

European Film School Network

La Femis, Paris, 3-4 April 2008

I.	Introduction – Marc Nicolas.....	2
II.	Outcomes of the MEDIA call for proposals – Pascale Borenstein	2
III.	Presentation of Cooperation Projects.....	3
1.	A Fistful of Euros – Ben Gibson	3
2.	European Animation Production Master Class – Eric Riewer	4
3.	Four Corners – Sergi Casamitjana	5
4.	Passion to Market – Paul Moody	6
IV.	Workshops	6
1.	Conference style learning events – Nik Powell	6
2.	School film co-productions – Paul Moody	7
3.	Film development – Robin MacPherson.....	7
V.	International cooperation programmes in progress.....	8
VI.	MEDIA presentation – Pauline David	11
VII.	Presentation of Cinespace – Ben Gibson, Kaster Hynds.....	14
VIII.	Conclusions – Marc Nicolas	15

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| • Lionel Baier
ECAL, Switzerland | • Dagmar Jacobsen
DFFB, Germany | • Kirsi Rinne
Tarik University,
Finland |
| • Pascale Borenstein
la Femis, France | • Guido Lukoshek
Filmakademie Baden-
Württemberg,
Germany | • Edith Sepp
Baltic Film and Media
School, Estonia |
| • Michal Bregant
FAMU, Czech Republic | • Robin MacPherson
Screen Academy
Scotland, UK | • Jyri Sillart
Baltic Film and Media
School, Estonia |
| • Sergi Casamitjana
ESCAC, Spain | • Paul Moody
NFTS, UK | • Zuzana Gindl
Tatárová
VŠMU, Slovakia |
| • Laikin Chang
Rits Erasmushogeschool,
Belgium | • Lotta Mothander
Dramatiska Institutet,
Sweden | • Markku Veima
TAMK University of
Applied Sciences,
Finland |
| • Bartolomeo Corsini
Scuola Nazionale di
Cinema, Italy | • Marc Nicolas
la Femis, France | • Paulo Viveiros
Universidade
Lusofona, Portugal |
| • Guillaume Cousin
la Femis, France | • Iskra Nikolova
NAFTA, Bulgaria | • Malte Wadman
Norske Filmskolen,
Norway |
| • Carole Desbarats
la Femis, France | • John Ole
National Film School,
Denmark | • Janos Xantus
Szin haz-es
Filmművészeti
Egyetem, Hungary |
| • Nathalie Degimbe
IAD, Belgium | • Daphné Pascual
Ecole Supérieure d'Art,
Belgium | |
| • Rita Domonyi
MOME, Hungary | • Marianne Persson
Dramatiska Institutet,
Sweden | |
| • Christine Ghazarian
la Femis, France | • Nik Powell
NFTS, UK | |
| • Ben Gibson
LFS, UK | • Eric Riewer
Les Gobelins, France | |
| • Andreas Gruber
HFF, Germany | | |
| • Anne Invar
Norske Filmskolen, Norway | | |

I. Introduction – Marc Nicolas

The sixth meeting of European film schools will provide an overview of the projects submitted and selected under the new MEDIA scheme for initial training projects, launched in 2007. Information will also be provided on the upcoming call for proposals under that scheme. This will be followed by a presentation of the other cooperative projects that are also underway at the bilateral level, that is, outside of the MEDIA framework will be presented. Finally, ideas and proposals for the future will also be discussed, along with any other matters that participants would like to raise.

II. Outcomes of the MEDIA call for proposals – Pascale Borenstein

In the past, only continuous training programmes were eligible for MEDIA funding. The new scheme therefore represents the first MEDIA call for initial training projects. The selection criteria require that projects span at least three partners, and deal with issues such as mobility, the sharing of good practices, and cooperation. About 15 projects were submitted to the MEDIA scheme in 2007, ten of which were selected. Overall MEDIA funds for this scheme amount to €1.2 million, a relatively small amount but nevertheless an important sign of support from Brussels.

Schools had to submit their proposals in July after a very short notice period (2.5 months). The 10 projects selected cover 23 schools, with four projects involving four schools, and six projects involving three schools. Average project costs were €182,000, with for example €43,000 for Four Corners and €265,000 for Passion to Market. MEDIA's average contribution amounted to €120,000 per project.

The projects can be divided into four main categories:

- film school co-productions: TRIDOC, Summer Media Studio.
- film development workshops (feature length films or animation): Four Corners, Passion to Market, European Animation Production Master Class
- seminars and training programmes: Engage, Fistful of Euros, European Film School Network
- digital projects: Prodigy.

