

MINUTES
OF THE THIRD NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF THE AUSTRALIAN SCREEN
PRODUCTION EDUCATION AND RESEARCH ASSOCIATION (ASPERA)
SENATE ROOM, MURDOCH UNIVERSITY, 28-29 JUNE
2006

DELEGATES	INSTITUTION
Leo Berkeley	Discipline Leader (Media) School of Applied Communication RMIT University. leo.berkeley@rmit.edu.au
Dr Mick Broderick	Deputy Director National Academy of Screen & Sound (NASS) Research Centre Murdoch University M.broderick@murdoch.edu.au
Sally Browning	Dept. Manager (Writing, drama, production initiatives) AFTRS. sally.browning@aftrs.edu.au
Dr Adrian Guthrie	Team Leader, Media Arts, Performance and Multi Media University of South Australia. Adrian.guthrie@unisa.edu.au
Peter Herbert	Head of Drama AFTRS peter.herbert@aftrs.edu.au
Michelle Johnson	Lecturer in Television Curtin University m.johnston@curtin.edu.au
Prof. Ian Lang	Head of School of Film & Television VCA i.lang@vca.unimelb.edu.au
A/Professor Gillian Leahy	President ASPERA 2006 Media Arts & Production

	University of Technology, Sydney (UTS) gillian.leahy@uts.edu.au .
Dr Leon Marvell	ASPERA Secretary 2005-6 Senior Lecturer, Film and Video School of Communications & Multimedia Edith Cowan University L.marvell@ecu.edu.au
A/Professor Allan McKee	QUT - TV a.mckee@qut.edu.au
A/Professor Kathryn Millard	Research Director, Department of Media, Macquarie University Lecturer in Screenwriting kmillard@people.net.au kmillard@scmp.mq.edu.au
Ken Miller	Lecturer Media and Information. Curtin University. k.miller@curtin.edu.au
Nicholas Oughton	ASPERA Treasurer 2005-6 Convenor Bachelor of Film & TV Griffith Film School n.oughton@griffith.edu.au
David Price	Head of Postgraduate & Post-production VCA d.price@vca.unimelb.edu.au
Dr Josko Petkovic	ASPERA Vice-President 2005-6 Director of National Academy of Screen & Sound (NASS) Research Centre Murdoch University J.Petkovic@murdoch.edu.au
Andrew Taylor	Lecturer UTS andrew.taylor@uts.edu.au
Tanya Visosevic	Lecturer School of Communications & Multimedia

ECU
t.visosevic@ecu.edu.au

Stephen Cottingham Lecturer
Notre Dame
scottingham@nd.edu.au

Carol Williams Senior Lecturer
QUT

Rachel Wilson Lecturer Film & Television Production
RMIT University
rachel.wilson@rmit.edu.au

Alison Wotherspoon Head of Screen Production
Flinders University
Alison.Wotherspoon@flinders.edu.au

DAY 1 WEDNESDAY 28TH JUNE SENATE ROOM

9.40 am **WELCOME ADDRESS : A/Prof. Gillian Leahy (President)**

The President of ASPERA, A/Professor Gillian Leahy, welcomed delegates to the conference and broadly outlined ASPERA's past activities and the present conference agenda.

She invoked some relevant issues from the "Imagining Tomorrow" NASS/ASPERA Conference, specifically:

- Prof Ian Lang's (VCA) 'throwing down the gauntlet' in his presentation "National Impact and Film Schools: Managing our Metric Conversion";
- Rachel Wilson's (RMIT) call to archive student production and
- Dr Josko Petkovic (NASS) ASPRI peer review system, IM Journal e-journal and his various lobbying efforts with Dr Mick Broderick.

Some other points covered were:

- The importance and value of research.
- The need to maintain and improve ASPERA's working groups and its Executive Committee.
- The need to find new members – other universities to join ASPERA?
- Australian Screen Council, how do we relate to it?
- Relations to community and industry, how do we relate to them?
- The need to discuss access to funding by post-graduates.

During this session delegates introduced one another. The President thanked Dr Leon Marvell, for incorporating ASPERA as a formal association, Nick Oughton for creating

the ABN number and for consolidating ASPERA on sound financial basis and Dr Josko Petkovic for organising and hosting the 2006 Conference.

10.00 **SESSION 1 – MEDIA DISPERSION**

Chair: Dr. Josko Petkovic

A/Prof Gail Phillips (R&D Murdoch)

Professor Duane Varan (ITRI - Murdoch)

A/PROFESSOR GAIL PHILLIPS - RQF, RESEARCH AND IMPACT

A/Prof Phillips emphasised the need for non-traditional areas to lobby Canberra especially in the RQF context. With the present emphasis on research ASPERA could provide peer assessment panels, metrics and legitimacy in relevant academic regulations.

A/Prof Phillips spoke about challenges of the RQF audit and its:

Focus on outputs

Focus on quality and impact

Focus on high quality publications

The possibility of teaching only universities and research only universities

Financial pressure on institutions: How do producers of film get into research funding?

The need to form research groups: research fields, courses and disciplines (RFCD) codes.

We need to focus on collaboration

DEST will want to know what producers DO

Evidence portfolios

For best outputs, etc.

Assessment discipline specific: 12 expert assessment panels – how will we be assessed?

Challenges:

1. Defining what we do.
2. Defining quality on our terms.
3. Defining impact on our terms.

No one has translated the problem for the nay-sayers (ie. How production is research!).

Defining what we do: Similar challenges for industry: No longer screen, but screen 'plus' ('mobile media', Internet etc.)

What are we producing now? How do we break it down into multiple outputs?

Local industry is defensive – why not a linkage partnership?

Defining quality – how to define our research?

Can we make what we do conform to traditional research paradigm? Should we?

What suits the present ARC model does not suit what we do!

Why should we do double the work?

