

CILECT

General Assembly 1995

Minutes

Oaxaca, Mexico

11 and 14 October 1995

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
2. GENERAL	1
3. VOTING PROCEDURE	1
4. APPROVAL OF DOCUMENTS	2
4.1. MINUTES OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1992, MUNICH	2
4.2. REPORTS OF THE EXECUTIVE	2
4.3. REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEES	2
4.4. ACCOUNTS 1991 TO 1994	2
5. REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS	2
5.1. RESOLUTION 1: CILECT PROJECT CHAIRS AND REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS	4
5.2. RESOLUTION 2: ALLOCATION OF FUNDS FOR PROJECTS	4
6. PROJECTS	5
6.1. PROJECTS 1992-1995	5
6.2. RESOLUTION 3: COMMITTEE STRUCTURE APPLIED TO THE WORK OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL	5
6.3. PROJECTS 1995-1997	6
7. FINANCES	7
7.1. FEES	7
7.2. FINANCING CONGRESSES	7
7.3. BUDGET 1996 AND 1997	7
7.4. PROPOSAL TO EXAMINE THE FEASIBILITY OF A DIFFERENTIAL FEE	9
8. CONTACT GROUPS	9
8.1. RESOLUTION 4: CONTACT GROUPS	9
9. MEMBERSHIP	10
9.1. UPGRADES	10
9.2. DELETION	10

9.3. WITHDRAWALS	10
9.4. ADMISSIONS	10
9.5. HONORARY MEMBER	11

10. ELECTIONS **11**

10.1. ELECTION OF THE EXECUTIVE	11
10.2. RESOLUTION 5: PROJECTS	12
10.3. ELECTION OF THE COMMITTEE CHAIR ANIMATION	12
10.4. ELECTION OF THE COMMITTEE CHAIR TECHNOLOGY	13

11. EXTENSION OF TERM **13**

APPENDIX

- Financial Report
- Projects
- Attendees — Apologies for absence
- Voting Members
- Letter from past VP Finance, Jack Gajos

1. Introduction

In order to ensure more efficient work a new format was introduced for the General Assembly 1995.

Reports of the Executive were circulated to the membership before the meeting, which made the traditional oral presentation of the reports during the General Assembly unnecessary. The three half-day sessions of the General Assembly were therefore devoted to discussing and voting on issues rather than listening to their presentation.¹

The new format also met with the wishes of the membership to reduce the time spent on General Assembly matters.

The present Minutes are a record of the significant points in the discussion and the decisions reached.

The list of the attendees and the voting members is appended.

2. General

The General Assembly was opened by Wolfgang Längsfeld, acting President.

Wolfgang Längsfeld expressed the thanks of the Executive and the membership to the founding fathers of the association on the occasion of fortieth anniversary of CILECT².

Wolfgang Längsfeld and Henry Breitrose paid tribute to the memory of Jerzy Toeplitz, Honorary member, and Jean-Jacques Languépin, FEMIS.

3. Voting Procedure

Following the decision taken at the previous General Assembly, Munich 1990, the first item on the agenda were two proposals for possible changes in the voting procedure: moving from the current procedure of "one country, one vote" either to "one school, one vote" or to a "mixed system" (one country one vote for long-term, political decisions and one school one vote for short-term, pedagogical decisions).

The required majority for changes to the statutes is two-thirds of the votes (Statutes, Chapter VII, Art. 28). There were 32 voting members. Two-thirds majority was 21. Voting was as follows:

- One school, one vote 9
- Mixed system 3
- Abstentions 19
- Blank votes..... 1

Neither of the proposals for changes to the voting procedure had two-thirds majority of the votes.

¹ Other reports presented at the General Assembly are available upon request.

² CILECT was founded in Cannes in 1955.

The current voting system "one country, one vote" remained unchanged

4. Approval of Documents

4.1. Minutes of the General Assembly 1992, Munich

Nenad Puhovski requested that the last line of Appendix 11 of the Minutes of the General Assembly 1992, "Voting Right", should be corrected as follows:

"*Croatia* (instead of *Yugoslavia*): Nenad Puhovski." The correction was adopted.

