S platform used in OC1, and found it easier to enter scores than a spreadsheet, some didn’t like the interface, and it created an additional admin burden of sharing the applications and scores, as external evaluators were not permitted to access the platform. This difference in methods also created room for error in comparison and collation.

- **Improve cross-consortium communication.**

Sharing updates throughout the process so that everyone was aware, not just those involved in each review stage. From OC1, we needed to improve information management throughout the process - access to evaluators’ scores (referenced above), and sharing successful applicant feedback with all consortium partners managing relationships with applicants, were two examples of where this was improved.

- **Allow more time between each stage of the review process.**

For example: we needed at least 3 days for eligibility checks before sharing applications with reviewers. Rushing important evaluation processes created a higher risk of error, and knock-on delays where one small delay occurred.

- **Consider external reviewers.**

We invited external artistic reviewers for the AfM and SmA tracks following advice from IRCAM and due to less availability of this expertise within the consortium partners. The decision not to seek technical and business reviewers was largely due to a lack of budget to pay reviewers, and due to the breadth and depth of expertise available within the consortium.

We did however receive some enquiries to volunteer as external evaluators, so we incorporated an open call for evaluators at the start of the second and third open calls. We also needed to consider the additional resources required to onboard external reviewers, as if there wasn’t an available budget to pay, there was a risk this would block diversity and inclusion efforts.

In order to create a fund for external evaluators to support the project, each consortium partner contributed to a communal evaluator pot, using underspend resources from travel budgets which couldn’t be utilised in the first year of the project due to the pandemic.

- **Include more detail in applicants’ feedback.**

Some successful and unsuccessful applicants requested more information based on the evaluators’ feedback. Additional time was factored in for this in the second and third open calls.

3.2 Evolution of evaluation stages

3.2.1 Process, guidelines and selection of evaluators

Process

The evaluation process was determined based on what had worked in previous projects (including VERTIGO STARTS RESIDENCIES program) that members of the consortium have been involved with, and reported to be efficient. The goals of this process were to give all applicants a fair and equal opportunity of progressing; to incorporate sufficient experience and expertise into the evaluation process; to ensure we identified the best applications to progress; and to condense the evaluation process into a one month period, without overwhelming evaluators and jury panel members. The process was altered to accommodate lessons learned from the open call and evaluation process in year one, which were summarised above, including feedback given at the European Commission reviews.

Guidelines

The evaluation guidelines were extensively reviewed as part of preparations for the launch of each open call.

Information in these guidelines reflected the updated challenge text each call, and was reflected in the application guidelines and application templates for SfC, SmA, and AfM. The evaluation criteria following the first open call, was split into three documents, to ensure evaluators only referred to criteria relevant to tracks they were reviewing, and could be used to brief evaluators.

Evaluator selection criteria

In year one of MediaFutures, we had agreed that individuals from the consortium partner organisations would make up the majority of evaluators, with external evaluators invited where gaps in expertise were identified. This was due to the variety and expertise of the organisations involved in the consortium, and the efficiency of using internal members in a busy and condensed time frame.

Reflecting on year one, we recognised that in addition to expertise, evaluators needed to reflect the diverse experiences and representations of the applicants we hoped to attract, in order to provide an inclusive and equitable experience for applicants. It should include people from ethnic minorities, the LGBTQ+ community, those with disabilities; or lower-middle income countries. This required us to incorporate more external evaluators and introduce some quotas (where feasible and appropriate) into our selection process for evaluators. It also required the consortium to put together a small fund to support external evaluators with great experience, who could not afford to participate in our evaluation process for free. The consortium needed to agree on a rate to offer external evaluators, which considered the level of effort required.

In year one we had [133 eligible applications \(AfM: 46, SfC: 61 and SmA: 26\)](#). Each application was reviewed by **at least 2 evaluators** over a **1 week period** for shortlisting, and the risk of conflicts of interest also needed to be taken into consideration. In addition, as NMA and IRCAM would be working directly with successful applicants throughout the BUILD phase, at least one representative from their organisations evaluated the startup and artists applications respectively.

For each track, it was agreed that the following expertise was needed from the evaluators:

- AfM
 - 1 x artistic expertise
 - 1 x technical expertise
- SfC
 - 2 x business expertise
 - 1 x technical expertise
- SmA
 - 1 x artistic expertise
 - 2 x business expertise
 - 1 x technical expertise

For years two and three, we kept this format of expertise per track, but with the addition of, 1) a second artistic expertise for AfM due to the subjective nature of artwork, so having a second evaluator on each application would help to balance this subjectiveness, and 2) removing one of the business expertise members from SMA so it was balanced between artistic and business. This then looked like:

- AfM
 - 2 x artistic expertise
 - 1 x technical expertise
- SfC
 - 2 x business expertise
 - 1 x technical expertise
- SmA
 - 1 x artistic expertise
 - 1 x business expertise
 - 1 x technical expertise

This meant as a minimum we needed 2 evaluators with artistic expertise, 2 with business expertise, and 1 with technical expertise. Keeping the evaluator group small ensured consistency in marking, however it did not account for the risk of conflicts of interest, risk of an evaluator falling ill during the review week, and the volume of applications that need to be reviewed within one week, so these priorities needed to be balanced.

