

“Exploring the Future of Film and Media Education”

CILECT Conference

FAMU, Prague, Czech Republic
30 November – 2 December 2011

The CILECT Conference 2011 was the first such annual event since 1967 when the annual conferences were changed to biannual ones and were connected to the CILECT congresses.

It was held as a result of the new General Strategy of CILECT voted in Barcelona 2010 in which a direction of going back to the “well forgotten old system” was set forward as a priority task for the newly elected Executive Council and Executive Director.

It couldn't, of course, have been possible without the generous support and organisation of FAMU – one of the founding schools of CILECT in 1954. It was a friendly, warm and sharing experience which raised the bar high for every next host.

During the Conference the participants had the opportunity to actively contribute to three panels which were held three times each – therefore each panel gave the floor to at least 9-10 official presenters and many more speakers from the audience.

- The Fundamental Values of Film and Media Education
- The Impact of Internationalization
- Benchmarking and Evaluation in an International Context.

In this publication you will find the edited transcripts of the sound files that were received by the CILECT Secretariat. As always some of the colleagues in the audience did not talk in the microphone so their opinions, statements, questions, etc. could not be transcribed by any of the three translators who took the task to its finalisation. Most of these colleagues did not introduce themselves either so that even the Executive Director –who proof-edited the final version– sometimes could not identify who was talking although he has been listening to those familiar voices for more than 20 years now :-). And finally, as in any public event at certain moments the recording equipment just decided not to work properly (probably to remind us that the personal presence and contact is still more important than any text circulated after the event). Therefore even some of the official presentations are missing or incomplete. I hope the colleagues whose presentations have suffered from this technical strike will take it philosophically and maybe will want to sit down and put their contributions to paper. We would be more than happy to include them in the compilation at a later stage. Anyway, it was high time that (after all the revisions) this text saw the bright daylight and I humbly present it to you as it is now.



Prof. Dr. Stanislav Semerdjiev
Executive Director, CILECT

Contents

Panel 1: Fundamental Values of Film and Media Education	2
Panel 2: Impact of Internationalization	22
Panel 3: Benchmarking and Evaluation in International Context ...	46
Summary of Panels and Conclusions	69

Panel 1: Fundamental Values of Film and Media Education

Moderator: Maria Dora Mourão

(a combined transcript of sessions 1, 2 and 3)

Maria Dora Mourão: Welcome, everyone. This panel is about the fundamental values of film and media education, the problem of the new generations, the question of the process of the re-invention because of new technologies and so on, innovative programmes, the changes of the audio visual environment, new formats, new approaches. And then we have three questions about the core values of film schools in an evolving globalized context. We are going to discuss what are the values and traditions that must be preserved for the future of film education and what needs to change or be discarded. But first we'll hear each panellist and then we'll discuss these more general concepts, the question of globalization, the future and what we need to discard or change. Each panellist has ten-fifteen maximum to talk. After each panellist you can ask a couple of questions, and after the presentations are over, we will open the floor for a general discussion. That is what the organizers have asked me to do, if you think that is ok.

Juan Mora Catlett: I'm from the Centre for Film Studies of the National University of Mexico (CUEC), which is our largest public school. Our school is more than fifty years old. I feel a little strange standing in front of you because I was a student at this school and I usually sat over there, not here. I've been at a film school, which provides a very good level of education and trains mainly directors, cinematographers, editors, producers and screenwriters, for fifteen years now. Sometimes, according to students' interests we offer them the opportunity to study for directors or film animators. The school couldn't offer its students a degree despite the fact that they studied at the university as we were considered just a centre for the fusion of culture.

So, we decided to become a school. According to the legislation, we exist as an entity independent of the university. For example, we have full-time professors although we're not supposed to have any professors at all according to the laws of the university. So, we sort of grew against the university's will. And because one of my ex-students is a brother of the current rector of the university, they gave us the chance to become a national school which means that for the first time our curricula will be sanctioned by the university council and we will be able to offer a degree. In order to do that, we had to review the whole curriculum. The process took us about two years. We also tried to adapt it to the formal conditions of the university curricula. The truth is that our programme expands far beyond that. When we counted the credits, it turned out that by numbers of credits we were providing up to a doctorate education.

Suddenly we had the problem that we had to lower the quality of our school in order to get into the university system. Then we had to review our fundamental values, of course. First, we had to see the profile of the students and the kind of profession they wanted to acquire. Our university is a public university and its main purpose is to produce professionals who will contribute to society in some way because university education in Mexico is mostly free. In our country the taxpayers pay for the education of students. In that respect offering education to film students, which is very expensive, is even a greater responsibility. So, our first aim is to guarantee that our ex-students would do something for the Mexican culture. In that way, we are connected to the industry but not as providers of entertainers, but as providers of filmmakers for the Mexican culture who will do every kind of film in every kind of field. In this sense we had to revise our curricula thus creating different and more formal degree courses. We arrived at a degree for animation which we didn't have before, a degree for scriptwriting, a degree for fiction, a degree for documentary filmmaking, a degree for directing fiction films, a degree for cinematography, a degree for production, a degree for editing and then we had to stop. The students are supposed to be at the school for four years and end their

studies. But in reality the material we covered before should be covered under the new standards in about six or seven years because we work so much that our semesters are not six months long but eight months long. It is a matter of fundamental values and we want to keep it. In that sense, our documentary films are very strong because our students go on and talk openly about things that nobody else talks about. Our filmmakers should not be only technical people but also people that would be contributing to the Mexican culture. That's why they have to go and do research.

In Mexico there's a lot of violence at this moment. There's a town where women are being killed constantly and nobody says anything about it. One of our students, however, did a film and risked her life. Her name is Alejandra Sanchez and she did a beautiful film about "Las Muertas de Juarez" ("The women who died in Juarez"). So students do things like that. They recently shot a feature documentary film on underwater life at the very small islands on the coast of Baja, California. These are protected waters where whales come and have their babies, and they are inhabited by giant fish and kinds of beautiful animals. One of our students did this underwater film.

So, our students are interested in exploring all of these themes. What we did was to reduce our programme to four years exactly, and what we used to do in the other time we're planning to start doing as part of a graduate programme. Now we have already started a master's degree in documentary filmmaking. And this process of implementing the new curricula is going to take five or six years. We're going to start next year, we have a new building. The university built for us a huge new building. We had to double up the quantity of students that we admit every year. We used to admit twenty students and now we're going to start with forty students. Year by year we're going to start implementing the graduate studies, first the master and then the doctoral degree. We have the advantage of being associated with a large university which will allow us to grow. That was what I wanted to share with you, thank you. If you have any questions, I'll be around.

Q: How did you decide what are the fundamental features of the programme to be retained?

Juan Mora Catlett: Well, the first part of the work was to define what kind of professions we wanted our students to acquire. Each head of department had to fill in a questionnaire. After a long discussion we put everything together and then we created something like a basic profile of the student. Each student had to meet several requirements: social consciousness, motivation to give back to the country what he/she has received from it and also the technical aspects of being able to do his work in the most professional way, and being able to continue research along with the constant change of technology. Last year the innovation thing was the Sony XD camera. Today it is the Scarlet. Everything is developing quickly and Apple discontinued Final Cut a few months ago so we cannot rely on teaching these fashionable techniques because they will disappear very fast. We had to make our students aware of that so they could do their own research and learn these new techniques by themselves. This is one of the most important skills that we want to develop. And the other one is the skill to work in a team. In the past we tried to train individuals: one director, one cinematographer and so on.

When the time came for us to do our thesis films, we had a group of five directors who were supposed to work together on everybody's projects. One would be director and the other would be his assistant director or producer. What happened in reality was that everybody worked for himself. So they got some people from outside the school to organize their teams. In other words, one of the changes was to create a team atmosphere from the beginning of the new curricula. Students will be encouraged to form partnerships. They have one year to find somebody they like, somebody they're comfortable working with. You surely will be, we hope, writer, producer, cinematographer or director. We feel that a lot of our students used to write their own scripts. Unfortunately you can be a good scriptwriter but that doesn't make you a good director and the other way around. We found out that when we collaborate we work better. So the idea is not to form individuals but to form

teams. Also some of our most successful ex-students, Alfonso Cuarón and Alejandro Lubezky, formed a team while at the school. And now they went out to the world as a team and a lot of our ex-students do it, so we think this might be a good way to proceed, also because it's easier to work with a team than to work with several individuals. That was another of the ideas that came out from this discussion.

Q: How competitive is the selection of the students compared with the values and the social aspects in your school now?

Juan Mora Catlett: Well that's an interesting question because once a student takes the university entrance exam; he or she can go into any school he wants, which creates a problem for us. If we can only admit twenty or forty what do we do with a hundred or two hundred or the five hundred that apply every year? So we found this solution, everybody who wants to get into our school must first go through the university admission examination, which is a general exam, and after that they should point out two options for schools. The first option can be any faculty of the humanities and the second option can be our school. In this way, the applicant can be admitted to our own special exam. Another aspect has to do with the applicant's interest in film. We don't expect an eighteen, nineteen year old person to have an encyclopaedic knowledge of film, we don't expect that. But we expect the applicant to be interested in films, to know how to look at the movie and see much more than the story or go beyond it into the complexities of art. The examination consists of three stages: first we get these five hundred, and then they fill some forms on paper. On the basis of the completed forms we reduce the applicants to about sixty, and then they go through another set of examinations where they get personal interviews. It is on the basis of the personal interviews that those students are accepted. We usually pick what we think are the twenty best students. And with the CCC (Centro de Comunicación Cinematográfica, Mexico City) which have their examinations in a different period of time, usually those of the top forty that don't get into our school get into the CCC. As our students are very young the function of our school is not only to give them information but to help them become adults. They have lots of problems inside them so this is some kind of a mentorship that you have to do, especially with art students. And I think that has worked very well. I don't know, but in my opinion it is a fundamental value to look at the student not just as if he or she is a client who is buying education but as if he or she is a complete human being who is going to turn into a professional in a few years. This student may even become the director of the film institute or the director of our school or one of the top cinematographers and that's how we value them. Treat them as adults not as children.

Q: Have your students become generally younger? Were they older before when you were not offering degrees?

Juan Mora Catlett: At the beginning our students were between 25-40 years of age. So when I got back to Mexico and started teaching my students they were older than me which was a very funny situation. After classes we all went out, got drunk and had a party and I grew up with many of them. People were surprised: "He is your student, he's older than you!" Yes, of course he was. But with the years the level has gone to people who finish preparatory school and want to go immediately into university or apply for filmmaking. Also filmmaking became more fashionable all over the world. Before people who wanted to do film weren't taken seriously. What's that, it's not a serious career. But now it's like every year we get more applications so that was one of the reasons we started growing.

Q: And how has that affected the school?

Juan Mora Catlett: Now there are different interests among the professors and the students. If you want to really work with the students you have to understand what their interests are. And that's not

to force them into your own interests. So, this has created a lot of discussions. For example, the director decided he was going to paint a wall with little shells. One of the students disapproved. So he showed up with a bucket of white paint and painted the whole wall! He did an excellent job, it was professionally painted. So we had this problem what do we do with the student? Throw him out of the school because he or she is disobeying rules? We got into a discussion with the student and with other students that did not like his new wall: "Why didn't you discuss it with us? Now you'll listen what you're going to do about that?" And the walls were already painted white so you ruined part of the building, now you have to do something for the school." So he went into the library and started copying, you know, doing piracy of a lot of DVDs for so many months. So these are the things that are different with this age change, you know, younger students are more rebellious it's part of the growing up. So we have to cope with that in a positive way, not in a negative way. And also we produce a magazine, like a quarterly magazine and we invite students to write papers for it. We have a show for films at our university and at other educational institutions and we invite the students to come and be part of the audience. They hear from the audience what they don't want to hear from the professors. You know, we show their films in the classroom and they say no, this is wrong, this is wrong, I don't believe you. Then it goes in front of a real audience and they're telling the same things... so those are the things that have changed.

Maria Dora Mourão: But there is one more question I want to ask you again. This new generation affects the curriculum, doesn't it?

Juan Mora Catlett: It affects it because sometimes they have more technological information. For example, we have a student and a project. There are several characters and each of them has a different means of recording - one has cell phone, the other has a video camera, the third one uses the camera in his computer and the film is going to be composed of the different points of views of these characters. If the professor only thinks about shooting negative and doesn't know how an IPAD performs under certain conditions of light, the professor is going to be in trouble, not the student. So that forces us also to be more aware of technology, to be on the edge. Sometimes the students are much further ahead than we are. We have students that come into 3D holographic animation and nobody in the school understands how it's done, for example. You have to go and study it. Now we have to go and find out what's a Scarlet camera. Before that we bought an Alexa, the first one that any film school had in Mexico. It was great because we used it to shoot one of our feature films. Usually, every year we shoot two features - a documentary and a fiction so we were very happy because all the generations came around to see this camera, to touch it, to see how it works, professors and students alike. It's like a work of discovery that has been done together which I think is the thing we need to do as otherwise we will lag behind. When you can learn things through the internet, you'd better use the internet.

Maria Dora Mourão: Thank you, Juan. I think that now we can move to Elizabeth Louw from Wits University of the Arts, Johannesburg, South Africa.

Elizabeth Louw: I want to pick up on what you said about young people. I believe that all youngsters born from 1990 on have technology as their first language and then all the rest follows and what we find is that we get students to come to first year and they've already made quite adequate forms because the technology is available and because it's something that they feel so at home in. We don't have a lot of resources but we try and give our students exposure to a really wide variety of technological challenges that might come their way. We do offer phone but in a very liberated capacity because it is so extensive so they basically get an opportunity to shoot one short phone film or usually a public service announcement, just to give them that tangible fabulous way of film making. So, what I'll do today is just share some aspects from my university, my school and how we work with our students and then I'll be happy to answer questions.

Our university is an urban university located just outside of the central business district of Johannesburg. It grew out from a mining college which started in Kimberly with the discovery of diamonds. They moved to Johannesburg and finally by 1922 there was enough support to start a formal university. We are turning ninety years old next year and we have five different faculties. Our school is situated in the faculty of humanities and it's great. It's probably one of the most iconic buildings in South Africa. A company delivered a presentation there and handed the world soccer cup over to Brazil, so that was all very exciting. Our students come from across South Africa although most of them dwell in Gauteng which is the province in which Johannesburg is situated. Students are representatives of all the demographic groups in the country.

In 1972 the university started to support the so called central television. It was like a support unit for the university to produce training videos, do commercial work and to initiate film and television training. The first training was done on Super 8 cameras. Today we no longer do commercial work or programmes for the university. We focus entirely on teaching and training. And South Africa's new constitution promotes rights which actually guarantee education for everybody but we still have huge discrepancies in terms of what is available to all. This probably is the most elite private school among the rural schools in Venda so I think it just gives you some indication of how different the available resources are. This photo is from the very rich cultural visual community in Venda. Now the reason why I am also putting these photographs up is because we don't really have literacy education in our schools. We need to incorporate in our programmes quite a bit of visual literacy training which you'll see when you go to the courses. Here are more of them. You can see the students walking home after school and they really have just the basics needed for education.

As I said, our university is in the centre of Johannesburg just off the Central Business District. We're a multi-disciplinary school and there are six divisions: Fine Art, Digital Art, Music, Drama and obviously Film and Television and then we have postgraduate courses in the Arts and Heritage Management which has become quite popular. Students can select courses across the various disciplines. We offer theoretical and practical training that is designed to enable our students to become critically informed practitioners. Our programmes explore issues of representation, visual storytelling, conventions and aesthetics. So, I think what is important here is that in a way we're very different from the film schools in South Africa in that 50% of all our courses are based on theoretical work and the other 50% on practical work except for the academic courses which focus on film theory. We feel that in our country we've just had a very difficult period when our state broadcast collapsed and there was very little work. A lot of production companies closed down. So, we need to train young people who can reinvent themselves whenever they need to. You need to be a conceptual thinker in order to be able to find realization in different fields. When graduating film and TV students should understand the media landscape and be informed and responsible for the contribution they make to it. A graduating student is able to understand social, political, historic and economic factors that determine the production context of film and television. Students are also taught to use production equipment and are exposed to camera, sound, lighting and editing technologies.

Now what I very firmly believe in is that when you become a film maker you're professional, you have a profession. When you become a doctor you're also professional. In my country you study for five years at the university to become a doctor and then you do two years of practical work. I firmly believe that after you earn an undergraduate degree you should be an intern for at least two years so that you can consolidate what you have learned in the professional environment. This is not always possible and very often industry expects young people who come from our school to be fully trained up professionals, I don't think that's possible. Within our division we give students a theoretical and critical understanding of the film and television media and the histories. The stream of studies focuses on comprehensive understanding of screen narrative structures and visual storytelling. Forming television is one of the professional courses we offer and it's sort of more focused in terms

of training directors. It's not just to train directors. The focus is to look at film making across the historical period of cinema and then to actually give students the skills but also the theory to be able to make their own films. And they make fiction films and documentaries that are not very long ones. I think fourth year students usually are expected to tell their stories at a length between seven and nine minutes. Then we have film and TV production which is more focused on the areas behind the camera, post production, production design, title design, sound design and all the other aspects of technological film making. And then we have a writing stream which starts in the first year. In the first year we try to develop conception writing skills and then we move into short films, factual writing and introduction to television series writing and to feature film writing.

What we have is a four year degree, which is known as a professional degree, within academic and professional courses which you can choose from a set of courses offered by the school. The students choose two options from film and television. For example, the students who are going to become performers choose a performance option and for example, television studies or writing. They can also choose design and drawing if they want to become production designers or are more interested in theatre or film and television design which is one of the options. There's a wider range of options for the third year and the students can choose between video art, sound design. We also offer multi camera for third year students. It has become very popular in South Africa and it's one of the cases where our students do find employment, so we offer a semester course in multi camera. What else? When they do the academic programme, they have to choose two professional courses and they have to do B.A. subjects. They usually choose English, psychology, anthropology, African literature and subjects that describe popular sign language. Then we also offer master's programmes in film and television, you can either do this by dissertation or you can do it by a research report and a film. We have a PhD programme which you can graduate by a thesis or you can write a thesis and produce a piece of creative work. And I'm afraid that's it. If you have any questions I'll be happy to answer them. If you want to see student works I got quite a few DVDs here and there's also a brochure of our school.

Q: How do the students choose between philosophy, history and something else?

Elizabeth Louw: Some students also choose philosophy or history; I just mentioned a few examples. But in the first year we don't do practical training. We look at the history of cinema; we also do broadcasting landscape and genres. So, the first year is an introduction to cinematic narrative and in the second year in the academic core we look at classical Hollywood cinema and we look at narrative structure. But I think all the courses are designed in such a way that students are encouraged to develop ideas around topics that they would like to make films about. Does that answer your question?

Q: Yes, more or less but let's say when you give an example of a Hollywood film it's very interesting. It is much more difficult to find your own subject than to look at some films and then start copying them. So, when you start from scratch and have to find something to be original for yourself, it's very difficult. Before you understand the structure, before you can create a structure you need to find a good subject and that's one of the most difficult parts of film making?

Elizabeth Louw: I think that's the way the conceptual training comes in. So the theory will encourage students to broaden their horizons ...

Q: I just asked because fifteen years ago we had a big problem. I was a student in the film school where now I'm head of the film department. But when I came back to the school all the short films were only violence, blood and knives. So I decided at this moment to talk to the students. In my life there are no murders happening every weekend. There are other themes and subjects. To start thinking about a story is something different from just analysing films that exist already. Before

storytelling you need the subject and the way to find for yourself a good story is not so easy so that's what I'm looking for.

Elizabeth Louw: No, I think it's fabulous. I've been really taught about it in that way but we do tolerate all those scary looks in constructing stories and you know we live in such a violent society that our students start to make films about violence. But they do make films about sex, drugs and rock n' roll and I feel it's something that young people have to get out of their systems. It's the same thing with a music video. They have to make a music video that gets it out of their systems. So I think in that way they start to develop their own voices and their own ideas but you have to work through a lot of preconceived ideas in terms of the good topics offered in films. You know, what we started doing with the first year is that with each classical film, we also showed a modern film with similar characters and conflict. For the stronger students it has proven to be a fabulous challenge.

Maria Dora Mourão: Well, we have the questions that our organizers have prepared for us and we can continue the discussion by opening it a little more, not to talk about one or the other school but about general questions. The first question has to do with the core values of film schools in an evolving globalized context, i.e. the problem of globalization. The other question has to do with what values and traditions must be preserved for the future of film education. And the third one has to do with what needs to change or be discarded. We can stay here for hours, talking about these three questions but if Juan or Elizabeth would like to start and say something about these three questions – then we can have some discussion.

Elizabeth Louw: I don't know if you agree but there's a difference for me between theatre institutions that offer film and television and the training in film schools. In South Africa the film schools are very decidedly focused on producing individuals who can be, who can fulfil a certain position in a professional world which is very different to what we do. So I think that one should always take that into consideration. Another thing that I think is quite interesting for us is that our students often want to see African films and they sometimes don't understand the value of being trained in the western tradition. For me the easy answer is that the technologies started in the western films. We just need to acknowledge that and then we can move forward.

Juan Mora Catlett: As to globalization, the writer Octavio Paz pushed Mexico so far away from the guidance of the United States. You see, if you get my miming we have Hollywood up there. And one day when they don't have money they come to Mexico to shoot. We just had a big shoot produced by Peter Jackson with the director of "District Nine" and we had a big problem in the studio, everything was paralyzed. So we have a relation with the American industry like the poor relatives towards the rich relatives. So that means that in our training we have to put a lot of emphasis not only on the similarities between the films produced in different countries but also on the conditions under which those films were produced. Let's say the advertising budget of an American film is sufficient to finance five Mexican feature films so there's no point in trying to make the same film that the Americans make. You have to invent another form, you have to create your own way of telling your own stories and for this the question you raised is very interesting because we try to expose students to the whole history of film making. We start from the moving pictures and we tell them: "Film is not reality. Film is twenty four frames, how do you interpret these frames. Film doesn't happen on the screen, it happens in your head, you build up the images here." And starting from that, we show them the classics. The most difficult thing to cope with is intolerance. They are very intolerant with intolerance. And I try to explain the process by going through film making. We watched "Alexander Nevsky" and I said: "Any similarity between Alexander Nevsky and Star Wars is purely coincidental." Then they see those German soldiers dressed in white, they start recognizing elements. We try to show films from all over the world, you know, from India, from South America, from Africa, from China, try to expose them to a lot of those so they see also the value of the richness

of cultures. I think that's the only way to face globalization because on the other side we have the internet, we have YouTube and all of these, so we have to be able to provide a counterpart.

Maria Dora Mourão: Anything else from the audience?

Q: The idea to get the people more confident in their story is the most important thing that should be said. In a country like South Africa there are so many people, with so many stories that it's not hard to find a story. Even if some countries are not so globalized, there's always a possibility and I have my right to tell my story. So I think it's something we can share, so I'll talk about working in the UK. I totally agree with the idea of making films in different countries. At my university in Leeds we have an international students' party in our first week. Our students make a presentation for the international students. We have the same programme and we would like them to work with us. The student film which is chosen, regardless of the country to which its creator comes, is discussed in terms of historical period. And then there is a discussion afterwards.

Maria Dora Mourão: Well if you don't have any more comments more it's time to finish because the next session begins at four thirty. Thank you very much.

(...)

Manuela Cernat: I'm the vice rector of the Theatre and Film University UNACT in Romania and I think that the best place in the world to speak about fundamental values in cinema education is here, in Prague, because we have a school with wonderful traditions, and at the same time a school which is exploring the most modern ways of the film education. First of all, I would like to ask you the following question: Do we still have fundamental values in our world? I think we have to start from there. Probably we need a new Decalogue for film teaching. After two hundred years of secularization in Europe which turned out to be very harmful for the structuring of the European culture I think that we need to go back to the fundamental values of the world civilization, i.e. faith regardless of religion. We have to teach our students that they have to have faith regardless of religion as this means love for the world, love for tradition, love for beauty, love for all that was created in the name of belief. Regardless of whether they go to catholic churches or Buddhist temples, we have to tell our students that in this new age which brings so harmful things for their inner body, they have at least to try to turn back to faith.

The second important value is tolerance, tolerance for other cultures, other values, and the right of people to express their personalities. And because being an artist has been and still is related to playing an apostle's role, we have to prepare our students to enter this profession with the conviction that they might be harmed, that they will not always encounter fame, glory and money, that they can be frustrated and that they must fight for their ideals. I think that the fight for ideals is one of the fundamental values that we have to keep in our film schools and also we have to teach our students to cherish culture. I heard what the speakers in the previous session said and I know that our students are no longer interested in history. Here we're in front of a big question mark - do we prepare our students for an even narrower specialization or should we, on the contrary, in this globalized world open their horizons to a sort of encyclopaedic knowledge, to a Renaissance approach to the world and to creation similar to the one in the period of the beautiful Italian Seicento when architects like Bernini, or Borromini, or musicians like Torelli were also working as art directors. This is indeed a choice that we have to make and they have to make but I think that we as teachers have to make it.

Speaking about culture and history I think that we have to revise film history. Early Soviet cinema still occupies two hundred pages in any film history book. And I screen to my students the *Gösta Berling Saga* in parallel. And my students discover that they both belong to the extraordinary early masters

the only difference being that the northern school in the books of film history presents is mentioned in one page and *Battleship Potemkin* in one hundred pages. Eisenstein's genial movie was about destroying a world while the Danish movie was about conserving the traditions of a cultivated world. Obviously destruction is more important in history... Also, in terms of teaching film history we have to take into account the new discoveries, the hidden archives, for example. Greenaway was preparing a fabulous film about Eisenstein in Mexico. And we have to be aware that there's a new perspective on the evolution of film history. We also have to tell our students that as Dziga Vertov said: "Truth is more important than beauty. Beauty is necessary but without truth the artist's work is condemned to oblivion." But it is not always important to present the truth of reality. As Brecht said, "It is not important to present reality. It is important to present reality the way it is indeed." This "indeed" is to be found in the documentaries of our students.

And to close my speech I'd say that at least in Romania now there is a big confusion in the minds of the young generation because for them globalization means totally neglecting their roots. They tend to neglect what was in the past. They're not interested in cultural history. They are interested in "now" and maybe "tomorrow". I think that our task is to make them understand that for us, Europeans, globalizations means to keep our own differences within the big family in the spirit of tolerance, love and faith. In this way the circle is completed. Thank you.