The Minutes were approved.

4.2. Reports of the Executive

The reports of the Executive were approved:

- Report of the President 1992-1994
- Report of the Acting President
- Report of the Vice-President TDC
- Report of the Vice-President Programme Development
- Report of the Vice-President Publications and Research
- Report of the Project Chair Production Curricula
- Report of the Project Chair Short Film

4.3. Reports of the Committees

Reports of the Committee for Animation (Caterina d'Amico, Dick Ross) and the Committee for Technology (Nenad Puhovski) were approved.

Ken Dancyger (NYU, New York) thanked Nenad Puhovski for his report.

4.4. Accounts 1991 to 1994

The statements and balances for the bienniums 1991-1992 and 1993-1994, including TDC Accounts presented separately, were approved.³

5. Regional Associations

In 1990, in Blois, the General Assembly approved a major restructuring of CILECT. The main idea behind the changes was to create a structure that would be more conducive to members participating directly in the activities of the association. For that purpose three key changes were made:

- Regional associations were created to "further the objects and aims of the association within the specific conditions of that region"⁴.

³ Appendix: Financial Report

- Four areas of programme activities which would benefit most the association were to be selected every two years by the General Assembly. These activities would receive special support in the form a Project Committee. One Project Chair would be elected for each project and the four chairs would be members of the Executive Council.
- Specific responsibility for a field of activity was allocated to each one of the Vice-Presidents in the Executive Council.

Two General Assemblies and five years after Blois, some members expressed their concern about the relationship between the Executive Council, the regional associations and the Projects.

These members considered giving the regional associations direct representation on the Executive and questioned the presence of the Project chairs on the Executive.

GEECT circulated a proposal for changes in the statutes that would reflect this alternative Executive structure and provide funding for the regional associations.

GEECT Proposal

“We propose that the Statutes and Rules of CILECT be changed in a way to give the Regional Associations the responsibility to carry out the Projects that are now undertaken by the Project Chairs.

At the same time we propose that at least 20% of the CILECT membership fees be allocated to a CILECT Fund for the Regional Associations in order to enable the Regional Associations to carry out an active policy for the benefit of their members. The co-ordinators of the Regional Associations, in agreement with the CILECT Executive, will redistribute the means of this Fund, bearing in mind the scope and quality of the various Projects proposed by the General Assembly, and the possibilities of further funding in the respective Regions.

By doing so, the Project Chairs associated to the CILECT Executive will at the same time represent a Project and a Regional Associations.”

There was a long discussion on the GEECT proposal during which distinctly opposite opinions were expressed.

Jennifer Sabine strongly supported the GEECT proposal and requested that 60% of the fees be returned to the regions.

Reinhard Hauff and Nenad Puhovski expressed their concern about a possible shift inside CILECT towards a region-oriented organisation

Gustavo Montiel added that the regional division of the world by CILECT was arbitrary, suggested that some regions should be developed through TDC and that projects between regions be encouraged.

Martin Loh expressed the concern that if funds were allocated to regions on the basis of the number of schools they represented this would create an undesirable unbalance between the different regions, strengthening the more powerful regions and leaving the others with no resources to initiate projects. This view was supported by Wolfgang Längsfeld.

Rolf Orthel pointed out that the GEECT proposal took special care of this concern by not making the allocation of funds dependent on the number of member schools in the respective regions. He also added that financing the regions should not be detrimental to the association as a whole.

⁴ Rules, Art. 32, 3)

It became clear in the course of the discussion that some form of link between projects and regions both in terms of activities and financing was desirable.

Acknowledging this situation and the concern voiced by GEECT the Executive put forward two resolutions to allow the implementation of suggested changes. Resolution 1 provides a link between the projects and the regions and Resolution 2 takes care of the funding of projects.

5.1. Resolution 1:

CILECT Project Chairs and Regional Associations

Acknowledging that members of the Executive Board of GEECT have communicated their concerns about the relationship between projects and regional organisations, the Executive Council of CILECT proposes that the General Assembly adopts the following resolution:

The sole purpose of this resolution is to enhance the relevance, member participation and the effective realisation of projects.