Other funding sources?

Non-traditional outputs?

What do we need to fight for?

What will we not be able to include as outputs?

What will be the appropriate quality measures? (eg. Equivalent to a refereed paper)

Is it more appropriate to fight for impact?

We need to define impact on our terms.

Importance of a united front: ASPERA is an excellent example of how to ignore institutional rivalries.

Other ASPERA benefits: Curriculum collaborations?

Industry collaboration: national talent pool?

Peer review and examination panels with national/international credibility.

RQF requires a pragmatic, strategic approach.

In December 2005 the first trial RQF audits were made at Murdoch and Curtin. They were based on outcomes derived from an older system. To change the present system will be like “turning around the Titanic.”

In the past there was an emphasis on teaching only vs. research potential. RQF pressures research groups according to new discipline codes with the emphasis imposed on group portfolios, based on science models. Though not really working in groups, researchers are forced to clump together in order to appease the requirements for research funding.

Now research groups need evidence portfolios, listing the four best outputs, full lists and ‘statements of impact’ from end users to attest to impact and to substantiate claims of impact. This requires a lot of paperwork.

Research groups may comprise 9 – 12 experts. It may be a multi-disciplined group. We need to tweak the model and learn how to appropriate assessments for ARC projects. The impact statements are related to final assessments.

We must define quality and impact on our own terms. Our producers ARE researchers. We must translate our field of knowledge to DEST/RQF and define what we do. A peer review panel can back this up.

Local industry is defensive and operates on the antiquated model of funding where partnerships with academia are seen as ‘double dipping’—as opposed to LINKAGE.

We are seen as *rivals* rather than as a form of ‘leverage’ towards funding organizations. Our multi-skilled, multi-output production research involves vertical integration and industrial collaboration. Universities need to become the Research & Development of Industry - experimenting and innovating.

How can we mould the ARC model? Should media groups be attached to history and museums? Is online learning taken as research? We must define what we’re doing in ‘their terms’ as well, as there is a limit as to how far we can go without losing the argument.

How do we determine digital boundaries within research terms when there is a resistance to funding creative works? We must define IMPACT incorporating traditional and non-traditional terms. The battlefield is clear.

What is Peer Review? - can it be taken as festivals - international and national? What is the value in being accepted into such festivals and winning awards? Is it equal to a research paper? Does it carry weight? Graeme Turner is fighting this issue in terms of the IMPACT metrics.

Trade magazines - do they account in the metrics and impact?

It is crucial to have this united front. ASPERA is the paradigm for Creative Arts. There are huge challenges, and a huge capacity to ignore universities and see them as rivals of industry. We need collegiality. RQF creates fierce rivalry. ASPERA is a national peak body with 'national muscle'. Strongly united it can bring many benefits in terms of curriculum development and accreditation, spreading and sharing expertise, organising national tours for speakers, international and national. ASPERA can draw on the immense "Talent Pool" which production-based researchers around the country can draw on. This talent pool can be used within industry partnerships. We can invite Industry onto the Boards. The talent pool and Industry can extend to peer review and examination panels.

The key issues, in conclusion, are RQF, peer recognition, IMPACT assessment and qualification, seeking international recognition as a peak body and collaborative planning, —culminating in a united national force.

PROFESSOR DUANE VARAN

Academic research is at a critical juncture. There are billions of dollars being spent in developing media hubs with a total disregard for content. We need to put in regulation to equate return on investment. What we see is our failure to speak to Industry in a way that they will understand and embrace. We need to model ourselves on the Science game. The way in which sciences access money is something we need to learn. We need Industry Linkage.

We need to stimulate discussion on this as we have a window of opportunity to change. At the moment selective Industry linkage is OK. BBC's collaboration with the ABC is legitimate.

But let us not construe other Industry linkage as dirty. When one sees NIKE as an Industry partner, one becomes automatically suspicious that we are pandering to Industry. The assumption is that Industry is evil and exploitive. But this need not be so. They have long-term investment goals. Due diligence. We have had very impressive dialogue with them. We discussed their labour relations. They did have blind spots. We criticise them. We engaged in conversation.

We need to lift the stigma of working with Industry. Science has no hang ups about this or about scholarship projects which translates into the real world. Otherwise we are living a fantasy. Our advisory group draws up 70 research questions. We select 20 research questions from this group, which we take to Industry. The client selects 8,

which we will research. This research has real world application. We start with a pool of questions and give them input to pick the questions they want investigated.

Academics are lone wolves – they tend to be selfish (detrimentally independent) and think that Industry should acknowledge what we care about. Is this the right approach? Science doesn't do that. They take the 'supply vs. demand.' approach and apply their research skills to industry needs. We should apply our own skills in the same way. We need to increase collaboration, establish unity of thought and vision between research and Industry and engage with Industry. We need to start to retool the research agenda.

Other issues Varan addressed -

1/ Early Career Research RQF may disadvantage early researchers making it harder to get a head start. In general, the money for early career research will dry up and money will be the focus! Science is stronger – it is more collaborative and allows early researchers “in”, as part of the team.

2/ Traditional Publication. Traditional publications have value. If it is not published, it is not on the radar. The papers are important, in the short term; they put runs on the board. So don't neglect traditional measures - look at science as a comparison. Science experiments – but every new discovery must be supported by published evidence. There is an obligation to communicate research to the community. Production is research yet there is no obligation to share. We must share results and communicate the fruits of research. If we think we are not obligated then we are wrong.

3/ Impact: What is non-traditional research to be? Is it its impact OR quality. The proposed RQF audit gives us an advantage as impact if we share the fruits of our labour. Are festivals to be valued as peer review/quality in the research equation or seen in terms of IMPACT on society? How do we park these things? RQF may not allow both quality and impact

4/ Content The Research & Development model could offer content as a dialogue with society. Content is / is not Art? Does it fulfil an obligation to the world? Is content Impact or Quality? It cannot be deemed as both.