Q: I'm kind of new in this conference and not very much in film making myself I come from the field of communications and therefore film making is one particular kind of activity which I am not very competent in. I look at film making from a different perspective. And I would accept if you refuse that perspective but if you don't then a few comments will be relevant to make. From your statement you already mentioned three points, i.e. faith, tolerance and cherishing cultures, and then the idea of reality which should be represented as it is indeed. Now, in this modern time, there are two points. One is the role of ideology and the other is the role of the intellectual tradition that might be disregarded or not, but which is quite influential – postmodernism. On the ideological level, when you mentioned faith, for example, and then you mentioned the role of intolerance. You know, historically, there are very strong beliefs which lead to intolerance and adding beliefs usually doesn't mean any law. So, there's a little bit of controversy on the ideological level which is made in the worst manner in my view. When you mentioned globalization, globalization is not a natural phenomenon, globalization is a name given to a certain ideology. It is almost trivial to say that globalization is just the extension of a single ideology to all the cultures, you know, I mean formidable marginalizing of any effect which triggers all the problems that we know. So I'd like to hear about ideology because if you're talking about values I think it's impossible not to mention Mannerheim. I mean we all believe in justice and freedom but we start to argue when we decide which of them comes first. And we know that the greatest ideology of the twentieth century is socialism and we're fighting about this. The last point is about the reality as it is indeed. Is there anybody here who believes that there is an objective reality? Because if there is, I'll continue. Otherwise I'll just stop. This opens up a problematic debate on the role of documentary...

Manuela Cernat: Well, thank you for the comments but I'm sure you understand that you're living in Finland and I am coming from Romania where the word ideology is not any longer even uttered so I prefer not to speak about ideology because it was too bloody for my country and personally for my family, so I cannot talk about it. Now maybe what I didn't mention is that we should consider film history as Marc Ferro put it in a context. Film history must be contextualized because up to the beginning of the 90s it was written as if the authors were living on the planet Mars, ignoring completely the social and the political background and this is not ideology, this is sheer history, but honest history which is not influenced by political belief. We need nowadays film history written by honest historians.

Q: May I make a comment? I think that we have to take care about the values that Manuela told us about and about ideology. We should try to avoid ideology as teaching is concerned because it has to do with the personal point of view of each student. We forbid two things in our school - the extreme right ideas and pornography. So, there're lots of things we can do which are very important but because of the growing role of technology which is getting more and more complex and takes more and more time and means, we have to stop students believing that they have learned something because of technologies. If they come to our school for three years or four years, they have not come just to learn how to be efficient on the set. The aim of a university is not to go directly to a particular profession but to establish the basis for understanding the world from their point of view and by their own means. The students need to know the history of art and cinema, and of course both of them must be contextualized with all the political and social periods so that they can easily understand them. I think that there was a misunderstanding about the problem of the fundamental values and what I wanted to say was that the danger now is to be overwhelmed by the technology which can be a mirage. And to look for the most ambitious way to make art and then we can stop there. We give the students in the beginning of the first year a small book to read. It is a book by Tolstoy, called "History of Art". It's a small book of a hundred pages; it's a wonderful work about what art is. And then, if they want, they can go to read more philosophical and history books. This is what we can do at school.

Maria Dora Mourão: Thank you very much, Manuela. Our next speaker is Ben Gibson from the London Film School.

Ben Gibson: Hello. Thank you very much. I'm Ben Gibson from the London Film School which is an international graduate academy. It is considered quite a small school which was established in the 1950s and therefore it's a school with quite a long tradition. I want to say on a personal level because I'm not sure whether what I've to say is going to hit fundamental enough issues given the conversation that has come before. I must say that I'm a producer by profession. I was pretty much against film schools before I had this job and it was not practical for me to be against film schools. But the reasons have something to do with how film schools can become established institutions which are part of a difficult social formation. The movement of film schools is about getting equipment to people who are not members of the Russian aristocracy and so then you move forward to a newer situation where actually middle class people who have money will go to a film school. And then the people who get the equipment from the High Street or they get it from the back of a video centre are not in a community of film makers together, which is organized for them. So, I have fundamental issues about whether film schools and their current formation as institutions, have any social or political value which we'll get back to.

The London Film School is the school that I run. I'll give you some names of some empty sounding ideological values then I'll talk about what I think it means for us in practice. In many film schools you can find a paper which says "A tradition of innovation" which of course is just an oxymoronic line but I think it's our mission so we have to find a way to deal with this paradox. What we emphasize is a commitment to innovation which is politically and practically a difficult thing to do really. A guarantee of creative freedom, which I'll talk about in practice very briefly, craft excellence and a whole picture in our way to multi because we're the only graduate schools in the world that forces everyone to work in every job. So the things that then become practical issues coming out of trying to assert those values are a bit like this. One is the relationship to the status of cinema in cultural and political life within the territory where you are, doing the training that you do and it's very important in the UK because film is not officially cultural in the UK. Film schools need to express solidarity and to work with cinema institutions, film historians and everybody across the culture for the idea that the cinema is an art form maybe for another hundred years and this have to see the assertion that cinema is an art form which is not in contradiction with any industrial or aspirational cultures. In

other words, the opposition which happens in coffee breaks between culture and commerce, between students or teachers has to be interrogated until it's destroyed. I don't have any experience with people who talk interestingly about art, whose careers have suffered from it, that's just an imaginary problem.

The second thing is the relationship with the film industry itself. I think if you want to have technical training, our friends already said this in a way, if you want to have technical training for specific or already existing jobs in specific grades within an industrial formulation in any industry, then that's essentially jobs for the industrialists to organize on their own behalf, for businesses themselves. In our working relationships with the real industry we have to stay real. And that's a good thing to do but we do need to make politicians and the academic authorities understand that if they want to add education to training in a formulation of the things that we're offering, that makes film schools and their cultural independence from the industry a necessity, and that we can't just follow and say "well the industry says this, the industry says that". The purpose of a film school is to create a film culture, not to create technical aspirational training inside the film culture which already exists based on which people are already powerful. Otherwise there's absolutely no reason for it to exist and of that point of view I'm with Lenin.

How do you do that? I think you have to question everything, you have to get involved, intensely involved in the local industrial formation. You have to question ideas of professional versus amateur as well as culture versus commerce; you have to question specialization versus professionalization. As a matter of fact professionalism and specialization are different things and I reject your categories entirely but my whole career is a rejection of your ideas about how industrial work should be undertaken. I think you have to put reading and interrogating existing films at the very centre of the study and again that has to exist in a space where it doesn't contradict your idea of total immersion. So you have to get away from the notion of an academic interest and practical interest, you have to learn how to watch films as an engagement with another professional in the detail of the thing and that's one of the hardest things to learn as a centre of our teaching practice. I think you have to insist on experience as your outcome. So you have to look at individual growth in a relentless way no matter what it does to your modules and your categories and your upgrades and your plan of studies. And that can be a huge challenge and spending a lot of time thinking about that...In a way that change should happen. I think we've got to remember there's a long period during which what we said about technology and the developing industry of cinema was that the great thing about film school was that all the equipment was on the carpet and I think we've got to admit that Japanese manufactures are not the people that have taken us out of that business and there's a lot of equipment everywhere. I think that people are very slow to admit this - what you get is a creative community. The reason you pay the money is because there's a hundred and fifty other people out there who have the same aspiration as you and you might spend the rest of your life working with them. And there's almost no interest if the companies are only half full and you do something about it but the idea that technology is going to lead the way in which film schools develop, I think, it's all very much finished.

But you also have to look at the other great paradox. Suppose that there's a lots of really wonderful REDS and ARRI ALEXAS and amazing telephones that can make incredible films that you can broadcast and so on. That means a lots of people have access to production and I think that's just a good thing but what it does mean in order to be visible in film and television in the world you've got to be better. That's how it works statistically. Twenty years ago if you got one 35 mm camera and a few friends you made a movie in a couple weeks, people would be very respectful: "Wow, you made a movie!" Now you can produce lots of films and you can have lots of people who are your friends, who look at your thing on the internet but actually you don't have any distribution at all, you don't have any access to distribution, because you can't reach the level of excellence in which you would

be visible. The film schools are much more necessary because of technology than they were ever before and I think that means we've got to focus on the film schools being a creative community and what it can really deliver: the opening of the doors. So, I think film institutions have to engage with the fact that there are always other people working with film and they have to find a way of not being close conservatoires from the point of view of this social and cultural formation. So that's it, thank you.

Q: Who decides what is creative? How do you decide what would be creative work?

Ben Gibson: Well, that's a long answer. I mean that cultures develop an idea of excellence through many cultural channels and then they work them through, it's a very complicated question, but I mean the most important thing is that the word "good" and the word "popular" appear on different letters in the dictionary and most of the people involved in teaching film get confused about that.

Maria Dora Mourão: Thank you very much, Ben. Are there any questions? Well, let's go to hear Adele Atangana from Cameroon, please.

Adele Atangana: I am from the media background in Cameroon. I am a news presenter with the national TV station. I am also the director of the audio-visual training centre. I've been there for five years now. The audio-visual training centre is one of the oldest schools created in the Central African region. It was established in 1983 and will celebrate its 30th anniversary in 2013, two years from now. The school was first established to train the Cameroon radio and television technicians and now we're open to the rest of the region and students from countries like Chad, Central Africa, Gabon and so on. I'm very honoured to speak here because this was the first school in that region and I believe we serve as a model for other schools created just some years ago. I will speak about all francophone schools in that region. We recruit about 250 students each two years, this is for four semesters. And we have an entrance exam – a written and an oral exam. Last week we were doing that entrance exam and the school resumes its work in January for the next two years. Cameroonian students arrive in our school, they come with their dreams, they want to be film makers or audio-visual producers and screen writers and so on. But then we tell them that it is not just a matter of going straight and fast. We have to see them learn some skills and as they go through the curriculum and the contents of the teaching they're kind of: "Well why do we have to go through all these? Why do we have to learn this?" and so we tell them: "School is about pedagogy. If you want to be producers, you have to refine your dreams, to give them a good shape that you believe will be accepted in the art media and the cultural media." So we believe that professionalism in the pedagogical aspect of our values is very important in the region. I go through the content and the curricula every two years. We sit down and we just come back to say what we are going to teach, whether we can upgrade it, whether we can come back and see if the curricula and the content are adapted to the level of our new students. The references and the qualifications of our teachers are also a big question to us. Where are they coming from? Mostly they come from the professional audio-visual sector, the Cameroon Radio and Television and sometimes from the universities. It is very important for them to be at that level where they can give the best of their knowledge. So, the equipment needs to be upgraded every year. That is a big question in this region and we believe it is going to be of benefit to us. We believe we give the best of what we call in French "le plateau technique". Every semester we offer internships to our students so that they can get in touch with the realities of their profession and their work in the field. So, to wrap it all we believe professionalism is very important in what we do at the school, we are a school and we have programmes, we have curricula, we have learning content, we have equipment and we offer internships. We believe we have to be very very serious as a school.

(break in recording)

Maria Dora Mourão: Please, welcome John Burgan from the Newport Film School.

John Burgan: Good morning. My name is John Burgan. I am from the Newport Film School, University of Wales. We joined as a full member at the last congress in Barcelona so I feel new to CILECT. What I'm going to talk about today has to do with presenting the official line of that institution because I have, both as a film student myself, but also as a teacher, had something of a long journey through various institutions. It really makes me think about the values that I have acquired both as a film maker and now as a teacher. I should apologize at this point that I am going to show several photos during this session.

What's interesting about the Newport Film School is that it is one of the oldest film schools in the UK. It was founded in 1966 by John Grierson who was back in the UK after his time in Canada. He was working hard and he was asked by the Newport Film School to help them create a film course and he drew up a three-page manifesto on the aims of the film school which I'm going to dig into briefly today. I'll just give you a quick gloss. He reflected on the fact that for many the approach to film is romantic and properly so because the film has its own unique forms of expression. But as well as being romantic, the approach, he says, can also be unreal, as there's a good deal of illusion about cinema and television as for many it seems to provide an escape from other disciplines. It has a special attraction for the frustrated and the non-finishers; it looks to many a home from home for drop-outs. So that's the start of Grierson's thought but it really forced me to think about my own particular journey that I've made till today. So, from now on, this is not going to be a self-promotional thesis, just an account of the journey that I've taken as a film maker and as a teacher.

I started actually as an editor at BBC in television news, I'm not very sure that I can talk about values but there I certainly learned how to make decisions in the cutting room. From then on I went to Beaconsfield. This is a picture of me from the 1930s. (*Laughter*) I think it was more like the end of the '80s but certainly the technology that we were dealing with was something that was found in the 1930s working on a steam record. Much has changed since then. I was an editor at that film school so I really had my training on the steam record. I started to work with non-linear systems. But actually that's not what I want to talk about today because the thing that you remember about film school is not really the equipment, that's always in a state of change, the thing that really is important in terms of values are the teachers. Here is a gentleman I think some of you will recognize: Roger Crittenden. I remember a lot of him as an editor. He taught me where to cut but also where not to cut. Another gentleman at that time who you can also recognize is Colin Young. He was actually rather absent at that point. He was something like the absent father. He was busy keeping the school running and wasn't that available as a teacher. However, at that time, I represented the students' union and I had many discussions and outcomes with him. In fact, he gave me a piece of advice on a small piece of paper that I've kept until this day that I'll share with you later in this presentation. But what I've learned from these teachers was very much that film making is an art and an industry and it's important to find where you sit on that axis. And at that time, one of the most important aspects of the film school, something that certainly left its values with me was the emphasis on documentary that Colin Young brought. He created a very strong documentary department at Beaconsfield and that certainly created interesting film makers. And that to me was something that really helped creating me as a film maker although I went to the school as an editor. It was that encouragement to engage and relate to the real world which the documentary line very much is about. In fact, everybody at the school, whatever they were or whatever films they were working in, was started in a documentary line. So, documentary for me as a discipline is a way of forcing students to think about values, to think about themselves and how they relate to the world. People in their early twenties are far more familiar with Harry Potter or Lord of the Rings. That's the world that they have. So, forcing these people to think about documentaries is a surprise. This is Andrzej Mellin. It was really the first period of him coming out to teach with us from Poland and the guy called ..., one of

best editors in the industry in the documentary field. All of these characters left an immensely strong impression upon me. And I'd like to stress that when we talk about values it is the relation of the teacher to the students that's one of the most important aspects of what we do. Another aspect of the NFTS that was usually important to me was the international make-up of the students. At that time I think we had about one third of our students from around the world, not from the UK. It's even greater now. And of course, there are film schools like the London Film School which have even a greater breakdown. So, for me the experience of the NFTS was very much something like a voyage of self-discovering in creative expression.

After film school I set off to Berlin. This was a film that I started to write in my last year at the NFTS and in many ways it was my graduation film. I disappeared off to Berlin and the film was based on a memory of being there as a child and I don't think I would have been able to make this film if I hadn't been at the NFTS and hadn't been able to think of some aspects of who I was and where I came from. Well I'm some twenty five years later and surprisingly wearing a plug which is the typical uniform of the Berlin film maker. And I stayed on in Berlin actually for many more years until 2006 where I taught at the art school there in a very different strand from what I had experienced in Beaconsfield. It was the experimental film and media. I was very much coming from a more narrative background but it was interesting to have to engage with colleagues who came from fine art background. In 2006 I left Berlin and I headed off to Denmark. This was a very different experience at the European Film College in which some of you may have attended a congress at some point in the past. This was very much like a film monastery. People are getting together for eight months. They go there because of the isolation. People are forced to really concentrate on film making even very late at night and I think even longer than eight months. So on good days it is rather like this place, awkward, and on bad days is a little bit like that. But the thing I'd like to mention briefly now is that the emphasis in the EFC is not on formal education but on personal development. There is no degree or deployment that's awarded and it's very much driven by this notion of lifelong learning. And I think what's interesting for me as a film maker was that it was very strongly driven by the sense of community and very obviously for film makers this leads to the question of team building, teams being a value that we can talk about in film making. The teachers of the school had a very close connection to the students, their staff/students ratio was probably one to eight, so it is possible to really get to know people there. I left Denmark and I ended up at another place in Wales which is perhaps as isolated as Ebeltoft. It was a department of theatre, film and television studies, which is probably the largest of its kind in the UK. I had something of a shock when I found I had to teach production and fiction with close to ninety students at any time. It is very difficult to talk about values without any personal connection with 90 students. The Department had a mission statement which means absolutely nothing. In fact, there's a statement that was the description of the first year production module introduction to filming students who should be able to acquire analytical, reflective and discursive skills. I think this was as confusing to the students as it was to me. So, I was in a completely different universe compared to the one I was enabled of. As a film maker I talk very much on the margins. Colleagues would talk about theory and practice, and this sort of a model of a strange tree that nobody has ever seen and that has hopefully got to have labels that connect theory and practice. And in a way there happens to be contrast between Ebeltoft, on the one hand, the school driven by a sense of community as very much driven by creative practice and the school driven by cultural studies. I decided not to stay for a long time there. The UK has seen a massive raise in student numbers. Departments are driven by credits, learning outcomes; notions of excellence, etc., which rarely have much to do with my notion of film. Of course, I, as a documentary film maker, have other inspirations; I like to talk about intuition, etc. This was completely alien to my colleagues. This is not about being analytical, discursive, but about when you switch off your brain as a film maker, and I think it's very important (if we're at all talking about creative film making) that's part of the equation and that's very difficult to square with an academic line.

Just briefly about a couple of books that I've found that are useful in this aspect. This was recommended to me by Herman van Eyken. It actually has an embedded values questionnaire which is a way of people developing characters for fiction but interestingly it also ends with some questions to the film maker about relating their own life to the characters they're creating. This is from chapters in the book: introspection, inquiring, intuition, interaction and impact. This very much is what drives creative film making and it's very much connected to the values that we certainly should have. I just want to wrap up now because I must be coming to the end of my time. Luckily on the Internet we can find all sorts of images and this one here is to me the only core value that really matters in terms of education. It is of course attributed to a lot of guys with beards whether Socrates, Plato, or whoever it is. It is in Latin. That's the meaning of the whole thing why we're educators and it brings me back hopefully briefly to the Newport Film School which is very much driven by the notion of story. By story we mean, and this is getting back to the Grierson's manifesto, it's really the ideas that are fundamental to what we do to our students to get them excited about the world around them. Grierson felt very strongly that the art of cinema is connected to drama, journalism, training the art of observation. He felt that the film school was rightfully situated in an art school context rather than perhaps at a university. And his final line of the aims of the film school which was back in the 1960s was rather curious that "you don't buy your golf in the shop", perhaps those of you who were at Barcelona would remember what that actually means. Well, for Grierson it means the technology is fine, but it isn't the thing that makes you a film maker or a storyteller and those are the values that really should be driving the film school. And to finish now with the piece of advice that Colin Young gave me on a small piece of paper and I kept it till this day and I've used it many times and the paper had two names on it which have proved very useful and people wonder who they were or whatever they wrote at all. These are not names of filmmakers like Jean Rouch or John Cassavetes. I'd like to share them with you and these are just the names of two favoured malts which are Lagavulin – 16 y.o. and Macallan – 12 y.o. And I think not as a film maker but as an appreciator that was a very useful piece of advice. So that was my long journey through the institutions - like moving between the Lagavulin and the Macallan.

Q: Who was the author of the book "Creative Filmmaking from the Inside Out"?

John Burgan: It's Doe Meyer and you can certainly find it on Amazon. Another book that I've recommended to many colleagues was the book by Alexander McKendrick on film making, which is a wonderful book.

Maria Dora Mourão: Well if there's no other question, we can go to Garry Griffin, please.

Garry Griffin: Hallo. Good morning, how are you guys doing? Basically I decided that probably the best use of my time here at CILECT would be to ask a question of everyone else here: as film educators should we still be teaching film and why? Now before I basically stop my presentation there and hear what you think because I'm absolutely fascinated to hear what people think I'll tell you about my university's art perspective. I teach in the American University in Washington DC. Primarily, my job is to work with graduate students doing MA and their work. Most of my students we train in film because we believe that film is a medium that is built for creative thinking, decision making and for training purposes. So at my university I'm known as the annoying film guy. The number of laboratories that we have in the United States that have closed in the recent years is just kind of frightening. The fact that Nikon and Panavision suddenly decided to stop manufacturing film cameras last year is another problem and I think eventually there will be a cottage industry of film and there's enough film cameras floating around to keep us floating. And I definitely had a fright from a friend of mine, one of our colleagues that are here at the conference, who told me: "Hey, Kodak will stop manufacturing film!" So, all of these things make me say, "What are we doing? What should we be doing and how do we go by?" At my school the idea of training our students in film is

not enhanced with digital image capture or video in any way. We're just as involved in new media, this media, that media, all media that you can find, as everybody else. However, the thing is that we think it's a method of thinking to learn in film. So, we firmly believe that we should continue to teach in film. Now as a background to that I just want to elaborate some of the things that I've heard from other schools about teaching film. First is, film is expensive, second is, it's integrated and complicated, frequently bordering on the mystic. For most of the people integrated means that shooting on film is money and I have a quote from a guy called Wally Pfister who is the director of photography for "Inception" and a lot of other movies, he says that "The notion that the digital medium is faster and cheaper is a fallacy of a false economy." I'm a crew member who has shot digital formats and I am surprised how slow the process is, how long it takes to set the cameras, how long it takes the technicians to be happy with what's going on and how much time we spend watching people scratch their heads because they're not getting an image on the monitor or it's not being recorded. Generally speaking, most of my students are really serious about making films. In the States the price of renting a RED or an ALEXA is somewhere around 2,000 or 3,000 USD a day. The price of shooting Firewalls in Super 16 in a day which is more than I would ever allow any of my students to do - if you buy it and transfer it and you do a good job in making all of the good deals with the labs, it's around two thousand bucks a day. So the price difference is negligible. The other misconception is that film is slow. I am a cinematographer by trade. I always make my students shoot film and digital side by side because I want them to see the difference and know how it works. The important thing is that they realize what the digital is good for and what the film is good for. The point is not to get them do one or the other but get them to learn both. So, we put up the camera and frequently the digital machine makes some weird noise and shuts down, the film camera goes on and on and on. The third misconception about films is that it's antiquated. For those of you who feel this way, I'd like to remind you the many video and digital capture formats have arrived with great fanfare only to later disappear very quickly to the dust of history. Betamax, one inch, two inches, even analogue HD, they were all heralding being the next great saviour. They are all gone, film is still here, and film still works. So I can converse with anybody in this room about film and I know what I'm talking about. Most of you have been working in film schools or universities; they're wonderful places, fantastic places. However, the resistance to the teaching of film in my university and many of the universities in the United States is high and growing. The problem is that most of our faculty is now too young to have themselves been trained in film. As a result some of the faculty and most of the staff harbour numerous fears and misconceptions about the use of film in an educational environment. They never learned film and no longer see the reason for teaching it. This is an unfortunate fact but perhaps inevitable. My students are interested in shooting on film. It is regrettable that some of the faculty and staff are not. Part of our university solution to the problem of film education has been through student exchange programmes with other universities with better facilities to teach film. I should put in a footnote at this point that for us in the United States Hollywood is much as a foreign country as it is to you. We're not Hollywood, we're film makers like everybody else. I've been able to travel around and fortunately enough I got my MFA from FAMU. I'm still involved with FAMU for the past twenty years bringing American students here. I teach at the University of Johannesburg in South Africa in winter and summer and I've been able to meet people and I like that, it's fantastic. So one of the solutions that we have come up with for our students at our small school, with its limited resources, is - we ship them here. We have, for the past twenty years, and we'll continue to do so. We join forces with many other American universities who are in the same group - Syracuse, Brown, Yale, people from the mid-West, there are several colleagues at California, Vassar. So there are a lot of good schools that are in the same group as we are. We want to teach them film but our own resources are shrinking so we send them to FAMU. My students come here, they live, breathe and eat film which is something I can't get them to do with the university structure that I have to deal with. So I tell any of my American students: "If you really want to be a film maker go to Prague." Film has been with us for over a hundred years; the problem is that

I'm afraid that if the universities, academies and film schools of CILECT do not continue to teach film as a basic tool in our curriculums film will die. It is more than simply being pedantic; it is a matter of survival and CILECT as an organization of schools dedicated to film education should support the continual use of film as an educational tool. Every artist must learn the basics of their craft, master the tools and understand the material before he or she becomes master of the medium. Every sculptor must draw, every violin player must learn the skills, every writer has to learn grammar, how can a film maker not learn film? So that's my statement and that's my question and I really want to hear what you guys think.

Maria Dora Mourão: Thank you. I don't know if we have time to answer your question because there are many people here but I think that is a question that we have to keep in our minds. Are there any questions? Yes, please.

Francisco Menendez: I am from the University of Arts in Las Vegas. I wanted desperately in the nineties to change our main department of film to the department of film and digital media and I worked very hard with the dean and then suddenly I was stuck and I realized just like when we talked about music videos when we shoot videos and when we shoot film, when we talk about film we're talking about an idea. I think that we'll be the department of film until the end of days because our students say: "I'm going to show you my film." We know they might have shot it on the cell phone but they say: "Have you seen my film, I'm Daniel?" and I don't think this is going to change for us. I don't see anybody saying: "Have you seen my media?" "Is film dead?" was a talk I used to give a couple of years ago. It isn't and it won't be and I mean obviously KODAK is the best way to archive our materials and it has proven to have a life of three hundred and four hundred years. But the notion of whether or not we should be teaching how to make a feature as a dedicated class on a curriculum is not something that really worries us. What worries us is how to make a short visual story, how do you tell a feature through a visual story, how the audiences support that. And I think that that's it. And we will continue to shoot on film and we'll continue to teach them how to do it on different levels that's the answer you want to hear from the United States somewhere in the desert. Thank you.

Paul Moody: Just a couple of points. In NFTS we still do teach film. At a certain point, it's a very funny moment when first editors arrive and they fill the floor, about half way deep, with off-cuts of 35mm film and then they spend a day walking around in this stuff and cutting it to make the film part of it. And they cut some things and they put it away and they move to digital. And this is great because they understand the process. I remember a few years ago when I was editing my first documentary for the German TV and the Dutch TV, I started off cutting on the Steenbeck and I finished with the first generation of AVID and I felt like being released from prison you know, it's fantastic. But I think to answer your question I think we do need to teach film language. That's the most important thing and film as a capture format has some negative aspects as a capture format. But I do agree with you I think we have to teach film but that it's like the idea of film. You have to learn the practice of loading cameras; you have to learn the practice of going through the hell of cutting something on the Steenbeck.

Robin McPherson: In Scotland we still teach film as a technology alongside video and additional formats. I think the interesting thing about film as a technology is we have inherited the strengths of it but there are also weaknesses of what we value. And a friend of mine, a documentary film maker, made a film many years ago, travelling and walking across on 16 mm, carrying all of their gear. She's a film school graduate of the Colin Young years, and she said that you have to think before you put the camera up and you have to think before you turn the camera on and when you turn the camera off. And that's because of the limitations. And what we need to do, I don't think we need to issue manifestos and say that the schools should teach film technology. But these all are the limitations of

the technology, ironically and it seems to me that what we need to focus on is the underlying points which are a part reflection, the time to think not just shoot. That's what we need, that's what we're talking about when we're talking about film, not the technology but the methodology. That's what we need to preserve because the technology will and hopefully be superseded by the issue formats.

Garry Griffin: I welcome your comments and thoughts and I'm happy to listen to you guys afterwards because I'm unable to continue but as I said I'm very curious to hear from everybody about what you think.