In setting expectations for evaluators, we suggested they should allow 1-2 days for evaluations, and we estimated it took 20-30 minutes to review one application, which allowed us to assign up to 28 applications per evaluator (allowing for a 7 hour working day).

Of these groups of evaluators, to ensure we meet our aspirations for diversity, equity and inclusion, we suggested that at least 50% of evaluators per discipline expertise identify as female or non-binary, and that at least 25% per discipline expertise were non-white. **While we recognised these two metrics do not account for all under-represented groups we were seeking to reach, they are two of the most visible aspects, and we felt these metrics were realistic and achievable.**

We also decided that as the ODI would be chairing and supporting the jury panels and artist interviews, those colleagues dedicated to these tasks were excluded from being evaluators as a matter of fairness.

3.2.2 Briefing of evaluators, and code of conduct

For both internal and external evaluators (including jury panellists and artist interviewers) we sent a code of conduct for them to sign. This was to ensure confidentiality was maintained surrounding the applications, and any conflicts of interest in evaluating were flagged and resolved as soon as possible.

For all evaluators, jury panellists, and artist interviewers, we created evaluation guidelines, and after the first open call, we split by each application track to ensure there was no confusion regarding the evaluation criteria which differed between AfM, SfC and SmA. These aligned with the application guidelines.

During the first open call, the vast majority of evaluators were internal to the consortium, but as we expanded this group externally for the second and third calls, we recognised the need to make the onboarding process more robust, and provided online onboarding for each stage of the evaluation process. This was also recorded for any evaluators who couldn't attend the sessions, or who may need to be brought in at late notice if another evaluator fell sick for example.

3.2.3 Conflicts of interest, and eligibility check

Conflict of Interest:

We asked evaluators to flag potential conflicts of interest, where there was a direct, personal connection with the artist or company being interviewed, or if an evaluator felt they were unable to have an unbiased view of an applicant for any other reason. Any known conflicts were to be flagged as soon as the applications were assigned, and shortlist and interview schedules were shared.

Eligibility criteria:

For startups and SMEs, only applicants legally established, and working (in the case of groups of individuals), in any of the following countries were eligible:

- The Member States (MS) of the European Union (EU), including their outermost regions;
- The Overseas Countries and Territories (OCT) linked to the Member States;
- H2020 Associated countries: according to the [updated list](#) published by the EC;
- UK applicants were eligible under the Withdrawal Agreement, as the UK will continue to participate in programmes funded under the current 2014-2020 Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) until their closure

Individual artists or collectives of individual artists from any country in the world were eligible to apply, provided that they were able to travel to Europe for the MediaFutures programme and that the Covid-19 situation allowed it. Arts companies had to adhere to the same eligibility criteria as startups and SMEs, except for nationality.

3.2.4 Application reviews and shortlisting

In the first open call, evaluators reviewed applications directly within the F6S platform, however external evaluators could not access this and the ODI had to download applications to share with them separately, and then upload their scoring. For the second open call, the ODI downloaded all of the applications from F6S and organised these into evaluation packs for each evaluator, to create a consistent process. Each evaluator had no more than 28 applications to review, and these were organised according to the expertise the evaluator brings to the process. Once basic eligibility checks had been completed, the ODI shared these evaluation packs, which included the applications, relevant evaluation guidelines, and an evaluation spreadsheet for scores and comments to be added to. For the third open call, we moved away from F6S entirely and repeated the process from OC2, downloading the applications from Survey Monkey. The new system provided a much simpler and clearer download, reducing the administrative time required to prepare the downloads for the evaluation packs.

Once the evaluators had reviewed and scored all applications, the ODI compiled these into one spreadsheet per track, created the shortlist of applications to proceed based on average scores and ‘promise vs polish’, and shared these with relevant jury panel members to review, ahead of the jury panels. These spreadsheets clearly showed which applications were the strongest (and required little to no further discussion to progress to START); which ones were borderline; and which ones were less polished, but showed promise if they had more hands on support during START phase, and needed discussion to agree if they should progress to START. This longlist informed the agendas for the jury panels, which the ODI produced.