5/ Teaching

The Australian government is unique in suggesting we need more plumbers than university graduates. In the last ten years teaching loads have vastly increased.

The link between teaching and research should be developed further. Student learning and the research agenda should become interrelated and inform one another.

A fourth year structure may be worth considering. AFTRS and the VCA already do this. We could extend this to other universities.

How has the curriculum changed? Industry continually deals with radical change. We need to develop skills that can be used in Industry. This is a timely mission.

11.15 **SESSION 2 – NEW MEDIA AND DIGITAL CONTENT**

Chair: Leo Berkeley (RMIT)

Presenters: Leo Berkeley (RMIT)

 Dr. Mick Broderick (NASS)

 Rachel Wilson (RMIT)

CHAIR'S OVERVIEW - LEO BERKELEY

Professional Content in the Undergraduate Courses.

There continues to be a division between practical vs. conventional academia, creative vs. analytical academia, theory vs. practice, and industry vs. academia. How do we go about changing this?

We need to look at how to set up students to meet an industry that changes constantly, in relation to external environment changes. We need to develop digital literacy, digital environments with the emergence of network media, peer-to-peer communicating and mass audience paradigms.

The delineation between the professional, highly skilled, privileged professional and the consumer is eroding. We should note the emergence of the *prosumer* which does away with the archaic division between professional and consumer. (Reference to Charles Leadbetter). The audience paradigm is likewise changing dramatically. Even top professionals have a hard time working this one out. Students need to learn about these changes.

Emergence network media allows new opportunities. Traditional media erect barriers. Instead of dealing with mass audience, we now find '**communities of interest**'. New media kills off old business models, not necessarily old media. This new media can generate income and new opportunities for graduates.

RMIT: No professional gear is given to first years at RMIT. They edit in iMovie, developing their digital media literacy. 2nd & 3rd year employ broadcast equipment in television and radio.

In second year RMIT has course-integrated media, where the essay comes in the form of "blogging". These are ongoing experimental rhizomes. We use QuickTime media and move away from Dreamweaver and the more expensive software. We marry theory and practice together in a traditional university environment. By 3rd year the student are given advance project work.

Curriculum development is essential in all this. We need new academic texts; screen production can be 'research', where it is effectively continual creative practice and critical analysis. We are reflective practitioners with theory imbedded in professionally focused degrees.

DR. MICK BRODERICK: DIGITAL CONTENT

We need to leverage funding from ARC initiatives and networks. We have sufficient critical mass. Two projects offer a good focus for collaboration: (i) How do we collaboratively digitize material and make it available? (ii) How do we re-purpose digitized material in a content hungry world?

We need to create a coordinated national approach. What do we do after the mining & resource boom is over? Rather than mining primary resource data alone, “data” can be the new resource. ASPERA must systematically set the agenda for this use of data in each state.

RACHEL WILSON:

There is a need to set up an online portal with open access repository. We need to pitch a national research priority and build meaningful relationships with Industry. In regard to the open access repository, each university will host the archive. There are large movements in freeware and open access, particularly throughout Europe.

Discussion: ASPERA needs to design a system to introduce this and consider the following:

1. Is there agreement that this is a valid idea?
2. Committee – maybe need a definite project to maintain momentum.
3. How to start this archival portal – the need for seed funding
4. The committee structure
5. Ethical and copyright clearance.
6. The IT technical aspects to archiving. (MPEG4)
7. Technically ‘future proofing’ and complying with technical standards
8. Rights of management regime (owning the rights, students and staff’s ‘work’ appearing on the web and in digital displays) Should we agree to one?
9. Need to apply ARC Linkage grant, we need to source Industry Partners.
10. Awards for projects and crated projects
11. Student online festivals for digital works.

Potential Problems: DEST attitude towards Open Access project

Resistance by IT departments to host the archive, due to the digital volume of these materials

Access needs to be embedded in the future.

Ethical situation in relation to clearance (in vox pops on the web)

Border Issues – freeware, open access in non-competitive and collaborative environment.

Work in ethnic and indigenous communities which have a set protocol for clearance— may offer solutions.

SESSION 3: RESEARCH & RESEARCH LINKS

1:30

SESSION 3 – RESEARCH & RESEARCH LINKS

Chair: Prof. Ian Lang (VCA)

Presenters: A/Prof Kathryn Millard

Dr. Josko Petkovic (NASS)

Prof. Ian Lang (VCA)

SPEAKER: KATHRYN MILLIARD: RESEARCH VS PRACTICE

Throughout Japan, USA, Europe and the UK, ‘practice-led research’ groups have been on going for some time. They are supportive of one another, reading and networking, viewing each other’s works. We are similarly placed and should do likewise.

We don’t have a monopoly on creativity. Practice led research not only means media and arts, but also must include digital image research as well as context based generated knowledge (‘practical solutions’) which potentially includes all disciplines as well as conventional analytical thinking.

Screen Production Research in the RQF context: Not all-practical based work is research. 1990 Strand Report is informative. Practical research interrogates itself and gives rise to new discourse. Its practitioners can be termed “reflective practitioners” who can contribute to new fields of scholarly work.

Films remember communities and invite identification. John Hughe’s Archival project is a good example. Media projects may not allow for footnotes but it does allow for empathy. Ethnographic and anthropological film practice has always been firmly embedded in the academic.

Hypermedia, visual anthropology and media in general can frame our debate. Production-led research involves intellectual rigour, ambition and pragmatism. Notes may accompany it, it may be articulate, and it may involve specific research themes. How does it fit into the academic debate? How do we fit it into the research debate? We must argue for practical forms of reflective practice.