We believe that projects be of the broadest relevance and interest to CILECT members, based on the principle of the greatest good for the greatest number.

The General Assembly recognises the importance of the contributions of CILECT's regional associations to the work of the project chairs and the successful accomplishment of projects.

The General Assembly endorses the goal of the election of project chairs from all of CILECT's regions, whenever possible.

The General Assembly recommends that CILECT's regional associations take responsibility for supporting projects based in their regions.

The General Assembly recommends that project proposals be discussed and developed in consultation with relevant regional associations before being presented to CILECT, though it will remain the right of individual members to present their proposals directly to the Executive Council and the General Assembly.

The General Assembly recommends that members elected Project Chairs be included in the steering body of the regional association to which they belong, in order to maximise collaboration and communication.

The General Assembly recommends that unanticipated Project Chair vacancies be filled in consultation with the regional association.

5.2. Resolution 2: Allocation of Funds for Projects

Acknowledging that members of the Executive Board of GEECT have expressed concern about the method for distribution of financial support for projects, the General Assembly adopts the following resolution:

The General Assembly instructs the Executive to establish a Central Project Fund for the support of Project Chairs and Committees.

Under normal financial circumstances, the project fund should be supported by no less than 20% of CILECT's biennial budget.

Distribution of finance from the project fund will be the responsibility of the Executive Council, in consultation with regional associations that actively support the projects, taking needs and scope of the various projects into consideration.

After Resolution 1 and Resolution 2 were circulated, GEECT withdrew their proposal.

Resolution 1 and Resolution 2 were then put to the vote.

<i>Resolution 1 :</i>	Votes	<i>Resolution 2 :</i>	Votes
Yes	24	Yes	27
No	1	No	0
Abstentions	5	Abstentions	6
Blank votes	5	Blank votes	2

Resolution 1 and Resolution 2 were adopted.

6. Projects

6.1. Projects 1992-1995

Two Projects out of four met with problems during the past biennium.

- Larry Engel could not develop his project "Masterclass" and resigned from the Executive.
- Arnon Zuckerman's "Debut" came to a halt when it became clear that outside funding for the project was not available.

In view of this the Executive presented a resolution aiming at strengthening the projects and also giving the future Executives the benefit of a committee structure.

6.2. Resolution 3:

Committee Structure Applied to the Work of the Executive Council

Background

When CILECT's Statutes and Rules were radically revised in Blois in 1990, the overall philosophy was to encourage and make it possible for any CILECT member to participate actively in the work of CILECT.

The vehicle for member participation was and is the committee structure.

According to the Statutes, projects are carried out by Project Chairs supported by Project Committees, while the President and Vice-Presidents may appoint ad hoc committees to assist them in their work.

The experience gathered since Blois is that only few project committees were set up; in the case of the President only one committee was established (the committee on voting system), while none of the Vice-Presidents set up committees. (TDC has had a Board that functions as a committee since its establishment in Sydney in 1982).

The Executive Council believes that its work would benefit from contributions from a wider range of CILECT's membership and therefore proposes that the General Assembly instructs the new Executive Council to take responsibility

for setting up committees for all projects and for the permanent Vice-Presidential areas of responsibility: Finance, Program Development, and Publication & Research.

The Executive Council is also instructed to take responsibility for effective and efficient realisation of projects and work carried out by other permanent or ad hoc committees.

The Executive Council shall take responsibility for modifying projects adopted by the General Assembly when and if needed.

Project progress shall be monitored and reviewed regularly on the basis of the Chairs' progress reports. The Executive Council shall assume the responsibility of replacing or terminating projects that have collapsed or proven to have made insufficient progress within an agreed time schedule, normally not to exceed one year upon approval of the project by the General Assembly.

Nenad Puhovski commented that the problem lay more in the project chair than in the need for a committee structure. However, he added, he supported the resolution.

The resolution was adopted (32 votes in favour, 1 against, two blank votes).