Maria Dora Mourão: Ok. Thank you very much and let's go on. Andreas Gruber has the floor.

Andreas Gruber: Hello. I have been the dean and the head of the fiction department at the German Film School in Munich for ten years now. Before that I taught screenwriting for two years in Cologne. And in my formal life I was a screenwriter and a director of feature films and TV movies in Austria. I would like to provide some answers to the questions of fundamental values. These are not only the fundamental values for film education, but also social values, political values, individual values. If we talk only of values in film education, these might not be very relevant. I'm not going to give sentimental speeches about techniques. I'm not talking about marketing, I'm not talking about promotion, I'm not talking about cell phones, I'm not talking about formats. It's fancy, it's not fundamental. I would like to talk about fundamental values that are fundamental for the individuals, society, and politics. The first is narration, the second is awareness, the third is our own positions and the fourth is hard skills, not soft skills. The first and I think the most important value for film schools is narration. Students should know the history, the tradition and all the different cultures which narration has. There's no culture without narration, it's not only film narration, it's literature, it's painting, it's theatre and it's narration. And first of all before you start teaching filmmaking you have to talk about narration. I'll just try to give one very special example. The US guys are really proud to be a nation. But in formal terms a nation is formed by people born in a place. The opposite is right for you. There's one thing they have very strong narration about in Hollywood and it is the lie that you will succeed if you really believe in it. It's the stupidest lie I ever heard but it's a narration for the whole country. So everybody needs in a political sense narration but you also need very important moments and very individual narration. So all the therapist ideas come up, they have to do with narration and all those things about leading a company have to do something with narration. You have to talk about the value of narration before you become a storyteller. That's the first fundamental value I think and there are some additional issues. First, do we always talk about narration as communication? Is your film also a communication? It's a huge difference if you really can explain what narration means and what communication means. It's not always the idea of our film students who come to make films to also make communication. They always have the idea to be great film makers but not such great communicators. And the second thing I also believe in is that narration has to be dialogical in the sense of Martin Buber, in the sense of the dialogical structure of our communication. And if you really analyse the traditions of narrative cultures you'll always find that there is this very specific moment of the dialogue which implies awareness. I would like to explain awareness. The aim of storytelling and narration is to improve awareness in the normal life of people. If there is no link between the normal life and narration you miss something and the link is awareness. So if you want to teach students about film narration, first of all you have to tell them something about precise visual perception. Lots of students are coming in and it's one of the key points of our applications to try to check out if people are able to have precise visual perception. And I do believe that it is a kind of talent, it's not only to learn something but it's a kind of talent to have a very precise visual perception. So we have to start in the first semester with a lot of exercises for visual perception. First, we start with the camera and it is very interesting that when they get a camera and keep this kind of perception on a material such as digital format, and then we watch it, they suddenly find out that they have filmed and captured something of reality and they didn't see

what they did. They didn't see what's in the picture, they just saw it when they had to analyse it with the students and we say: "What do you see? And what's the function of what you're seeing in this picture you've made?" It's a very important exercise for us to do not only in the first semester. Perception is the fundamental criteria of visual narration. And perception has a lot to do with some kind of awareness. You know that ordinary people have to stretch to select what they see. And we have to do the other way round to select to tell a story. To select out of a lot of perceptions in our frames and to select them because we know that there is a narration function in them and we have to keep this. The third thing I really believe in is close to normal life because I believe that film and all the film education teaches us a lot about human life. So the third thing is that the students know that they have to put the camera at a very special position and when they put it exactly there they know that this is a kind of perspective they open up now for the frame. And when they put the camera at another position the perspective changes totally. So the kind of storytelling means that we have to find our place, our position from which we're telling the story. If you don't find it as a director or as a storyteller, you can't find the narration, so the really fundamental thing is to talk with students about their position within the narration. They have to know what kind of position they take and it's not that easy because they're convinced of the formal aspects of storytelling but they're not convinced of their narration and their position and that everybody has to see in their narration that they have a position. It's the basis, it's really fundamental. Of course students have to acquire soft skills, such as how to lead the team on the set and so on and so on, how to communicate with editors from TV stations. So maybe those are soft skills but there are lots of hard skills and they're not changing. I really believe it hasn't changed to know what the motion of your camera means and what the emotion of your characters means, how to combine talking and walking, how to combine body language, aspects of the frame and your work with the actor and so on and so on. There are a lot of fundamental hard skills, they don't change if you can do it on ALEXA, then you can do it on 35mm. I really do think that it's fundamental because it's also fundamental for society, to respect skill and not just to be fancy. That's what's important for me, thank you.

Maria Dora Mourão: Are there any questions? If not, we move on to Eduardo Lejano, Jr. and then we can have a general discussion.

Eduardo Lejano, Jr.: Being the last speaker I'm going to be brief and avoid any overlapping with all the topics we've already commented on. In the face of the changing media landscape the challenge has led to new approaches to the teaching of film. The UPFI, where I come from, is trying to adapt its academic programmes to reflect the impact of globalization, the Internet and social media on film development and practice. These words have impacted the film language, cinematography, editing and the way stories are told, including job prospects in the so-called film industry. That brings a cautionary vision of the future which perhaps reflects what technological determinism may have foreshadowed. The advancing technology and the evolution of today's student structures have produced considerable shifts in more ways than one. Globalization has seen a gradual shift of the world's economic order and the rise of emerging markets. The advent of web 2.0 has similarly ushered new ways of managing information and communication. The impact of the Internet and the predominance of social media in the last few years have led to significant changes in the medium of film as well as in its teaching. Plus film education lies at such confluences that make for a curious case where the old rules do apply and the only constant thing is the change. Today's film students come from a generation that has been equipped with such tools as MP3s and 1TB hard drives, search engines and very soft ringing systems from dual course, smart phones to touch screen tablets. It's an information obsessed lifestyle saturated with images from a bombardment of screens. It's a daily twenty four seven routine of staring at cell phones in the morning to tablets, LCD computers, flat screen TVs, digital projections from art museums to IMAX Cineplexes. Using in the way of tools for image capture from brochure to camcorders to I-phones, from ETM cams to Skype. Where tools such as DSL dual camera and an Apple laptop can be used to make a feature, the equation of movie

making may apparently have altered. The wide range of options, the movie experience in an era of net flicks and torrents has brought for shifting discourses to what our film institution is or what it will be. Digital cinematography is taking over celluloid in many film industries around the world. Recently Norway and Hong Kong have announced their movie theatres are phasing out the traditional use of film reels giving a way for digital projections nationwide. Today our colleagues have to be reminded to use tripods since a lot of them favour hand-held shaky camera work. The MTV or YouTube have great images from mob dog or fan footage examples that have come to affect the standards of the so-called big picture. The task of cinematography then can be treated these days with standard practice and three points light with the range of options available in post-production. Now, to the impact in editing in discontinuity and continuity... In traditional film grammar continuity editing is the usual aim to contain the time space continual between shots. And as we always tell students: "Learn the rules before you break them." with this new generation of baby Tarantinos and future Wong-Kar-Wais. Yet, in a lot of those films like *Transporters* the rules of continuity editing are frequently getting out of the picture in place of light fast editing cuts, standard camera moves and state-of-the-art CGI effects. Such elements help disguise the so-called visual discontinuities of jump cuts. And such high adrenaline flare is what drives people to the Cineplex and that's what helps sell popcorn. And *The Fast and the Furious* type of editing finds its opposite in the static round that's favoured in some art house films providing such a local relief. "Movies aren't what they used to be" is a common comment coming from a sense of nostalgia and perhaps from factual basis. The ways stories are told today may have somehow been impacted by the postmodern impulse that pulp culture has ushered. These titles may be some examples of nonlinear multiple plot structures that were encountered in the terminological and single strength norm of storytelling. That's like pulp fiction. The wide problems of digitalization, like random access memory, web gaming and RPG may have brought about the tendency for non-linear time storylines. Interactive computer games may have had influence on movies like *Inception*, *Memento*, whose high concept stories have come to appeal to a new generation of audiences. The assurance to get into the film industry as a result of the educational and training obtained at film schools is still a mind-set in a fashion to pursue higher tasks than that. A recent NY Times article reported that prospects for full-time jobs in the film industry are declining as in all film schools across the US numbers are increasing. The world's rapidly changing media infrastructures have opened up possibilities where the movie image is no longer confined to the traditional notion of what the film is. This dynamic media after all is essentially a passive activity of staring at the blind empty screen. The history of film has been marked with succession of visionary individuals who have contributed to its factological, aesthetic and industrial development. The challenge in front of film educators is to preserve the natural spirit's creativity, practical know-how, entrepreneurship and passion for the medium. The film – a noun or a verb, whether a commodity or an art, the media or the format – is a diverse multidisciplinary field... Perhaps the fundamental values that need to be sustained are those same values that have been accepted from previous generations and film scholars and practitioners. The styles and tools may change but some things remain unchanged. The core principles in film will find their place as we all can see in the biological and technological change. Thank you.

Maria Dora Mourão: Thank you all, thank you very much to the panellists. As there is almost no time left I suggest we continue our discussions outside.

Panel 2: Impact of Internationalization

Moderator: Wangtae Lim

(a combined transcript of sessions 1, 2 and 3)

Wangtae Lim: Good day to you all. My name is Wangtae Lim. I am a professor in directing and screenwriting at DIMA in South Korea. I am very pleased to be the moderator of this panel which focuses on the impact of internationalization. It is going to be the most practical of the three panels and hopefully we can have some fun during our time together, while we share our experience. As you know, the world is getting smaller and smaller because of globalization. Nowadays we tend to have more and more international co-productions. As implementers of programmes at TV and film schools we must equip our students with the skills they need for working in an international context. I know that some of your schools have already established some good international programmes and I would like to invite you to share the experience you have gained in that direction. I also know that some of you want to design some new international programmes. This forum is going to provide you with a good opportunity to publicise your new programme, and ask your colleagues from other universities for more information or advice. At the end of this discussion, hopefully, we will be able to address some of the consequences of internationalization, as well as the advantages and disadvantages of international development. Let's try to address those issues. Despite the fact that most of us believe that we have benefited from international development and that it has enriched our professional lives, some people may think of it as a threat to the development of cinema on the national level. If any of you has any ideas about those issues, please feel free to share them after the presentations are over. And now, may I ask our first panelist from Hungary, Prof. Gyorgy Karpati. He is a corresponding member from Hungary. He retired after serving 36 years at the Academy of Drama and Film in Hungary and for the past ten years he has given seminars and workshops in many different international venues. I would like to invite him so that he can have a talk about the overview of internationalization from the perspective of students and that of professors.

Gyorgi Karpati: When I was tackling the issue of internationalization I was looking for a key word and I found a word for myself, and that is the word **mobility**: mobility of students and teachers. Without contact there will be no international effect. I would like to point out two issues at the beginning, regardless of whether we are talking about students or teachers: the issue of language and the issue of finances. These are basic issues. Language is a strange paradox. We are teaching the visual moving images and almost no words are needed to express them. But in order to teach them we need a language. So, you see there is a strange controversy. And there is no surprise that those schools who basically use as a teaching language English or Spanish are way ahead in terms of internationalization. Because just like in aviation or IT, film uses English as a number one language, followed by Spanish which is the language spoken in the huge Latin American world. Finances come to be another issue because those schools, who admit foreign students, do it either on the basis of scholarships, or on the basis of intergovernmental exchanges, or the students have to pay their fees which comprise a large amount of money. The semester fee in the United States is about 30,000 USD, in Europe we are talking about thousands of Euros. In my country the language is a barrier but strangely enough, the medical university offers a full-time six-year study for medical doctors either in English or in German for a lot of money. And the students who come and pay this amount of money are sure that their investments will get back to them when they start working as medical doctors. So, this is the issue: are we sure that the students who pay a lot of money will have a good career once they leave the school? It is the responsibility of the school to guarantee certain level of quality in return of the financial sacrifice made by the students. In a time when there is a festival for films made by telephone, which I don't think needs too much education, what can a school give to teach students how to make a film. In my opinion and according to my experience the whole educational

programme is based on the famous sentence: "Imagination is like a muscle, you have to train it every day." And this is, in my opinion, what a school should provide to students: make the muscles of their imagination like Schwarzenegger. And this is what I am looking for when I am talking about internationalization in pedagogy. Pedagogy is a science, art is not. And if it is a science it should be handled as a science. We should use tests, exercises. We should design exercises in order to train the imagination muscles of our students.

First, I am going to speak about the **students'** mobility. A lot of schools are offering summer schools for either a specific subject like directing, or camera, or documentary, or animation. And another form of student mobility is exchange of crews, which happens very often, and which saves again a lot of money for both crews. I always remember a famous Hungarian humourist who said the following about marriage: "Marriage is a contract between two people to solve problems which would never exist if they stayed single." The same applies to co-productions. It does not always happen with student crews, but if you go to a foreign territory, you have to understand the local way of living, making films, and you will never ever succeed without the active help of the local host school. And this is absolutely essential. Then comes **teachers'** mobility. I have experience as a guest professor with seminars, workshops and master classes. And each of those has a different character and I am not going to invent the wheel but you know that the seminar is always, or just for a theoretical subject. What I do is documentary: ethics of documentaries or the impossible job to write a script for a documentary. These are things which you can discuss without any need of technical facilities, just like a seminar. The other format, the workshop, is a much more interesting issue. There is creative work in the workshop, where you are doing films.

One of my most successful exercises in my whole career was an exercise which I did in several countries on the same subject. It was a Jacques Prévert poem and the students were asked to make a film in the given two-week time from the very beginning to the very end. There in the film you will hear Prévert's poem in its original French or translated in the local language. I did it in Hungary, of course, where I started doing it, and then in the Netherlands, in Mexico, in Sao Paolo, in Norway, in Finland, and in many other countries. I have now 80 films on the same subject. And believe it or not, none of the 80 films are similar. And for pedagogical purposes you can prove that it is possible to achieve an artistic goal in many different ways. In the workshop I use the following: in twenty four hours they come back with an improvised script, prepare the job, shoot it, post production, see it, and evaluate it and after all of these we are going to see the international menu. And this exercise I started for a lot of reasons. The first reason was the one I told you about – how many different ways are possible to reach the same goal. But there is another one. You all know that work in class should be competitive and that competitive spirit can sometimes be disadvantageous because it's not always positive, unless you are handling it as a professor who knows psychology properly. But when everybody is working on the same subject this disadvantage disappears. Because then you can compare works and everybody will see which is more efficient or less efficient. Because what we are teaching, and I am going back to the basics, what all artists want to do is to affect their audience. Whether the artist is a musician, or an actor, or a filmmaker, or a painter, he or she always wants to affect people. And this can't be taught.

Another workshop issue should be commercials. Students hate commercials because they say "I don't like to manipulate people, and I don't like to be manipulated myself." But 90% out of all the graduates will make their first money in television commercials. And I think school should prepare them, because it is not an easy job, unless you are prepared for it. So in my experience it was only the Turku Film School which asked me to have a workshop on this issue where we were all doing practical commercials in that workshop. The last but not least is the masterclass. And here I can tell you that Hungary was the first to start the masterclass for the DOP students in 1991. The idea I got

from the Belgrade school which in 1989 started a summer master class for directors and it was run by Istvan Szabo and the next year they did it with Krzysztof Zanussi. And then I was thinking that my school was always famous for its DOP work, so why don't we do one for the DOP students. So, I started to work on this issue with the financial help of Kodak. They were very clever because they invested in their future consumers. I don't know how it's now but at that time it was still important. So they were backing it financially, of course CILECT did help too. And we created a programme that could invite sixteen students for free. They had to pay only for their travel, but everything was supplied by us, tuition, teaching, lodging, eating, transport, camera, materials, negative, lab, post production, everything. Why sixteen? Because this was a two-week programme with eight possible shooting days in two sets at the same time. So they were working in two different sets, two crews and in eight days you could have sixteen students. Every CILECT school could send one tape of its nominee and a board of professors, DOPs, decided who the sixteen students should be. There were always many more applications so we decided that we would have observer students who were completely involved in the work, except that they were assistants, actors, whatever. And at the end they got the same diploma. But they had to pay for it. At that time I think it was about 2,000 USD in the early 90s. Each student got a little scene. The scene was made so that there should be always a basic change in the lighting. If the set starts in sunshine, it ends in sunset. The next day we got the rushes, in twenty four hours. After editing them we put all those films together and sent them to all the participating schools. There you could use it in your DOPs teaching. It was called a masterclass but it really had and still has real masters - Oscar winners like Dean Cundey, Vilmos Zsigmond and Lazslo Kovacs. Our school was, and still is famous for the invention of this very special master class and I still hope that Janos Xantus will run it in the future as well. If you have any questions for me or him, please feel free to ask. Thank you for your attention.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you George. Next, I would like to introduce Ms. Tania Nelson from the Humanity Institute of Television and Radio Broadcasting in Russia. She is the Dean of Radio and TV Journalism and the coordinator of international projects.

Tania Nelson: The Humanity institute of TV and Radio Broadcasting in Moscow or GTR, as it is also known, puts great importance on international relationships. GTR has a number of international relationships. It works with the media department of Edge Hill University in the UK and with the Institute of Northern Culture of Finland. Our relationship with EHU is now over five years old. Every summer between 8 to 20 students from GTR fly to England for seventeen days of study and practice. We call it a course of international practice, or a summer school in the UK. That's because students get new ideas and learn professional techniques in England. This is achieved by combining a series of lectures and practice. The students are split into few groups to make two films each. They choose their own genre and form, we find they tend to try out doing fiction which is different from documentaries and news features that they usually do in Moscow. So they can practice what they want. The finished products are then presented to the tutors for critical judgment. The Russian students also get to see examples of documentary films. As an additional benefit, the students practice their English language skills and learn some of the English language broadcasting vocabulary. After completing this programme some of the students start to think about continuing their education after finishing GTR. The certificate they get from attending the course can be attached to their CV and can help them get on a foreign-based master degree programmes. It can also be considered an advantage as they apply for jobs in Moscow. If the students do not want to attend the course, they have to spend the summer in one of Moscow's television or radio companies instead. So the course replaces their mandatory practice. But some students are greedy for practice and do both. The benefits enjoyed by our students are obvious as their experience increases a lot. What makes this programme unique is the flexibility of the learning content and that depends on the specialities of the students who go on the course each year. This can be done before the course starts or while

the course is running. So, if we have more directors and journalists we will organize special master classes for them. Last year we had most sound and editing students, so there were extra lessons about sound and editing. Feedback from students shows they enjoy the balance between knowledge and the experience being in a different country.

Last year we developed a relationship with another foreign partner, and as you can see with another culture, in Tornio, in Finland. We have put up this on our website so that the students can see it how it works. Currently we are working on a cycle of a few portraits of our neighbours in Russia and Finland. They are going to be documentaries about famous and common people from our countries who have lived (permanently and temporary) in the other country. How do we see each other? It is always interesting and useful to know. We have in mind to exchange our films between our schools, show it on the Russian TV, on the main internet channels, and send it to national and international festivals and also to educational institutions. Our next plan with the institute of Northern Culture in Tornio is just a general project called ALLEGRA. We hope this will give our students a chance to work together and learn from each other. ALLEGRA is actually the name of a train which moves from Saint Petersburg to Helsinki. So the plan is for our students to do the part to the Finnish border and Finnish students to do their part.

I'd like to add something about master classes. I think it's useful to have famous directors and script writers. Our famous film director Nikita Mikhalkov delivers master classes in Moscow every few months which are free of charge for students. And it's a practically oriented and good master class. He's talking about things with passion and it's useful. Students in our school know written English language but the thing is that they can't talk English. A couple of students would like to join master programmes in foreign universities with English language. But again they have to pass a special exam like TOEFL. I don't know how they organize themselves additionally as part of this. And finally our director wants to ask you if you can give us a link with films from your schools so our students can just go to your link and see maybe some of your films. I think it's important to see school films, to see what other students in other countries do and on what level, subject, stories, etc. This is why we think the CILECT Prize is very important for us. I normally show the films to the students and it is a great interest on their side.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you, Tania. George talked about mobility in international programmes and he mentioned international workshops, summer schools, exchanging crews and master classes. He also said that there was a problem with the language and that finance was very important and I think we can talk about that later. Tania introduced to us her experience with two different schools, one in England and one in Finland. The first programme was a seventeen-day workshop and she talked how she can hold a master class. Do you have any questions for these two colleagues?

Q: I would like to ask George is there a difference in the approach of teaching foreign students and teaching local students, is there some difference in pedagogical factors and philosophy?

Gyorgi Karpati: Of course the difference is how you get the feedback. Do they understand what you are saying? That's a basic question. So I always start with a joke and if the laugh is correct then I continue. If I feel that my humour is not appreciated, then I am in trouble.

Ben Gibson: I come from a school where we don't have any foreign students, because we are an international school. We have 75% people from outside of the UK and we have some home students but we never use foreign students as an expression. My experience is that what happens unfortunately for us, for our self-esteem is that they teach each other. So, they have an experience which completely transforms their lives, organized by one another. So, what's interesting about that

situation for me is the following. In Britain there are two studio schools, there is the National Film School and there is the London Film School. And where we are lucky is that we are not responsible for a national cinema. Nobody walks in and says: "Ok, what are we doing with the future British film." Nobody ever says that which means we can debate, we can challenge, we can create new things, and we are not bound in a stupid debate about something which different generations of people, with a political agenda, with nostalgic feelings are imposing on us. We are not responsible for cinema. And that is what the students are interested in. And they begin by teaching each other about the national film cultures. And that learning process is the beginning of everything that they do. So I think that the challenge of internationalism is that we unfortunately have to say that generationally we are involved in concepts of national cinema. And of course there are national cinemas. But in the real live experience of lots of young film makers national cinema is a historical, ironic, difficult space that they need to use but it isn't a mission. Maybe if we are over a certain generation we think there is such a mission. But I think that is where we are not creating national cinemas. Like in Britain everyone who refuses to be part of the national cinema, like Terrence Davies who I have made films with, who completely doesn't compromise with the national cinema, they are the treasures of the national cinema. So this is the paradox of national cinema. Anyone that doesn't give a shit what cinema is supposed to be, they are the most important film makers in that country. And I think the challenge of internationalism is for the people who are from the generation of the teachers to understand what their process is. For a generation of students who are interested in local history and local culture, but they have a notion of the culture of cinema, which is way beyond most of us think we teach.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you. Yes, it's really important that students can learn from each other, they teach each other. In your school is there any special venue for knowledge of that kind of experience among the students? Of course, they can talk about their cinema in progress form, of course, but is there any special programme in your school for teaching each other?

Ben Gibson: They watch an incredible number of movies together. We try and create a United Nations in the coffee bar. In Britain, you know, the one problem is that it is difficult to be a cinéophile in Britain as it is not supposed to be a version of business. So it means that most British students, even really interesting British students, who go to the London Film School, when they arrive at the coffee bar they find they are socially unacceptable because they have never seen the three films by Robert Bresson or one film by Yasujiro Ozu and then for the first six months they watch eight or twelve films a week until they belong to a group. So, one of the foundational jobs of the London Film School is to start this process that may last some months.

Q: I think that when we say international it means completely different things if you talk about the United States or if you talk about Europe, especially countries where English is not the language. So these are countries with different approaches. I also would like to add that when you say that students can teach each other I would add a different approach or aspect. As I see what could be the most efficient thing in film education, the practice of film education, this is the common experience. In the cinematography master class, I think one of the strongest things this year was that we had sixteen shooting students from fifteen countries, actually. We had students from Georgia, from the Czech Republic, from Germany, from many different countries. And what is very inspiring for the students is that they work together in a team, with people from completely different cultures and cultural backgrounds. So, I think I see that this common experience can have a very strong effect on the community.

Adèle Atangana: Thank you so very much. I just wanted to say that there are so many places in Africa nowadays as far as cinema is concerned, mostly in Ghana and in Burkina Faso. But how do you think Africa can connect to all this moving and moving of the cinema, going around the world? And

international means to me something that maybe also involves all these productions and film industries. South Africa is one of the countries also, which is really green wood in the film industry so I've heard of all the prohibition as far as the internationalization is concerned as you're saying, but then how do you think Africa can connect to that? I believe a school can be a good field for some of the students to come and see maybe what is going on in Cameroon which is my own country, and then maybe to be connected to the culture and the history and all the things that we are doing on the field there. Maybe I am not always able to come to your schools and to see what's going on and still we know it through television, through cinema. So I come back to my question. How do you think Africa as a whole continent can connect to this big movement?

Gyorgi Karpati: You have to forget your minority complexes because of technology, which is a financial issue. But you have all the manpower, the brain power, which we are interested in. Burkina Faso has the best film festival in the whole of Africa. As I said, now you can make a film with a telephone. It's the content, not the form. You can do it. And you have wonderful people, so I don't think that there is a problem. As to your question how you can get students there, I would say that first you have to get the professors and then you will get the students.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you. Do you have any other suggestions for solving the problems in some African countries? I know that because of the Erasmus programme the mobility within the European countries is really great. But it is difficult with other countries that are far away from Europe. We represent many different schools in the world and you may have ideas how we can shorten the distance. I am from Korea and if I want to go to any foreign country, I have to fly. I can go nowhere in Africa. I think that Africa may face some problems in that direction. I think what we can do, as George said, if we have more budget, is to seek for European students, buy tickets and invite some professionals. I realize that in most European countries to speak English is not much of a problem. I think it is not the same with the Asian countries and with Korea in particular. English always poses a barrier to the internationalization of our schools and our programmes, because faculty members, school staff and students speak insufficient English. Even if we want to offer something to students from foreign countries, the language barrier makes it really difficult. So is there a school that can offer some kind of a solution? As George said: "If you are good at teaching, it is not going to be a problem!" but when you really speak almost no English, it's really impossible.

Christine Ghazarian: I would like to say something to the school members that are not part of the European Association. The European Commission who set up the MEDIA programme can invite non-Europeans to join the programme. So I think you should go into the website of the European Union, the programmes that they are involved in, and if you think that there are programmes that you will be interested getting involved in with your school, you should talk to the other partners and maybe you can create things together. This is a possibility that exists since we have money in Europe. Maybe one day there won't be any money left but today it's possible. So, I think you should also be active in that sense. Go to them and see if you can do things together with the help of the European programmes. It is possible to do that today, even if you are non-European, so I think you should do it.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you for the information. Do you have any other questions or something to say?

Participant: What we find in our master school is actually that English is a bit of a problem. Even when everybody speaks English, if you want to have a conversation at a certain level and it should be at a certain depth, we find that sometimes it is problematic. And we actually get English conversation lessons to students for those who want. And also they have to write, they have to write in English. Then that is a problem which we try solve. What I mean is that language is important. Maybe it is not a problem when you are making a film, but it is when you are talking. That is part of the education.

