

**MINUTES**

**GENERAL ASSEMBLY 1992**

**MUNICH**

**6 AND 10 OCTOBER**



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Report of the President.....	1
2. Report of the Executive Secretary .....	1
3. Report of the VP TDC.....	1
4. Report of the VP Programme Development .....	2
5. Report of the VP Finance .....	3
5.1. Approval of the Accounts.....	3
5.2. Increase of the Fees .....	3
6. Report VP Publications and Research .....	4
7. Project Chairs .....	4
7.1. Animation.....	4
7.2. Greenhouse.....	5
7.3. Short films .....	5
7.4. Technology.....	5
8. Regional Associations .....	6
8.1. CAPA .....	6
8.2. CNA .....	6
8.3. FEISAL.....	6
8.4. GEECT .....	6
8.5. Africa.....	7
9. Projects for 1992-1994 Biennium .....	8
10. Statutes and Rules .....	9
10.1. Amendments.....	9
10.2. Set Term of Office.....	9
10.3. Voting Procedure.....	10
11. Membership.....	10
11.1. Admission of New Members.....	10
11.2. Corresponding Member.....	11
11.3. Status Changes .....	11
11.4. Withdrawals .....	12
11.5. Name Changes.....	12
11.6. Proposals for Deletion .....	12
12. Election of the New Executive Council .....	12
13. Site of the Next Congress.....	13

14. Other Matters.....	14
------------------------	----

## APPENDIX

1. Report of the President
2. Report of the Executive Secretary
3. Report of VP TDC (including financial report)
4. TDC Workplan for biennium 1992-1994
5. Report of the VP Programme Development
6. Financial Documents
7. Report of the VP Publications and Research
8. Proposal for amendments to the statutes and rules
9. Report GEECT Co-ordinator
10. List of Participants
11. Representatives for the votes

*The Minutes should be read in conjunction with the written reports in the Appendix.*

## **1. REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT**

---

Further to his written report<sup>1</sup>, Colin Young described the changes that had happened within the governing body of CILECT over the last biennium.

- \* Henning Camre moved from Copenhagen to Beaconsfield.
- \* Nenad Puhovski, on leave from Zagreb, moved to Beaconsfield.
- \* Arnon Zuckerman, on leave from Tel Aviv, moved to New York University.
- \* Dick Ross retired from New-York University.<sup>2</sup>

There was another aspect of changes in the Executive that the statutes are silent about. Two members of the Executive (Arnon Zuckerman and Dick Ross) were attached to one institution and three members (Henning Camre, Nenad Puhovski and Colin Young) to another.

This concentration of power was not in any way intentional. Nenad Puhovski had been invited to Beaconsfield to offer his advice in the television curriculum and to be able to complete his work as project chair for technology, and Henning Camre had been appointed director of the NFTS. Colin Young had ceased being a director of the NFTS in April 1992 but was still under a contract with the school. He had been elected for a four year term in Blois in 1990 and said he was willing to continue his mandate, but would do so only if the General Assembly supported it.

There was a vote of confidence by acclamation for Colin Young to remain President for the next biennium.

Regarding Projects for the biennium, Colin Young commented that only few had been received and he invited members to submit new proposals for projects during the course of the meeting. This procedure was however not to be repeated in the future and special care should be taken to ensure that adequate projects have been received before the General Assembly.

## **2. REPORT OF THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY**

---

The report was tabled and discussed in the context of the different items it covers.<sup>3</sup>

## **3. REPORT OF THE VP TDC**

---

Henning Camre made a detailed presentation of the TDC activity during the biennium.<sup>4</sup> It covered:

- the method of work
- the Database Project

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 1.

<sup>2</sup> If the statutes were to be followed rigorously Dick Ross would not have been eligible to present his report in Munich since he was no longer attached to a film school. The situation has been taken care of since Dick Ross was elected corresponding member by the General Assembly in Munich.

<sup>3</sup> Appendix 2.

<sup>4</sup> Appendix 3.