SPEAKER: DR JOSKO PETKOVIC: IMAGE BASED THESIS

Dr Petkovic invoked some of the research related work he and ASPERA Research Committee have been undertaking, including:

- ASPRI publication index,
- ASPERA Peer Review Committee,
- IM e-journal editorial “Manifesto”,
- “Imagining Tomorrow Today” presentation at the NASS conference
- The formation of the NASS itself.
- RQF lobbying submissions
- “Image Based Thesis” in the first issue of the IM e-journal.

We should not be defensive about our work. Practice-lead research is a most innovative research methodology which uses multi-dimensional/ parallel logic (parallel codes) rather than conventional linear syllogism. This quantum-like system of meaning has many implicit features which can go unrecognized. This is the intellectual work required to construct the visual text using multiple codes and crew. Only peers can appropriately recognize this type of-work. Textual “innovations” indicate an original contribution to knowledge as well as content.

Our methodology is not all that different from that of science. We have research teams/ crew and complex equipment, which requires delicate handling and sophisticated knowledge. The Intellectual property (IP) produced from these production teams/crews likewise should be shared as in science research – as indicated in our own ASPRI.

We deal with the major and topical problems in our society. Films often deal with cutting edge issues.

Our productions are our publications which are judged by the audience. We have impact and are generally more visible than conventional academia.

But we still have problems with DEST and we need to lobby to get funds from ARC.

Further discussion: -

Some people are more comfortable with the science model.

There are issues of quality control.

Josko reiterated that our research has both “implicit” as well as “explicit” elements.

For **Kathryn** the ‘standard’ of work is a contentious issue.

Gill summary: We need to revisit and refine our research criteria and the exhibition process as publication. Could training and corporate videos be classed as “research”. Can “innovation” be the defining feature of practice-led research?

Josko: We cannot be too introspective. We don’t use footnotes in our productions but there is are implicit references in “constructivism”. This is a richer referential system which has history, inter-textuality, phenomenology and can be self-reflexive. It outweighs conventional analysis.

Mick : Peers can decide whether it is research. The peer committees must be self regulatory , as ‘we’ are the experts, therefore it is best to judge ourselves.

Adrian comments that we need to communicate to DEST that we are already very close to their research paradigm.

Alison makes note that the two systems , creative and science models are not mutually exclusive.

Gill: Exegesis should accompany the work.

Ian: We need to convince politicians what we want and what we are about. There should be some written contextual statement to accompany the work. Invokes Visual Arts Exhibits. Images are accompanied by a catalogue and attached to the hung image. Visual artists usually explain their work.

SPEAKER : PROF. IAN LANG - PARASITES AND BUSINESS MODELS

Organisations are formed by people with individual need, though they work towards a common benefit. We need to prioritize our agendas. If we don't attend to the prioritisation of goals there will be fragmentation. If your needs aren't met you'll go off on your own.

We have a mission and a conservative budget. The group needs to be self-perpetuating. Should we have higher levies on members? The business model is not suitable for a group like this. We could adopt the 'Viral operational model', which negates excessive commitment on members.

The Arts Council host Visual Arts funding yet they are not allowed to fund film. We need vertically integrated outcomes, which permits cross-subsidising of filmmaking.

ARC has a strong science agenda. Science is where government is expecting ARC to succeed financially, outside the government funded and directed CSIRO.

ARC submissions takes six months to prepare. One needs to have a PhD and several publications, preferably books in order to be taken seriously. ARC believes there are exclusive agencies for filmmaking.

ARC has regional responsibilities with national priorities. These national priorities indicate a lack of uptake of digital content. International events impact on ARC.

Documentary makers address powerful societal problems which affect the voters. ARC projects are predominately text based presentations & submissions. We need to draw attention to production solutions.

Our work should not be "victim" based as often seems to be the case with Australian films. We should portray empowered individuals, individuals working toward innovative solutions.

Lang discussed the applications of digital content and digital imaging. He note financial application for digital images. There seems to be a lot of work for image-makers in Defence applications. Simulations of an attack on Australia are some of the more financial avenues for successful digital image graduates. Others: covert surveillance, contracts with corporate internationals, the new play stations. We don't do any of this.

Funding agencies may respect our mission but monies are still difficult to get. We require a high level executive who can speak on our behalf.

We have leverage: 40% of Queensland youth are in tertiary educational institutions. 50% NSW youth are enrolled in tertiary institutions. To ignore the Australian voting population is detrimental to the government. These statistics should be used to leverage funds.

Josko : DEST could turn into a friendly body to us. They may well be waiting for us to give them a set prescription for assessing our work. Non-conventional work can be evaluated by peer assessment. Bibliometrics is not the way. DEST wants prescriptive measures.

Previous Minister alluded to 25% of research funds going to Humanities. This may be a good outcome but we need to lobby for our proper share.

Mick Broderick: we should consider holding a CHASS event and lobby to get our members on the ARC Executive.

Ian: Students should be allowed to apply for funding from agencies whilst enrolled.

Kathryn: We need to fine-tune the peer review process incorporating international peers, reflecting international standards. ARC applications do require submissions from those with a proven track record. We need to articulate an optimistic approach.

Gill: In regard to ARC submissions we need an impressive chief researcher to attach their name to the project. The team itself can be multi-disciplinary.

Alison: Research institutes usually approach ARC. We can pool talent within ASPERA and apply with cross-institutional teams.

David: The Chief Investigator may come from an interdisciplinary partner, outside of media, such as having an architectural Linkage.

Josko: We should not forget that most producers give rise to original works. Originality is foregrounded at the outset in all film schools. Research could potentially take place at any time – in the first year of production for example.

COFFEE BREAK 3.00PM.