Another thing that we find interesting but not easy is the differences that our students have in relation to their educational experience and the way they have been taught, I mean the techniques of teaching. We have a lovely Hong Kong student who finds our open way of teaching impossible. The teaching is done on the basis of everybody participating and everybody sharing, etc. But when I ask her “what do you think?” and she goes into a kind of stupor, I mean this is not the way that she was taught. That was a completely different relationship so those things are not impossible but they demand time and energy, and consideration.

Bert Beyens: What you are talking about is that we have to become much more aware of the cultural differences. I was very impolite today. I mean, I don't know who gave me this card, a colleague from Asia and of course being a European I took it and put it in my pocket. I think I made a big mistake because at least the thing to do is hold it. So it's the awareness that we need to share more. So, we are learning, too.

Ben Gibson: There are a couple of things about language. And what is interesting in London now, I mean that it's just a reflection on internationalism, is that there are certain countries where they all will get in one flat together and then they will never get to a master's level of English. So if I can, I mean I can't control everything, but I try and distort the living arrangements of those countries, for instance Italians, who go in the same flat and never speak English. The Spanish used to do that but they don't do it so much. Certain Asian countries have that. The level of learning is completely different depending on whether they will get one flat. So, in two years in London if you don't move into a flat with English speakers, you have like only 40% of the programme.

Adèle Atangana: What I wanted to add is that Cameroon is the only French speaking country in CILACT and the language barrier seems to be very important in discussions like this one. Last year in Barcelona we were with a colleague from Burkina Faso and he was really in trouble, totally confused. He couldn't understand a single word. He kept asking me or Madeleine what was going on, what they were talking about. You see this year he did not come with us as he got lost in these discussions because he couldn't understand the language. We have Egypt, Egypt is an Anglophone country. In South Africa normally they are English speaking, and Cameroon we're just bilingual. My first language is French. Now I am just trying to cope with English and I am sorry if I am not correct. We are four of us in CILACT and I was telling my president yesterday night that I am not sure many other countries will be willing to join. Cote d'Ivoire, for example, we have contacts over there but then still it is a matter of “will I understand what's going on, can I really be involved in discussions, can I express myself”.

Ben Gibson: So, maybe we should talk in CILACT about the possibility to have translations in French, it's an important thing. And most of the important film cultures of Africa are francophone anyway.

Bert Beyens: But in Melbourne 2002 there was a vote on that and we saw there were less than 15% of participants who wanted translation in French. I think that there is very often a difference between understanding and speaking. Some people don't dare to speak English, let's say it's very good to ask questions in French, everybody will understand it. Ask questions in your own language, then listening and understanding is less a problem for people who don't dare to speak.

Wangtae Lim: The most talked about thing in Korea among universities is internationalization. At the Ministry of Education universities are categorized in terms of how internationalized they are, meaning how many English classes they teach. So now some Korean universities teach Korean literature and language using English language. It seems like a lot of stress for teachers and for the students. Like you said we can understand the class better in English than in Korean. Thanks a lot.

(...)

Our second discussion group consists of wonderful panelists from all over the world. We have here Pascale Borenstein from La Fémis and Herman van Eyken from Griffith Film School. Please, welcome Pascale.

Pascale Borenstein: Hello. I will try to speak more slowly than I usually do. Those people who know me are aware how fast I can speak and they have told me that when I speak in French I sound like a machine gun. So, I will try to do better in English but you can always say “It’s too fast”. I work as Head of International Affairs at La Fémis, the French Film School based in Paris. The school was established in 1986 and currently offers ten different film programmes to approximately 170 students. It is a national film school. It is public, it is free. Being the only national film school offering all those programmes might be considered both an advantage and a disadvantage. Unlike other European countries, we have another film school, ENS Louis Lumière, which enjoys the same kind of status that we have. It’s located in Paris and it offers mostly programmes in sound and cinematography. And there are also representatives of VARAN here. And VARAN is a great programme for documentary film makers. So I can’t say that La Fémis is the only film school because it would be completely arrogant. But La Fémis has a special tradition in France of being the national film school and it has the heritage of being the successor of IDHEC, a school that operated in the period between 1943 and 1985 with a clearly expressed international profile. A lot of directors from the rest of the world, and especially people who ran away from dictatorships or from regimes that they didn’t agree with, for example Angelopoulos, Costa-Gavras and others, were actually IDHEC students. So, this is the tradition and the philosophy that we have. I just would like to focus on two things. First of all, in my opinion, there are both weaknesses and strengths to La Fémis being a school that implements international activities. I don’t think we are an international school. We are a French school which offers international programmes. And this is all very different. The second thing I want to say has to do with the types of cooperation activities we implement. Paradoxically, La Fémis is supposed to be a good school but we have a very bad website which hasn’t been updated for something like five years. I shouldn’t be saying that because Marc Nicolas is not here but he knows it quite well. But we have a Facebook profile and we have really good friends. When I counted the number of schools we worked with it turned out there were sixteen of those schools. So I think it’s pretty impressive.

What are the strengths and the weaknesses of the French cinema and La Fémis? I think La Fémis offers some kind of a magic combination due to different factors. What are our strengths? First, as you know, the French cinema was very popular for a long time and basically when we get students coming from all over the world they know two names at least, the names of Jean-Luc Godard and Luc Besson. The second thing has to do with the industry. The French industry is very strong due to different factors. I am not going to get into details but only during 2010 over 220 films were produced with French money, many of which were co-productions. The box-office is pretty big for Europe, compared to other countries. 200 million tickets were sold last year. Right now in France there is a phenomenon called “Untouchables”. It’s French and it has been directed by two people who have not studied at La Fémis. Eight million tickets were sold for two weeks. You can imagine what that means for France the population of which is about 65 million people. The movie is about a paralyzed guy and a black guy from the suburbs who helps him and that’s how they become friends. In other words, this is a buddy movie. It’s an anti-crisis movie, an anti-depression movie. I haven’t seen it because I don’t need that type of lesson right now. But anyway, eight million people have seen this film in two weeks, so it must be really a huge thing.

There is yet another thing about France and the traditions of the French cinema. I really don’t want to sound arrogant. I am happy and lucky to live in France but sometimes I am also bored to be

French. Many filmmakers from all over the world, however, have loved France to the point that they don't want to leave it. I will just mention a few of them who became directors and stayed in France. Now I can think of Luis Buñuel, Pavel Lungin, Costa-Gavras, Krzysztof Kieslowski and a lot of other people. So, there must be something about France. I think of Ben Gibson, who I have been very close with since we were together at the London Film School, who always said something about the cinéophile. In France we talk about film as an art, and it is a business. "Untouchables" is a huge box-office hit. It's true that we like to talk about films, just like everyone here, but maybe that's not the case everywhere in Europe. That means that there are students at La Fémis, and I am sure there are students like that in your classes, who talk only about films. They don't care about the economy. They don't care about debts. What I mean is that they don't even know about that as they don't even read the paper. They only read about films and watch films. They are obsessed with films. And the tradition of the cinéophile is comforting for us because it is like a world we can live in. We are very happy to be in this bubble of cinema. There is also some political background to the French cinema. It has a very ambitious political strategy as well as a strategy for international development. There are about fifty international agreements between France and other countries on the basis of which films can be co-financed between France and Russia, France and Argentina. So, those agreements can be interpreted as an indication of how much France would like to be involved in such projects. And France tries to keep its rank in terms of international presence. The president of the school currently occupies the highest position in the hierarchy. He is an embodiment of internationalism. He was born in Haiti and went to the dffb. I don't know when but I guess that was ten years ago. And now he works as an international director and directs documentaries, some of which you may have seen, but also fiction movies like the one about Patrice Lumumba, which participated in the Cannes festival. Along these lines, our president is very much a symbol of how open our school is trying to be. As far as La Fémis is concerned, there is an exam for international students. Students from all over the world can take the exam which is different from the exam that the French and the European students take. This exam offers yet another way to get admitted to the school because we know how hard it is to speak French and to write in French when you were not born in France. So we try to completely forget about the fact that those kids don't know French. They are very young when they apply, at the age of 21-22, but if they want to study at La Fémis it is usually because they like the French cinema and because they know about Godard and Besson, and they want to be friends. Over the last couple of years about five of the fifty students who get in are international students. By international students I mean non-European students. The European students have to take the exam for Europeans. No matter which country in the world they come from, students who like the French cinema can come and study at La Fémis. Right now we have a student from Korea, two students from China, one student from Ukraine. The admission process is completely open and in most of the cases it is up to the students to decide what they would like to do. Since our website is very bad, the potential applicants learn about La Fémis through other sources. What is more, our website is only in French, shame on us. If you don't speak French you can't understand what it is about. But when the applicants take the exam, we don't look at how good their French is, we try to look at how they approach a film and if they react to it as film makers. We don't pay that much attention to individual mistakes they might make. One of the assets of the school is that some of our graduates become famous. This is good for the reputation of the school. Their names function like advertising brands.

Of course, there are some real obstacles as well. The language barrier comes first. As I already said, speaking and writing in French is not easy. The second factor has to do with the fact that France ranks fifth or sixth in the list of countries in the world that welcome international students. Basically, this means that if you are a student and you want to study abroad and have the opportunity to choose among several countries, you will choose to go to the US first, and then to Canada, Australia, England, and France. The last obstacle has to do with the fact that we don't have the same power in terms of marketing and international globalization strategy as, for example, NYU. If you go to New

York, it's impossible to miss that they own almost half of Manhattan, especially the village. They have 40,000 students, we have 200 students. So, basically it's like David and Goliath. It is really difficult for most of our schools, not only for La Fémis, to attract international students who consider going to the US and are familiar with the brand of NYU or Columbia University. These are some really good schools. We work with them so we think they are very good. In other words, that is the environment.

The second thing has to do with the kind of co-operation we have today. What kind of things do we do? I will start with the most integrated curriculum and will finish with the least integrated. Firstly, our school offers joint degrees between two schools which end up with a joint diploma, just like the ones lots of schools offer, especially schools in North America and Europe. And La Fémis has been doing it with a German film school in Ludwigsburg – the FABW. A joint degree means that the students have earned a joined degree from La Fémis and the FABW, and this is a degree in European production. The programme is one year full-time. Students who apply should have completed a three-year degree from any university and they study production, distribution, marketing, writing for a year. The aim of this programme is to train European distributors and European producers. Right now there are six French, six German and six European students on this programme. It turned out to be very successful. It was launched in 2002 so it has been running for 10 years now. I think this programme works because there is no bureaucracy between the schools, no paper; we just agree on what we want to do. The process is similar to the process when we train people for the open market and provide to them the best training possible. This is a very intense one-year full-time programme, and students learn from each other. When I meet them for the first time I am very impressed by the fact that they speak two or three languages without any problem. They think like a new generation of Europeans. I call them the “mad” students, they live in a suitcase and they don't care. They can be in France, in Germany, in England. For them it's Europe, they think and they feel as Europeans.

And the other kind of co-operation we do is mobility, which means that we exchange students between schools. Students from La Fémis go to other schools and we are very happy to welcome and host students from the list. I'll give you a brochure of the schools we work with. I will just mention their names; we work with CalArts in the US, Columbia University, UCINE in Buenos Aires, the Tokyo University of the Arts, ECAL in Switzerland, INSAS in Brussels and others. What we do, and what those students do, is they go abroad, leave the school. Actually, we try to finance their stay as much as we can because we don't want to discriminate students on the basis of their income. So we finance their travel and the schools really do barter, nobody charges anyone. We try to really exchange students as a barter thing. Their stay ranges from two weeks to two months; in the US they stay for two months. And they go to the school and there they become the students of that school for two months. They attend the class, they work, they write a script in English and it's really a help for them. It changes the way they see the world, the way they see films and they understand things about their old school. Usually, they come back very happy with La Fémis, it's amazing that La Fémis produces films without asking for anything. It's very good for us actually that the students leave for a while, because when they come back they find out that their mother is better. They really learn from each other and discover a whole new world. For example, in Columbia University screenwriting students can attend TV-series, with somebody who was a show runner of “Homicide”, so for them it's like a dream. So, it's really fabulous to have this oxygen and not to be just French, and in a small bubble. And the last thing I am going to say is that we do a lot of things, we share experiences and make a lot of projects together in Europe with the support of the MEDIA programme, which we talked about earlier. This programme has been open to film schools since 2006. It is a pretty recent programme. We work with the NFTS which has a programme for graduates. We still work with the London Film School, and the Hungarian film school on the low budget film forum which is a one week seminar on how to produce low budget films. And we are also going to do something with DFFB, UNATC and ESCAC. The project is called “Making waves”. This is Ben Gibson's title because Ben

Gibson is very good with titles. That's it. This project is a huge priority and I have been working on it almost every day since I started working for the school. This priority was set by my director Marc Nicolas, because he said "All good schools have to be international today". So we are doing it.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you, Pascale. She has talked about the cinéophile in French cinema industry. And she also talked about some problems they're facing at La Fémis. And she also introduced some nice international programmes at that school. Thank you. Now I would like to invite Herman van Eyken, who is the head of Griffith Film School in Australia. He is going to tell us about the different ways through which we can intensify the multicultural dialogue among people from different cultures.

Herman van Eyken: Yes, I would like to make it a bit shorter because otherwise we're going to run out of time, then we have to get the opportunity to discuss. I was recently appointed there, after many years in Singapore and before that in Brussels. And one of the things that I've been asked to pay more attention to is exactly the international agenda of the school. Griffith University is a very big university, about 40,000 students. It's ranked in the top 5% of the world so it's a rather good university. And it's a prime institute in the sector dealing with design and photography and with very big tracker hood. The youngest baby in there that has been given a very special place is the Griffith Film School and it is much younger, it's not even ten years old actually. But nevertheless it is a very successful school. It's the largest film school in Australia by the moment. The international side of the school has always been a very active one. I think this is of course because of the Australian context in the first place. As you already heard from Pascale, it's the number three where foreign students want to go and study and that's not different for film. So, we have quite an important cohort of foreign students. We have a very different entry system for the foreign students. The system of intake for the national students goes through a qualification of their previous studies actually. They call it an OP court and it's a number. The lower the number, the higher they are actually qualified and the more chances they have actually to go into the school of their first choice. Griffith Film School is extremely successful in that because we go up to OP 4, and I think every year we go higher and higher. Which means that we have very motivated students to come to our place and the places are of course limited. So if we can only put a number there and the quality needs to attach them, we need to go up with a number and we go like last year we had OP-6 and this we had OP-4 because we have always these entry numbers that we need to respect and we can't take any more students because there's a limited number of spaces. On top of that we accept of course international students and they come from many places. We take students from Scandinavia, from Canada, we have a few US students, we take quite a lot of students from China and India, and of course from the South-East Asian region. We have also some arrangements with existing schools just like La Fémis. I think the numbers are about the same. We have that on different levels. We have MOU arrangements which are a Memorandum of Understanding with a school where we actually facilitate the exchange. We have articulation agreements which are basically intake facilitation for both Australian and for international schools that come and have actually advanced standing with us because of the quality they have from their own institute. We have started to work now on a more pro-active role with our international partners.

One of the things that we are trying to get up together with the VCA, is to start a joint degree with two European schools. We are actually in the middle of negotiations with these things. It's an important thing because one of the particularities that we found attractive in this mechanism is that VCA has a very different approach, with very different programmes. And so because of that in that exchange model with the EU we are actually not competing with each other. The students from the European institutions who would come to VCA or to us are very different because the schools and the programmes of these two schools within that joint degree are very different. We have the advantage that we teach in English. We have the disadvantage that if we want to go to in an

exchange agreement with a school where the teaching is not in English this is a problem as well. Because our students most of the time speak English, and nothing but English. And I think that is a problem because I myself speak a few languages and I have done that myself and had to learn a language because I wanted to do, after my first film school, another school to complement my studies. And I had to learn a foreign language which was Italian and I will never forget what it did to me. So I think it's a very important thing and I am actually pushing these only-English-speaking students to learn another language. On the other hand we, of course, can welcome students from a foreign background, speaking another language and we have exchanges with PWSFViT, the school in Poland, which were quite successful and of course they came to do their graduation film with us and it was a film in English of course with Polish subtitles. But I think this is a very good thing. My background from Singapore has taught me that actually working in developing and making the films in your authentic voice can sometimes mean your own language. Not always, it could also be the language of the other. And I think that is where the real challenge is coming now. I think the next step that we want to attack is actually cross-cultural collaboration and that's much more complicated. We are now developing an Asian Pacific Screen Lab, we have one of the big advantages that we have a very important event on the Asian Pacific calendar that happens in our backyards in the Gold Coast which is the Asian Pacific Screen Awards that have existed for five years. The Asian Pacific Screen Academy was launched three years ago and they have actually a sister agreement with the European Film Academy. In the Asian Pacific Screen Lab we will work together with South Korea and we will develop a joint lab for professionals to help them go in their first cross-cultural collaboration, which means a co-production of course between the Pacific and Asia. The life line of Australia is becoming more and more of course the Asia Pacific. Before it was dominated entirely by the Anglo-Saxon line but that's not the case anymore.

The new thing that we have launched in terms of post-graduate studies that is a little bit oriented towards what has already happened in the Asian context is our new Master's degree in Screen Production that will work on long formats. And the two examples that we have are KAFA and the Tokyo University of the Arts who are actually developing low budget but long format films with their students, which we are actually developing now as well. And we try then of course to get our undergraduates to work all around the short format and the post-graduates around the long format and finally the Asian Pacific Screen Lab that taps into the untapped resources of these Screen Academy members who come once a year to our backyard. We hope we're going to work and develop our own cross-cultural collaboration things. The last thing I would like to say is that in the context, you have already highlighted that the world becomes a bit smaller; I would say it becomes extremely exciting and that's exactly the facility of being able to develop a digital interface. I call it a digital interface, because it's the school's tool to tap into resources from anywhere they would like and I will give a few examples. We are calling now for our jury members over violation films, people from all over the world. We send the films out, we get them assessed and we get actually our assessment panels back. Initially they were industry based panels, now they are not anymore. They are just from all over the place. We try to do that also to get the students' body of work out all there. So we have, of course, a very active website, we change our website not every seven years but in three days let's say. And one of the very active points is that we upload whatever we want, whatever activity, things, sometimes just interviews, workshops, artists in residence. The artists-in-residence is sometimes the most classical, old-fashioned way of the face-to-face, but where it's interesting is that we can continue the dialogue with our artists-in-residence online. Last, again in digital context, we are developing cross-culturally together with a university in Los Angeles an online course that is called "Cinematic Storytelling across Cultures" and it's again the obligation to work in a cross-cultural context, this time between America and Australia. That's all for the moment. Thanks.

Pascale Borenstein: I just want to add one thing. I forgot to say that the French-German class we have is taught in French and German and it's really something very important to both schools. In France we speak French in Germany we speak German. So at the start students have to speak French or German plus English, so it's really two out of three which are required to take the entry exam. They go to Ludwigsburg for the first session which is three months from October to Christmas. And basically we put headphones; I mean the school finances a headphone system for the French speaking or people who haven't mastered German enough. And after a few weeks they take off the headphones and it works. People kind of get it. And the same thing is in Paris when they come in Paris for the German speaking students they had headphones, translation for two, maybe five weeks again and then headphones again – off, and it works. So it kind of goes against what we think that we should all speak English. It can work if you actually work on it. Even if we don't have a website I think La Fémis is one of the best schools in the world and there are 12,000 people who apply every year, who want to get in this school. So it's not only about the website and the last thing that I would say is that: Columbia tried an online programme for writing and they stopped it because they were actually killing themselves, so I think online programmes are really big thing to debate about. And I think learning how to make films is learning how to put people together to do something together. It's the basics of films as long as films have been made in the history of cinema which means since 1895.

Herman van Eyken: I do agree with you that film making is an extremely co-operative art and it is only possible face-to-face. We exchange information data and all these things online and we do develop treatments because I think screenwriting is probably the only thing that you can really very nicely develop in an online environment, not necessarily only in face-to-face.

Wangtae Lim: Now I would like to invite Elena Rusinova from VGIK, Russia. She expressed an interest to briefly introduce her international programme to us.

Elena Rusinova: Good afternoon. We had the head of the international department of VGIK and she is not here, she is currently ill. She was supposed to be a panelist and talk more about the international life. But at the moment I would like to shortly introduce to you an international summer school which will be done for the fourth time next year. Probably it would be very interesting for schools who teach documentary film because it is focused on documentaries. So usually it is in July and it goes for about three weeks. It is organized by VGIK under the patronage of the Minister of Culture of the Russian Federation and the local Minister of Culture. The aim of this international summer school is to acquire additional knowledge and training in the profession of film production of documentaries, to develop academic and creative film production contacts between students from schools from different countries, and to exchange the knowledge and the experience in the field of film education. For the last three years the school has invited students from directing, cinematography and film production departments and next year we plan to invite sound engineers or sound directors to join the crew. The programme usually consists of nine international crews. By the way, the language is English. Usually there is a competition with prizes. And there are master classes given by European and Russian documentary film makers. The task for the students is to explore the area and to present a synopsis or a short story, covering local problems or historical aspects of the area. VGIK provides board and lodging for the participants, equipment and materials for film production, transportation costs within the Russian Federation, and the DVD with a collection of the films made during the summer school. The participants pay for flight, the visa for Russia, and for the international health insurance. So the first school was done in Svetlogorsk, the second one was done in Azov and the last one of this year was done in Kazan city, the largest city of the Republic of Tatarstan. In order to participate in the summer school, students should send a film which they have done during their studies at their school, and as I already mentioned, a short synopsis of a future film. In other words, they have to do research work in the mass media or on the Internet. If they are

short of information then the international department of VGIK takes care of that and they provide more links and information about the city and the venue of the summer school. This year we had 27 participants and eight of them were foreign students. I'd like to say that by Christmas we will have more detailed information on our website and I invite all of you and your students to take a part in this international summer school. And if you have any suggestions concerning documentary directors who can deliver master classes we are open to your opinions and suggestions. Thank you very much.

Wangtae Lim: Are there any questions on the presentations?

Paul Moody: There is just a brief thing I want to say. As you may know the NFTS along with PWSFViT and La Fémis has a project called "Passion to Market", which unfortunately didn't get MEDIA funding for three years. However, we don't want to give up on this project and we will probably go ahead with it with a new application in the coming year. We are not sure yet whether it will be an initial training or whether it will be continuing, we are deciding now. What we did do in the previous application was that we decided to open it much more to the other film schools in Europe. And this will definitely be a part of the new plan. What I want to say briefly is that, as with the most funding agencies they cancelled it just as the thing started to get really perfect, but next year we should have about four feature films, either fully funded or actually going into production next year for the first foreign intake.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you for sharing that important information. For feature movies this is impressive, I must tell you. Thank you. Are there any other questions?

Q: I think we are all talking about internationalization, globalization and of course it's all very fascinating. I don't really have a solution to the issue of how we can make international programmes with international students, sometimes having to speak English, but it's not a question of language, but a question of how we can maintain the cultural difference of our students and their different visions. And how can we guarantee that the students won't do the same mainstream films that are on the international level? This is my question.

Paul Moody: Could I answer just from my own experience? We work with not just French, Polish and British but with lots of students from other countries in the different schools. And you don't have to say: "How do we make them all different". They are all different. There is not one of them who is producing the same film as anyone else. They are all producing very particular things. Also we never said: "You have to do co-productions". It was always like "Do something small because at an early stage of your career you're not really worth co-producing with, you've got nothing to offer to those bigger boys out there, unless you are working really at the really low level and it's too much hassle and it's not worth doing a co-production anyway. So this is a non-question as far as I am concerned from your point of view. The cultures of the people are so strong in cinema, and the cultures of the film schools are so strong, that they don't all make the same thing. They make very different things but what is the same is the things we teach them, they are almost always the same. How do you ride a bike? How do you write a script? It's the same pretty much in every country.

Pascale Borenstein: One thing I just want to say. I think I may have been completely misunderstood if you thought that what we were doing was internationalizing our students. We do exactly the opposite. We want our students to get an air of what is going on elsewhere, understand how it works, how you may feel in the US, in Argentina. We want to make our students highly experienced outside and get students from outside experiencing the French cinema. I really agree with him that students are so specific, they all have their world. I remember last year we had a student from La Fémis but she is from Bulgaria. She will be all her life torn somewhere between Bulgaria and France,

and she is brilliant, she wants to do a movie in Baghdad and there is no way for those students to be international yoghurts, I mean we are doing exactly the opposite of that.

Robin McPherson: I want to agree and disagree with Paul and Pascale at the same time. We've been running a summer initial training programme for four years with BFM in Estonia, Aalto University in Helsinki and IADT in Dublin, and it is continuing for three years, I'm pleased to reveal as it were. And last year, this year rather, we also had contributions from China and from Canada. But what I wanted to contribute is that I agree that our students in the film cultures can be very strong and they remain resilient in the face of the globalizing pressures. But I think there is another interesting dimension which is when their tutors get together that there are differences in the way that we approach script development and how we feedback to students on ideas and treatments. I am always surprised that in our workshop, which is like in many of the other workshops, three workshops in three or four countries, when we get to the end and the projects are pitched to an international industry panel, the opinions about the merits of the projects and which ones are eventually picked to be the prize winners, it is always surprising and there are always kind of people who think, "I can't see that film ever been made." and somebody else says, "This is an amazing film." This reminds us that there is no monopoly, there is not one approach to script development, there is not one approach to mise-en-scene. And there is a tendency, I think, for us to try to find common approaches. That I think is dangerous in the pedagogy. And the differences in our pedagogy are as important as the similarities.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you. Respecting our differences is quite important.

Herman van Eyken: And there's also another thing. It's very interesting when students have been abroad and come back that they have actually not only a very different perspective but they are actually much more mature in their approach to things. And very often there are migrant stories out there and migrant stories are actually very authentic. And of course, it's not a question to encouraging students to become pudding makers, like they used to call them Euro-puddings, with the co-production agreements that the EU is installing, etc. It's exactly the opposite that we want. The cultural identity works very much together with storytelling that we all, I think, embrace. It's very important that you have to have a story that connects with you before you connect it with your audience, whatever audience you're looking for. And I do think that search for cultural identity, where there is migration connected to it, that is a very interesting journey for the young people. That is my experience.

Participant: I'm from FAMU international. Our students even go back home for the summer to shoot something that they are really interested in. So they spend some ten months with us here studying and then there is some urge and they go home and they shoot documentaries or other projects back home because that is something they really would like to do. I am talking especially about students from Burma these days. There is, you know, quite tough situation back home for them so they really feel they must go home and work there. And the other question I had was for Pascale. Does it mean that you do not have any courses in English at all?

Pascale Borenstein: We have one class which is taught in English usually by an American teacher from Columbia University for students in production. It is a writing class which takes five weeks. And sometimes we have master classes, like two weeks ago we had Johnny Depp. He spoke English and that was ok with us.