- the Asia-Pacific Conference, Beijing
- the Zimbabwe Film Training Project
- the Young Communications Professionals Exchange Programme
- Inter-regional co-production programmes
- Fund-raising activities

When discussing the financial report (Appendix 3.) Henning Camre said that it was very difficult to raise funds for the administration of the programme. However, he was pleased to report that TDC had been able to raise for its activities twice as much money as it had been allocated in the CILECT budget.

In the discussion that followed the presentation of the report, there was a number of questions from the floor on the way TDC operates. Henning Camre clarified that the programme is not a funding agency for schools or students, and said that it encourages training in the regions as opposed to sending students from the developing countries to study outside their geo-cultural region. The programme also stresses the importance of multi-lateral co-operation with the developing countries.

The TDC Workplan for the next biennium is annexed.<sup>5</sup>

#### **4. REPORT OF THE VP PROGRAMME DEVELOPMENT**

---

The report of the VP Programme Development is annexed<sup>6</sup>.

During the discussion on festivals that followed the presentation of the report, Colin Young said that there is a need for students to know how their films are received outside their schools, particularly by an international audience; this was the particular value of the Karlovy-Vary RIFE. As it had been confirmed by FAMU that they were no longer able to organise this bi-annual event, there was a long discussion on the festival policy of CILECT.

Wolfgang Längsfeld announced that he was negotiating with his authorities to have a CILECT international festival every two years in Munich, alternating with the well-established (European) Munich Student Film Festival.

It was noted that the bi-annual festival of Tel Aviv has applied for CILECT recognition.

Under this scheme it would be possible to have a CILECT festival alternating between Tel Aviv in even years and Munich in odd years.

Further to these two festivals, Wolfgang Längsfeld reported that an offer had been received from Edinburgh to host the CILECT festival every year, starting in April 1993. Colin Young agreed to investigate if Edinburgh can host a CILECT in 1993, without committing the association to a yearly event.

Another alternative would consist in alternating between four festivals: Edinburgh, Munich, Tel Aviv and Mexico.

Henry Verhasselt recommended that CILECT set up an international festival in each of the regions, in collaboration with ANIWA for Africa, FEISAL for Latin America, the Philippines school(s) for the Asia-Pacific region, Munich and Tel/Aviv for Europe.

---

<sup>5</sup> Appendix 4.

<sup>6</sup> Appendix 5.

Another matter for discussion was the periodicity of the CILECT festival. As there was no consensus among the participants whether to recommend a bi-annual or an annual festival, it was decided that this matter would be investigated further by Wolfgang Längsfeld and Arnon Zuckerman.

Several members said that they were finding some difficulty at selecting the appropriate festivals to which they should send their films. György Kárpáti announced that he had prepared a directory listing 52 festivals, including basic information on each of them. The list was distributed to the participants.

It was decided that CILECT will publish a Guide listing the CILECT recommended festivals for schools. This publication will be the responsibility of the Executive Secretary.

## **5. REPORT OF THE VP FINANCE**

---

The financial documents are annexed.<sup>7</sup>

Jack Gajos reported that he had fulfilled the contract he accepted in Blois, and had demonstrated that it was possible to attract substantial funding to cover CILECT activities or projects (though not the association itself).

The financial situation of CILECT is healthy, with a reserve of USD 90,000. Jack Gajos announced that he will present a balanced budget for the next biennium, but stressed that it was essential for the General Assembly to devise a policy of activities and projects, after which he would be able to set up an appropriate budget.

Although substantial funding has been found for the 1990-1992 biennium, the income is still dominated by the fees received from the members. Here, Jack Gajos noted that members were slow in paying their fees on time, and insisted that members should instruct their finance department to send the fees in the first three months of the year, as is prescribed in the statutes.

### **5.1. Approval of the Accounts**

The General Assembly approved following documents<sup>8</sup>:

- Income and Expenditure Statement 1 April - 31 December 1990
- Balance Sheet 1 April - 31 December 1990
- Budget Forecast 1993-1994

### **5.2. Increase of the Fees**

Jack Gajos pointed out that there had been no increase in fees since 1985 and proposed to increase fees for full, associate and candidate members by CHF 200 as from 1st January 1993.

The proposal was accepted.

---

<sup>7</sup> Appendix 6.