3:00 **SESSION 4 – LOCAL ENGAGEMENT: Journalism, CTV, ABC, SBS and other local digital content producers**

Chair: Alison Wotherspoon

Presenters: Leo Berkeley (RMIT)

 Rachel Wilson (RMIT)

Rachel and Leo outlined RMIT's local media engagement (Community TV and Channel 31) and its usefulness as an incubator of education and pedagogy. were

Issues:

- No access to digital spectrum
- Gradual commercialisation of ABC and SBS
- What should ASPERA's role be?
- Digital content industry action agenda?

Mick Broderick: ASPERA could write a lobbying letter demanding digital spectrum space

4.00 **SESSION 5 – FUNDING BODIES/GUILDS/ INDUSTRY**

Chair: Gillian Leahy (UTS)

Presenters: Gillian Leahy (UTS)

+ Discussion

Gill drew attention to the existence of the Screen Council of Australia - a steering committee consisting of SPA, ASDA, Writer's Guild, MIA etc., which has been formed to advise the government on all matters related to screen industry.

ASPERA should also be represented on this body. Discussion followed.

David: Screen Council needs to be a peak body to be heard.

Alison and **Kathryn** discussed the possibility of having an alternative Oz Doc documentary conference?

Alison suggested we offer our academic input to AIDC as a resource.

5.00 Drinks & Coffee

DAY 2

THURSDAY 29TH JUNE

SENATE ROOM

9:00 **Coffee**

9.15 **SESSION 6 – PROGRESS AND CONSOLIDATION**

Chair: Allan McKee (QUT)

Presenters:

Nick Oughton (Griffith) - OHS

Gillian Leahy(UTS): Student Surveys

9:20 SPEAKER: NICK OUGHTON: OHS

Mick: RQF impacts need to be tracked, ASPERA should do this.

Ian: High value students need to be tracked

The well being of the screen industry workers historically follows on from the Miners Act in England. There is a moral obligation in protecting workers as the most valuable asset with “real value”. Workers are seen as units of production, like a machine.

Occupational Health and Safety (OHS) is all about understanding people. Factors, which need to be addressed in a contemporary context, are short contracts, unstable work opportunities and the role of the unions. Some sectors are not unionised - who mediates for them? What about OHS risk management at home - to reflecting the current shift in the workplace back to the cottage industry model?

There was a report, which looked at TAFE and higher education OHS management. It was a scathing report, which came to the conclusion that closer monitoring was needed.

Risk management must be considered, even in small crews and student productions. This undertaking has already started in Queensland. We must encourage uniformity of reporting and create structures to free people, and not impose structures that are restricting or imposing. The risk management model must cater for the extremes in filmmaking practice, from Warner Studios in Queensland to student productions where ‘incidents’ often go unreported.

From the Floor:

Ian: Yes, it is important work. Does this risk management model increase liability? Does it increase litigation towards film schools, directed at the supervisors serving in the ‘Executive Producer’ role? Will it eventuate in decreasing production level and ultimately; curtail travel to foreign countries where there is a perceived increased risk? (War and disease.)

It is the Vice Chancellor who carries the fine or threat of imprisonment, more so than staff member, supervisor, Executive producer or Lecturer. We must manage people by training them more effectively in this area of risk and safety. Increasing the physical fitness of crews, improving knowledge of the possible hazards, particularly electrical! Has any staff ever been sued?

David: Yes there has been staff sued.

Alison: Shoots are regarded as ‘fieldtrips’. In the field of cultural tourism one needs to investigate the rules, check the framework and have uniformity. (For example the introduction of having regulations first aid kits and snake kits in remote location productions.

Nick: Legal definition ‘of duty of care’ – is taken to be read as ‘reasonable behaviour’. Common sense is definable. Loss management, acting in defence, acting, as a ‘reasonable person’ is all appropriate risk management issues in regard to litigation.

SPEAKER: GILLIAN LEAHY (UTS) - STUDENT SURVEYS

Surveys of students, known as Exit Surveys’ are often taken one year outside graduation. These exit surveys give a skewed account of the viability of the degree /course. Often students, one year out, are in the transitional phase, doing menial jobs, whilst practicing as filmmakers, applying for grants and submitting to broadcasters.

Whilst caught in transition, these students see the survey as a way to ‘punish’ the university. The ‘liberal arts’ degree gives the students multi-oriented skills enabling them to write, direct, budget, deal with locations, source props, operate technical equipment with a great degree of responsibility, not to mention developing the ethical values inherent within their project, whilst addressing issues of drama and aesthetics. All these skills are “considerable”, though at first not overtly identifiable. The surveys do not accommodate the specific nature of ‘production units’

It takes between five and ten years for the total integration of production students into the ‘Industry’. It would be better to do staggered exit surveys, at two to five year increments. Too often there is criticism that there is an over supply or that the students are not Directors nor Producers on graduation.

There is a need to design and carry out our own ‘exit surveys’. We will need to employ statistical experts and design strategic directions. Group needs to be formed to look after this specific area which has ramifications in peer review, impact, quality and long term’ outcome based accountability.

From the Floor:

Josko: We need to establish an ASPERA Discipline Profiles for our teaching which distinguish units that are product and outcome orientated and are based on groups rather than individual efforts. Productions are an intense emotive undertakings. They often break up for reasons that have nothing to do with curriculum or teaching.

Gill: Debate between ‘products vs. process’ based units. How do we judge students who may not do as well on the final project due to the fact that their artistic ambition exceeds their skills at the time of unit completion? Aspiration and vision needs to be complimented, recognised and encouraged.

Comparison with other teaching surveys is often irrelevant. Production units do something radically different, particularly with people out in the field.

Leo: RMIT has big issues with this. Few students realise that the ‘neutral’ answer is taken as a negative response. RMIT lobby the students and inform them how to fill in the survey forms.

Alison: We should track our students.

Gill: UTS has a graduate database, maintained via Internet and email for the ‘Golden Eye Awards’. The secretary checks the database and calls the ex-students. However there is a labour drain and it is expensive. Alumni associations have a version of their own. It is worth campaigning the third year students to stay in touch.