A new call for proposals was made on 14 March 2008. La Femis will re-submit a proposal for the European Film School Network in 2008. Fistful of Euros and Passion to Market will also be re-submitted.

Discussion. Robin MacPherson believes that MEDIA should be funding projects on a 2-3 year basis rather than year by year, as this does not leave enough time to fully develop projects. Marc Nicolas advises that this is what MEDIA plans to do.

Marc Nicolas advises that MEDIA will be experimenting a new idea this year: projects that involve film schools from both the EU and the rest of the world. Janos Xantus welcomes such a development, and Kirsi Rinne adds that Erasmus, for example, has been funding cooperation projects between Europe and Canada for some time.

Andreas Gruber warns that if the same projects are renewed each year, there is a risk that there will be no more room for new projects in the medium term.

III. Presentation of Cooperation Projects

1. A Fistful of Euros – Ben Gibson

Coordinator: London Film School (UK)

Partners: Budapest Academy of Drama and Film (Hungary), la Femis (France), National Film School of Denmark-IADT (Denmark).

This project arose from informal discussions during a previous meeting of European film schools organised at la Femis. The idea was to explore low-budget filmmaking as a way of making innovative and inspiring films. It represents a challenge to the closed model of film schools in favour of a model where they are seen as part of a learning-intermediate-professional continuum.

Fistful of Euros is a mini film festival, conference and graduate training workshop that will be held at the French Institute London on 30 May-6 June 2008. It brings together 10 recent graduates from each of the four partner schools, with film professionals leading case studies in open sessions and exploring proposed projects in tutorial groups. Mike Figgis and Mike Leigh, for example, have both committed to tutoring. Each day includes a fully documented film case study from one of the participating countries, with the producer, writer and director in attendance.

Participants are selected by each school's faculty on the basis of their script or proposal. The projects should be considered as a starting point for discussion rather than as fully developed products. The focus is on development and "packaging" the idea for a future production, rather than creating a final product ready for producers. Passion to Market and Four Corners are more concerned with developing a proposal that is ready for production.

Discussion. Marianne Persson notes that the new generation of students sees the market very differently from the way it is seen by established professionals and teachers. There is therefore a gap between what they learn during their training and the reality of the film industry and market. Marc Nicolas agrees that the boundary between education and industry is shifting. For example, in France, graduates are increasingly being taken on as interns for longer and longer periods of time, rather than entering the industry as professionals. For Ben Gibson, focus should be given to the year or two following graduation, as this is the period in which most graduates are really struggling.

Nik Powell points to another major trend: the line between film school short films and micro productions is now blurring. The old model of the graduation film being a short film is disappearing, principally because students are demanding the production of feature length films. This is a major change that is being driven by students. Marc Nicolas adds that the same evolution is occurring at la Femis. For Ben Gibson, this represents a growing relationship between students and independent producers, which is a good thing. However, Sergi Casamitjana points out that 23-year old directing graduates cannot be expected to be successful executive producers. Andreas Gruber

states that 80% of HFF graduate films are produced by young and independent production companies.

Robin MacPherson highlights the difficulty of teaching production techniques as opposed to directing. It is very difficult to provide students with the rich experience of producing in a school setting. John Ole, in contrast, explains that the National Film School Denmark has successfully trained about 50 producers in Denmark. Ben Gibson points to the need for the school to maintain a certain level of control over a project: is a given project on an appropriate scale for a film school? Zuzana Gindl Tatárová adds that VŠMU supervises its students' projects, which represents an enormous amount of work.

Marc Nicolas concludes that developing the link between film schools and industry will depend on the situation in each country, the size of its film industry etc. In smaller countries, it may be easier to develop these ties. La Femis has developed a new exercise – the long form – to make the link between short and long films. It is important for writers and directors, as well as producers, to realise the different narrative structures and audience expectations of feature films. The long form allows them to experiment these differences. Carole Desbarats adds that the long form is a low budget or micro budget format.

2. European Animation Production Master Class – Eric Riewer

Coordinator: Animation Workshop (Denmark)

Partners: Filmakademie of Ludwigsburg-Institute of Animation (Germany), Les Gobelins (France), Moholy-Nagy University of Budapest (Hungary)

One of the challenges of animation schools is to make students aware that they are genuine film makers – with all that this entails in terms of story telling, dramatisation etc. Teaching animation and making animation films is a very slow, laborious and time consuming process. Making a feature animation film while at film school is therefore not possible. At Filmakademie in Germany, for example, graduation films are 10-15 minutes long but take 2 to 3 years to make. At Les Gobelins, the five-month production period is used to make films that are 0.5-3 minutes long.