During all evaluation stages we asked evaluators, jury panellists and artist interviewers to give their overall impression and the things that should be corrected if the project was chosen for funding. They were asked to recommend things they can implement to improve the project.

3.2.5 Jury panels

The MediaFutures jury panels brought together expert evaluators to review the highest scoring applications and decide which would progress to the next stage of each programme track. They provided an opportunity to ensure that each application was reviewed thoroughly, and the strengths and weaknesses of each (longlisted) application were discussed. The ODI organised a jury panel briefing session ahead of the jury panels, to ensure all members understand the process and objectives ahead of the day.

Once the applications had been reviewed and a longlist created, jury panels for each track met (virtually) to discuss them. Each panel had a minimum of three evaluators who had all of the expertise required for that track. They were given time to review the scores and comments for each application before the meeting. Jury panels were chaired by LUH during the first open call, and the ODI for the second and third open calls, who also managed time keeping and note taking. Jury panellists were also encouraged to make additional notes.

The chair briefly summarised the applications which did not need discussion, and invited the panel to flag any concerns. This was to simplify the process and improve efficiency, while ensuring there was still oversight on final decisions. If there were any concerns, the panel discussed this application further.

Either the chair, or a representative from IRCAM or NMA then summarised the applications to be discussed, with 5-10 minutes for the panel to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of each one.

The chair then invited the panel to vote whether each application should be accepted, pending, or rejected. Voting was done via Doodle Poll in the first open call, and then by Zoom Polls in the second and third calls. This was to ensure each panellist could vote independently and privately, and weren't just voting in agreement with their colleagues. The chair then reviewed these votes, and if there were too many accepted, the applications closest to the cut off amount were discussed further, to reach a final decision.

3.2.6 Artist interviews (AfM only)

The interviews were scheduled for one week after the jury panel for AfM. The interview stage was to select 5 applicants to join the BUILD stage of the programme.

The interviews were chaired by the ODI, with a minimum of three interviewers covering the artistic and technical expertise required for this track.

The ODI compiled tailored questions for each applicant based on the first two rounds of review, alongside a set of standard questions that remained the same for each applicant.

Each interviewer recorded their own scores on a spreadsheet provided for them by the ODI, and at the end of the interviews, they discussed as a group which 5 should progress to the BUILD stage. Scores were used as a guideline to make the final decisions.

3.2.7 Evaluation summaries, and notification of applicants

Both selected and non-selected applicants received an evaluation summary which included the combined scores for each criteria, and a short explanation from these scores, based on reviewers' comments on the applications and during the jury panel (if they had reached this stage). The ODI put these explanations together, but discovered following the first open call that not all evaluators had provided detailed enough commentaries, or in some cases, only negative comments which weren't constructive. For the second and third open calls, we provided evaluators with example commentaries during the onboarding process to ensure we had sufficient, and good enough feedback to compile for the applicants to benefit from. ZABALA sent these scores and feedback once the shortlist had been selected after the jury panels and interviews, and the ODI supported in response to any questions around the evaluation summaries.

Non eligible applicants were informed by ZABALA following the eligibility checks that they did not meet the eligibility criteria, and were therefore not evaluated.

4 Evaluator Feedback

Following the first open call, we gathered anecdotal feedback from evaluators to learn from for the next open calls. Following the second and third open calls, we formalised this process into a survey, in order to quantify improvements we were able to make.

4.1 Process changes between open calls

OC1 → OC2

- Transferring applications from F6S to spreadsheets for scoring seemed to go down well with evaluators
- The scoresheet still wasn't perfect, with some aspects unclear (e.g. exact wording, meaning of certain fields and criteria, nature of desired comments, lack of features like links to proposal docs)

OC2 → OC3

- The improved and clarified instructions and criteria seemed to go down well with evaluators, there were fewer issues and questions in OC3 than OC2

4.2 Overall process

Comments

- OC1:
 - Better communication desired for all information, to be sent to everyone in the consortium, not just those involved in a particular evaluation stage
 - Evaluators wanted more time between each stage of the process
 - The distinction between evaluator requirements at each evaluation stage was not entirely clear
 - Diversity, Equity and Inclusion (DEI) requirements were not entirely clear
 - The conflict of interest process was not entirely clear
 - Criteria were not exactly the same in the written guidelines and F6S
 - We should have at least 1 female evaluator per application
- OC2:
 - One suggestion was that having written evaluations and jury panels is too much, and we should just have jury panels and discuss all proposals collectively. This was not deemed feasible given the volume of applications that would need to be discussed.
- OC3:
 - No additional feedback