Heidi Gronauer: I just wanted to say I am very happy that you have this positive experience. I am from ZeLIG, a documentary school, and we are a multi-language and a multicultural training institution. Of course, we try to support the students in their cultural diversity and their individual

language has to be developed and to be supported. But we see a tendency that this difference becomes always a lesson. We have a Chinese student, for example, a student from Tanzania, and a student from Estonia. And I cannot say that there is strong cultural diversity when they do their films. It's not only a question of whether they go back to their country, the way they view the place where they stay in South Tirol could be totally different. When we started our European training initiative, our aim was to have half of our participants from the new member states. And the first year their applications were totally different and their image language was very different from the language of the participants from the old European countries. Today I must say that I can't differentiate between applications, if I don't see the name, I can't say if the student comes from Estonia or from the Czech Republic. No, they are not worse! I just say I can see a tendency of this international global language that I just wanted to point out that I see always more similar way of realizing and talking. Nevertheless we support, of course, their individual approach, their individual language. We develop this strongly.

Participant: I do lots of work with entire campuses as well as in schools; I think it is really important to be aware of what you just said, as something to guard against. And the way I think is best to focus in on our reality, our truth, is to let them know, to keep reminding them that we want to know about you, we want this to be original, we want to know your personal voice in the story. So don't try to and fit into something that you think will be better for the market. It's **you** that is special to us. So, we keep on reminding that is you. There is one little story I wish to tell, I think NFTS used to tell it. It is a story about a student from Greece, from an island in Greece, who does come back to Greece and goes home and everybody there is so proud of him and they say, "You are from our little island and you are a film maker!", and he says "I'm here to make a film about us!" And he goes from his community and starts shooting here and there. And there is a very important man in the story, who is the local idiot. He is always there, at every single shot showing himself in some way. And the filmmaker finishes his film, edits the film and goes in the local bar and asks the people there if they want to watch his film. And as the film was happening, the village idiot is realizing that every time he is on the screen everyone is laughing and laughing. And they are watching this film and no one notices that the village idiot has left the room. And they carry on watching the film, laughing and laughing, and they get appalled in the end. At the end of the film there is a bell being rung, which is the local warning for something major that has happened. And they rush out! And they find in the local church that the village idiot has hung himself. He didn't know who he was until he saw the people seeing him on the screen like this. That's the cautionary tale.

Herman van Eyken: I think the beauty of film language is that it is good and universal, you know. And I can watch something from anywhere in the world. And I just have made a lot of interviews with very famous film directors and some producers as well all over Europe and they all said the same thing. At a certain point we were exposed to films from other cultures whether from the east, the west, the north, or the south, and that changed the way they saw the world, you know. So that's communicated absolutely indirectly and that's the greatest thing we have whether it's film or a TV, or a documentary, whatever. I can often show a film and you don't even need to know what it is about, the story tells itself.

Participant: I just want to say one more thing, something about the online process, because it is happening a lot now. And I recognize I knew about that Columbia University experience too and I think it has a lot to do with the reality of the way the world is. I think online development, especially of scripts, is going to keep on happening. But I think it is really important and must be protected, that you start with everybody together. Start the process of at least a week and it should really be a workshop, a hot house situation that really puts people together, tests people and you laugh a lot and so on. And after that you have the chance of being real in the online process in Skype and so on.

(...)

Wangtae Lim: First, I have the pleasure of introducing Frédéric Papon from La Fémis in France. He is going to tell us about the international experience he has had at his school.

Frédéric Papon: I just joined the school last June so I am very young and I will try to present to you some details about the exchange programmes. For us exchange programmes with foreign schools are very important because we think, as you said before, that we live in a global world now and it's impossible to produce films just in our country, especially in France because France is open to all foreign film makers and we co-produce a lot of films in a lot of countries. But first, maybe, I should provide a very brief description of the school. La Fémis offers a four-year programme at nine departments. We have six students in each department. We offer a lot of exchange programmes for the students at the end of their study because we think that is a good time for them to get more mature. For the nine departments we offer seven exchange programmes. The first one is with Columbia University in New York and it is aimed at screenwriters. Six screenwriters from La Fémis go to Columbia University. They stay there for two months, write a short film and work with this specific way of writing that you can find in the United States and that is so very different from the writing in France. So, it is very interesting for our students. The second one is with ECAL in Losanne and it is aimed at editors. We have six editors at La Fémis who go to Losanne and they edit a diploma film given by the directors of the school. And after that the directors from Losanne come to La Fémis to mix the film because there is not such a professor at Losanne. The third programme is with the FABW from Ludwigsburg. This is a very specific exchange programme because one of the student directors comes to La Fémis with his team and makes a film in 35 mm. So, it's just if we have six students, in this workshop we have seven students. Another programme is with Buenos Aires, with UCINE for directors at La Fémis. We send these directors to direct documentaries and after that three foreign students come to Paris just for the workshop, for the DOP. Another programme we have is with CalArts in Los Angeles for directors also. They have specific workshops for these three students. Another one is with Tokyo University of the Arts aimed at students of production at La Fémis. The students go to Tokyo and stay there for two weeks. It's workshop about the co-production between Europe and Asia. And we do the same with the students from Tokyo. The next exchange programme is with INSAS in Brussels for the continuity. And we try to make something now with the sound department and the image department but it is not finished yet. We have some programmes which are not specific for the students of the school and for our students it's a kind of collaboration between schools. The *Atelier Ludwigsburg-Paris* is a kind of workshop about production between the two schools. We have 24 young producers from all countries of Europe. You can read all the details about this programme in the little paper, because Pascale is very organized and she has brought a lot of papers for you. There are two more programmes. One of them is a summer university in Paris aimed at countries outside Europe and North America. So we have a lot of students from Africa, Asia, Russia and South America. It's a two-month programme and the condition is that the students should have directed a film in the end of they stay in Paris. This is the only condition. The last one is *Archidoc*. This is specific programme for documentaries based on archives. Only ten people can take part in it. They are very young. It is a very interesting workshop which takes place at La Fémis. There are a lot of screenings, meetings and at the end of the programme, a production of documentary films based on archives. The question posed by the facilitator of the discussion had to do with the impact, advantages and disadvantages of internationalization. What I see is that the students are not the same before and after the exchange. I am sure this is an advantage. The impact is that they open their minds, I think. This is very important. That's all from me.

Wangtae Lim: Thank you, Frédéric. He was very kind to introduce the seven different exchange programmes between La Fémis and other international schools. With such diversity I think your

students are very blessed. I have the pleasure of introducing Mr. Wim Aerts from the School of Sint Lucas in Brussels, Belgium. He is the director of the international programme there.

Wim Aerts: Thank you. Good morning to everyone. First of all, I am not a film maker so my speech will look at internationalization from a totally different side, but you are always working with it, of course. And before I start I would like to tell one small anecdote. I was not planning to be on this panel. I thought I would be in the audience but I did something wrong when I hit buttons to register and now I am glad that I have the opportunity to give you a short presentation. Very briefly, what you need to know about us is that we are an art school with film departments. We are not a real film school. The school was established in the beginning of the 19th century but the film department was established in the 70's of the 20th century. It's important for you to know that in the Flemish part of Belgium most of the art programmes have a lot of theory that is literally built into them. So that means that we sometimes have a rate of 60% practice work and 40% of theory. And for that theory we are not only trying to give our students an insight of Belgian culture and history, but also of the international history within and outside Europe. So, that's an important aspect of internationalization in the curricula. Also what is important is that in our system with regard to teaching positions we invite our practice-related professors who are still active in the field. Maybe it's the same in your institutions but for us it's very important. Another important thing is that despite the fact that they are full-time, we allow them to work on their projects on the national or international level.

Internationalization, first of all, has to do with locations. Brussels is quite an international city. I think that about 40% of the students have foreign nationality and they don't always have access to the programmes we offer because of language, social skills or financial issues. So we are trying to do something about that. And also Brussels is a very nice city with two nice communities, two nice languages and two nice cultures that are really different from each other. Sometimes they clash but we also try to reinforce them by setting projects together. I think that's also a very important factor. And also important is that 15% to 20% of the entire teaching staff are not Belgian nationals, so we have already quite a lot of international teachers walking around on campus. Of course, we receive more and more inquiries from applicants who would like to study in Brussels, who would like to do art or film study in Brussels and often the problem is, that was already discussed yesterday, language. And although the film language speaks quite for itself, we find it important that we have a critical evaluation between teachers and students. And of course that kind of communication is mostly verbal so we need English or in some cases we can also do it in French, but we need another language than Dutch in order to be able to evaluate and to discuss the work of the students in a critical sense. We also had problems when it came to the curriculum and how to build in it windows of mobility. The first problem was that of course we have a strict budget and if we would like to develop special modules to host international students or to send our students abroad, we need additional financing. That's the big problem. We try to develop such modules and in some cases we are successful in our endeavours. The second problem, I think it was already highlighted yesterday, sometimes has to do with the language skills of our professors. You cannot ask your professor to be as international as you wish. Some of them are very reluctant, not because they are not interested but because they are afraid to speak. So, we have to develop modules where we can help our professors prepare for such type of activities abroad. It can be a language course; it can be some kind of guidance by someone who already has a lot of international experience. In other words, we are working further in developing this aspect. And the second problem, when it comes to the curriculum, is to have an interesting curriculum. If you wish to attract interesting students, you need to have a good offer. We did it by installing what we call semester windows for internationalization by adding elective courses in the massive programmes, which students can do in English, by allowing our students to write their dissertation in English or in French. So, we are quite flexible in that respect as long as our government allows us to do that because there are sometimes restrictions.

We also would like to offer our students an international mobility experience. And there are many reasons for that. We first believed in it but now we are also a little bit forced by the government. Maybe you've heard that in the next couple of years around 2020, they would like 20% of your students to have had international experience. That's very ambitious. I don't think that we will reach that target but we have been setting up already some systems in order to offer those who are interested the opportunity to undertake a couple of mobility windows. Most of you know the Erasmus programme and many of you have used it. It's not often used by the film schools because film education is not always very compatible with the way Erasmus works. And we have the same problem but we try to manage it in some way. We already have film students who spent a semester abroad, studying in Finland or Portugal. But we also invest in the internships, we think that it's important that students learn what working and professional environments can be and that they don't do one short exercise but they do some short training. Most of the time the training is delivered abroad so we are using that part of the programme. Strangely enough, we also have Erasmus Belgica which may sound very strange to you. It's a system where we try to stimulate students to go to the other language community. So it's strange that we have this year for the first time a student from INSAS which is, you can correct me if I'm wrong, one kilometer and a half far from our institution and a whole cultural way. So that's really something striking but we think it is important that we have links with our French speaking colleagues and vice versa.

Henry Verhasselt: Can I add something there? INSAS is the French speaking counterpart of RITS and for many many years the Flemish school and the French speaking school shared the same building. So we shared the cinema, we shared the teaching rooms, but that is all we ever shared. The students never talked to the students from the other school; the teachers never talked to the teachers of the other school. The only time when there was some serious exchange was when we had parties, because my students found the Flemish girls prettier. This may sound really surreal but Belgium is the country of surrealism. This is history and I am happy to see that the French and the Dutch speaking filmschools in Belgium are now cooperating.

Wim Aerts: And I can even comment on that again because we are having a project and I will speak about it later on, where we are working together with the Belgian film academy and with our colleagues of INSAS and it was thanks to the co-operation with China that we started to co-operate with our colleagues, which is really strange. Thanks to CILECT also for financing this project! Next to that, our institution finds it also important that we have Leonardo internship programme. That's maybe something that has not been used by many of you, but some of our film graduates do it. It is a programme where students after graduating a BA or an MA, have the opportunity to undertake an internship abroad at a production company, at a film set with a film director, to learn on the spot what they have been taught in a theoretical sense. And this is quite a success because some of our students are working now already in England for instance. We have a student who is assisting a film professor over there; we have another student who was working in a production company in the Netherlands and the company said: "You are so interesting, you're doing great work, please stay!" So also that was a kind of possibility.

Last but not least, yesterday there was someone who asked about the role of Africa. Belgium has a very good programme which is being used now more than Erasmus programme where students can work on projects, they can have a grant, it's not a big grant, but they can apply for a grant to work on film projects in Africa, South America, Asia and it is more and more taken by all universities, colleges and art academies in Belgium. So that is really a big success. The aim is to provide opportunities for the programme to start working both ways so that we can also have in our programmes people from Africa, Asia. They also have good experience and they can have an added value to what we are teaching.

When it comes to the film department we have been setting up a couple of things. It's not a promotion talk but it is just letting you know why we do it, why it is important. The first was the *Cinemaker* which we do together with the colleagues from INSAS, BFA in China and USP in Brazil, and hopefully in the next couple of years also with our colleagues from South Africa, if we can work it out. It's a programme where students are working on a video diary with a voice over and it's a kind of documentary impression of self-chosen theme which has been provoked by the encounter with an unknown culture. So even if someone falls out of the plane, breaks his leg and has to be brought to a hospital in China, he can continue to work, he can shoot his experience on that. If you would like to know more about it Rob is over there, he is supervising the programme. It consists of six weeks of mobility, students have to do some research, they have to compose their crews, they have to do the actual film shoot, of course, and when they return to their country they have to do the editing and the post production. It's a very intensive programme. And the final outcome is that every year we make compilations of those films. And the project has been supported by different agencies, by different ways of funding such as CILECT, such as our own means, such as the Brussels government, and we have been doing it now for four years and we have just signed the agreement continuing it for yet another three years and for attracting new partners.

Next to that, we have the *Ensemble* project which is coordinated by Manuel José Damasio from Lusofona Univeristy in Portugal which unites four film schools working around a specific topic. It's MEDIA funded and each partner produces one film that mixes life and virtual images and we work on four scripts. It's not only the shooting of the film but the whole process is supported by a couple of modules, so in each of the four countries we are holding one module of one week. So we have five students per partner travelling to all those modules. And the first module is about scriptwriting. It takes place in ifs, Cologne. The second module is about pre-visualization. It takes place in the Moholy-Nagy Univeristy in Budapest. The third module is about digital cinematography and that's held at Sint Lucas in Brussels. And the fourth module is what we call animation in 3D aspects, that's done in Lisbon. What you need to know is that for us it is an important project because in the course of the programme we have realized that this is not something that students have to do in addition to other things, it is part of their curriculum. It's completely recognized and built in their study programme.

And the last project I would like to shortly tell you about, because it was quite an ambitious programme and it is new to all of us, not only to those who are part of it but I think for most of you. We applied for an Erasmus Mundus programme and it was quite an extensive call and we had to do lots of things. Basically we developed a programme which is the first master programme of that kind in the audio-visual arts. But it is also a jointly developed curriculum. It is not designed on the basis of adding or connecting existing modules. We know what we are good at but we also know what we are not good at and we try to find complementarities and build this in the programme. It's built for film schools, it's a two year master programme, it's in English of course. A big advantage of the programme is that we receive very big funding to attract the students, to give them scholarships. If you would like to have international students, they have to stay for a while in the specific countries, so we have scholarships for them. But we also have scholarships to invite good, well known guest professors, which again gives us a plus in the programme. So that's an important thing because that was always trouble. Internationalization is not always sending away your students but is also letting your own students benefit from the international teachers that are working around on campus. But also there we had sometimes budget cuts and this can help us have very interesting people on the campus that we can use not only in this programme but we can use a little bit outside the programme by giving them an extra workshop, for instance. I can give you more information about the programme later on.

To end, I would like to say the following: you heard about a couple of programmes but for us it is important what the opinion of students and professors is and whether internationalization is important for them or not. And students say that in some of the intensive workshops we did, they gained more knowledge after very intensive international workshops as they would do for instance doing a scriptwriting course which is always on Monday, two hours a day, and at the moment the discussions start they already have to leave because they have to go to another class. So we had been working on scriptwriting for a full week intensively where they gain more of it during that week than during the three previous years in our programme and that is something very remarkable. It's also about the exchange of teaching, partners' experience and teaching methodologies. Also it combines what we find to be interesting components, using units from different degree programmes and giving students access to them. We also noticed that when our students work in international teams that experience boosts their level of professionalism. They are more motivated to accomplish things that they have been setting up in the beginning. It's more and more mirroring the professional field, I think, co-production is not a rarity anymore, it can be difficult but it's not a rarity. But it's more and more a common practice. Students have developed their own professional network, they have developed cross-national friendships and, of course, some of them have really changed, not only the students but also the teachers who were involved, their view on national or international and cultural issues. That's also very important. You also have the social skill and the language skills. I will give the example of Erasmus exchange students. Sometimes we send our students who were not our top students. And when they return, they become our best students because they are so changed by the international experience. For us that is important. It's not always about sending your best students and getting the best prize but it's also about noticing that a student has undergone a very good and very extensive development. As to the advantage for professors, I think most professors who have been working with international students say that they give an added value to some of the discussions. They create a different group atmosphere and a different group involvement. They also bring new perspectives and ideas on working or processing methods. And they also make teaching staff aware that sometimes they have to question the courses and the methods that they have been using for so many years, if they are still actual, still the essence. Maybe they have to change part of them. So, for them this is a kind of a wake-up call. We also have noticed that through these networks new collaborations emerge between the teaching staff group. They start to share lectures, they start doing research projects together and in the end they also start to implement international projects on our campus, which is important. So I think that these are, in general, the advantages for the professors. Of course, there are negative sides to it; it's not that we have to implement it blindly. We have to do it because we believe in it and because it gives an added value to our professors. It's not something that we have to do to reach numbers given by government or whatever. It's just because we believe in it.

Wangtae Lim: He seems truly internationalized. You know when I say internationalization I think it means internationalizing faculty members, student population and their curriculum. And it seems that they are internationalized. Listening to his presentation I could not help but think of the Korean situation. We try to internationalize our Korean universities which are very far from being such. This is why the Korean government is trying to evaluate the Korean universities. We try to get a record in internationalization this means how many percentages of the classes are taught in English. And as you can guess, it's very tough. So many schools are trying to make the number bigger and bigger every semester so now some Korean universities are teaching Korean language and literature using English language. So it's getting too serious. Our professors are very frustrated and you can imagine how frustrated their students are as well, if they spoke just Korean language they would have a better understanding of Korean literature but some students are using Korean-English.

Nick Oughton: I have a question and it is particularly related to our context in Queensland. One of the things that we always try to dissect is why a student elects to come to our graduate programme. I

am sure one of the reasons is the curriculum. We are certainly one of the best schools in the world, so we always think of other reasons why they came. I am thinking of the added values and how these work in each of the institutions we had representatives from today. For instance, we know that they come to Queensland because it's sunny, we have lovely beaches, it's comfortable, it's just really a lovely place to be. We know they come because in the back of their minds some people would be looking to change their country of abode, they are looking for ways and there certainly are students who extend their visas and then they become Australian citizens. It used to be cheaper, now it is getting a bit more expensive than a lot of other places in the world which is a problem for us, and the dollar has been high. So I am just wondering. I think it adds to the cultural background of just learning about education, about discipline.

Frédéric Papon: I don't know if I understood the question but foreign exchange is obligatory for every student so when I turn to the continuity students they are going to Brussels. They are very jealous because the other ones go to Tokyo, or to New York. A part of every exchange is associated with vacation.

Wim Aerts: On the basis of my impression, I would like to say that it also sometimes depends on what kind of students and what kind of activity you'd like to develop. If it's a master's student then the motivation for choosing Brussels or choosing our institution is totally different from the motivation of an exchange student where you can rely on your partnerships and the teaching activities that have taken place. When I read the motivations most of the time "Brussels is multicultural, it is very international, they have good food, the European Commission is there". But we do not often read about what they think about our programme, and that is also because we have the problem that we still don't have our own identity. We have been discussing it yesterday that each institution should be able to say: "We are important for this or that part of our curriculum, for this or that part that we think we are good at and try to make other people aware of that, so that we can attract students for those reasons." But it's not really the motivation of the student who is choosing Belgium as a destination and then Brussels and then turn to Sint Lukas. It's not that he or she is a bad student but he or she is not always aware of what we can offer him as an added value to the curriculum. And I think that is something that we have to make them aware of during the programme. And in the end it goes the other way around to Sint Lukas, he says: "Ok, it was a nice experience and Brussels was a nice experience and Belgium was." And that is important.

Ravi Gupta: I just want to substantiate on what Nick just mentioned. We have the same experience that international students tend to come to India to Whistling Woods primarily because they get a lot of hands-on exposure in life and making. Whistling Woods International is located inside the film city, in Bombay, in Bollywood. Therefore, the largest amount of film shoot that happen anywhere in India or perhaps anywhere in the world happens over there. There are 24 shooting floors over there, 24 studios all around the campus and on any given date there are at least 12 to 14 films shooting there plus any amount of television work happening. So therefore students get that kind of an exposure and one of the reasons we find is that a lot of international students are motivated to come here is because they get lot of live, hands-on exposure and the possible opportunity of connecting with professional film makers and finding their first job or their first assistantship under some director or some production company. The other reason also is that we have a tie up with SONY and SONY has set up inside of Whistling Woods International a TV film making set up. So therefore we teach TV film making with 3D cameras and 3D assistants and everything. So that is something very unique which our school offers and therefore we do find out that a lot of students would want to know more about the three dimensional film making. They do tend to come specifically for that. So if any of you would like to take advantage of these unique opportunities that are offered by Whistling Woods International, please feel free to connect with us, our website gives all the details. And we will be happy to help you. We work with film schools in the US, in UK and with the south of Europe as well.

We're also happy that we have a tie up with schools like Griffith, Syracuse and others. We will be happy to look at opportunities of exchange because we want our students to go out and learn as much and get some unique additional values as we could offer.

Gyorgy Karpati: Students are making market research before they join anywhere and they do it on a very clever professional basis and there are places to get information. There is a book about all the USA film schools, describing them and even giving points. All the professional magazines like "Variety" or "Film Screen" regularly give ranks and analyses of different schools. So this is, sorry to say, but this is an educational business and the students want to get value for their money.

Zuzana Tatarova: There are two points I want to talk about. The first is that international exchanges and mobilities are always a challenge. And this is also a challenge for students as well as for professors. It pushes you to move not only your body but your mind. I can speak about this from the point of a student and then I am speaking about this as a professor who is travelling and teaching at many schools. There is one thing which Wim Aerts pointed out, this is that these exchange programmes are becoming a part of the curriculum. Hence there is always the problem, especially through Socrates exchanges in Europe and so on, that we send the student or we got the student but we couldn't give him the same thing he needed for his curriculum to finish his school. But why move, if it would be the same? Of course, that's a question. So sometimes it's great not to invite just single students to any school but to invite a professor, but not as a workshop teacher or seminar teacher but as a part of the curriculum. We had managed something like that in Lisbon this year. The students sent to me their scripts in English, I read them and then we had a vivid seminar and we went through all the scripts. And this was something very strange for them to listen to a teacher who is not speaking in white gloves with them and I really tough and saw that they were a little bit shaken. But later on they send me letters and mails and they said: "Ok Zuzana, that was great, you could advise us this way." So I think it is always challenging.

David Price: Just a couple of comments, if I can make. Actually Gyorgy was talking about programmes and it is very much that the students are doing marketing. The Budapest workshop is one of the aspirational things that our students looked to, we have got a student this year, we have got a student almost every year in that particular programme. From the VCA in Melbourne I don't have the advantage of Nick's weather in Queensland and people have been asking me about our international and non-international students and most of you will assume that they come from south-east Asia, which is not the case. We have had students from South Africa, from Norway, from Finland. I just made an offer to a Colombian student, a student in East Timor, a student from Germany for documentary. We don't have exchanges at present. We are trying to develop such programmes. In fact my university places obstacles in the way of international students, not just with the fees but with English language requirements. So we are actually finding that a bigger challenge than it is actually to attract applicants. I had 14 applicants for my undergraduate programme and six of them couldn't make for the English language requirements within the period of time. Within the school we don't find that a problem but our university has a particular requirement. Prior to that, we actually had more flexibility with regard to attracting students. But much of our tertiary education is being focused on bringing international students to underpin what has been a diminishing governmental responsibility for tertiary education. Fortunately within my school that is not the case. We are still able to attract students but also select students on certain criteria.

Garth Holmes: Could I ask all three panel members, do you have any experience of using collaboration in international programmes as a process for creating new markets for distribution of content, and selling pathways that will lead to future distribution opportunities?

Wangtae Lim: While they are thinking about their answers I would like to quickly comment about the Korean programmes. We have a programme called Asian Team Academy; it is administrated by

Pusan International Film Festival and Pusan Film Commission. Each year we invite about 27 students from different Asian countries to a 17 day workshop, it is an on-going programme with theory. After that workshop many of the students establish some international human network and after they go back to their own countries they call each other and put some movies together and even for distribution they have somebody they can talk to when they want to distribute a movie in a foreign country.

Frédéric Papon: We have some marriages, weddings, but not working together. I am too young in the school so I must think about the background.

Wim Aerts: I think that maybe it is the one that Rob would like to talk about but we had once a student who had the opportunity to do such an internship after his graduation, working in a production company. It was in one of the biggest Dutch production companies. And right now we have Rob who worked on a project and it was a very nice coincidence that the impression of our students working there also had a positive effect the discussions of helping Rob with his project. But we already experienced in other programmes in the art programmes where young fine art artists did such a training afterwards, they worked for instance with a known photographer and thanks to that placement she was able to do her first small exhibition and right now she has already done three big exhibitions in Switzerland. So that is not getting to a company but it's also something which develops further on when the mobility has already ended, there are contacts and there are new professional possibilities that grew from that international mobility. It's maybe not the example that you are looking for.

Rob Rombout: I would like to say something. Sometimes we even insist that students continue living in our country after the mobility is over. Suppose you have a student from Italy who does a course in our school. We say: "Why don't you start living in Brussels? Because then you can apply for money in Brussels." You don't need to be Belgian to apply for money; you just need to live there. And you can apply in Italy, because you already have your contacts. So what's the difference between living in Brussels and living in Rome? The plane tickets are not very expensive. So it's all about contacts and getting into something, which is very important. And when any student, a Belgian or a foreign student comes into the school we say: "This is the programme and this is what it is and the teachers are what they are." They are very often film makers, maybe not the best pedagogues you can handle. That's the official programme but you shouldn't only look at the official programme, you should look at the unofficial possibilities. The whole school is the whole film industry walking around. If you ask all those people to drink coffee with you, you can use that. That is what it is all about. The programme is what it is but most of all film makers are at one place and they love to be asked something. The students don't do it enough. All the teachers love when students say: "Can I talk to you?" It's not used enough and that is important also, I think.

Gyorgy Karpati: In my active time, at the television channel they had a very good short film programme, unfortunately late night and you could apply with your student films and some of them were shown. I don't know how it is today.

Wangtae Lim: I think we can close our discussion now. Thank you, all.

Panel 3: Benchmarking and Evaluation in International Context

Moderator: Michal Bregant
(a combined transcript of sessions 1 and 2)

NB: Session 3 is missing out of the received audio files.

Michal Bregant: I would first like to give the floor to Alison Wotherspoon, our corresponding member from Australia.