The European Animation Production Master Class involves a group of about 16 students from the four partner schools (or elsewhere), who take part in two 4-week courses spread over the member schools. In this way participants get an idea of their own national and other European markets. The master class will encourage European mobility, share good practice, and create networks among students.

The idea is to encourage students to think beyond their own frontiers and beyond the usual clichés of animation films, in order to come up with new ideas: Europe clearly has its own ideas and personality in animation films which can compete with the US model. It is also necessary to get students to think outside of the specific world of animation, as more and more animation graduates are being hired by the feature film industry.

A European network of animation schools already exists under Cartoon, which holds two main events in Europe each year. The Master Class also aims to prepare participants to pitch their proposals in these forums:

- Cartoon Forum (September), which brings together all players in this market to pitch ideas for TV series.
- Cartoon Movie (March) for animation feature films.

The 8-week course is taught by professionals and is very intensive. The first edition is primarily concerned with knowledge sharing. Next year's course will focus on three or four projects to be developed throughout the course.

Discussion. Rita Domonyi notes that the Master Class is an excellent opportunity for students to develop links with industry, with a view to getting their films produced. Zuzana Gindl Tatárová refers to VŠMU's strong animation department. Graduates would be very interested in opportunities for cooperation and sharing their expertise. Guido Lukoshek adds that Filmakademie has many links with the German animation industry, which could benefit students from other countries who attend the course.

Nik Powell asks whether graduates of other schools could also apply. Eric Riewer explains that the project is currently focused on the partner schools. Because making animation films is so complex, it is easier to work with students who already have fundamental know-how but require more information on the marketing/industry side. Marc Nicolas notes that this raises a wider issue for all of the proposals: to what extent should they be opened up to other schools? It would be useful, for example, if participants in Passion to Market met with those from the European Animation Production Master Class.

3. Four Corners – Sergi Casamitjana

Coordinator: ESCAC Terrassa (Spain)

Partners: Aristotle University and Film School (Greece), Bournemouth Screen Academy (UK), UNATC Film School (Romania)

The project is currently better described as "Three Corners" until Bulgaria becomes involved next year. It is a completely open programme looking for scripts from all over Europe. Each year, 12 project teams are selected to participate in three international workshops spread throughout the year. Eight of the projects will come from the four founding members, with four places left open for other European schools. Applicants must be in their final year of study or have graduated within the preceding 18 months. Their projects must be in treatment or first draft stage. It is expected that at least one of the films will go into production by 2010. For further information, consult www.four4corners.com.

Discussion. This project raises the issue of *initial versus continuous* training. MEDIA has clearly advised that the projects can be open to recent graduates, which includes those who have graduated in the past 18 months. This is a crucial stage in the graduate's career path, and the fact that MEDIA has made this funding available meets a real need. Paul Moody adds that it is also necessary to be sensitive to individual

cases. In Poland, for example, film students follow a 5-year course and the 18-month period could be extended for them.

Robin MacPherson asks whether there is scope for participants in these courses to obtain some sort of accreditation or increased credibility with MEDIA with respect to their future projects. Marc Nicolas agrees that this would be valuable. A request to that effect could be made to MEDIA in the coming years.

4. Passion to Market – Paul Moody

Coordinator: NFTS (UK)

Partners: Polish National Film, TV and Theatre School-Lodz (Poland), la Femis (France)

Passion to Market is a bridge into industry for recent graduates. The project will focus on 18 writing, directing and producing graduates from the member schools, working in six teams of three – two from each of the partner schools. The aim is to enable them to quickly establish themselves and their projects in the market in a realistic way. Individual tutoring throughout the year will enable them to develop a full-length feature script, a detailed marketing/publicity package and strategy, and a short film related to the feature project. While there is a free choice in subject matter, projects with a truly European dimension will be encouraged, as opposed to projects that only consider their own particular domestic markets.

Discussion. Nik Powell adds that this project differs from many similar ones in that it involves making six films to demonstrate participants' competencies. The idea is to get people used to working in a team.

Marc Nicolas notes that it will be challenging to organise three separate workshops in the three schools. However, this *European* aspect is key to the project, as it will help participants develop a real understanding of how the film industry works in each country.

IV. Workshops

Participants broke up into four workshops for detailed discussions, followed by a debriefing session.