6.3. Projects 1995-1997

From the project proposals received four were considered to be suitable for development over the next biennium and were put to the vote.⁵

- Success through the Cultural Path — Myron Emery, Calarts, Valencia, USA
- Traditional and New Languages of the Moving Image — Maria Dora Mourão, USP, São Paulo
- Triangle — Caterina d'Amico, CSC, Rome and Rolf Orthel, NFTVA / GEECT
- Curriculum and New Technologies — Marina Stavenhagen, CCC, Mexico

Above four project proposals are in the Appendix.

The other proposals were either withdrawn or referred to the Vice-President Publications and Research.

Media Development in East Africa — Eston Munyi, KIMC, Nairobi: withdrawn

Video of Vorkapic Lectures — Marko Babac, FDU, Belgrade: referred to the Vice-President Publications and Research.

Teaching Screenwriting — Ken Dancyger, NYU, New York: referred to the Vice-President Publications and Research.

Manual for Cinematographers — György Kárpáti, SFF, Budapest: referred to the Vice-President Publications and Research.

There were other projects proposed, but were submitted too late for consideration.

⁵ see Election of the Executive, page 11.

7. Finances

7.1. Fees

With fees still constituting the major — if not only — source of CILECT income the association is vitally dependent on the punctual settlement of the fees by the members. Wolfgang Längsfeld noted that a considerable part of the members (including members who were present in Oaxaca) had not paid their fees for 1995 and reminded them that fees have to be paid in the first three months of the year for which they are due.

7.2. Financing Congresses

The acting President commented that the 1995 Congress and General Assembly was the largest expenditure in the biennium. While CILECT Congresses and General Assemblies were traditionally hosted by a member school covering all expenses for meeting rooms, accommodation, meals, visits, etc. this Congress had to be financed out of CILECT's own budget. The new financial model gave CILECT a greater freedom in the choice of the place and time for its Congresses, and should for this reason be preferred.

However, it will be not be possible to repeat the new model unless sponsors are identified to finance CILECT Congresses. This will be one of the tasks of the new Executive.

7.3. Budget 1996 and 1997

The budget for the biennium 1996-1997 (see page 8) was proposed by Henning Camre on behalf of the Executive.

The budget was approved (32 votes in favour, one abstention, two blank votes).

The General Assembly also agreed that funds available out of the 1995 budget should be allocated in conformity with the 1996 and 1997 budget, to the extent possible (35 votes in favour).

BUDGET 1996 and 1997

The budget is based on current membership fees. It includes projections showing the variation of possible distribution of income pending on the percentage of fees collected. The 120% column shows the possible distribution if fees were increased by 20%.

The expenditure budget is divided in two main blocks: fixed overhead costs and variable costs. The projections show that the money available for variable costs (including all projects) dramatically decreases as fees are not collected. Were the fees to be increased the fixed overhead costs would remain the same while the amount of money available for variable costs would increase considerably.

The distribution of variable costs is based on fixed percentages.

INCOME (percentage of fees collected)	<i>100%</i>	<i>120%</i>	<i>90%</i>	<i>80%</i>	<i>70%</i>	<i>60%</i>	
Membership Fees (two years)	360,000	432,000	324,000	288,000	252,000	216,000	
EXPENDITURE	360,000	432,000	324,000	288,000	252,000	216,000	
Fixed Overhead Costs	151,000 42%	151,000 35%	151,000 47%	151,000 53%	151,000 60%	151,000 70%	
CILECT Secretariat	99,000	99,000	99,000	99,000	99,000	99,000	
Accounting/Auditing	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
Depreciation/Equipment	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	
Communications (telephone, fax, e-mail, postage)	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	
Consumables and small office items	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	17,000	
Secretariat	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	
Gratuities	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	
Meeting activity							
Costs associated with meetings of the Executive (Accommodation costs not covered by hosts or members of the Executive; travels of Exec.Sec.)	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000	
Authorised travel representing the association	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	
Other General Costs (may vary)							
Bank charges/loss on fluctuating exchange rates	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	
Variable Costs	209,000 58%	281,000 65%	173,000 53%	137,000 47%	101,000 40%	65,000 30%	
Newsletter (8 down to 3 issues over two years)	16,000	16,000	13,000	9,000	7,000	5,000	
CILECT Projects and Activities	30%	107,000	147,000	89,000	72,000	53,000	34,000
Project Chairs							
Standing Committees							
Publications & Research							
Additional activity carried out by regional associations							
TDC	14%	50,000	69,000	41,000	33,000	24,000	15,000
Contingency Fund							
Provision for bad debt		nil	nil	nil	nil	nil	nil
Contingency	5%	18,000	25,000	15,000	11,000	8,000	5,000
Reserve	5%	18,000	24,000	15,000	12,000	9,000	6,000