<sup>8</sup> Appendix 6.

## **6. REPORT VP PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCH**

---

The report is annexed.<sup>9</sup>

John O' Hara commented that although the scope of Publications and Research goes beyond the publication of the Newsletter, it had taken all his time to publish the Newsletter. No work has been done yet on another type of publication, the Review, with more authoritative, in-depth articles; however, that type of articles has sometimes appeared in the Newsletter.

In his report John O' Hara also suggested that AFTRS may not be in a position to continue publishing the Newsletter and that adequate funding should be found for the publication (the direct costs of producing the Newsletter are currently split between the Australian school and CILECT).

Colin Young commented that the fundamental question was if the Newsletter is a valuable publication to receive. Answering that question, several members commented that it was a very useful link between them and the organisation, and source of information about the schools.

Pat Elliott suggested that the Newsletter should be re-named Journal to make it more interesting to libraries, to which the publication could possibly be sold. However, the change in the title would affect the contents of the Newsletter. If it were to be sold outside the CILECT membership it could no longer be focused essentially on news about the schools and a more thematic approach should be considered. Some members questioned whether this would be a positive development.

Rolf Orthel suggested that the Newsletter be distributed at the next meeting of ELIA in Strasbourg.

## **7. PROJECT CHAIRS**

---

### **7.1. Animation**

Caterina d'Amico reported on the project in which she undertook a study about the different animation techniques and teaching methods.

Caterina d'Amico regretted that there had been very little response from CILECT schools that she contacted to be part of an international committee to run the project.

The first part of her study consisted in a research on the practice of animation in CILECT schools. Caterina d'Amico reported her disappointment at the very limited response she had to a questionnaire she had sent to CILECT schools in order to establish where and how animation was taught.

A survey covering the practice of animation in 22 schools has now been completed but is unpublished yet. Additional information will be collected by Caterina d'Amico in Munich.

The second part of her project consisted in a symposium held in Urbino, Italy (9-13 September 1992) which was attended by 130 delegates and was probably the largest meeting ever of teachers of animation.

Twenty-five schools —eleven of them were CILECT schools — presented their animation programme.

This was the first time since 1955 that CILECT has considered the problem of training animators.

---

<sup>9</sup> Appendix 7.

Caterina d'Amico will prepare a report on the meeting in co-operation with Dick Ross.

## **7.2. Greenhouse**

Arnon Zuckerman reported on the project. Greenhouse aims at bridging the gap between the schools and the industry. In November 91 a questionnaire was sent to all members. 36 answers were received, which form the background for a conference held in New-York at the end of April 92. The Conference was hosted by NYU, and Arnon Zuckerman extended thanks to Mary Campbell and Jack Gajos for their assistance and support.

Arnon Zuckerman reported that the vast majority of the schools do not have any set of measures to help the students into the industry; with the notable exceptions of the — now folded — Greenhouse project in Sweden and the Opera Prima project at the CCC in Mexico, where feature films are produced with the graduates. Some representatives commented that the links they have established with the industry do not need to be strengthened through special programmes.

The main conclusions of the study are that the industry is hungry for young talents, new distribution technologies have increased the need for more low budget projects and schools should encourage formats that are marketable.

Arnon Zuckerman recommended that a CILECT first feature non profit company be set up to enable graduates to have their first professional experience. The following members would be involved in the project: Thoma Stenderup, DDF, Simon Mallin, NFTS, Klaus Keil, HFF Munich and Arnon Zuckerman.

## **7.3. Short films**

Dick Ross reported that he had completed Volume 1, a source book on the teaching of short film. A copy of the book was distributed to each participant.

On the question of publishing the research, and whether it should be a commercial publication, it was agreed to wait until Volume 2 was completed. Publication of Volume 2 was announced for the next Congress.

Several members agreed to form a committee to work on the last stage of the project: John O' Hara, Larry Engel, Brendan Ward, Martin Loh, Michael Rabiger, Stanislav Semerdjiev, Yves Yersin.

Gustavo Montiel suggested that Dick Ross be asked to travel to the schools and teach teachers how to use the book.