Alison Wotherspoon: I went from industry working mainly in television, in production, and also documentary, and I got a job at the university 15 years ago and it was interesting when I started at my department I was involved in production first and I was treated by my colleagues like a good working teacher and it was very nice when I went to the first CILECT conference in 2002 and I found out that these people were doing what I do. So, we are expanding. The degrees are changing to Bachelor of Creative Arts from straight Bachelor of Arts. And it's been nice because I've been working more and more as a writer, director, producer, on educational content. I've been making films as well as I just submitted my PhD which was seven short educational documentaries. If I pass I will be able to supervise creatively PhD students, which is good.

What I am presenting is not my original work. I was a team member on two different research projects in Australia that were about benchmarking and evaluation. I come from a big university. I am kind of putting forward a representation of the University of Screen Production and the National Film School. I am here also representing the Australian Screen Production, Education and Research Association. There are 22 Australian universities which now offer practice-based degrees for screen and media production. And what we found and what we have as on-going challenges at universities is quite different for people teaching at film schools because we are, as part of our tenure, expected to produce research outcomes. So, there is a number of issues that we face which is how to practice best academics produced research which is founded on the traditional university notion of research and also how our students work within the university and how are the standards applied. We are also going through a change of government. We had ten years of conservative government and there was increasing and on-going pressure on universities to justify their funding, to attract research and to bring money in. So, we were going through layers and layers of evaluation, of matrix. It's a very economical and rationalist view to provide evidence that you are contributing or attracting money in.

So, we had one research project. It is an organization that is now finished because it was part of the old government and has been displaced. But there is another commission which had funding for research and methodological things. So, we are one of the founding members of ASPERA and ASPERA was successful in applying for funding for assessing graduate screen production outputs in 19 Australian film schools. That was in cooperation with Murdoch University, Griffith University, University of Technology - Sydney, VCA in Melbourne and other schools. It is now very common in Australia to have screen production programmes in tertiary institutions. And that has been going on for the last 30 years. For many of us screen production is one of the problematic activities within the academia. So, the challenges were how to balance image outputs with conventional outputs and how to compare image based hits with the journal article, for example, a book chapter or a book. These are the things that we get points for, and we get funding for. And the national government pays on the basis of how many points have been generated by the university. And it is possible to establish appropriate assessments and procedures. It is possible to establish international guidelines for assessing screen production. And again this is working by having a sustained work by staff producing creative-based research as well as student work.

The rationale for the project lies within the fact that it does not fit neatly into the normal notions of scholarships. It was a 219,000 AUD grant and you see there was enough money for us to get through. So, here again you see conventional scholarship vs. the creative arts scholarship. They have created different methodologies that can be described, measured, prescribed in how to evaluate creative work, what are the observed results and qualification processes and how to bring the matrix into the creative processes.

Basically the process was quite rigorous. There were 30 screen production academics from 22 institutions that tested these in the same sample of 45 short productions. So, each partner school was invited to sit and meet with the 19 schools. There was a process of random selection of which films would be assessed. And then there was a selected set of 34 criteria. There was an interesting starting point of criteria. The created works were assessed without any written components; we were just simply looking at screen-based work. And this is the psychometric modelling that was used to test the consistency of the assessment against the ideal of sample comparison.

There was a leader from each team, a project manager from each state who could be approached by colleagues from other institutions. And then we sat down and watched these films and we did blind assessing. Any information about where the films came from was removed. We could occasionally say where the film came by means of the car number plate, for example. We also had 5 assistants from the UK just to give an international kind of control to it.

I didn't put all 24 questions because it could really get boring. But initially there was no marking. If you see a film that you see is worth we had a system of pass credit distinction and we had an agreement of which numbers meant what to all of us. And there was a range of issues from what's the quality, the concept, script, research, direction, camera, editing, etc. And there were questions about what the audience thought. We thought that the film maker actually had identified an audience, or had no idea about the audience. There was this notion of could you say as a publication there would be an audience for it and what will be valued by people.

There were additional questions on originality, clarity, artistic quality, inspiration. Again, these were terms that when you look at them they are weird terms. But when we actually looked at the questionnaire properly there was a clarifying sentence that made them make more sense and be more accurate. And there was an interesting thing about timing, whether the production was long, short, appropriate. Again, this was not the ideal language but it was an interesting project. Social relevance, production dynamics, exhibition. You know that - different productions made for different reasons. And these films were made for a special conference. They had an educational, theatrical, TV potential or it's fabulous for YouTube, whatever.

Then the results were really interesting. There was incredible consistency against the assessors. We all had given the same range of marks and it was very consistent. I haven't put the data here. It was interesting because between professional screen practitioner teachers there was consistency of standards. We actually agreed on that is a good film for a range of reasons, and we also agreed that this is not a good film. And it was starting to get some rigor into what is deemed as subjective or emotional.

Because this was deemed a successful research project we are now putting another project which is developing into a collaborative national postgraduate research programme between 22 Australian film schools. It runs for two years. We are not necessarily clear on how rigorous this project is. And again we are looking at funding options for postgraduate students. Can we apply for funding from Screen Agencies, can we have funding for research that focuses on postgraduate screen works?

The other research project I was invited to be part of was the learning and teaching academic standards project. That was something that was established in Europe with the EU requirements and definitions to degrees and so forth. What we were aiming to do is with the RQF, the Research Qualifications Framework was going to go with the government to get TEXA. We decided that rather than waiting for the government to tell us what degrees would need to look like in this new world, we applied for funding and got a disciplined scholar who actually came up with the minimum standards for all of our degrees.

What was quite nice about this was that we were working across disciplines so we had dance, we had creative writing, etc. We were looking at graduate attributes with universities in Australia and told them what we expected from our graduates, what standards. And we were also looking at standards in Europe, in the UK and in America to see what had been done before. And again, we were looking at the importance of learning outcomes. There were a total of 222 respondents who completed our surveys and questionnaires.

What was really nice about this project is that it brought together the peak bodies of universities and design schools, ASPERA, which I was representing, the writing programmes, etc. And what we were trying to do was to come up with set of standards or principles which you could literally take from drama and put on screen, or take from screen and put on music. And they would be consistent because we thought that if there was strength in uniformity, we could prove that something is worth funding or acknowledgement in the government circles. But also it was really quite interesting because we took a specific discipline words out. In fact it was very easy without losing our identities to say that we were actually doing very smart things for students to have research, to have standards. So, that's me, these are the two projects. There may be things that were done before but for us that was new territory and we would be glad to share our knowledge and if it is of use, we'd be very interested in talking about this.

Q: I have one question basically. What was the response of the students to your system?

Alison Wotherspoon: It hasn't really impacted on them yet because this is all happening beyond student level at the moment. It's very much examining what's happening at the teaching level and at the programme level. So, at the moment it hasn't. What was really important and what we found interesting was that a lot of universities have aspirations such as "we want our students to have these attributes which are key ones." What we were actually saying was that the minimum requirement for a degree is here. If the university wished to add aspirational things, that was fine. At the national level we had to say: This is the minimum, this is what we expect for getting a degree." These are two different things; actually, what you want from a student and what realistically is a minimum standard that we've set rather than having minimum standards dictated to us by bureaucrats in government who didn't know actually what they did.

Michal Bregant: Those who were in the Bologna system in Europe know about the so called double descriptors which were pretty popular at universities in Europe. And it was very hard to adopt those standards for art schools and our programmes. There was a discussion about that.

Alison Wotherspoon: We were in contact with people who had come through the process in Europe and the UK and knew what hadn't worked. So, we were trying to learn from what had already been done and hadn't worked and try not to make it too complicated in order not to end in a situation where we are stuck with things that are not useful.

Q: Did you find any useful way of assessing creativity and did you adopt any methodology for that?

Alison Wotherspoon: Have a look at the criteria, and they are just 24 and we can easily make them twelve and we'll still come with quite consistent results. We used a model from creativity theory and applied it as well. And what was interesting, it's quite exciting. Some of us are positioned to say we are interested in getting a project between South Africa and Australia. Let's apply for it. We are six schools around the world and do questionnaires, collect data because we haven't done that yet. I am a practitioner but I am attracted to having academic research in our field because then we can say we do it well and here's the evidence. So, let's be creative because we can prove that it works and we are good at it.

Michal Bregant: If there are no more questions, we'll move on to our colleague from dffb - Jan Schütte.

Jan Schütte: I studied Philosophy and History of Arts. I have an MA but turned to a film director and I directed a dozen of feature films, mostly for the cinema, but also for TV, which have been screened at the festival in Cannes. I consider myself a filmmaker, a film director of independent cinema but I also teach. In addition to directing, to support my family I started teaching and Michal asked me to talk a little bit about evaluation of our programme and I've been teaching mostly in three different venues. You know that dffb is an independent film school. We are not a university; we are a limited company financed by the state of Berlin. It is a film school teaching directing, cinematography, producing and script writing. We have only 150 students. We are not in any Bologna process, there's no MA; there is no evaluation; there are no grades. Students have to attend classes during the first two years. They have to shoot a first year film and a second year film, respectively a 7-minute and a 15-minute film. The films are getting longer and longer. And then they shoot a third-year film and a final project by which they graduate. As you can imagine, the graduation of directors very often takes very long. I have been at the school for one year now and I've met students who are in their twelfth year. So, that school has no evaluation at all. There's no evaluation of students, there's no feedback for anybody. I have also been teaching as well at American colleges for a couple of years. I've been a professor at Dartmouth and I taught for a couple of years at Harvard undergraduate students. This is a completely different world. This is a university, and if you have a look at the ranking of universities, this university is among the top ten universities in the world. There's a lot of money involved there, as well as a lot of evaluation. And if you look at the three fields of evaluation, i.e. the evaluation of students (which we are not talking about here), how you grade them, how you see them, how you give them feedback; the evaluation of programmes and the ranking of universities. As far as film schools are concerned, ranking turns out to be very complicated. The understanding in our schools is that we need to train professional filmmakers. The people who leave the school in the end should be able to direct or produce films, survive within the industry, at the art scene. We are a very artistic school. For example we had a film which won something like the Turn-up Prize in England. And the student won the best young artist Turn-up Prize in Germany. So, we got invitations for the Turn-up Prize ceremony which took place at the National Gallery of Berlin. So, that is also what we try to develop.

I also established and developed ten years ago with a director and producer colleague of mine and with Mark Nicolas from La Fémis a joint venture of two film schools with FABW (Ludwigsburg) and La Fémis in Paris. It is a post graduate programme for young producers. And it is one-year programme for 18 European students. It is now ten years old and it is very successful in terms of ranking because we have 95% of our students who find paid jobs in the European film industry. The thing is that they are trained in Europe at the moment in understanding financing functions in France, in Germany, which is completely different. In England we have one lad at NFTS. So we get Polish, Italian, Spanish

producers to understand how different European systems work and how you can combine them. It is a very intensive training. I discovered the evaluation of a programme in America because it has a very intense process of how you are evaluated as a teacher. At first, if you are not used to it is a little bit frightening. They did grades. In Harvard the only grade is an A, if someone gives you a B, they will test. There's A, B, C, D, E, and E is a fail. It is called grade inflation. So, the students' grades are very restrictive. If they don't like the class, they give you a bad grade. Some of you might know this process but it was new to me, so I wanted to give you an idea how it works. There are general questions that students have to answer, they are now online. For example: Did you find the class or lecture engaging? (From 1 to 5) what was the usefulness of the website? What was the work in class? What was the value of sections (the sections are extra classes run by assistants). There are also some open questions and everything is anonymous. The students rate the class within a week or couple of days and the arrangement is very complex. Students are asked to comment on the strengths and the weaknesses of the course, how it can be improved, whether they would recommend this class. What was the pace of the workload, how were the assignments chosen and were they relevant to the material, were the assignments returned promptly, were the comments on the written work helpful, comment on reading assignments. And then it becomes personal in a way that it is about your performance, how you answer questions in class, how you encourage the students, how prepared you are. And at the end, which is interesting, you can add some extra questions which are interesting for yourself. We, for example, added the question "Would you like more technical narrative instructions?" for the directing class for undergraduates who are from a very wide range and are not specializing in filmmaking. Has this course changed your experience of watching or making a film? Has it inspired your interest in making films or taking more films in the future? I have to say that I learned a lot from this type of feedback. I asked my students always to give their evaluations in the classroom, and not doing at 4 am after having 15 beers or so. It is nice for them to do that while in the class so that they could focus on what happened in the last half a year or so. We had the pleasure of founding this programme in Paris. And if you have to decide on a new programme, it's nice because it is as if you have an open blank sheet in a way. On the other hand, it is clear that you are prone to a lot of mistakes. And we used intensive evaluation process not as much as the American college but three times in a year we gave them a couple of questions to fill in. The students could write their names if they wanted. They could be very frank with their critique, make suggestions and give ranks in different sections, after three months, after six months and at the end of the programme. Then we had a very open discussion with all the 18 students. And I have to say in the beginning we changed like 20 to 30 % of the programme every year. It was a year-long programme. And because of the not so many explorations of what worked from very simple things we had way too much travel back and forth from France to Germany and very specific things what should be trained, what people from the industry they wanted to have. We were speaking to them about what went well and what went not so well. So, every year we changed the programme by 20 %, then it slowed down maybe. If you have 4 or 5 really good suggestions, it is of huge help for the programme to become better and turn into a living process. And there would be now time to start it differently. It is very complicated to make the programme good because the students feel uneasy in a way commenting on the teachers. On the other hand, it is also very complicated to give them feedback because you are working so close on projects and so on. So, we discussed that we might have to do it in a written form. Students want to have feedback even if they don't like it in a way. It is a very ambivalent process. But I personally have to say that I always go back to my old assignment evaluation sheets when I teach a class again to check what worked well and what didn't work well, to remind myself and get a point of view whether the class worked well or not. And I personally don't want to miss the evaluations anymore because for my teaching they were extremely helpful and the students liked them.

Q: I think it is a useful thing to get feedback fairly soon after the particular programme, my question in a way picks a modular programme that people are doing in a very clear way, it takes film students on a journey, and there maybe a little bit of that journey where they are not very happy at all, when they have distressing experience. But years later they realize that that time was worth it.

Jan Schütte: I completely agree. I think it can only be two positions. The first one is for the teacher. The other thing is that you have to see the broad picture. For most students in our school it is like that - after one year they think they know everything and they correct you, after two, three years it changes a little bit and they are really thankful five years after they leave the school. We had a system where in the first four or five months the students didn't do practical things and the only objective was to discuss things with different teachers and we changed that. We have to do something practical. And then you can see the effects, you can see different things you can see how students change as well, focus, attention spans, all those kinds of little things.

Q: Are there any peer evaluation programmes in which students evaluate themselves?

Jan Schütte: No, not yet. I wanted to give you an idea of what the American college is doing, which is very rigid, as you say and you can't transfer it to the film school. It's good to have some response. In a way there's no evaluation at all. I think it is also the spirit of the school in a way. But there's something that we have which is very nice and very intense. It is a critique session which happens every Friday at 11 am when we have a screening of a couple of short films or one long film, whatever is on. You are only allowed to present at festivals a film that has passed the "critique". It is open to everybody to teach us. It's usually a group of 100 people and it is run by a teacher, or by me very often, or my director of studies. And in the beginning we screen the film and the students are given the floor to talk. But before that they listen to a critique from a teacher, and then we give the floor to students. Then, it is an open floor discussion again. That's the most powerful instrument. It is complicated because there are cliques that promote some ideas or want something. Evaluation is very complicated in film making, as we know. And only at the box office there's a true number, the rest, even a festival award, is... There is an anecdote. There was one film. It was two years in the making, 25 minutes, very complicated. The girl couldn't handle it, it was very tough and she couldn't work with her peers. I saw the film and I didn't tell her it was a failure, it was a kind of a slow movie, but we finished it and it came out ok. And we picked that film for Cannes, everybody could send their own film and the girl sent her film and it was taken. And not only taken it was, but it won the main award. She has an open invitation for her first feature film to be on the Cannes competition. You never know what happens to a film and your evaluation is limited and presents one point of view. And there are a lot of other points of views. So, I am really prepared that a film nobody liked may win a hundred awards at festivals. We have to face that. But the "critique" is our main evaluation of a film.

Q: Do you choose students through a selection process, how much do they pay and how are they getting to your school?

Jan Schütte: The payment is 200 euro a year. And it's a shame it is very hard to press them to pay the 200 euro. That's more as a fee for damage than other things. And only the script writing students pay 1000 euro a year because it's a three-year programme and it's financed with resources. We have about 600-1000 students applying for the directing programme. After they shoot a film and do all the other types of assignments, this is the pre-selection. Then another team selects among them and cuts them down to about 25 and they have to direct a scene in front of us, shoot a documentary, do a couple of tests, do interviews and it's like a ten-day long process. But the selection process is very complicated and this is another big subject which is very interesting to me.

(...)

Michal Bregant: So, let's move to our next speaker – Alistair Oldham from the UK.

Alistair Oldham: I teach at the University of West England in Bristol. It's not a film school and I'm not a dean or a rector, or a head of department, or anything like that. I'm a common lecturer. I teach filmmaking. When I say we are not a film school, let's say in the last four years we got seven documentaries in Sheffield Documentary, first of all. And we won the national creative filmmaking prize twice in the last six years. So, we can weigh above the standard. I make documentary films which seem to do better in Slovakia or in the Czech Republic than they do in Bristol, which is quite good. When I say it's not a film school, it's the department of Media and Design. So, I basically work at the Arts Faculty. And the course I teach is called Media Practice and it is a course that competes very well with the top film schools in the UK, and we have participated in a number of festivals. It is designed around the idea of the convergence of sound production, media production and the interactive media and we've been there for about ten or twelve years. So, it's quite an innovative course. Anyway, I've taken a different approach to benchmarking because I think in the UK we have probably a different set of associations to it and it's really about sort of benchmarking in relation to industry because I think that is what benchmarking normally stands for. In every higher education course in the UK you have to get through a thing called the Quality Assurance Agency. And looking at how and where we interface with industry was when I realized that I had somehow foolishly accepted an invitation to speak on a panel on benchmarking. Like any self-respecting media student the first thing I did was going to Wikipedia. And there I found that the derivation of the word benchmarking has to do with shoe-making. A shoemaker would put the customer's foot on a bench and would draw a straight line, a mark around the customer's foot and would see if the shoe fit the foot. And there's this fear of trepidation that we are going to add to our workload when we have to suddenly say "Well, your curriculum has to match these standards or those standards." There are two scenarios that I am involved with at the moment.

The first scenario is with the BBC and I am involved in designing two MAs. The first one is an MA in Factual Media where we have got a partnership in conjunction with the UC Bristol where the factual is centered. We are going through the very early stages of module specification, programme specification and programme design. And we are happy to design those MAs in a much more industry facing way. I think that's good for all sorts of reasons. The main thing is that we have to ensure that the BBC understands what we are asking students to do. And this is forcing us to look at it from a more industry perspective with regard to the process i.e. the protocols, the standards. The programmes are not written down as a set of benchmarks we have to follow. And I talk to colleagues and people say that's benchmarking when we come to talk about it and I say yes, it is. It's a professional set of standards and protocols which we are taking to match to our more traditional arts-based curriculum. The second MA that we are writing is an MA in Wildlife Filmmaking. Actually, we are writing it in partnership with the Natural History MA. So, the stakes are quite high. And it is full of benchmarking, I think.

The second situation I am involved in, we are just starting this process, is a thing called Skillset which you have probably heard of. Skillset is the industry body which supports skills and training for people and businesses to ensure that the UK creative industries maintain their world class position. Another quote, Skillset is the creative industries sector skills council which comprises of television, film, radio, interactive media, and animation, put against facilities, photo imaging, publishing, fashion and textiles. So, it's a benchmark in all organizations within the UK and the University of West England has been invited to come to apply for a SkillSet accreditation. There's nothing particularly remarkable about that. There are three SkillSet film academies in the UK and there are 23 SkillSet media

academies in the UK. It's a mark by which the university can be playing to be working at a set of industry standards. And that's a great thing in many ways. But I think a kind of a complication that comes in a fear for us the lecturers on the ground is that we have been given a huge catalogue of different units from SkillSet which are performance skills-based. So, you get units in directing or producing. We are not a television school and we have been forced to go through that process which is a bit of a threat for us actually. And also I believe the SkillSet standards were written in 2005 and we deliberately ran a course that had been anticipating change in technology. When I look at those performance skill objectives, it worries me that we'd been asked to kind of map the thresholds onto our curriculum. It's too reductive. Has the student done a budget? Etc. And we have our own assessment criteria which are far more open ended and they are about things such as narrative design and storytelling, and imagination and creativity, and working in teams and caring about critical awareness and contextual understanding of the historical and the cultural context of the genre we are working in. I am literally into this process of exploring what are the advantages and disadvantages of this benchmarking that is going on. And I think that is what is important to me. And in terms the employability of students I would say, yes it is because the industry will now understand exactly what our students are doing at that course and that will be done in an industry language. The danger is that you lose what I would call the free creative space that film schools and art schools can occupy. Now you can ask me questions.

Q: How's the SkillSet benchmarked against the results?

Alistair Oldham: I don't know how to answer this question. I don't want to give the impression that I am anti-skills. I do want to give the impression like a lecturer on ground level what it feels like to have these kinds of dictates from the management. I think I am fairly confident, actually, that we will preserve the essence of our course but will have to fight our corner to make sure that the SkillSet performance-based objectives don't somehow wash over the more intellectually creative things set in our assessment criteria. The learning system should be judged on the basis of the products that result from this.

(...)

Michal Bregant: Thank you. I would like to give the floor now to Manuel Damásio from Portugal.

Manuel José Damásio: I'll just briefly introduce myself. I am from the Department of Film and Multimedia at the Lusofona School of Communication and Information Technology in Lisbon. What I'll try to do is briefly try and answer some of the questions that are put forward in the abstract for this panel. But I also want to give a perspective on what I believe is the common situation in least in Portugal, but I guess in other European countries, which has to do with the tension that currently school and media schools at university level are confronted with. And I think that similar to what happens in the industry there is a tension between four areas and I think that CILECT might have a role at least in two of those areas. The first thing is that there is clearly a tension for accreditation. Similar to the example that was given in the UK we now have a national accreditation agency in Portugal. And I think there's clearly a role that CILECT might take in that area. Secondly, there's a big pressure for financing. As I am sure you all know there's no money in Portugal. So, basically the institutions have to find new ways of attracting finance. And certainly there is a big pressure for research and that is an aspect where in our case the discussion that has been going on in the country not only in how we can attract people that produce research results, but are research results accountable as outcome for film and media schools. And fourth, there's a need for attracting foreign students. Currently in Portugal, and I suspect in other European countries, there's a clear need to attract students from abroad basically because there are no kids being raised in the country as we

are one of the oldest countries in Europe. This is a problem common to other countries. So, I'll try to briefly present those four tensions and then some of the areas that I think CILECT might have a role.

So, first of all, most of our schools have adopted the so called Bologna Declaration. Now we have a three cycle degrees and in order to develop those degrees schools in Portugal were compelled to follow a European model, so to say. We were asked to design our degrees in accordance with what was the model in Europe. This was clearly one of the areas where we had a problem. This was in 2001 and until today there's no clear organizational model in terms of the Bologna process. There is the more traditional six pack model which we saw didn't fit in our reality and to the reality of a country. So, we designed a slightly different approach based on a strongly applied teaching at the first level, a more creative teaching at the second level, and then a research-oriented teaching and training at the third level. A clear pressure came out of this because we were compelled to have at least 75% of our teachers to have a PhD degree. This puts a lot of pressure not only in terms of hiring new people, but also in terms of how do we mingle those people with the experts, that's how we call the people that provide the actual professional training and the actual skills that are needed for teaching the students.

In terms of financing, one of the answers we had is to try and apply for European funding and we tried to mix that, in the case of Portugal, with what is called public and private research and development. So, I would say that this tension for finance will force, at least at university level, schools to mingle in finding standards of applied research. I would say that these four tensions can have a clear answer that tries to mix the training of people with clear teaching and creative skills with compatibility measures. And that's clearly the focus and that's where I think CILECT might have a word. So, where do I think there's an opportunity for benchmarking?

The first opportunity I see is in a course structure and I am not talking about a particular curriculum of the degrees but in the particular case of the three-cycle model the clear definition of the outcomes expected at each one of the levels. Currently in Portugal second-cycle degrees and even first-cycle degrees in the area of film and media studies are being evaluated on the basis of research outcomes which is clearly, in my perspective, a complete disaster. So, we need to have a clear set of orientation in course structure and curriculum for this idea of the three cycles. Then, there's a clear need for staff and teacher qualification labels. And we are also compelled now to use evaluation methods similar to the ones that we discussed. So, in this case, the methods are based on a national online platform which is a complete nightmare because students all over the country are supposed to do their evaluation. Obviously, not even 5% of them do the evaluation. And I don't think that good students do the evaluation. I think that only the best students do it. They are the only ones doing evaluations. Teachers' qualifications and evaluations is certainly an area where I see a need for improvement. And thirdly, in terms of financing there's been quite a discussion in national terms because currently the financing we get from the Ministry of Culture cannot be applied in equipment and facilities. Don't ask me why but there's this rule that you cannot apply any type of finance in terms of equipment and facilities and I think that in terms of benchmarking there's also an opportunity for us. But those are the areas on which we are discussing problems on the local level so to say.

And I go back to the role that I think CILECT might have. First of all there's clearly a need for a European standard in terms of the outcomes of each one of the cycles for the courses that are taking the Bologna model at least at the university level because this can be a tricky problem in the future. And a much more complex problem is that in national terms film and multimedia was included in terms of external evaluation by the National Accreditation Agency in the area of social sciences. So, currently our degrees are being evaluated by people coming mostly from sociology and in some cases

history of art, because the area of social sciences and the humanities is very big and then you have panels for each of the areas. The thing is that since there are no international experts in these panels from the areas of film, when my school comes to be evaluated in 2014, I will probably be evaluated by a guy in archaeology somewhere in Europe. So, I think that not only CILECT but also other organizations should have a role in that but I suppose it depends on the local schools to ask for that to be able to nominate experts for these panels because otherwise in terms of external evaluation at the national level this will be a major problem for the institutions in the near future. Also, and this is at the level of teaching, but also at the level of research we have exactly the same problem. So, there isn't currently any panel for research evaluation at the national level that includes the area of arts and media studies. Once again, arts and media studies are included in the social sciences and humanities panels. So, basically the only projects that could be in those areas are projects for film archives. No type of applied research is financed. So, I see that there's clearly a problem also there.

So, to conclude, I can say that there are two areas where CILECT can have a role. The first role is to demand to be able to nominate experts in the national evaluation panels and not only at the national level, but also there should be such at the international level and in the frame of the so called European programme. And then, to be able to push forward projects that have an international dimension in terms of learning outcomes. We are currently involved in a project that follows that direction, the Erasmus Mundus project in documentary training which we see as a good example in trying to set a standard for training that follows at the same time the Bologna idea of cycles, but also this idea of standards in terms of outcomes for training in the area of film. One final word in relation to rankings... I see rankings are a little bit dangerous because most of them are based on a very large sample that cannot be applied to niche areas of training but in the particular area of film and media, like in other areas, I think there will be a pressure for rankings. So, I think that CILECT should have that in mind in the future because if not from the associations of schools, from somewhere else there will come a pressure for rankings. I have been involved in the Europas label which is a label for schools of engineering and I think that that is a very good alternative to ranking. So, instead of creating a ranking what you do is a label of quality in international terms, in this case in European terms. I think that's probably the best alternative model to ranking. But you just have to have this label of quality applied to schools. Thank you very much.