7.4. Proposal to examine the feasibility of a differential fee

Rolf Orthel commented that paying the fee was a strong burden for some schools and suggested that a differential fee be introduced which would be calculated on the country's GNP.

Some members pointed out that the financial situation of a school was not necessarily related to the GNP of the country; the problem was rather that some schools cannot afford to be a member of CILECT irrespectively of the country they are in and the GNP of their country.

Brendan Ward warned against the establishment of a two-tier level of membership fee, which would introduce a type of second-class membership status.

Rolf Orthel's proposal to examine how a differential fee can be introduced was put to the vote. The proposal was adopted (22 votes in favour, 2 against, 6 abstentions, 1 blank vote).

8. Contact Groups

The Executive put forward following resolution:

8.1. Resolution 4: Contact Groups

Acknowledging the fact that CILECT has little penetration in many of its member institutions beyond the directors and a few senior staff members, the Executive Council puts forward the following resolution, the purpose of which is to broaden the base for CILECT's activities and initiatives in all member schools and thus help enhance the overall quality of CILECT's work.

We propose the creation of Contact Groups as a means of preparing a new generation to take responsibility for CILECT in the years to come.

The General Assembly recommends and urges all CILECT institutions to appoint CILECT CONTACT GROUPS of at least 3 members chosen from among their active teaching and curriculum staff.

The Contact Groups shall help disseminate and discuss relevant information about CILECT activities and make contributions to current and future work of CILECT.

The Contact Groups shall provide an effective and broad basis for communication and exchange with other CILECT schools, within their various individual areas of interest and expertise.

The Contact Groups should be given modern means of communication to carry out their role at a distance.

The development of Contact Groups shall be assisted by the Vice-President for Program Development.

Several members pointed out that the proposed text was actually a recommendation from the Executive to the member schools rather than a resolution. After some discussion on the semantic differences two votes on above text were taken.

As a recommendation, the text was adopted (29 votes in favour, two abstentions, four blank votes).

As a resolution, it was not adopted (13 votes in favour, 16 abstentions, 6 blank votes).

9. Membership

9.1. Upgrades

The General Assembly upgraded four institutions to full membership.

- * The *Universidad de Cine*, Buenos Aires — previously Candidate Member
- * The *Centro de Imagen y Nuevas Tecnologías*, Vitoria, Spain — previously Associate Member.
- * The *Escuela de Artes Visuales*, Madrid — previously Candidate Member.
- * The *National Association for Higher Education in Film and Video*, London — previously Associate Member.

9.2. Deletion

The *Sri Lanka Television Training Institute* was deleted from membership for non payment of the fees since 1989.

9.3. Withdrawals

The General Assembly noted the withdrawals of the *British Film Institute*, London, and the *Development and Educational Communication Unit*, Ahmedabad.

9.4. Admissions

The General Assembly unanimously admitted following new members:

* Belgium	RITS, Brussels	Full
* Bulgaria	The New Bulgarian University, Sofia	Associate
* Canada	INIS, Montréal	Candidate
* Canada	National Screen Institute, Edmonton	Associate
* China	Beijing Broadcasting Institute	Full
* Germany	Academy for Media Arts, Cologne	Full
* Germany	Aufbaustudium, Hamburg	Associate
* Germany	Film Academy Baden Württemberg, Ludwigsburg	Full
* Ireland	National Association for Audiovisual Training, Dublin	Full
* Israel	Camera Obscura, Tel Aviv	Associate
* Japan	Academy of Visual Arts, Kanagawa	Full
* Lebanon	IESAV, Beyrouth	Associate
* Netherlands	Maurits Binger Film Instituut, Amsterdam	Candidate
* Singapore	Ngee Ann Polytechnic	Candidate
* South Africa	Newtown Film and Television School, Johannesburg	Associate