1. Conference style learning events – Nik Powell

A package of master classes, conferences and workshops could be submitted to MEDIA, with each event hosted by a different school in a different country but submitted as a package. These could include themes such as script development from the point of view of a producer; animation, documentaries, editing etc. Such a proposal would be attractive to MEDIA as it would be available to many schools. A second series of lectures could be organised by GEECT on themes that are relevant to film schools as opposed to film students: finance, budgets, curricula, etc. more beneficial to schools rather than the students. In that way, GEECT can be used to address issues that are specific to schools and that are not necessarily of interest to MEDIA.

Michal Bregant adds that it would also be useful to develop a set of criteria that would form the basis of a common evaluation system for film schools. This could be used when schools apply for funding. It should be reasonably easy to reach a consensus on the criteria to be used.

2. School film co-productions – Paul Moody

About 75% of film schools were involved in some type of exchange or co-production programme. A distinction should be made between ad hoc or informal arrangements that arise from economic needs or from individual links between students in different countries. These types of arrangement will continue to occur in any case. However, formal arrangements are more useful as magnets for attracting funds. Whether or not such a formal arrangement becomes part of the curriculum or remains extra-curricula will have to be decided in each case.

Possibilities for co-production included a summer academy that would produce a feature film, or documentary film exchanges to provide students with the experience of working in a new country. There was an existing project to film a series of Chekhov short stories. This currently involved six partners, with potential for other partners to join the project. Applications for funding have been made with MEDIA and IPPB, and the project also involves broadcasters in the partner countries.

Generally speaking, the projects can be broken down into three categories: bridges to industry, teacher exchanges, or student exchanges.

Marc Nicolas provides the example of la Femis/Filmakademie Baden-Württemberg project that has been going on for the past five years. Production students from seven countries are given the opportunity of producing a film made by students from both schools. A given theme is chosen each year for all the films, for example, *I Lost My Keys* or *You're Fired*. The project is co-produced by Arte and results in nine 8-minute films that are broadcast in the Spring.

3. Film development – Robin MacPherson

Development was a key tool for encouraging students to learn about compromise and the reality of filmmaking. Nevertheless, there were various approaches to film development, and teaching development was quite a challenge. What age and experience should students have to benefit from a focus on development skills? Is there not a danger of over-developing ideas? What was the future for film schools in a context of greater access to online tools? Is the real function of a film school not to teach technical skills but to *socialise* its students on the workings of the industry? In this context, it would be ideal if schools could obtain funds from MEDIA with the flexibility to spend them during the year as opportunities arise for collaborative projects.

Ben Gibson adds another useful concept: whenever a film school in the network has a major international festival it should organise a social event for students from all schools who happen to be in that city on that day. Marc Nicolas notes that la Femis has organised such events in Cannes in the past, and this could be extended even further in the future. Dagmar Jacobsen advises that the Berlin film schools usually

organise a social event in Berlin. This year, it was very well organised, by the students themselves and could be extended to other students in the future.

Zuzana Gindl Tatárová states that when films are invited to festivals, she would like to have the flexibility to send any member of the crew and not just the director. Andreas Gruber notes that HFF partly funds the travel expenses of students whose films have won a prize in their festival. However, they accept any person who is representing the film and not just the director.

V. International cooperation programmes in progress

Marc Nicolas notes that European film schools need to develop greater expertise in international relations, and progressively build up competence in these types of cooperative activities.

The meeting proceeded with an exchange of information on the bilateral programmes that are underway in Europe, outside of the MEDIA framework.

Michal Bregant, FAMU, Czech Republic. FAMU is a “traditional” film school located in the centre of Prague, with all teaching in the Czech language. Courses are free and language is the only obstacle to participation by foreign students. Its international activities include:

- A one-year programme in English that combines both Czech and international students.
- Within the framework of Erasmus, FAMU conducts many joint activities with schools from all over Europe.
- Summer workshops are organised for US universities.
- FAMU has just obtained accreditation for its 3-year masters programme (Cinema and Digital Media), which will begin this year. Students pay €16,000 per year, which covers both tuition and production costs. The programme offers three specialisations: directing, cinematography and screenwriting. It is expected that there will be 5 to 6 students in the first year intake.

Regarding co-productions, FAMU launched a very ambitious project a few years ago with Helsinki, which has been very successful. The resulting film has been sold to several European broadcasters, including Arte, and has had a cinema release in a number of countries. FAMU is now ready to pursue further international development, and is currently considering the creation of a joint degree or joint programmes with other schools. However, this is a longer term project.

Ben Gibson, London Film School, UK. The LFS has a deliberately international intake, with foreign students outnumbering British students by three to one. Film schools are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with commercial establishments that spend massive amounts on marketing and advertising. By increasing their international activities and programmes, film schools may find it easier to compete with these companies.