Mick Broderick: - It is important to find funds for this for marketing purposes and for tracking outcomes. This will serve the RQF strategic pitch in terms of IMPACT, quantifying industry-ready graduates which integrate into the industry in time. CHASS may give funds.

Alison invokes the Carrick Institute as a possible source of funding.

Ian: Tracking the rising profile of students gives us an ‘embryonic philanthropic agenda. Written surveys are so flawed and meaningless but focus groups are more valuable. There is also a need for feedback on curriculum. Focus groups meeting between 2 – 5 years would be the most effective.

Health & Safety issues discussion:

Within broadcasters there has been an OTC shift in attitude, for the better. Cowboys get reputations. Employer attitude has changed. Safety issues are being taught in television. Universities first production lecture is now on health and safety issues. Safety assessment forms are adapted for shooting situations. The script breakdown now has a safety report attached. Prior to going out on a shoot, students must submit a safety report. Productions are responsible and ‘everyone’ is responsible for safety.

Nick: Investigation of journalism OHS has found that hazard management and OHS in general is not at a good level. This was established via focus groups and surveys. The modus operandi has changed; there are systems now in place, however they are not being taken up.

David: How do we encourage other educational sectors to take on this OHS issue? If it is not self-initiated then it will come ‘top –down’. Safety practices will be imposed so that they will curtail production, not allowing anything outside of the studio confines.

Issues of robbery re-enactments, fake guns, enacted murders etc all cause ‘safety issues’ in the outside communities. Following the right channels means that permissions need to be sought. This cost money and permissions may not be given. We need to be proactive in this area designing our own specified practices, rather than having these imposed by those who are not conversant with production.

Josko Petkovic: OHS issues often bring in more questions than answers. Litigation is an important issue. Does this expose the universities to greater risk of litigation?

Gill: Lawyers do offer risk assessment. What would happen if student couldn’t go out without staff supervision. This would cripple the production units. Doing the safety checklist, prior to equipment leaving is one-mechanism universities can insist on.

As long as we ‘do our best’, act reasonably, document the fact that these issues are being discussed, tabled and minuted, then this measures in themselves reflect that ASPERA and Universities are taking this onboard and that safety and risk management is important. These measures and minutes provide evidence against any liability in regard to OTS.

Nick: Standards are rising every year.

Ian: There could be an abrupt halt to Media courses if staff had to attend every student production.

10.30

SESSION 7 + 8

STRATEGIC PLANNING + ACTION GROUPS

Chair: Dr. Adrian Guthrie (SA)

This session is for us to discuss some of the other things we think the organization might do – eg. lobbying, infrastructure, Discipline Profile, Peer Review, digital content, research, research links, student staff exchanges, local intervention, industry, international connections, teaching media in a time of cutbacks & business plans, involvement with other conferences and organization eg CHASS, AIDC, CILECT etc

From previous discussions - 6 areas to be discussed in the later agenda.

1. ASPRI/PEER REVIEW/RESEARCH
2. Lobbying – govt funding organizations, agencies and others
- Who, what, when, why?
3. Digital Archiving.
- 4 Website for ASPERA & ASPERA Festival - Who, what, when, why?
5. Connections to Australia Screen Council
6. NASS Conference idea

REFEREEING PANELS: Discussion on refereeing panels initiated by A/Prof. Kathryn Millard during her presentation. She indicated a need to have reputable national and international academics and researchers as well as supporting statement to go with the work being refereed. Prof. Lang indicated support for a **research statement** of around **750-1000 words**. Dr. Josko Petkovic supported the urgent need to form peer review panels. These panels are administrative committees rather than referring panels as such. The committee will locate referees as required although can be referees if appropriate. Kathryn response that there is a golden opportunity to get less traditional work accepted. General discussion in relation to the number of words necessary for the supporting statement given that we may have to deal with many works which could be as short as a 30 second clip. Essentially the statement must convince the panel that this is “serious work”. The statement shouldn’t be an arduous task. At the end it was resolved:

MOTION 1: Submissions for referring will include a research statement of up to 1000 words, contextualising the works as original and scholarly contribution to knowledge. The referring panels will include reputable and experienced national or international academics with relevant expertise in the field.

Moved: Kathryn Millard
Seconded Prof Ian Lang
Motion Carried.

MOTION 2. That we represent ASPERA interests to various groups such as AIDC, ASDA and/or the Screen Council and talk to AIDC ‘Baby Documentary

Conference' in order to create links and present complimentary events within the conferences.

Moved: Alison Wotherspoon

Seconded: Rachel Wilson.

Motion Carried.

Discussion: Adrian discussed an outreach committee from the executive council, should make the contacts to these groups and departments. This outreach committee may be made from Alison Wotherspoon, Gillian Leahy and Marie Deloski.

MOTION 3. That Gillian Leahy be the representative of ASPERA at the Australian Screen Council should we be permitted to join. The term of the ASPERA representative not to exceed two years.

Moved: Josko Petkovic

Seconded: Mick Broderick

Motion Carried.

General Discussion regarding fees involved in joining the Council and attending conferences, what ASPERA's standing will be and any financial implications. Furthermore, Gillian Leahy will report back to ASPERA regarding any financial implications.

AMENDMENT from Adrian: that the executive should have room to move and the ability to make decisions on behalf of the ASPERA. Executive to report back at the next AGM.

Seconded: Mick Broderick

Motion Carried.

ASPERA Council: General Discussion on the possibility of having an advisory ASPERA Council made up of former ASPERA presidents. General discussion about possibility of Industry representatives on the ASPERA Council.

Lobbying: Josko Petkovic and Mick Broderick discussed the urgency involved in the need for Peer Review & DEST related to Non-traditional research.