4.3 Written evaluations

Overall process

- OC2: 80% clear, 20% unclear
- OC3: 100% clear

Instructions

- OC2: 100% clear
- OC3: 100% clear

Criteria

- OC2: 90% clear, 10% unclear
- OC3: 100% clear

Scoring spreadsheet

- OC2: 90% clear, 10% unclear
- OC3: 100% clear

Duration of written evaluation period

- OC2 (5 days): 40% just right, 60% too short
- OC3 (7 days): 66.6% just right, 33.3% too short

Number of proposals per evaluator

- OC2 (min 7, max 22): 60% just right, 40% too many
- OC3 (min 3, max 16): 89% just right, 11% too many

Time spent on evaluation per proposal

- OC2: 30-60 mins average, 10mins min, 2-3hrs max
- OC3: 30-60 mins average, some 1hr+

Comments

General

- OC2:
 - We needed to improve communications for some people who weren't aware they had this task to do until the last minute (internal consortium evaluators)
- OC3:
 - It would be good to have everything in an enclosed platform, combining proposals, materials and the scoring mechanism - this was not something we could achieve.
 - It would be good to have examples of what good proposals look like. Evaluators weren't always sure whether they were being too lenient or too harsh.

Instructions

- OC2:
 - Would like single track specific guidance docs (one each for AfM, SfC, SmA)
 - Would like more guidance about desired feedback comments
 - Should highlight that certain aspects are mandatory e.g. comments
- OC3:
 - No additional feedback

Criteria

- OC2:
 - Would like better explanation of diversity expectations, which is heavily influenced by local cultural norms
 - Would like more consideration of score weighting across criteria and sub-criteria
 - Suggestion to reduce or remove sub-criteria (there were opposing views on this)
 - Divide bigger questions into smaller questions
 - More binary questions
 - Maybe consider open code and open data
 - Maybe consider citizen involvement
- OC3:

- Would like a better explanation of diversity expectations. A team may be balanced in gender but not otherwise. A team may not be balanced at all but focussed on a diversity challenge for the content of their project.
- Would like more consideration of score weighting across criteria and sub-criteria
- Suggestion to reduce or remove sub-criteria (there were opposing views on this)

Score sheet

- OC1:
 - Some evaluators liked using F6S but many didn't, plus there were some F6S access issues, so it was ultimately decided to change to spreadsheets for OC2
- OC2:
 - Include links to internal tabs and external documents within the scoresheet
 - Include all project details rather than having the evaluator copy-paste between locations
- OC3:
 - Would like more granular scoring levels to allow for ½ marks

4.4 Jury panels

Instructions

- OC2: 100% clear
- OC3: 100% clear

Duration of sessions

- OC2: 80% just right, 20% too short
- OC3: 75% just right, 25% too short

Number of breaks

- OC2: 100% just right
- OC3: 75% just right, 25% too short/few

Input from chair

- OC2: 100% just right
- OC3: 75% just right, 25% too little

Method

- OC2: 80% just right, 20% would prefer a more quantitative approach
- OC3: 75% just right, 25% would prefer a more quantitative approach

Comments

- OC1:
 - Unclear process
 - Should ensure that when an evaluator works on both written applications and jury panels that they are assigned to the same application track in both cases, to minimise the number of proposals they have to consider overall
 - Would have liked more preparation time, including a briefing meeting to support the written instructions

- Would have liked more discussion time, in particular to consider all applications rather than just the outliers
- Would have liked a more structured approach
- Would have liked access to the written evaluations
- Would have liked a clear voting process
- OC2:
 - Efficient and focussed process
 - Would have been nice to have an informal pre-session icebreaker meeting
- OC3:
 - It was an efficient and focussed process which converged to the desired outcome in the allocated time
 - Maybe split over a couple of days rather than do in a single afternoon (one afternoon per track)
 - Would have liked more time for discussion

4.5 Artist interviews

Instructions

- OC2: 100% clear
- OC3: 100% clear

Duration of sessions

- OC2: 33.3% just right, 66.6% too short
- OC3: 100% just right

Input from chair

- OC2: 100% just right
- OC3: 100% just right

Comments

- OC2:
 - Maybe a bit more time at the end of each session for further clarification with the artist if needed
 - Maybe a bit more time between sessions
- OC3:
 - Maybe a bit more time for final deliberation
 - The sessions were well balanced and allowed for input from all interviewers

5 More Information about this Document

Project acronym	MediaFutures
Project full title	MediaFutures, Data-driven innovation hub for the media value chain
Grant agreement no.	951962
Deliverable number	D1.2
Deliverable title	Summary of evaluations
Deliverable nature	Report
Dissemination level	Public
Work package and task	WP1, T1.6
Contractual delivery date	28.02.2023 [M30]
Actual delivery date	03.05 .2023
Authors	Tara Lee, ODI Darren Temple, ODI
Reviewers	Thomas Zimmer, Zabala Michael Fribus, LUH