Nik Powell, NFTS, UK. About 45% of NFTS students are foreign, and the student population is very diverse in cultural, nationality and language terms. Its bilateral programmes include:

- An exchange with la Femis, under which la Femis sends set designers to complete a module at NFTS, and NFTS sends composers to la Femis to score second-year films. The programme is working well so far.
- VGIK Film School in Moscow and NFTS will exchange students to make documentaries in each other's countries.
- A screenwriting programme with la Femis, made up of three workshops, with excellent teaching quality and good results. Two feature films are currently in post-production.
- NFTS also has master class and other programmes within the UK with screen academies etc.

Zuzana Gindl Tatárová, VŠMU, Slovakia.

- Contacts established through MEDIA meetings held at la Femis have enabled VŠMU to establish bilateral exchanges (of staff and students) with three Belgian schools.
- At the local level, the Višegrad Fund provides a framework for cooperation between the Czech Republic, Poland, Hungary and Slovakia.
- Exchanges occur within the Erasmus framework, with students developing relations with each other all over Europe, eventually leading to genuine co-productions. Going forward, teaching students to cooperate in this way is crucial to the development of a *European* film industry.

Guido Lukoshek, Filmakademie Baden-Württemberg, Germany. Filmakademie holds a 4-week Hollywood workshop for about 12 students each year, paying the relevant UCLA tuition fees. Open to third and fourth year students, the school pays for their flights and expenses. Rather than holding formal classes, visits are organised for the students within US industry, to familiarise students with the system there. The programme has been running for the past 7 years, and is very popular, with an extremely competitive selection process. Some students return to Germany very impressed by the Hollywood system; others return with a greater appreciation of the European model.

Nik Powell adds that NFTS carried out a 10-day programme in the US for 12 students that is more of an inspirational visit, with funding from the American Academy. Another programme of visits concerns various European centres of excellence (Rotterdam, Cannes, Berlin).

Marc Nicolas suggests that these types of visits could be organised jointly with a group of students from three or four different schools. It would be useful for European students to link up in Hollywood. Ben Gibson agrees that it would be valuable to bring together the links and networks that each school has in Hollywood. Robin MacPherson notes that this would be particularly advantageous for smaller schools that may not have the resources to organise these types of visits on their own.

Andreas Gruber warns that students can become too focused on the “networking” aspects of the industry to the detriment of actually learning how to make films. Marc Nicolas explains that these are not tourist trips; they involve a lot of hard work. Nik Powell adds that he sends producers to Cannes and not directors; it is a genuine learning experience that is carried out in their second year, when they are mature enough to take advantage of the opportunity. Carole Desbarats agrees that the needs of producers/distributors are different from those of directors. Directing students need to be exposed to films by students from other countries, and this can be done elsewhere than in Cannes. John Ole only sends producers to Cannes if they have first of all obtained an internship with a production company in Denmark. Anne Invar advises that Norske Filmskolen has a similar requirement for Norway. Guido Lukoshek adds that his programme has been very fruitful in terms of production output; it is definitely not a tourist trip even though it is obviously highly attractive to students.

Marc Nicolas, la Femis, France. La Femis has four main international activities.

- A continuous training programme with Filmakademie, a one-year programme with 18 students from 7 countries, leading to a joint degree. It also has a continuous training programme for directors: a workshop on archive based documentaries.
- Bilateral cooperation: exchange programmes with Columbia in New York, ECAL in Switzerland, NFTS in London, and Ludwigsburg. A new programme is in the pipeline with Buenos Aires.
- A Summer university has been held for the past 12 years, with support from the French Foreign Affairs Ministry, with 12 students from 12 countries attending la Femis for one month. A new Summer University will involve 12 students from Harvard attending la Femis for one month. This Summer, 10 students from Indian film schools will attend la Femis. All of these courses are taught in English.
- Involvement in programmes under MEDIA’s new initial training scheme, for example, Passion to Market and Fistful of Euros.

La Femis believes that, even though France has a well-developed film industry, it is important for students to be open to how films are made and taught in other countries.

Ben Gibson notes that 70% of LFS graduation films are made outside the UK, and it would be useful to develop agreed formulas among the schools for students making films in other countries. Nik Powell agrees that NFTS students regularly develop stories that take place and are shot in other countries. There is much more movement within Europe today, which is being driven by the students themselves.