* Spain	Media Business School, Madrid	Associate
* Switzerland	Focal, Lausanne	Associate
* Switzerland	Höhere Schule für Gestaltung, Zürich	Candidate
* Switzerland	International Academy of Broadcasting, Montreux	Associate

9.5. Honorary member

Henning Camre and Dick Ross proposed Colin Young, who served as President of CILECT from 1980 to 1994, as honorary member.

Colin Young was elected unanimously.

10. Elections

10.1. Election of the Executive

Three posts in the Executive were up for election:

- the President.
Two candidates: Wolfgang Längsfeld and Gustavo Montiel.
- the Vice-President Finance.
One candidate: Don Zirpola.
- the Vice-President Publications and Research.
One candidate: Henry Breitrose.

There were 35 voting members. Two-thirds majority required for 1st, 2nd and 3rd ballot was 23. Simple majority required for 4th ballot was 18 votes.

President			
	Montiel	Längsfeld	Abstentions
1 st Ballot	16	17	2
2 nd Ballot	19	16	
3 rd Ballot	18	17	
4 th Ballot	18	17	

Gustavo Montiel was elected President for a term of four years.

Vice-President Finance			
	In favour	Against	Abstention
Don Zirpola	31	3	1

Don Zirpola was elected Vice-President Finance for a term of four years

Vice-President Publications & Research			
	In favour	Against	Abstention
Henry Breitrose	29	4	1
			1 vote not valid

Henry Breitrose was elected Vice-President Publications & Research for a term of four years.

Projects Chairs

Caterina d'Amico	23	9	3
Myron Emery	18	14	3
2 nd ballot	14	19	2
Maria Dora Mourão	26	8	1
Marina Stavenhagen	25	9	1

Three project chairs, Caterina d'Amico, Maria Dora Mourão and Marina Stavenhagen, were elected for a term of two years.

The fourth project chair could not be elected. To deal with this situation, the Executive circulated Resolution 5.

10.2. Resolution 5: Projects

Background

The revision of CILECT's Statutes and Rules in Blois in 1990, assumed that the General Assembly would have the possibility of selecting four well-prepared projects from a number of projects submitted by the membership.

Experience has indicated that this may not always be the case. Therefore, the Executive Council proposes the following motion to deal with this possibility.

If the General Assembly does not approve four projects as specified in the Statutes, it shall be the responsibility of the Executive Council to solicit additional project proposals from the membership by mail, and to propose projects relevant to the goals of the organisation.

Decisions about which of the project proposals submitted in the manner described above shall be taken by the Executive Council in consultation with the Regional Organisations.

Nenad Puhovski suggested that "within six months" be added to paragraph 2 of the resolution.

The amended paragraph reads:

Decisions about which of the project proposals submitted in the manner described above shall be taken within six months by the Executive Council in consultation with the Regional Organisations.

Amended Resolution 5 was approved (33 votes in favour, 1 against, 1 abstention).

10.3. Election of the Committee Chair Animation

The General Assembly decided that the standing committee for animation be continued.

Myron Emery was elected Chair for the standing committee for Animation (35 votes in favour).

10.4. Election of the Committee Chair Technology

The General Assembly decided that the standing committee for technology be continued.

Nenad Puhovski was re-elected Chair of the standing committee for Technology (35 votes in favour).

11. Extension of term

As the Vice-President TDC and the Vice-President Programme Development were elected for a period of four years at the previous General Assembly (Munich, 1992) their term would come to an end in 1996. This posed a technical problem since there was no provision to hold a General Assembly in 1996. The General Assembly therefore approved the extension of the mandate of these two Vice-Presidents to the next General Assembly scheduled for 1997 (35 votes in favour).