Possible Action: A letter to Julie Bishop to be drafted from the Executive informing her that ASPERA is the peak advisory body for the university sector and to arrange a meeting with her advisor.

ARC Panel of Experts: This year there are at least two ARC Panel of Experts vacancies. General discussion into who should be nominated by ASPERA on this panel. Prof Ian Lang explained that this position requires enormous amount of work, with at least one week in Canberra. Heads of Schools and Professors are often overburdened with administration. One can self nominate and it was resolved to leave it to individuals to nominate.

ARC Projects: General discussion. It could be possible to invite high profile academics (such as Ross Gibson etc.) to collaborate in an ASPERA ARC submission.

Possible Action: To collectively draw up a list of possible academics that could be approached for inclusion in such a submission. Similarly, leading academics be invited to nominate themselves and encourage senior academics to do likewise.

MOTION 4. That ASPERA communicates our ARC/DEST requests to the Minister of Education.

Moved: Mick Broderick
Seconded: Alison Wotherspoon
Motion Carried

MOTION 5: That ASPERA sends a representative to CILECT and informs CILECT that ASPERA now exists. That the ASPERA representative investigates the possibility of CILECT membership and the financial ramifications of this membership.

Moved: Alison Wotherspoon
Seconded: Rachel Wilson
Motion Carried.

Discussion: It was suggested that nominations of such a representative be held via email election. Prof. Ian Lang discussed that some of the members are indeed already members of CILECT by default, via their institution already being a member. Ian communicated that CILECT has strict guidelines as to who can vote. It was suggested that the existing ASPERA-CILECT representative attends the CILECT conference and reports back to ASPERA.

Alison Wotherspoon is the Asian region representative and Ian Lang also holds membership. Alison's position is a two-year term. ASPERA could have a floating nomination, which can be put in place 12 months hence. The congress of CILECT is held every two years, coming up for renewal in October. Issues such as paying for subscription to CILECT can be investigated at the next conference.

Parallels were drawn between UFFA and ASPERA with an opportunity to represent 120 schools members and affiliate schools. The standard is high, as are the fees. The school or institute must be in existence for a minimum of fifty years. (An interesting sideline from Ian Lang:- CILECT was established by the CIA, during the Cold War to serve as a cultural watchdog over the Eastern European film Schools.)

MOTION 6 that APSERA joins CHASS. Also, ASPERA to invite CHASS to initiate a conference which focuses on image based and screen based research.

Moved: Josko Petkovic
Seconded: Leo Berkeley
Motion Carried.

General discussion: CHASS has been dominated by the Humanities rather than non-traditional research activities. The ASPERA agenda needs to be protected and invoked. Discussion with CHASS should include performing arts.

Murdoch University's Vice-Chancellor would like to host a CHASS event. There is an IT conference to be held in December. Perhaps a CHASS event could be simultaneously

hosted, though Sydney has centrality. The Executive can make a decision regarding this, in consultation with CHASS.

Possible Action: It may be worthwhile to confer with the CHASS, CEO, Malcolm Gilles and the administrative conference organiser, Toss Gascoyn, as to the best way to progress with this action.

MOTION 7. ASPERA endorses the digital archive committee to begin work scoping the feasibility of establishing an open access repository/archive portal. This includes supplying information to the committee in relation to rights management protocols, IT and technological questions in timely manner when requested, securing on ASPERA's behalf, potential industry partners and to begin work on setting up a possible ARC linkage or DEST infrastructure grant.

Moved: Rachel Wilson
Seconded: Gillian Leahy
Motion Carried.

MOTION 8. That ASPERA increase the annual membership fee by \$500.00 per institute and/or academic unit to enable a pool of funds for ASPERA directed research.

Moved: Dr Mick Broderick
Not Passed.

From the floor: Leahy felt that the monies should come from ARC grant. The Executive meets within two months of the APSERA conference. Nick noted that the Conference costs are already paid into their allocated funds. There are very little funds. If APSERA is a 'peak body; perhaps state funding may be captivated though constitutional issues may be at stake, as well as inviting political interference into the direction of ASPERA. Other strategies may be sought in order to fund ASPERA objectives.

MOTION 9. THE ASPERA Conference delegates strongly supports the Community TV sector, in its objective to immediately secure adequate and financially viable access to analogue and digital television spectrum in the period until analogue broadcast conclude.

Moved: Leo Berkeley
Seconded. Michelle Johnson.
Motion Carried.

MOTION 10. THE ASPERA Conference delegates endorse the APSERA executive to draft and send letters to the Ministers of Communication and Education, Science & Training, communicating its strong support for CTV sector to immediately secure adequate and financially viable access to analogue broadcasts conclude.

Moved: Leo Berkeley
Seconded: Michelle Johnson.
Motion Carried.

MOTION 11. The ASPERA 2006 Conference delegates endorse the ASPERA executive to draft and send a letter to the Australia Council of Vice Chancellors asking for their support in lobbying the government to make sure that there is adequate space reserved in the digital television spectrum for community, indigenous and 'not for profit' and education use. This includes forwarding to the Vice Chancellors, each ASPERA member institute, and the above documentation.

Moved: Leo Berkeley
Seconded. Michelle Johnson.
Motion Carried.

Action Point: Research and Graduate Exit Outcomes Survey

Gillian Leahy is to head the committee, which will look at the strategic issues related to the Research and Graduate Exit Outcomes. Josko Petkovic will develop a disciplines profile for 'non-traditional image based academics, which will help define what we do and how it can be measured.

12.30 **Lunch Break – CLUB MURDOCH**
<http://www.murdoch.edu.au/maps/murdoch/food/ClubMurdoch>
& Tour of MAC (NASS) & ITRI

SECTION 9: ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ASPERA 2006

Chair: A/Prof. Gillian Leahy (UTS)

Presidents Report: A/Prof. Gillian Leahy (UTS)

Summary of her Day one Welcome

Financial Report. Nicholas Oughton informed delegates there was \$8,000 held in the APSERA accounts.