Malte Wadman, Norske Filmskolen, Norway. The Nordic film schools have been working together for many years on an ad hoc basis, with some funding from Nordic cultural funds. For example, a master class in editing with a guest speaker who has worked with schools in the three countries. As of 1 April 2008, the Norwegian funding system has changed. As a result, the responsibility for continuous training has been transferred to the film schools.

VI. MEDIA presentation – Pauline David

Marc Nicolas introduces Pauline David, in charge of MEDIA's initial and continuous training programmes. Pauline David begins by expressing her desire for a very open and frank discussion with the European film schools represented at the meeting.

Objectives. The aim of the initial training programme is to encourage

- the mobility of students and/or trainers in Europe
- the collaboration of film schools in Europe.

Another priority is to create links between film schools in order to facilitate the entry of graduates into the film industry. This is a priority for both MEDIA and the film schools, who obviously want their students to get jobs. Today's students often believe that obtaining a degree from a US school is a guarantee of a job in the film industry. MEDIA's objective is to ensure that students truly believe that attending a European film school provides the same level of certainty with respect to their careers.

Currently, there is not much "Europe" in the curricula of European film schools. Students in one country will probably not know very much about how things work in other countries. The training activities supported by MEDIA will hopefully have an impact of the *approach* of the film schools, and help them learn from each other.

There are two possible approaches to initial training.

- A number of countries working together, with students going to each country to see how the film industry works there, and presenting their own industries. Students exploit the strengths of their own film industries and would also be able to work in other countries in the future, based on what they have learnt.
- European film professionals come to the schools, to present the European film industry. The training activity should have a significant impact on the school itself, and not just on the students involved in the project. MEDIA funds should not be going to specific students but should have an impact on the school as a whole.

Proposals submitted. In the first year of the scheme, many of the proposals submitted to MEDIA were "copies" of the continuous training model without adapting that model to the level of the participants being targeted. Other ideas could be pursued, and MEDIA is interested in fresh, innovative ideas.

For example, the continuous training sector tends to rely on a dozen tutors that are systematically put forward in all proposals for training. Film schools have the networks to enable them to go beyond this. MEDIA does not want to create a "mini-continuous training scheme" that is simply grafted onto the initial training sector. Instead, it wants to create real added value – what can *Europe* bring to its students to assist them in their futures. There are three areas in which added value can be provided at the European level: management, new technologies and scriptwriting. Scriptwriting is in fact now referred to as "development" as there is no real added value to be brought to the techniques of scriptwriting.

The cost effectiveness of projects was another important criteria. MEDIA firmly believes that it is possible to develop interesting, value added projects that have an impact, with limited funds. In the future, the size of the budget will not increase while the number of projects submitted can be expected to rise. For example, 10 projects from 17 countries involving 27 partners were accepted this year. This means that over half of the 33 countries involved in the MEDIA programme did not make submissions. It is also important that the costs engaged are appropriate to the level of the participants: these are not beginners; nor are they professionals.

Discussion. Marc Nicolas notes that most film school are very small, with very individualised programmes of studies. A project that involves only five students, for example, will therefore have an enormous impact on the school. Similarly, film schools did tend to base their proposals on the continuous training model but this is because there are few alternatives available due to the nature of the constraints that apply to film schools: language, equipment, limited resources.

Paul Moody states that Passion to Market, for example, sits in parallel to the rest of the school but certain sections are open to the whole school, and vice versa. That is growing in an organic way and demonstrates the impact of such a project on the entire school. He argues that there is no reason why the MEDIA budget should be reduced in the coming years. If the projects selected are proven to deliver, this would provide a political argument for increasing the budget. Pauline David explains that it could take years to obtain an increase in funding. As more and more projects are submitted, choices will have to be made.

Zuzana Gindl Tatárová raises the issue of the curriculum. If the aim is to have an impact on the whole school, this would involve adding the project to the school curriculum. That is a complex process, and one that would require a guarantee that the funds will be provided on a permanent basis. It would not be possible to change the curriculum year on year, according to whether or not a proposal was accepted for funding. With respect to the issue of US versus European film schools, it should be noted that many of the best teachers working in the US are European. She believes that there is no longer a clear divide between Europe and the US in this area. Nevertheless, Pauline David believes that European funds should be used to promote European industry. There is considerable know how and expertise in Europe that could be shared, without necessarily spending huge amounts of money. For example, the Best Kept Secret programme.

Ben Gibson believes that it will take time to integrate *European* issues into the life of the film schools. Considerable cooperation and continuity of funding will be required to achieve this, and it will also be necessary to develop mechanisms to make the network function. Today, the funding provided is not predictable or consistent enough to allow the schools to include these projects in their curricula. Marc Nicolas adds that the fact that at least three countries have to be involved makes it even more difficult to include the scheme in the curriculum.