While the idea of introducing the notion of Projects and Project Chairs was meant to encourage participation of a large number of CILECT members in the activities of the association, the experience that both Caterina d'Amico and Dick Ross had in running their projects indicate that they have been able to count only on minimal support from other members.

## **7.4. Technology**

Nenad Puhovski reports on the Technology Project were distributed to the participants. After the oral presentation of the report the General Assembly agreed that the database on hardware be continued into the next biennium under the umbrella of a standing committee for technology.

## **8. REGIONAL ASSOCIATIONS**

---

The Rules require that the regional associations designate two representatives to the Executive Council at each General Assembly (art 32, 5).

### **8.1. CAPA**

Representatives to CILECT are John O' Hara, AFTRS, Sydney and Pat Elliott, HKAPA, Hong-Kong.

### **8.2. CNA**

Don Zirpola reported that a new council had been voted.

Co-ordinator:

Don Zirpola, Loyola University, Los Angeles  
(chief delegate to CILECT)

Members:

Henry Breitrose, Stanford  
Ken Dancyger, NYU  
Larry Engel, Columbia, NY (delegate to CILECT)  
Debra Henderson, Windfields  
Elvino Sauro, Toronto

### **8.3. FEISAL**

Gustavo Montiel reported on several activities of FEISAL, such as the screenwriting workshop organised in San Antonio de Los Baños, Cuba and announced a meeting in Brazil of the association in November 1992. The association is planning to develop production activities. They have already developed co-productions between the schools of the regions and they are producing the first Uruguayan feature film and also a TV Series "New looks".

Representatives to CILECT are Gustavo Montiel, CCC, Mexico and Maria Dora Genis Mourao, USP, Sao Paulo.

### **8.4. GEECT**

The report from Jack Gajos, co-ordinator is annexed<sup>10</sup>.

Jack Gajos announced that a document on European sources of funding has been prepared by Femis, it will be published in French and English by the end of 1992 and sent to all GEECT members.

It was agreed that the definition of Europe for GEECT would include both shores of the Mediterranean. The schools in Egypt, Israel and Lebanon are therefore members of GEECT.

The composition of the new GEECT Council was announced:

Co-ordinator

---

<sup>10</sup> Appendix 9.

Rolf Orthel, NFTA, Amsterdam

Members

Caterina d'Amico, CSC, Rome

José Bogalheiro, ESTC, Lisbon

Jack Gajos, FEMIS, Paris

Ywe Jalander, TKK, Helsinki

Josef Pecák, FAMU, Prague

Roberto Provenzano, CFPTC, Milan

Henry Verhasselt, INSAS, Brussels

Yves Yersin, DAVI, Lausanne

Ex Officio Member:

Colin Young, NFTS, Beaconsfield

Representatives to CILECT are Rolf Orthel and Caterina d'Amico/Josef Pecák. However, Rolf Orthel said that this needed to be rediscussed inside the GEECT Executive.

### **8.5. Africa**

There is no formal association in the region yet.

Martin Loh reported that he welcomed the discussions he had been able to have for the first time with Keyan Tomaselli, our corresponding member in South Africa.

The setting up of a regional association for Africa is on the agenda of the 1992-1994 biennium.

## 9. PROJECTS FOR 1992-1994 BIENNIUM

---

Following projects were presented on the day of the vote.

- **Contact** FEMIS France  
It was agreed that “Contact” does not need the Project format. The Contact project should become an ongoing activity inside CILECT and be organised by students from different CILECT schools. HFF Munich announced that they would organise and host the next edition of this event.
- **Creativity / Technology / Expression** CFP Italy  
Roberto Provenzano withdrew his project, which was referred to the standing committee for technology
- **Debut** NYU/TAU USA/Israel  
The Executive supported the project with reservations. The project must be designed to be international, not only European; the establishment of a Debut company needs the approval of the next Executive, if the project is successful.
- **Didactic Updatings** Ipotesi Italy  
The Project can be combined with Masterclasses.
- **Distribution Agency** NYU/TAU USA/Israel  
The project was not considered to be feasible.
- **Long Form Screenwriting** Columbia USA  
Project could be incorporated in Short Film
- **Master Classes** Columbia USA  
The Executive was not convinced this was a project but felt that attention must be given to teaching practices.
- **Media Effects** NATFIZ Bulgaria  
Project does not fall within the competence of CILECT
- **One Hundred Years of Cinema** UNAM Mexico  
Project withdrawn by Alfredo Joskowicz
- **Producing Curriculum** CCC Mexico  
Project supported without reservation
- **Schools and Archives** UCLA USA  
This project could fall under the responsibility of the VP for Publications and Research.
- **Screenplay Workshop** NYU/TAU USA/Israel  
This activity does not need Project format. It can be supported in a different way, like the DOP Workshop in Budapest.
- **Short Film**  
The Executive was of the opinion that this project should be continued
- **Teaching the New Documentary** Stanford USA  
Project supported without reservations.