Q: Can you give us more detail on your Erasmus experience?

Manuel José Damásio: It hasn't started yet. It will start in 2012. It is a consortium promoted by the Budapest Film School, us and Sint Lukas Film School from Belgium. It clearly deals with one specific type of production, a documentary. And secondly it has a clear international approach because the primary targets for the course are internationally suited. That's why I think it is a good example because it answers some of the tensions that I started talking about in terms of finance, in terms of applying the Bologna standards to other types of degrees. And I think it represents an opportunity for joint European master programmes. They are an extremely good opportunity, first of all, in terms of attracting students, secondly, in terms of finance, and in terms of financing the students' internal productions. So, I think it represents an opportunity to go and answer some of those tensions.

Q: Can you tell me a bit more about what the financial benefits from them are and what's the application process like?

Manuel José Damásio: The application process is quite complex. They have Erasmus Mundus Masters and Erasmus Mundus PhDs. So this is a Master's programme. This is the second cycle. The application process is lots of paperwork basically where you have to follow a clear set of rules and procedures in order to make yourself interesting to that programme. In terms of the financing model,

it is a very interesting financing model because the project finances at the same time scholarships for students and expenses for trainers in production. So, that's a very key model. The main goal of the project is to attract university students from abroad. So, I think it answers some of the questions that we have been discussing and I think it's a very good model. Basically Erasmus Mundus so far has financed courses in the areas of chemistry, physics, computing. So, I think that there are very few degrees financed in the area of the arts, and I think there's room there for other schools to apply and to develop projects. And obviously, we as a consortium are interested in attracting students from abroad, but also in developing this type of approach. As to the scholarships they pay for everything. They pay for the fees plus a scholarship for travelling and accommodation.

Michal Bregant: Well, it is my pleasure to give the floor to Nick Oughton.

Nick Oughton: Thank you. My name is Nick Oughton and I'm from the Griffith Film School in Brisbane, Australia. I think that this is a particularly important topic. Let me start with a quote from Groucho Marx. He famously said "I would not join any club that would admit me as a member". This sentiment implies many things but importantly attested the value a person attributes to themselves and the communities to which they belong. So, my thoughts were about that particular statement by Groucho. If we are happy to be part of our organization, it really says something about us if we are proud of that organization. And if we are proud to be part of an organization, certainly this will be because we think we are doing a good job. But in many respects how do we know that, how do we test and measure that? So, values in many respects are at the heart of this conversation. And the fundamental values that underpin CILECT are, from my perspective, both appropriate and laudable. Without being forged at a post war Europe, at a time when every building shattered countries and communities, I believe they've stood the time. Along with these values are the criteria that define the type of institutions that qualify for admission as for CILECT members. And I note them. If you go into the actual website and have a look at how a member applying would qualify, these are some of the standards and criteria by which they are tested. It says that an applicant for full membership should be an established film, television and media education and training institution, recognised as higher education entities by the appropriate authorities in their country. They train and educate students to professional level as generally understood in their countries or national associations representing groups of such schools. They must have been in existence for three years prior to the date of application. They must have appropriate staff, equipment, and finances. For a school to be accepted as an applicant for the status of full membership, its presence at the General Assembly held during the period of its candidacy is obligatory. So, there are already some standards set by which a candidate institution can become a member of CILECT. With this description in mind I briefly looked at the role of standards and benchmarking, both useful tools to test and qualify candidate institutions for membership of an organisation and perhaps to evaluate how this procedure is presently conducted. Let's first start with the role of standards.

Standards should be driven first by the values and expressed aims of an organisation and that organisation's policy. Policies that reflect aims such as... and I am postulating these as I think they are appropriate for an organisation such as ours and many others, but these are important: equity, inclusivity, transparency, and quality. The standards are a matter of life and death in some arenas. In an area I work in such as occupational health and risk management, they can be a matter of life and death. Standards are set because they protect people against illness and death. And they are very important. They are also a guarantee of quality and performance. For instance, the sixty millimetre standard was used in clutching of images, moving images for many years was a wonderful standard used across the world and everybody who picked up a piece of film knew where the perforations were, they knew there was a rotation put in a projector, etc. We can guarantee that the thing worked. They are also gatekeepers to ensure the quality of the service such as admission to medical

practice. To qualify as a doctor, you have to measure up to the standards of that very qualification. So, what standards should govern CILECT membership? They will be determined by the style and the quality of the institutions that are admitted to the CILECT and by default therefore define our institution. I know that standards are gate-keepers. Standards can be employed to exclude as well as admit. So, they can be inclusive and provide, I think, a way for people to enter a learned academy, or they can be used to put a wall round it to exclude people. And I think this has always been considered. So, to repeat, what standards or performance indication should be used to measure an aspiring candidate institution and also evaluate the performance of the admitting body itself and its admission policies. In a way we are not only looking at how we provide a set of criteria to attest the aspiring institution, but we should also be evaluating those very procedures that we are using. And I think we should ask the question of what we have established above and I gave you a description of some of the criteria for admission into CILECT. Are they appropriate in today's age, in the beginning of the 21st century?

Standards can provide accountability and transparency and this can deliver efficacy, consistency and trust. But do quasi standards currently exist in an organisation like CILECT? Are the standards that we use a favour for favour, or mates helping mates, or are we using a rigorous set of criteria that provide consistency? What value is attached to the currency of being a member of CILECT? There are film schools that I've heard about, who regard being a member of CILECT as not appropriate for them. And some of them might say that it's because of what they believe or have heard CILECT is, how it conducts itself, how it selects the candidates. And they feel that it's not appropriate. In some cases they think that the process is appropriate or adequate. Perhaps we are at the beginning of a formal view of the principles that govern how an organisation's standards apply to those wishing to be its members. In terms of benchmarking, this is another tool that we can use, sometimes defined as a measurement of one entity against an exemplar for the purpose of the evaluation, continuous improvement and insuring quality. How can this work in CILECT? Perhaps benchmarking CILECT against an exemplar organisation? But what type of an organisation? Are there professional academic disciplinarians? We could all name some but I think this is certainly a possibility. If we don't test what we are doing against what other organisations, using similar strategies to admit membership, if we don't test ourselves against those, the appropriate ones that we see around us, perhaps we are never going to know whether we are doing a good job or a bad job.

We benchmark an aspirant school against the CILECT example for the purpose of capacity building and building towards membership. So, in this case, we are looking at the very people who are applying to join our organization and what I was saying here is how does a school measure up to the criteria that CILECT is setting? How do they know they have arrived there? So, perhaps after a period of time a school who's an aspirant to become a member of CILECT can be matched to a fine exemplar of a CILECT member, and test themselves against that and grow and develop by that comparison. I would argue that what we are doing in CILECT is probably a benchmarking exercise and we are also using a set of standards for admission to this academy, and always remembering that those selection procedures and the standards and the benchmarking procedures we use define our organization because our organization is defined by what people see as our members. Our members define us as an organization; they are the shop-front of the organization; they are what everybody around the world sees exists as CILECT through its members and how they conduct themselves and the standards and the quality of the education they provide.

So, what can we learn from other organizations and how would these learnings lead to new and perhaps more appropriate standards for CILECT? So, I am really asking a whole lot of questions here. I think that the tools of standardization, the tools of benchmarking are very appropriate but when we actually use these tools we must use them in an intelligent and educated way. We must use them in

a way which is going to be to the benefit of CILECT, but also to the benefit of its members. And I think this journey is about to begin and I think it is probably time within our organizational structure to redefine the very things that define us and that is in some respects the way we select the people who are going to join and become members of CILECT. Thank you.

Michal Bregant: Thank you. I think that was a very useful presentation to begin with. Are there any questions from the audience? What are your reactions, comments?

Pavel Jech: I just want to mention that the membership is a form of benchmarking already. Can you define that a little bit further like what do you think the CILECT benchmark defines?

Nick Oughton: Look, we are one benchmark. I'm not sure how valued that benchmark is. It certainly is valued to a 155 member schools, or whatever the total is. They obviously realize that it is a value being a part of CILECT. But also I know that there are many very fine film schools, a number of them in Australia, which I think would probably qualify, who see that perhaps being a member of CILECT is not appropriate for them. They talk of the way CILECT has been in the past, I think it's less than what it is in the present and what it is going to be in the future. But they talk about it being an "old boys' organization" that has had certain ways of selecting people favour for favour, and part of becoming a member of the club. As a new member of CILECT, I've had the opportunity to be here for five years. And I think that this isn't exactly true. But perceptions drive everything and I think that if CILECT is to take itself forward, in my humble opinion, it means we must engineer the perceptions that exist about this organization. And if we find that there are pockets in the world, particularly within our discipline, that don't regard us as having the appropriate efficacy, having the appropriate quality in terms of what we are doing to qualify our film schools, then I think we have a bit of a job to do. I don't think there's anything to panic about; I just think that it's something that needs addressing. And I just mentioned that standards and benchmarks are tools by which we can look at ourselves in a mirror, but also test ourselves against other institutions or academies, or organizations. It's like seeing where we are now, how we are going, what we need to improve; just a SWOT analysis. I don't know if that answers your question, but...

Alison Wotherspoon: Could we make a parallel with medicine in a certain sense?

Nick Oughton: I can't necessarily because I know that medicine is a bit like a walled city. Getting into medicine requires a certain amount of training, it is very close. And I don't think we want to have standards which define us too closely. I think sailing deep is a wonderful thing, but I think sometimes the paradox of the situation which we live in, which gives us the power of creative people and some of the ironies that you assist and even some of the things we do wrong, sometimes they should define us in a way that makes us different to other people. So, I don't think we want to be too prescriptive. I think there's a very fine line between determining a set of standards that are an advantage rather than a drawback to our organization.

Q: What kind of changes would you suggest then?

Nick Oughton: It is a process, like any other process. The benchmarking process is where we take an organization like CILECT look for an exemplar and a dialogue takes place for about two to three months and a number of position statements are created and one organization looks at the other and what the exemplar one becomes. That's what we would like it to be like. Maybe not exactly the same but we learn from them and then we can evaluate our own position, and look at what we are doing comparing to the exemplar and there we can begin to redefine the standards by which we define ourselves. I think standards are important, but again, they must not be too close; they must

have enough room and rigour room where they really provide an opportunity for plurality, a whole number of things which give value to our creative lives.

Michal Bregant: Ok, if there are no more questions, we can step forward and I'll give the floor to Andreas Treske. He will introduce himself briefly and will give a presentation.

Andreas Treske: I'm German but I am living in Turkey and I have been teaching there for about fourteen years. I developed a programme in communication and design and was the head of the Communication and Design Department at a private Turkish university. My background is film school, the Munich Film School. I finished the directing department, at that time it was Wolfgang Längsfeld and all the gang from Munich in the 80s, 90s and so on. When I started teaching in Turkey the first experience was that the university I was working at had a closed benchmarking and evaluation system which was based on "the American model of university education" and followed a model of student evaluation and teachers' research evaluation. The second experience was that nobody understood the teaching model I was coming from, i.e. how film education should be built. So, we had the kind of curriculum which was built around a couple of core courses. This meant that every student had to take a management course, a social science course and a scientific course. The administration was engineering-based. So, the evaluation comes from an engineering point of view. This was just to give you an idea about the starting point and what I want to come to is what we were doing (the Bologna process), what we are doing now in designing a curriculum and what would be the expectation on my part, being a representative now of another Turkish university, to become a CILECT member and to profit from CILECT under the aspects of benchmarks and evaluation criteria.

The situation in Turkey at the moment is quite hype in the sense of Turkish cinema. We have 30% box office in the cinema. This year 12 competing films, new fiction films, participated at the Antalya Film Festival, nine of these were first-time films for their film-makers. There are around 20 to 30 short film festivals held all over Turkey and the amount of student film production is increasing rapidly for the last 10 years, since actually DV cameras came on the market. When you talk about film education in Turkey you don't talk about film, you talk about digital video, and you talk about the magic of the Canon 5D, and the whole design, what's coming with the 5D. There are only one or two schools that will certify or produce for the 35 mm and they work in a way – one of them is in Istanbul, it is a traditional school, a public school – in which the student comes with a script and he finds a producer and a budget, and the equipment. The school doesn't provide anything. But the school graduates an artist, much more the model of an art academy education. So, when we have so many films produced in that way the question is how we can put this number of productions into a curriculum at a standard university, at a general university on the undergraduate level. And, of course, the other question is, do all those young filmmakers, who have their first films on the screens of the big Turkish festivals (there are films which are not necessarily coming out of Turkey but the films which are making the box office), come from film schools. They do not come from film schools because there are no film schools, except perhaps the art academies, which are two or three. They come maybe from the communication faculties. There are about 30 communication faculties and more than half of them belong to private universities. And maybe they come from Art Faculties at public universities. There are about 50 public faculties, i.e. about 50 schools of art in Turkey. So, when you look at what the higher council of education in Turkey has set up following the Bologna rules, you will find out that on the undergraduate level, opposed to film education, the courses which teach film take maybe maximum between 30 to 60 credits in a 240 credit system. So, how does that work?

If you look at the first year, the student comes fresh from the state entrance exam and is 18 years old, and the student has to take, of course, the history of Turkey class, the Turkish class, the English

class again, has to take a social science course again, has to take an orientation course. So, that means if you want to train a student in film, the student will have a maximum of three hours a week in a 15-week semester. And in two semesters that makes, you can count the hours. When you come to the second year, you get rid of the university wide core courses. You can add two more courses, and now following the Bologna process it means that you have to add electives. So, the goals and the outcomes of the programmes should be that you educate a round citizen rather than somebody who is focused on one specific area. So, the chance to teach in film comes in the third or in the fourth year. And then, again you have to select electives to get to the points and criteria of the programme outcomes in the undergraduate education. So, from the 240 credits you are teaching, the student will be in your department only for a very limited period of time and you have to set up criteria what you want to teach students and what you would like them to take over from film making education which you know from film departments, from schools are into these programmes. So, when we are designing a programme now, we are looking at which schools we could produce, which programmes we could look at. So, that means that if you surf the Internet you look at all schools which are set here, all the departments you see, and you find some of the partners, some of the benchmark universities who have applied to Bologna. And there's one problem that this is very invisible because no one likes to share their tricks of the trade and you have to have time to find out about these curricula and to go through them. The second thing that you see is that you are dealing with undergraduate education but there are courses in screenwriting, sound design, editing, camera, script writing. It would be wonderful if you could teach that too but you can't because you first have to teach the students film appreciation. So, what we are doing is, we spend the first two years on designing a programme which deals with film appreciation. And then, we try to get students to make films. For me, as a graduate from a film academy, the most important factor why I went to Munich was that they made films, they shot 35 mm, their films won student Oscars, I met professionals and I was at international festivals, and I had international contacts, and I wanted to earn a good mark. So, how can I offer these opportunities to a student who comes to university and pays for the programme at the same time, if it is a private education? Just to give you a number, such a programme costs about 6,000-8,000 euro a year in Turkey. Not everyone can afford such an education in Turkey.

So how do you get all this into the curriculum? You can't design electives such as advanced editing, sound editing, or camera's lighting, etc., because if you design those courses you will need more teachers, you will need more instructors who add more expense to the programme, and cost too much. The university I work for is funded 95% by student fees. So, if you have 95 % student-fee funding you cannot buy any Alexa. That's up in the stars. You cannot buy a lot more than Canon 5Ds and lenses. The students actually come with their equipment to the school. They come with what they want to do and they have their computers and their Final Cut systems. They have to operate those and what we do is design courses into the curriculum. We put a slot of 8 hours teaching which says "8 hours film studio production". In a production course, you spend as much time as possible with the third-year student, you mentor the student, as we know it from the film schools, and at the same time the student can produce as much as he/ she wants. The drawback is that 95 % of the students you teach will not become filmmakers. So, you have to find a way in the curriculum that those 95% of the students find a way to graduate and take their path in life, in the education system, on the job market, maybe in a field which is not necessarily based on the ideal that you teach filmmakers.

There's a 5% which stay and will become filmmakers. They might go to FAMU, La Fémis, to programmes which give them the opportunity to specialize in that matter. So, what we are dealing with under the Bologna process is to design a programme which takes ideas from a film education at film schools into the undergraduate education by saying that film education belongs to the second

cycle of film education. So, that means that if you want to put up free art education into such a programme, you have to do this in a master's programme. So, our way to design it now is to put this in the master's programme. So, the students we are getting, we don't select anymore by any aptitude exam. We take them directly with the points they've achieved at the state exam because it doesn't make sense to interview them, it doesn't make sense to make them do many more other things. Anyhow, we have to fill at least 30 % of our seats because otherwise we don't get paid well. We have problems with equipment, and all that kind of stuff. That means in the second spot, we split the students again when they come to the third and the fourth year, and there we can concentrate on film education.

And here comes the issue of what the expectation from CILECT will be. The expectation would be to say how we can service the curricula, how we can set a standard for the minimum outcome of film education, and that film education could state very clearly that you teach these objectives. My colleague explained how we select CILECT schools. So, that would be something that you don't actually find outside CILECT which says "Look, we are the best in film education." Rather, we need to fish around and see where we find our modules for syllabi, where we find our modules for different cameras. Now in this world of changing cameras, and computers, and technologies, it is very clear that what I teach my students today is not valuable tomorrow, if I don't generalize and conceptualize. When I am conceptualizing I should say CILECT stands for these concepts. And that would be an expectation in benchmarking and evaluation. CILECT should evaluate the schools by means of the degree to which they appreciate these concepts and for setting these concepts. And whatever Bologna will be and what comes after Bologna for other countries, these concepts should be traded for further education. So, I think that was the idea put together.

Claire Barwell: It seems to me that there is a fundamental philosophical question. In the UK there are lots of committees and there are national benchmarking standards for different disciplines. Now, what's interesting is that every time I have to rethink my course, I have to map it against the national benchmarking standards, but which standards. I do both. I work at a university for creative arts so most of my colleagues work in the field of art and design. And that's interesting because that sort of benchmarking has to do with a particular philosophical approach. But I also have to recognize and balance against the media and communications national benchmarking standards. And maybe there's a place for CILECT to see that in fact film education is a possibility, is between the two, and what we are doing working with students is in both directions, which is why film is important. We are trying to work creatively and differently. Actually, what we do is so hugely complicated that we need to find an expression that we could all use, because we all work with technologies, with disciplines, with genres, with historical and theoretical stuff.

Participant: In addition to what you just said, a lot more programmes now have come to resemble traditional film schools that they can be addressed in terms of the traditional benchmarking discussion. But we need to draw a line because there are longer programmes, shorter programmes, flash programmes, degree programmes and all that. There should be no competition, but maybe some demarcation line with minimum standards should be set in changing the methodology used in these courses. This is not a question.

Michal Bregant: I think there are so many differences – regional, historical, political, and social. There are differences between continents and countries, with their own identity and traditions. But we should look for the things which are common. And there are so many standards, not only in the UK but in many other countries as well, for the older schools. The film schools are very young, but there are much older schools such as the technical schools, the universities teaching humanities. We should probably, within CILECT, call for something that is not necessarily an act of self-defence, but

which can be a tool that works in different discussions, including political discussions, and that can make us more self-confident. And maybe we'll have another tool for protecting the space that we need for assuring quality that we want to offer to our students.

Alison Wotherspoon: I think that one of the absolute strengths of CILECT is that fact that it is an extraordinary group of schools and people who have such range, have such diversity. And it seems to be a great shame when some people start complaining about the fact that there are criteria to become a CILECT school. And it seems to work effectively and seems to accommodate a great range of cultural, technical organizations within it. Everything is changing and we cross all over and it is about finding basic benchmarking which in some way already exists.... I just think that diversity is the strength of CILECT in many ways.

Suzanne Regan: I come from California where entertainment is the third largest industry in the state so bureaucrats decided that we needed to create standards and benchmarks starting in kindergarten. And universities were brought in to decide what were the standards and benchmarks from the time you cannot read to the time you get to university. And it's a disaster because we've ended up with getting rid of basically any kind of realistic standard in public education and the university is stuck with people who can no longer read, who cannot write or express themselves. Standards in theatre were designed by key people from departments. And it was awful for universities to work with government bureaucrats who made things homogenized and absurd. Articulation is maybe what you think a fourth grader should know, having absolutely no background in teaching fourth-graders. It is basically a great argument for a private school. And I've found that under standardization they basically teach to the test, to the bottom, not to help to excel, it has become quite debilitating. And as it has hit the university system, we are all sending our kids to private school and not making us empathised. Nobody who taught at university level sent their children to public schools. The government enforcement of benchmarking standards to me has very different political reasons than actually for creating an understanding of where we should be going and what in fact this is going to deliver to the economy of any country or state.

Nick Oughton: The idea of social engineering through standards is of course anathema and we've seen evidence of that in the past few hundred years and what it has led to. There've been some great films about that too. I remember one with Anthony Quinn. It can be devastating but I think there's another world or another realm which can be used as inspiration to aspire to as set goal which is going to lead people to where they want to go. Not to club them with but to get them targets.

Andreas Treske: I just want to add one thing to what's kind of a guideline for us at the moment to continue facing some of the problems of standardization through extremely strange bureaucratic ways, cultural mixtures, whatever, European adaptation of Asian standards, mixtures, etc. So, the simple principle is what the student is doing. So, we are a private university and in a private education you can focus on the student and therefore try to run the whole programme's perspective from the point of view of the student; that's what we have to look at.

Bert Beyens: I think that it is difficult sometimes to define some of the criteria of those on the other side as well. But the word education is something everybody understands, no matter where you live. I am from RITS in Brussels, Belgium and we are talking now with the government about how and when to start with the audio-visual education. Someone said in another panel today that the technology is so important and from such a young age in our lives that soon we would be unable to teach them. When they come to the film school they would probably know so much more than the professors that there would be no point of contact for teaching. I disagree because I think we have even more things to teach them now – we need to teach them how to think and how to use the

knowledge and the tools that they have accumulated without understanding them. How to look at the screen and how to evaluate it – this is what film education is...Teaching you taste! We are talking today about the criteria for admission – I think this is one of the criteria – can the applicant school teach their students to distinguish between different aesthetic values. There are too many introductions probably – which we have to get rid of. But the advanced teaching and learning the students can get nowhere else. Technology will evolve and evolve but who will teach the student to create original content? Then comes, of course, this feeling of the CILECT schools being “the old boys” club because some people will think we are still teaching words and not practicalities. But at the end of the day what we get is quality which comes from the teachers and their teaching. And we see it in the end product of the students – the films they produce. This is what should be benchmarking – what is the result in the end! Who are our alumni matters! It is not a matter of showing but of results. This is what CILECT is – a network in which teachers communicate for the best of their students. CILECT is an organization for teachers and schools, where teachers generously share their best practices.

Michal Bregant: Thank you for this very inspiring contribution, Bert. Now I pass the floor to Marc Nicolas.

Marc Nicolas: Thank you, Michal. First I have to tell you that I am not a good student because I replied too late to the invitation to be part of this panel, so I didn't prepare in the way I should have. I will limit myself to sharing some of my remarks with regard to Michal's questions. I'll try to provide my answers to those questions.

How is the value of film school education to be determined? - I don't know really. I have different things to say about this.

Are our international reviews and guides sufficient? - No, obviously.

Are our member schools evaluated in an international context? - Today that is done in a very poor manner.

Should an international standard be established? - No.

Should CILECT lead in the European standards? - No, because there shouldn't be any standard.

And should CILECT become an organization functioning as an international guarantee of educational standards in film and media education? - Yes, absolutely.

Now I want to present some of my remarks. First, as I already said I am not going to speak here about the evaluation of students, teachers and programmes, which are at the base of any serious evaluation of schools. But I don't want that to be the subject of our meeting, even if it is at the centre of the topic. So, let's talk about the evaluation of schools which, as I understood, are at the core of Michal's question. First of all, there are basically three reasons for evaluating schools. Two of the reasons are good, and one of them is problematic. The first good reason is paramount to the teaching job. If we want to be good teachers, we should know the maximum of what we can do. That means that we should be able to evaluate our schools, not only speaking about that with the students, and not only among us, I mean, the adults running the school or the teachers. So, this is a good reason for trying to evaluate the school permanently. The second thing, of course, is almost the same but not exactly the same because it provides access to progress and change. Regular information about the school allows us to think about it and to think about change, which is essential to the position of the teacher or the head of the school. But it seems to me that what makes the subject so important today, because the previous two ones were very classical reasons for evaluating schools, is that some people want schools to compete and this is the central reason why today the system of school evaluation and benchmarking is so often used. As to my opinion of benchmarking, I am opposed to this view of our activity for simple and I would quote “political” reasons, namely that

education is a non-profit activity and this is not to be discussed now. Again, this is my personal opinion. But I think this is the main origin of the question today and the main problem that brings us so many bad questions, such negative attitude with regard to benchmarking. The whole discussion is structured by the question "Is it a problem or not?" And again, for me, cultural goods cannot be commercial goods, despite the fact that many liberal activities exist on the market right now. It can be in a liberal system, in a market system. It can be in cultural attitudes or goals. So, this the main reason why we speak so much of benchmarking today, i.e. competition. Why has competition become such an important question among film schools, provided that it was not twenty years ago? Good competition makes good people progress, like every one of us. Natural competition is good competition, and this is a good thing, of course. What are the causes for bad competition? I think that the first reason is that our sector is developing. It used to be a tiny activity with the sector of education. It is still tiny, but a little bigger. To us the question of the number and who is the best probably should be asked. The second reason is that for a long time, the cinema industries were mostly nationally structured. And the film schools, not all, of course (maybe it is a bit excessive), a few of them were established to provide people for the national film industry, with some notable exceptions, especially in the US. In the rest of the world the film industry was inflation based. The second reason is no longer valid because the markets and the movement of people made it more open. So, we are numerous, we are less than before organized on a national level. And the third reason, in my opinion, is that there are no longer world zones, like it used to be. Let's say 20 years from now, 25 years, it was clear that the world was separated into two big areas at least, the east-west and the north-south. And what we've been experiencing for the last 25 years was the exposure to these two classical frontiers. This was my first argument related to the notion of competition, namely the question of the number and of the zone in which we work.