Ben Gibson states that it is necessary to distinguish between the technical side of filmmaking and the networking side. European film schools have a very good reputation in the US. However, students want to go to the US because they want to

develop their networks. Pauline David reiterates that MEDIA's overall mission is the circulation of European films in Europe and the rest of the world, and the strengthening of the European film industry. The initial training scheme obviously shares those same objectives.

Malte Wadman suggests that the best way to develop teachers is to get them to meet with each other and develop their own ideas, rather than imposing ideas on them from above. However, seed money is required to get that process started.

Jyri Sillart would like to see the programme extended for two years to allow real output to be obtained; one year is not enough to achieve any concrete results. Pauline David advises that it may be possible in the future to extend the scheme to two years.

Andreas Gruber states that it is necessary to think about what exactly it means to be European in the film context. For him, the European cinematic tradition has a very different aesthetic from mainstream cinema. It also has a very different set of production conditions, that should be seen as a strength rather than a weakness.

Guido Lukoshek asks for an example of the unnecessary costs that are to be avoided. Pauline David provides the example of students who do not pay any tuition fees, and are also provided with free travel, accommodation and meals when travelling in Europe. This can make people lazy and expect that everything should be done for them. Marc Nicolas notes that this is simply a reflection of different European traditions. In some countries, there is a long tradition of not making students pay. Paul Moody adds that, if the objective is to increase student mobility, it would seem quite reasonable to pay for their travel expenses. The food and accommodation provided is very basic. Zuzana Gindl Tatárová states that her students would find it very difficult to pay for flights due to the differences in buying power around Europe. Robin MacPherson notes that film education in the UK is expensive, and it is important to be able to offer these opportunities on a free basis. To date, these and other projects have delivered very good value for money, and can be entirely justified.

Pauline David agrees that the situation is different in different countries, and programmes can be adapted to ensure that all students have access to training activities.

Ben Gibson asks whether MEDIA is trying to encourage the schools to obtain sponsors. Pauline David agrees that it would be wonderful if film schools could raise money from other sources. Marc Nicolas notes that, again, each country has very different traditions with respect to sponsoring: in some countries it does not exist at all.

In response to a question from Marc Nicolas, Pauline David advises the projects submitted in this year's call for proposals are requesting more money. She is therefore not able to promise that existing projects will receive the same amount of money this year.

Regarding the relationship between MEDIA and non-European schools, Pauline David advises that the first year will focus on continuous training activities for professionals and not on film schools. The concept has not yet been fully defined, and further

information will be available in Cannes. Marc Nicolas adds that many of the schools present today are interested in opening up to non-European countries.

Lionel Baier asks for details of the global budget for this project. As new countries join MEDIA, for example Croatia, will the budget increase? Pauline David advises that the budget for initial training this year amounts to €1.6 million this year (compared to €1.2 million last year). As new countries are added, the budget can be expected to increase, but only slightly.

Malte Wadman notes that the film schools have a major role to play in bringing cinematographers into the digital age. This is a very costly programme that concerns both continuous training (for those already in the profession) and also initial training (for those who are just starting out). Would this be admissible under the initial training scheme? Pauline David advises that there is no reason why not.

VII. Presentation of Cinespace – Ben Gibson, Kaster Hynds

Cinespace is an online European film school network. It is currently at the research stage, with the budget and package being determined. This multi-lingual website is designed as a network for both students and staff, and is aimed at improving communications between individuals and establishments. It is organised around a departmental structure that mirrors that of most film schools, including camera, sound, production, art, screenwriting, music, direction, post-production. The data provided is either public and available to all, or available only to specified user groups. Different access levels can be established, and the key distinction made is between users and the public.

Cinespace is a collaboration or project management tool where people can set up spaces for their projects.

- Students can post projects at the international level, recruit crew from other countries, and manage projects and resources – all from a single access point. They can also upload music and sound, images, screenplays and film (show reels, etc.).
- Staff can promote and manage student exchanges, exchange information among faculties, monitor student projects, promote special programmes, advertise workshops, and announce festivals.

It will be necessary to determine how this network fits in with the film schools' own websites. The fact that the site contains public content means that it could be used to attract funding, sponsorship, and advertising.

A very rough estimate of costs is €80,000-100,000, and it would take about 8 to 12 months to get up and running.