After discussion, 8 projects remained to be voted on. As five of them had very close results in the voting Colin Young suggested to have a second ballot on the five.

Here are the results of the vote on the 8 projects; the four selected projects for the biennium are in bold characters.

(38 voting members):

	First Ballot	Second Ballot
◆ <b>Debut</b>	23	25
◆ <b>Masterclasses / Didactic Updatings</b>	25	38
Long Form Screenwriting	4	
◆ <b>Producing Curriculum</b>	30	32
Schools/Archives	9	
Screenplay Workshop	8	
◆ <b>Short film</b>	31	34
Teaching the New Documentary	22	20

## 10. STATUTES AND RULES

---

### 10.1. Amendments

The Executive had asked the Executive Secretary to examine the Statutes and Rules and suggest changes in order to eliminate possible contradictions or incoherences.

Henry Verhasselt presented the proposals and the reasons for amendments<sup>11</sup> of the texts. They concern art. 14 and 22 of the Statutes, and art. 8 and 16 of the Rules dealing with a) Executive members leaving their institution; b) Vacancies in the Executive; c) Attending and Voting at the General Assembly.

The amendments were accepted (37 in favour, one abstention).

The General Assembly congratulated the Executive Secretary for the revision of the statutes and rules.

The new version of the Statutes and Rules will be printed and circulated by the Secretariat.

### 10.2. Set Term of Office

John O' Hara presented the interim report of his working party on two possible changes in the statutes and rules. One was to set a fixed term of office for the members of the Executive, the other to change the voting procedure.

The working party considered that the new statutes and rules approved in Blois already provided for changes inside the Executive (the President and the VPs are elected for four years, the four Project Chairs are elected for two years) and that it may be counterproductive to set a fixed term of office beyond the existing rules.

---

<sup>11</sup> Appendix 8.



• <i>Ecole Supérieure d'Audiovisuel</i> , Toulouse	Associate
INDONESIA	
• <i>Jakarta Institute of the Arts</i>	Full
ITALY	
• <i>Zelig</i> , Bolzano	Associate
NORWAY	
• <i>National Centre for Screen Studies</i> , Jar	Associate
ROMANIA	
• <i>Academy of Theatre and Film</i> , Bucharest	Full
SPAIN	
• <i>Centre for Images and New Technologies</i> , Vitoria	Candidate
• <i>Escuela de Artes Visuales</i> , Madrid	Candidate
SWITZERLAND	
• <i>Ecole Supérieure d'Art Visuel</i> , Geneva	Associate
UKRAINE	
• <i>Film Faculty of the Kiev College of Theatrical Art</i>	Full

### **11.2. Corresponding Member**

Henning Camre proposed Dick Ross as corresponding member.

Dick Ross was elected unanimously.

### **11.3. Status Changes**

The General Assembly voted unanimously following status changes:

#### **UPGRADES TO FULL MEMBER**

- *CERC*, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- *ECA*, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil
- *Varan*, Paris, France
- *The Jerusalem Film School*, Israel
- *Escola Superior de Teatro e Cinema*, Lisbon, Portugal
- *Centre Calassanç*, Barcelona, Spain
- *ESCIVI*, Andoaín, Spain
- *DAVI*, Lausanne, Switzerland

#### **UPGRADES TO ASSOCIATE MEMBER**

- *Canadian Film Centre*, North York, Canada
- *UQAM*, Montreal, Canada

- *Yayasan Citra*, Jakarta, Indonesia
- *CFPTC*, Milano, Italy

#### **11.4. Withdrawals**

The General Assembly noted the withdrawals of:

- *HITCS*, Brussels, Belgium
- *Università di Roma*, Italy

#### **11.5. Name Changes**

Following name changes were recorded:

- The Polytechnic of Central London has been re-named as *The University of Westminster*.
- The Canadian Centre for Advanced Film Studies has been re-named as *The Canadian Film Centre*.