Secretary Report: Dr Leon Marvell.

ASPERA is now officially recognised. It was incorporated in NSW, with a Sydney based address and has an ABN number along with a proper constitution.

The President, Gillian Leahy thanked the office bearers for their report.

Motion 12: Conformation of 2005 ASPERA Conference Minutes

Moved: Josko Petkovic
Seconded: Nicholas Oughton
Motion Carried.

Sub- Group Activities Reports.

General Discussion:

- That the working groups continue with their activities. In regard to HD & 16 aspect ratio, Paul Ritchard had some information, and overview working with students and their post-production problems. Alison suggests keeping up to date via email.
- Digital Content – merges Archiving:- Ingo Petzke, Tim Thomas, Leon Marvell, Josko Petkovic & Mick Broderick.
- Exit Surveys: Marie Delofski, Alison Wotherspoon & Gillian Leahy, Geoff Portman, Huge Burton.
- OHS signalled, audited and research papers – to be put on web.
- Website - who is managing the website?

Motion 13. That the ASPERA Advisory Council be established, with Honorary membership of ASPERA but with no voting rights at the AGM conferences though they may be invited as observers. This membership need not be constitutionally tied but be available to the Executive as a way of constituting an advisory body to advise and to provide guidance. Past Presidents will be offered membership of the Advisory Council specifically Jenny Sabine (past president) and Gillian Leahy (present president) will be offered this membership.

Moved: Josko Petkovic

Seconded: Gillian Leahy

Motion Carried.

Binding Decisions Arising from the ASPERA Conferences

In broad terms, Heads of academic units or their representatives are expected to be ASPERA delegates. This will give political weight to decisions taken as these can be assumed to be binding. It should be assumed that delegate can take decisions on behalf of the universities though this authorization could be formalised in writing in regard to lower level academic delegates.

This binding authority to the delegate's decisions is covered constitutionally on page 4.

A right, privilege or obligation which an institution or an academic unit has by reason of being a member of the association:

- (a) Can be delegated to an authorised person(s) representing the institutions or the academic unit in question.

The fact that the University is paying for the delegated to attend the ASPERA Conference, implies the University's commitment and compliance to the delegate's decisions.

Discussion ensued in regard to the unique situation of the AFTRS in relation to non-traditional image based research, in that the work of their students is not necessarily 'research based'.

One-Third Qualifier for ASPERA membership

There was a general discussion regarding the one-third production subjects qualifier for the membership of ASPERA (Constitution page 3 part 2).

This clause clearly identifies that delegate membership has a high investment in production focused research. By keeping this 'one third qualifier', smaller schools which spring up will not hold the same leverage as the presently accredited academic

institutions and universities. Membership should be restricted to Universities and AFTRS and accreditation should invoke the criteria of research and university education in general.

Replacement of Executive (under Pt 18.Special Circumstances). That under special circumstances a delegate can nominate another delegate to take their place at the Conference. Voting rights then are transferred to that delegate.

Constitution

The Constitution is a general template. It seeks to define the role and aims at the first Conference. It defined membership qualification and dealt with nomination and membership issues. Fees and liability were covered, as were duties, meetings and quorum.

Election of the New Executive:

The positions vacant will be Vice-President . The former Vice President Josko Petkovic becomes President. New Vice President to be elected (who will organise the next annual conference at their institution and preferably from a non NSW, VIC, WA state), Secretary, Treasurer and One other member.

The new Executive elected on nomination as follows:

- | | |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| 1. PRESIDENT | Josko PETKOVIC |
| 2. VICE PRESIDENT | Nick OUGHTON |
| 3. SECRETARY | Leon MARVELL |
| 4. TREASURER | Alison WOTHERSPOON |
| 5. MEMBER | Leo BERKELEY |

3:30

Drinks and Coffee – **CLUB MURDOCH**

<http://www.murdoch.edu.au/maps/murdoch/food/ClubMurdoch>

4.00

SESSION 10 – PLANNING FUTURE ACTION

Chair: Nick Oughton (Griffith)

Reports from group leaders

Planning future action

Other Business

ASPERA WORKING GROUPS AND TASKS 2006-2007

The following action groups and leaders were constituted :

1. **RESEARCH:**
Josko Petkovic: Ian, Kathryn, Mick, Leon + others
ASPRI Review
Research Network,
Canberra Lobbying,
CHASS Conference,
National Conference
2. **AIDC CONNECTIONS**
Alison + Gill
Flinders as host for academic component
Gill to write a formal letter to AIDC
3. **AUSTRALIAN SCREEN COUNCIL – Gill** to draft a letter
4. **MANAGING WEB SITE:**
Chris Caines: Leon Marvell, Leo Berkeley, Mick Broderick,
Timeline 6 months
Adjust current website first
Nick Oughton: OHS to go to website + discussion group listed
5. **ARCHIVING + DIGITAL CONTENT**
Rachel Wilson: Mick Broderick, Josko Petkovic, David Price
Timeline 6 December
6. **INVITATIONS TO OTHER UNIVERSITIES**
Wollangong
UWS
LOFA
UNSW
Lismore
DARWIN (Leon)
UWA (Josko)
USC (Leo)
Batchelor College
(Contact drop outs – **Leon**)
7. **TEXTBOOK PROPOSAL – Mick + Leon**
8. **POSTGRADUATE STUDENTS AND FUNDING BODIES - Josko**
9. **ASPERA E-MAIL LIST – Josko + Leon** to contact Patrick
10. **ARC COLLEGE OF EXPERTS**
Online nomination invited www.arc.gov.au

The meeting ended at 5:00 pm.

The next conference and AGM to be held in June/ July 2007 at Griffith University.