There's probably a second reason which has to do with the previous one, namely that competition is made in front of the public, in front of the students. It happens now that the students ask themselves "Where should I go?" and this question, in fact, didn't really exist before, or it certainly hasn't been as relevant as it is today. And the second group of people who ask themselves this question are the owners of the schools, the money providers. They permanently ask themselves "Should I put money in this or not?" This is why we are more and more faced with this notion, which is new, in my opinion, of competition, and what I call bad competition. If this exists and brings the question coming from our students, parents of future students, our governments, people giving us money, banks, everybody, probably is going to develop and finally to exist. I am sure. And there will be in the very close future an international ranking of film schools. It won't be today, I cannot say when, maybe in 5 years, surely in 10 years, but probably in 5 years. What kind of questions does it bring to us? I think many questions which are very, very difficult to deal with. The first one has to do with the expertise, who has the good expertise to deal with that? I am not sure who will be the people to lead the ranking. Probably there will be some good people in this work, probably some of us. But there will be other people and these other people might be experts who wouldn't like to discuss things with us because there are other criteria than ours, especially concerning what I said before about non-profit activity. The other question is the question of the independence of this ranking, not only the experts but also the house in which this ranking is established. Would it be an international law agency, UNESCO or I don't know what, will it be a commercial agency dealing with evaluation every day and in every sector, we don't know but the independence of this ranking will be a big question. And I have to say that I am not very confident of the quality of this independence, if I compare what exists today in international ranking for higher education, generally speaking. So, independence is the second big problem. And the third one, of course, is the pay. This is a problem that we have even if we practice internal evaluation, which is a criterion because we can make 100 congresses of CILECT discussing those criteria. So, it is really a complex matter and that makes me very pessimistic.

For me there are only two solutions to fight this process of commercial benchmarking provided by money dependent, not so competent experts, which would be the case for me. And I think those solutions are to be found in two directions. The first one is to try to replace the notion of ranking by another notion which is close but not exactly the same and far better, in my opinion, i.e. description of what film schools are. For me, this kind of description doesn't exist, I mean in a serious and profound way. We all have websites and documents of the schools but we don't have that. And we don't have it for CILECT which, for me, has always been a major problem for the members of CILECT, any sort of a description of the film schools which are members of CILECT. And I think that the description is a very good tool, I would say a weapon, against ranking because it provides information which is not presented in a way which makes it appear too classified. This information may be used to classify but not to rank which is very different. So, I think this is the first direction to go, description instead of ranking. And then the second direction for me will be plurality, i.e. avoiding the domination of one ranking or two but using multiple rankings. In this way, you achieve a goal which is close to the description goal because you would have different rankings but so many that they will be only descriptive and not ranking in the bad sense, saying to whom the money should go in the end. So, description and plurality are the best ways to fight against corruption in benchmarking.

And to conclude this, again some short remarks on the question and the way I prepared to discuss it because as you realized it is not a presentation, it is only some reflection. I think that CILECT could play a role in this, and probably in two senses. The first one is to be part of the description job. And I have to say that what I have seen since the first day in CILECT that I would very much like to add a description of all the member schools. I think that if we do this in CILECT, if we participate in the general description activity that I mentioned, it will be great. And we need to orient our descriptions to something. Because when we describe something, we are forced to describe it in one way or another, to take back to the people concerned. And by doing that, we'll probably do what should be done in terms of description. And the second thing, which I would say is more political, CILECT should make a lot of noise about some very simple affirmations, very few, but so much noise that no one can avoid it concerning what should and what shouldn't be done in terms of 10 basic sentences like the Constitution, you know. You state some very basic principles on which you can build some things but you cannot build other things. These principles should be very basic and widely discussed among us. They should be taken into account by the people who come after us to make their commercial activity. I would finish by a comment that might surprise you, it happened that in my previous life, it was mainly in cinema, but I've spent some time in film policy and in research on film policies and cultural activities. I was involved in some work on statistics on culture. And I'll finish by that because I just want to remind you that one of the good things in statistics is description. It is not completely by chance that social statistics was invented at the same time of modern democracy in the 18th century, in the modern world. And why was it invented? Its goal was to count the poor people, and then to build policies for the poor people. That's why I think that formative statistics is a progressive tool because of its descriptive character.

Michal Bregant: Thank you, Marc. I think that was a very good illustration of what's happening in France. I think it was very useful and very inspiring, and this idea of description, I think there's nothing more practical than that. I'll have the first round of reactions, question. I think that for description, you need certain standards, you need criteria for description. So, that will be basically a similar task to benchmarking.

Marc Nicolas: I will tell you a short story because I told you that in my previous life, it was 20 years ago, I was the head of the research department at the Ministry of Culture in France, so I worked with historians, economists, sociologists and so on, and in our business we had to do a small statistics job and very frequently I asked my colleague "How many whatever things are there in France?", for

example “How many theatres are there in France?”, and my colleagues would say. “Oh, we don’t know.” But I had to provide an answer to the minister because he had asked me that question, So, I would say 800, and my colleague would say, “No, no, no”. “So, tell me how many, more or less, 500?” “No, no, no.” This is the first step in statistics. It consists of creating categories which obviously exist and which may be in contradiction and have intellectually refined composition. There are different categories of theatres, the national opera and ballet, small theatres, etc. And if you want to discuss the issue with the minister, you tell him that there are 550 theatres. But if you want to discuss the issue with the union of theatres you have to be more refined. I think it is the same with our criteria. And very often when we discuss this with new colleagues in CILECT who are not convinced that there could be a full description of film schools I assure them that this is possible. I will tell you what I do when I meet new colleagues. I ask them a very simple question “Are you working at a graduate or an undergraduate school?” Some say one, some say the other, some say both. And then I ask them how many students they have, 50 or 1000. How many students are there in your country? All those questions help me understand better. There are plenty of questions which are very simple that we use permanently. And of course, it is about statistics. But it is the beginning of something which has to do with the description of who we are and I think that if we take this very pragmatic way, and of course be more sophisticated, trying to build more refined thought categories, we could find some criteria to try to launch such a description. And I think that probably it would happen very quickly that our bad descriptions, with bad categories, would be a good warning against what I call bad benchmarking. So, probably we are not so far from our aim. First of all, we have to start with description which wouldn’t allow people to do what they want with their classification.

Bert Beyens: I don’t know whether I am right but I think there was a project with the Finnish school of bringing all information from all schools together. And finally, we never saw the result of that. The idea was there and I still think you need that.

Marc Nicolas: Again, I insist on simplicity because I can tell another story about statistics. It is about how tall we are. In some identity cards in some countries you have a figure but if I measure you now, I’ll arrive at a different figure. I am sure. Because you were measured five years ago, because your position was different, because the ground wasn’t flat... But this is not important because the difference will be only 2 centimetres and you would be either tall or small. That’s why I think that first we have to make things simple, and then, it might take a whole programme, maybe 20 years, to sophisticate them. But let’s not try to make something very good, like the programmes for mothers that are frequently used for schools, trying to be a very good school, or a very good mother. Statistics is the same, quite enough good statistics.

Bert Beyens: When you were talking about the 10 constitutional principles, are they drafted in relation to being a member of CILECT. This process started 2 years ago. Is that what you mean? More like a way to promote CILECT and bring it to potential money, etc.?

Marc Nicolas: This is the exact type of thing, yes. But maybe we should be more tactical and think first of what we don’t want and then put it as a principle. Let me give you an example. If the majority of us think that a film school is not a school where you start by learning how to make a film for mobile phones, we can say that that’s what in fashion but film is film. Making a film for mobiles is a very interesting form of cinema but is not real cinema. We can write that in a sentence: The film school is not a school where you learn how to make a film for mobiles. And that’s how you kill the schools who train to make films for mobiles and as we know these are not very good schools.

Bert Beyens: The real problem will be if you say that a film school is not a school where you make movies for the gaming industry.

Marc Nicolas: You have to be tactical. Very often these important tasks are not taken because we are afraid. We are afraid of sophisticated things. Sometimes to be sophisticated in our fights we have to be simple in the beginning. That's why I insist on this. And then sophistication comes in an easy manner.

Stanislav Semerdjiev: I couldn't agree more with what you say, Marc. This is something that is essential for the future existence of our association. Bert cited *Six-Pack Plus* which was a project that never happened. It never happened because there were no money and no people attached to it. A similar idea originated in 1992 – if you read the Minutes of the Munich Congress you will find it there. Wolfgang Längsfeld wanted to make a list of all the important graduates of the schools and thus to start a kind of a benchmarking system to which he could further add other elements: how many students they train, in what fields, etc. But that idea collapsed, too, in its time, again because there were no people and money for it to happen. Now we have a solution – CILECT has an Executive Director. This should be part of his (my:-) job. And because I am that person, I would also want to tell you all that I am willing to do this and will do it with great enthusiasm. I actually started preparing some pieces of a similar project for my own school a few years ago. Some of you know that I was the head of the National Theatre and Film Academy in Sofia, Bulgaria – and I used to get always the same questions: What is CILECT? Why are we members? Who are the other members? Why don't we know anything about that school or the other school? So, I started gathering information for myself in order to be able to answer. And now I will not have to start from scratch – I will use that information and believe me, it is a lot... and very useful exactly for this particular project. And the second thing that Marc proposed – the Ten Commandments or whatever we would name them – I find it also extremely important but it has nothing to do with the document that we called *10 Reasons for Being in CILECT*, Bert. Marc is very right – before we start doing the description of the schools we have to first describe what is a film and TV and media school. This has to be widely discussed and agreed upon at a CILECT congress. And this is actually the first step to a **new** CILECT.

Summary of Panels and Conclusions

Pavel Jech: Ok. So welcome back everyone. We're ready to conclude the conference aspect of the meeting. You know all the moderators, Maria Dora Mourão, Wangtae Lim and Michal Bregant. The topics that you covered were always the same. The first was *"The Fundamental Values of Film and Media Education"* and the reason why we posted this one as one of the panel issues is because the more we think about the future of film education and ideas of structural, curricular or technological changes, it really comes back to the issue of promoting fundamental values.

Maria Dora Mourão: The panel that I coordinated worked on the fundamental values of film and media education. We had ten panelists. In the first panel we had Elizabeth Louw and Juan Mora Catlett. There was one basic question we discussed: What kind of profession do we want to prepare our students for? I will summarize some of the highlights of this first panel.

- The fundamental value we have to offer to the students is to enable them to become critically informed practitioners by giving theoretical, analytical and practical training.
- The students have to be able to have social consciousness and make a social compromise by giving back to the society what they have received from the school.
- They have to understand the social, political, historic and economic factors that determine the production context of film and television. But it is very important to respect the cultural values of each region or each country. Many of the African students, for instance, don't really have literacy education and their instruction is preoccupied with visual literacy and that is something totally different from what happens in other regions.
- Creating a team atmosphere instead of reinforcing the individual behavior as well as generating space for dialogue is vital.

The panelists of the second panel were Manuela Cernat, Ben Gibson, Adèle Atangana and David Price.

- First, we have to have faith, then we have to have tolerance for the different cultures, and we have to be prepared to face frustrations and to fight for our ideas. Last but not least, we have to revise some patterns of the film history, and to provide a basis for understanding the world. Do we prepare our students for specialization or should we adopt the Renaissance approach to civilization in the moment of globalization?
- The relationship to the status of cinema in the cultural and political life could define core values.
- There is no contradiction between the assertions that film is an art form and an industrial form.
- Practice and theory have to come together and there is no conflict between them or between specialization and professionalism.
- What is the contribution of what we are doing? We need to become aware of why we do things and that we have freedom of choice.
- It is difficult to teach what is right and what is wrong. The stories, culture and history are the most important elements. But we need to know what story we're trying to tell and for which audience. This will enable us to be innovative by breaking structures in the contemporary media context.

- What is fundamental is participation, collaboration and information as well as to keep the memory alive.

The panelists in the third panel were John Burgan, Gary Griffin, Andreas Gruber and Eduardo Lejano Jr.

- The teaching of documentaries forces students to be engaged in the real world and to think about values.
- Again the question of the theory and practice came up and I have one sentence here that is in quotation marks but I don't remember who said it. "In theory, theory and practice are the same, in practice they're not." And I thought that this sentence provides a perfect foundation for discussing the relation between theory and practice.
- It's important to create a strong sense of community and a good relation between teachers and students.
- The question of technology was also raised. Should we as film educators and film makers continue to teach with film? Technology is developing at a rapid rate. Shooting on film is a method of thinking. It is about critical decision making, it is about teaching our students the value of understanding and manipulating the images created by an educated mind. The experience of shooting on film cannot be recreated on digital measure. However, technology changes but the story never ends.
- Talking about values only in film teaching is not relevant, it is not fundamental. Fundamental is the individual and the society. The fundamental things are the values of narration, of visual perception, the position of the storyteller and the film maker in the narration, and the core skills, the basic skills do not change. Education today lies at such confluence that makes for a curious case whether the old rules still apply where the only constant is change.

Pavel Jech: I would now like to give the floor to Wangtae Lim from South Korea who moderated the second panel "*Impact of Internationalization*".

Wangtae Lim: As we all know, each year we have more and more international programmes. As organizers of these programmes and as professors who teach in these programmes, we want to evaluate the consequences of these international developments. I want to pin point four things.

- First, we talked about mobility. International programmes must include some sort of mobility between schools in different countries for both students and professors. So, I really liked when our friend Gyorgy Karpati from Hungary summarized the mobility of students and professors in the international programmes. He talked about three formats such as seminars, workshops and master classes. And I also had the pleasure of having Pascale Borenstein and Frédéric Papon from La Fémis. They told us they have affiliations with sixteen different foreign schools and they have seven exchange programmes. So, I believe the students from La Fémis are very happy students. For a professor from an Asian country it seems to me that mobility among European countries is less difficult because I know you have a great programme called Erasmus and you can take full advantage of it. And because of the fact that your countries are so close to each other, you can easily find yourself in a totally different culture. But this is difficult to achieve in Asian countries, especially in Korea. In Korea if you want to visit Japan even though it's so close to Korea because of the much longer distance. Adèle Atangana from Cameroon expressed her hope that in the future we can have some programmes between European countries and Asian countries and African countries, etc. So hopefully in the future CILECT can work out this long-distance mobility.

- Secondly, we talked about the language barrier. International programmes also mean that we have to teach students who come from countries where they use totally different languages and that our national students must also work with those students speaking different languages. So I believe that the language is a key to the success of any international programme. To me the languages in European countries sound alike and they're maybe a little bit similar to each other because you use at least similar alphabets but please imagine some of your students coming to Korea. If they want to mingle with the Korean students using Korean words your students will be in big trouble because our alphabet does not have any resemblance to your European alphabets. It's the same with me trying to learn Chinese or Arabic. I just cannot understand how anybody would dare to learn those languages. So you know just because foreign languages are so difficult to master, they pose a barrier to international programmes.
- Next I'd like to quickly talk about cultural differences. Cultural differences can be very tricky, sometimes you try to respect other cultures and just by trying it hard you can be in bigger trouble. As international students studying in America we have had such experiences quite often. I was doing my graduate study in the University of Wisconsin and I met a really nice retired professor. His wife was even greater because she had lived in Korea many many years ago and she could cook Korean food. So I could enjoy Korean food in an American family once in a while and at some point once a week she invited me to a very nice western chicken dish which I really enjoyed. When I had a small chicken bone I dropped it on the plate and then the nice lady said in a straightforward manner: "Wangtae, in my country if you drop a chicken bone on the plate is a sign of bad manners." Of course I was ashamed and I felt bad. But I knew that it was with a good intention. She told me that saying this was even more problematic for her but she wanted me to learn it so that I don't make the same when being invited to another American family. A couple of years later my professor and his wife visited Korea and I thought this was a wonderful opportunity for me to say thanks to them. So I invited them to my parents' house and of course my mum spent a whole day getting ready with the Korean dishes. But at some point there was something which bothered me quite a lot because she was eating rice from the rice bowl. I know it is ok in China and maybe in Japan but in Korea, you know, it is a little bit out of polite manners so in my brain there was, you know, a big debate should I bother to tell her or should I not. Finally, I explained it to her and the moment she heard my explanation her face turned all red and I realized that I've made one of the biggest mistakes in my entire life. I invited her to thank her but I humiliated her. Sometimes I recollect, you know, that instant and I still feel that was foolish of me. So you know, I think sometimes cultural differences can be really tricky. The real key is to respect the fact that our international students are different. A gentleman from the famous school in Lodz made a very wonderful remark that students teach each other. In a multicultural environment students teach each other, they learn from each other, which is really great. So I don't think we have to really worry too much about cultural differences.
- Then, we talked about the advantages, and if there are any disadvantages, what could they be. I think we came to the conclusion that there weren't any serious disadvantages, there are mostly advantages. We had the pleasure of having Tanya Nelson from Russia who shared her experience about their two international programmes with England and Finland. She told us that those great steps in international experience have opened up opportunities for their students getting good jobs after graduation. And we also had the pleasure of having Wim Aerts from Belgium who told us that their school is free in all areas of internationalization, student population, faculty members and international curriculum. A lot of faculty members also benefited from these international programmes, they all had some new perspectives and sometimes they questioned their old curriculum, their old course designs. Another advantage was the possibility to create wonderful human networks among students. After several years I will have finished my own first Korean movie and I may want to release my movie in the Philippines, for example, and I have

some friend I can call. He may not be able to distribute a movie but definitely he will know somebody who he can call too. In conclusion out of the three discussions we had we thought the impact of internationalization is actually quite positive. So we believe that in the nearer future we will have more and more international programmes with much bigger mobility and students and professors will benefit from these new programmes. So I think this is yet another reason why CILECT should really assist member schools when they're trying to establish international programmes. I want to conclude my summary with a sentence by my good friend Gyorgy. He compared internationalization with a mosaic. You know if you have many small pixels of uniqueness, together they can successfully create a big piece of mosaic art. Yes, we all believe in the beauty of well-crafted mosaic so hopefully in the future we can get together and create more and more truly international programmes.

Pavel Jech: Finally, the third panel was moderated by my friend and colleague Michal Bregant from FAMU: *“Benchmarking and Evaluation in International Context”*.

Michal Bregant: I would like to thank all the colleagues who took part in this panel: Manuel Jose Damásio, Alistair Oldham, Jan Schütte, Alison Wotherspoon, Mark Nicolas, Nick Oughton, Andreas Treske, Jarmo Lampela and Guido Lukoschek. It was great to have you on the panel and also I'd like to thank the participants in the audience who were very pro-active.

- The first thing that we had to find out about was the terminology. What do we mean by evaluation? What do we mean by suspended benchmarking or ranking? These are things which are sometimes confusing us and sometimes maybe we are not using these words in the same way. There are many obvious differences between countries, continents, individual schools. So the individual contributions of individual panel members were also various. Every school has some kind of evaluation but what do we evaluate?
- We obviously evaluate the applicants who want to stay at our schools. Someone said that we should also work with the parents of potential applicants. So it is kind of an interesting perspective for the future. We evaluate students' assessments. Some schools don't do that at all. But for the majority of schools this kind of assessment is important.
- Many schools do also evaluation of teachers. This is something done by students. There are many ways, methods, techniques to do that. We concluded that it was a very important part of the awareness of each school.
- Then, we also evaluate outcomes of the students' works. That represents the school and its curriculum.
- And at the end also the institutions as such are evaluated and this is exactly what was supposed to be our main topic.
- So these are different subjects and they're approached differently, individually according to each school's status and statutes. Assessment is something that we all know; particularly our colleagues from the United States have a long experience with that. Someone said that the schools are assessed and the kids are assessed from the kindergarten up to the PhD programmes.
- Benchmarking is probably the core notion. What are the criteria for benchmarking? And at the end, there was a very important question whether we should set up something like minimum standards. The question then was, for what purposes? Should we set up those minimum standards because this is a very sensitive topic and once we define minimum standards they may

be easily violated. Ranking is like a river around us, we hear about it on the radio, in the news every day. We hear that a ranking agency changed the status from triple A to AA plus and from AB plus to BA minus. So that is something that is very political and very popular and I think that rather sooner than later we'll start receiving e-mails offering opportunities to our schools to get ranked among top 10, top 50, top 100 film schools in the world. This is not going to be for free this is going to be maybe political and we should be prepared for that moment. Nothing can stop private agencies from doing this in the field of education as it is a very interesting area. So we should stand still, be self-confident and we should co-operate within CILECT, maybe more than before. CILECT should be aware of its mission to support film and media education as a phenomenon of culture. Therefore we should say clearly that nonprofit schools are the priority. There are thousands of various film programmes worldwide but we should focus on those who are not for profit.

- On the three panels we had a whole range of ideas so I would pick some of those just to offer an image of what the discussion was like. Schools are unique and individualistic and should be like that forever. Some schools don't even evaluate students' assignments so it's kind of totally open. Evaluation of teachers is a useful practice and should be used as a valuable feedback but there would be certain problems that might appear, like how to secure the anonymous responses of students when we have four or five students in the class. Should the evaluation of teachers happen in the class or outside of class? What is the relevance of such feedback when we have only a small number of answers?
- Benchmarking has individual forms and formats – it can be against the industry, against other film schools, against the educational programmes of all kinds, like nuclear engineering... So we should be aware that benchmarking has many directions maybe. National accreditation boards, committees, commissions whatever they're called, should be provided probably with a list of expert evaluators who can participate in the accreditation and evaluation process. I think this should be rather urgent. We heard from Manuel from Lusofona University that in 2014 his university will be evaluated internationally and there are obviously some non-qualified people who might appear.
- We don't need standardization but we might need standards. There is a big difference between those two things. But on the other hand, we don't want to create a club, we want to give targets. Someone said that competition among film schools does not necessarily bring progress. So we should rather co-operate and we should be aware of the size of ourselves, our programmes and be ready for co-operation rather than competition. In the book that you all have there's a set of questions and the panels tried to figure out the answers to those questions. How the value of film school education should be determined? The answer is roughly based on the individuality of each programme and values are to be defined according to this.
- Are internal reviews and guidelines efficient? Some are – for local authorities, governments, financial institutions, foundations and so on but external evaluation might offer stronger arguments in this rather political discussion. How are our member schools evaluated in an international context? Nothing should be institutionalized. Ranking system will appear anyways so we have to be prepared to offer serious self-description, self-definition and self-evaluation. Should an international standard be established? The prevailing opinion was negative. Should CILECT become an organization functioning as an international guarantee of educational standards in film and media education? If there are no standards, no guarantees are needed. What CILECT is expected to offer are support, coordination and networking.

- To conclude, there are a few suggestions that came up during our discussions. First of all, we should probably create a journal review of cinema education in order to have a complex set of arguments why this kind of education is so expensive. Second, we should probably prepare a description of all our member schools and programmes no matter whether they're independent or within universities. Third, we should identify experienced film educators who might become CILECT experts, who would become members of national and international accreditation evaluation bodies. The example from Aalto University in Helsinki, Finland earlier this year showed how easy it was to get professionals in the field of film education as members of evaluation panel. Those also aim at question: What is CILECT for us? And as an answer I would quote another respected colleague of us "CILECT must make noise".

Pavel Jech: Ok. So now is your opportunity to make some noise since you're CILECT. I'll start with Maria Dora with just a simple question: When people are representing their idea of fundamental values was there any fundamental value which was controversial that people did not agree about?

Maria Dora Mourão: The only one that was controversial in my point of view was the question of technology. Because one of the panelists thought that we should teach on film not on digital because shooting on film is different from shooting on digital. It also came to the financial question: If digital is less expensive or more expensive? Well, digital can be as expensive as film. This has to do maybe with the fact that film provides more opportunities to think in aesthetic terms, it gives more time for thinking about the production. With film the student will probably think a little more about what he or she is doing compared to shooting with digital...For me this was the most conflicting thing that with discussed. Of course, there were also some questions about ideology, about points of view but in general you can see that the worries are quite the same: the kind of students we have; the kind of students that graduate our schools; the question of the diversity, of the respect for the different cultures; the question of the relation between the teacher and the student. That's it. If any panelist here can help me with some other issues that were being discussed, please do.

Brendan Ward: I'm sorry but I was teaching until last night so I just got here and I missed most of the sessions. I have one issue which is the fundamental issue of how do you generate content? I don't know to whom to address this question.

Michal Bregant: I don't know if I have the answer to this question but I wanted to touch on this notion of content. It's a term which appears more and more often and many people start speaking about content not about films. I come from one of the rather old and maybe conservative schools and we're very proud to have film in the name of our school and I hope that it will never disappear. I hope that we're not going to become a content and TV school. We're going to stay film and TV school, hopefully. I think that content is the same as it was in the past. The fundamental qualities are remaining the same. I don't think that the digital era is changing the aspect of content. Content is to tell a story properly and to be original to say substantial things. Everybody can make a movie but few people have something to say. So this is the role of a film school, to identify the talents of those people who have something to say and this is the content in my eyes.

Wangtae Lim: I think it may be a good idea if you could show diverse international films to your students. I sometimes have students from our affiliated American schools and in my class I try to refer to some important movies but most of the international movies they haven't seen. So if you want to stimulate your students with some new type of story I think it may be an idea to persuade your students to see some totally different movies from different countries.

Maria Dora Mourão: I agree with Michal. Content is the same as language but it also depends on the technology we're using. It depends on the contexts, on the cultures, on the historical moment, but I think the problems are more formal than that of content. If we teach the students some narrative

forms, feature films or short films or television or internet, the form changes but the content can't change because of the audience. Even when we use games, the content is the same.

Michal Bregant: If I may add only one sentence, I think that we speak about those new media and new environment as one. I think that very often I feel that the students should teach this to us. That we're not able to teach it to them because they do it, you know. This is how they make their living very often and they know so much about that. What we can do for them is maybe to slow them down a little bit. They can be very fast, be very progressive and trying new things, which is great! And this is the energy they bring to the school but I think that the school maybe should not try to catch the most recent things that have appeared on the market.

Pavel Jech: Today on one of our walking tours people had the chance to meet a renowned Czech film maker and one of the people asked him: Is it necessary to have film schools? This film maker did not attend a film school himself and he's quite progressive in what he makes. So for you is the film school still necessary?

Maria Dora Mourão: We have so many examples of very good filmmakers that have never been to a school. I think the school gives the opportunity to share things, to discuss ideas, to get orientation. But you cannot teach how to be creative in the sense of making a good film. It depends on the creativity of the person.

Michal Bregant: Yes, I think it makes sense to have a film school as soon as the school is able to offer something that is an alternative to the mainstream media and industry. Film schools are good when they make students' lives more complicated. Film school is a challenge, so film school is not for everyone.

Pavel Jech: Ok. What do you think was the answer of this very important and visionary Czech film maker? - Yes, of course, it was very obvious to him, film schools are important although he never attended FAMU.

Alison Wotherspoon: We didn't really talk about knowledge. Yes, you can reinvent the wheel but sometimes it's nice to know it already existed so you can make more interesting wheels in the future.

David Price: And there's another point perhaps. If film schools were not important why do we have so many applicants? They all come for different reasons but there must be a purpose otherwise students would go elsewhere.

Pavel Jech: So thank you again to the academic panels, to the chairs and I leave it now to our new President and the Executive Council to conclude.

Maria Dora Mourão: I think that the Executive Council now has to read the reports of the panels and take action. There are already proposals, we're going to discuss and analyze them and propose some things for you.