#### **11.6. Proposals for Deletion**

A majority of two-thirds is required for the deletion of a member (Statutes, art. 15). There were 38 voting members. Two-thirds majority was 25 votes.

##### **University of Silesia, Faculty of Radio and Television, Katowice, Poland**

The institution was already proposed for deletion at Blois for non-payment of the fees but the proposal had not been followed. At that time the General Assembly had instructed the Executive to find a solution for the institution inside CILECT. Now the University of Silesia has confirmed that they are unable to pay the fees and has asked for deletion.

The General Assembly accepted the request and deleted the institution (30 votes for deletion, 7 against, 1 abstention).

##### **Sri Lanka Television Training Institute, Colombo**

The school is four years in arrears of payment of the fees and there has been no response from the school to reminders for payment.

A fax from the new director of the school, D. Wesumperuma, was received in Munich in which he said that the institution was unable to renew membership with CILECT due to their financial situation.

The General Assembly recommended to postpone the proposal for deletion and instructed the Executive to renew contact with the new administration of the school (14 votes for deletion, 23 against, 1 abstention). If no solution is found, the institution will be proposed for deletion at the next General Assembly.

## **12. ELECTION OF THE NEW EXECUTIVE COUNCIL**

---

At the General Assembly, Blois, 1990 a straw vote was taken to select the two Vice-Presidents who would serve an initial term of four years (until 1994), the remaining two Vice-Presidents serving an initial term of two years (until 1992).

As a result of that vote, the TDC and the VP Programme Development were up for election in Munich.

The General Assembly also had to elect the four Project Chairs, serving a term of two years.

There were 38 voting members. The two-thirds majority required to be elected on the first three ballots was 25 votes. Simple majority to be elected on the fourth ballot was 30.

---

**Vice President TDC**

*Henning Camre*

	In favour	Against	Abstentions	Not valid
1st ballot	22	10	5	1

Nominations were reopened (Rules, art. 22; 2 c). No new nomination was received.

2nd ballot	24	12	2	
3rd ballot	24	14		
4th ballot	25	13		

---

**Vice President Programme Development**

*Wolfgang Längsfeld*

	In favour	Against	Abstentions
	33	4	1

---

**Project Chair Short Film**

*Dick Ross*

	In favour	Against
	37	1

---

**Project Chair Producing Curriculum**

*Gustavo Montiel*

	In favour	Against
	36	2

---

**Project Chair Masterclasses**

*Larry Engel*

	In favour	Against
	35	3

---

**Project Chair Debut**

*Arnon Zuckerman*

	In favour	Against
	36	2

---

**13. SITE OF THE NEXT CONGRESS**

CILECT has received an invitation from the Austrian school to hold the 1994 Congress in Vienna. Confirmation of the acceptance of the offer should be communicated to the school by the end of November 1994.

Colin Young noted that there is also a wish of CILECT to meet outside Europe after two consecutive Congresses in that region. CILECT has never had a meeting in Africa and it is an area where the association has a lot of work to do.

Wolfgang Längsfeld pointed out that, under the present organisational structure of CILECT Congresses, where the total cost of the event is supported by the host school, the growing size of CILECT and the requirement to invite two delegates for each full member school and one delegate for each associate or candidate school, posed a budget problem to Congress organisers.

#### **14. OTHER MATTERS**

---

A proposal to elect Mario Verdone honorary member was received during the meeting but could not be considered since proposals for honorary membership must be made six weeks ahead of the General Assembly (Rules, art. 6). However, the General Assembly thanked Mario Verdone for his work of support to CILECT.