Discussion. Robin MacPherson warns that many different sites have been developed in recent years, with various degrees of success. It is important not to develop too many different sites that cannibalise each other. Students have evolved into new uses of the internet, and many of the above functionalities are available on MySpace,

FaceBook or other proprietary software. It is important to consider students' behaviour when developing such sites. Nik Powell adds that a lot of effort would be needed to ensure that the site remains up-to-date and cross-referenced. Guido Lukoshek suggests that, by offering exclusive information on the site, students could be motivated to use it more. Markku Veima suggests that some time of competition could be launched to encourage use. Kaster Hynds agrees that the project should not try to reinvent the wheel. However, the social networking sites mentioned do not enable the collaborative function that is being developed here. Ben Gibson adds that, while student behaviour has changed, staff members would find such a site useful for organising their collaborations.

Marc Nicolas states that this raises a wider issue of the role of film school websites – an issue that deserves its own conference that could provide valuable feedback to the Cinespace project. Many film schools are dissatisfied with their existing sites and would like to evolve them in the context of Web 2.0: using internet as a tool for information sharing and collaboration, notably through web-based communities. Film schools face the further challenge of achieving all this in a context of intellectual property issues. Students, for example, consider that the la Femis site should serve as a portal for *their* work, and not simply as a marketing device for the school. Dagmar Jacobsen adds that DFFB students are making similar demands. On the other hand, Ben Gibson advises that the LFS website is crucial to the school's recruitment, with 75% of students coming to the school through the site.

This leads Robin MacPherson to distinguish between websites that are marketing tools for the schools (brochure style, formal information etc.) and those that act as forums for collaboration, which require a higher level of involvement. Nik Powell adds that it is important to be very clear about what the website is hoping to achieve. Problems arise when a site is trying to do too much, and the marketing function should be kept very separate from the community function. Similarly, a site that is aimed at faculty will be very different from one that is aimed at students. In this case, he suggests that Cinespace should initially be set up as a network area for staff. In that way it would form a valuable point of contact for continuing discussions and following up ideas that have been presented at meetings such as these. Only later, as a second step in the process, should consideration be given to extending the site to students.

VIII. Conclusions – Marc Nicolas

As usual, this meeting has allowed European film schools to share information with and about each other. 17 countries and 25 schools were represented, the largest attendance so far, demonstrating that this movement towards cooperation is gaining momentum. Some of the main points raised include:

- The workshops showed that participants were all interested in continuing existing activities such as **thematic seminars**. These seminars fall into two categories: those involving teachers (where ideas for further cooperation often arise) and those involving students (including post-graduate students). Both of these themes could be submitted in the next MEDIA call for proposals.
- **Staff exchanges** were a complex exercise, and currently relied on the goodwill of the individuals involved. It was important to develop a process to facilitate

this, for example, a pool of teachers could be set up and managed from one location.

- In order to develop contacts among students from the different schools, even very modest **events held during film festivals** – such as the Berlin event organised by the students themselves or drinks put on in Cannes by la Femis – can be very productive.
- While the results of the current MEDIA call for proposals are still unknown, it is clear that interest is growing in this programme. It is up to the film schools to continue providing as much information as possible to MEDIA. The issue of **cost-effectiveness** is a crucial factor here, and it would be valuable to share experiences on this in order to improve the proposals that are presented to MEDIA.
- Pauline David called for **new and innovative proposals**. While the different categories of cooperation are limited, given the constraints faced by film schools, there is obviously some room for innovation. Teacher exchanges and thematic seminars are an area that could be explored here.
- The possibility of holding a conference devoted to the issue of **film school websites** was envisaged.

Ben Gibson raises the unresolved question of to what extent the projects should be open to students from schools that are not partners to the project. This is an important issue that should be discussed further.

Malte Wadman adds that these meetings have played a crucial role in developing cooperation between schools on many different levels. He believes it is important to set up some type of website that would provide a forum for further exchanges and brainstorming. He notes that, when it comes to cost effectiveness, it is very difficult to measure the *quality* of outputs as opposed to their *quantity*. Pauline David agrees that MEDIA is not concerned with quantity, and this is not a criteria in the evaluation of projects. Rather, MEDIA wants to ensure that training activities provide real added value to students. Some of the proposals, for example, were very good in theory but had no concrete impact on students. While her presentation may have appeared somewhat negative, she believes that it is more valuable in this type of meeting to focus on the negative aspects of an issue as a way of improving proposals in the future.

Participants applaud the organisation and content of the conference, and Marc Nicolas concludes by advising that la Femis has submitted a new proposal for this type of meeting to be held again next year.