



# SCREENING LITERACY: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY



# Contents

---

	<b>Foreword</b>	3
<b>1</b>	<b>Context</b>	4
<b>2</b>	<b>Terms of reference</b>	7
2.1	Scope of the research	8
<b>3</b>	<b>Methodology</b>	9
3.1	Research team structure	10
3.2	Online Survey	10
3.3	Seminar on initial findings	11
3.4	Film Literacy Advisory Group	11
3.5	Supplementary Research	11
<b>4</b>	<b>Main findings</b>	12
4.1	Why film education?	13
4.2	What strategies are in place?	14
4.3	Where does film education happen?	15
4.4	Who provides film education? Who receives it?	17
4.5	What support is provided?	19
4.6	How is film education funded?	20
<b>5</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>	21
	<b>Appendix: list of survey respondents</b>	23

Cover image: BFI Southbank, UK

## RESEARCH TEAM

Mark Reid, BFI  
Professor Andrew Burn, London University Institute of Education  
Ian Wall, Film Education

Michelle Cannon  
Kate Domaille  
Wendy Earle  
Caren Willig

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The research team wish to thank a number of people for their contribution to the project:

The Steering Group at the European Commission MEDIA Unit: Dag Asbjornsen, Susanne Ding, Helen Parnham, Kjersti Sjaatil, Ilias Sotirchos, Bronagh Walton, Matteo Zacchetti

Our Experts' Group: Vitor Reia-Batista; Simone Moraldi; Irene Andriopoulou; Sara Duve; and Laszlo Hartai

All of the respondents to the research survey (listed separately in the Appendix)

Alice Guilluy and Alejandra de Leiva, our two MA placement students

# Screening Literacy: Film Education in Europe

---

## Foreword

In July 2011, the European Commission published an invitation to tender for a European-scale Experts' Study on film literacy in Europe, covering all EU and EEA nations, and asking for evidence-based recommendations to inform policy making in the forthcoming Creative Europe framework. The tender was won by a consortium of UK and wider European partners, led by the British Film Institute. This report forms the Executive Summary of a fuller report, to be published in early 2013.

The Terms of Reference for the survey included a definition of film literacy, later amended, as follows:

'The level of understanding of a film, the ability to be conscious and curious in the choice of films; the competence to critically watch a film and to analyse its content, cinematography and technical aspects; and the ability to manipulate its language and technical resources in creative moving image production'

The Tender specified coverage of the formal, informal, and audio-visual sectors in film education (but not including Higher Education).

Our keynote throughout this research has been a belief that core to film education is an *adaptability* – across genres, national cinemas, industrial contexts; across platforms; across school subjects and disciplines; and across education settings – in the classroom, after school, and outside school. We intend to make this adaptability – its *translatability* – into its key strength, and into a funding principle.



1 context



The context of film literacy in Europe is seen in this report from three perspectives: the established practice of film educators across all sectors in the member states; the wider arguments about film culture and its importance; and the relation between film literacy and media literacy, especially in the context of the EC's media literacy initiative.

Europe has a long tradition of moving image education. The abiding motivation for this is the film cultures of Europe, and a longstanding desire in many countries to make this heritage accessible to children and young people. As with other art-forms, such as literature, music and art, this desire is to some extent manifested in school curricula, in the work of independent agencies, in institutes which are custodians of national archives, and in a variety of voluntary organisations.

In addition, the film industry itself has supported educational work, motivated often by the desire to develop future audiences, and we use this emphasis to draw attention to two different conceptions of film education: as an entitlement for all, a social good (akin to the entitlement to universal literacy) and as an instrumental means to developing film consumers, or audiences. We propose that a universal entitlement for all European citizens to be able to understand, appreciate, and participate in the widest range of film cultures will have as one consequence among many the development of more adventurous, challenging, and informed audiences. But, like universal literacy, this entitlement to understand and enjoy a wide range of film, and to master some of its language, is an important social and cultural end in itself.

Despite the best of intentions, it is fair to say that film education has always struggled to establish itself in school curricula. While the 'traditional' arts, especially music, art and literature, have commonly been established as core elements of national curricula, film (and media more generally) have typically been either absent or marginal. The findings of this report will provide, for the first time, a confirmation of this picture in some detail.

The ecologies of film culture are complex. As has already been said, the various film heritages of European countries are valued in certain ways, often supported by government or lottery funding, promoted in education where formal curricula exist (though as we shall see, national heritage is by no means the highest priority on many film educators' lists). However, the concept of national heritage, while it still has some purchase and will be respected in the recommendations of this report, is complex and contested, like any body of work with canonical claims. All European states have different language communities and cultural traditions within them, often as a result of historical inequalities of power or economic status. Turkish films in Germany, Anglo-Hindi films in the UK, and Bosnian, Serbian and Croatian films exploring the Balkans wars are all obvious examples of film cultures whose representations of ethnicity, language, culture and nationhood resist any easy attempts to homogenise national film heritages. European culture is above all a culture of translation, and we aim in this report to make the cultural affordances of translation a core strength of European film education, rather than a potential obstacle.

Furthermore, it is often difficult to draw national boundaries around films. In an era of global markets and production economies, films often involve international casts, crews, finance and location. By the same token, the familiar distinction between independent and commercial cinema is difficult to maintain, either on aesthetic or economic grounds. In addition, in the context of education, film educators must grapple with the indisputable fact that young people's experiences of and tastes in film are often orientated to popular cinema. For all these reasons, it makes no sense either in principle or practice to demonise Hollywood, Bollywood or the commercial films of China and Hong Kong. Rather, a tolerant approach to diverse tastes, genres and styles seems more likely to attract young people to less familiar film traditions, including those of their own country. For this reason, we asked film educators in the EU member states about the merits of including world cinema and popular cinema alongside national traditions; and the outcomes of these questions will appear in the report.

The third context, the relationship between film education/literacy and media education/literacy raises several questions. One is the relation between critical appreciation and creative production, and the shift in recent years, with access to affordable filming and editing equipment, towards the latter. Another is the tension between film (often conceived as an art form) and media more generally (often conceived as entertainment and information). Yet another is the tension between protectionist versions of both as opposed to more positive engagements with young people's cultural experience. While media education has sometimes been seen as a protection against a range of social ills, from meretricious content to misinformation and moral debasement, film education has sometimes been seen as a protection against Hollywood. Some of these questions are directly addressed by those reporting from EU member states, and represented in the report. In general, our position reflects recent versions of media education in Europe. It recognises that children and young people

have the right for their media and film cultures to be respected, while also having the right to be introduced to European films they might be unaware of. It recognises that the aims of media education and film education are virtually identical – to foster a wider literacy which incorporates broad cultural experience, aesthetic appreciation, critical understanding and creative production. And it recognises that, in an era of 'convergence culture', young people's engagement with powerful media fictions may range across books, comics, films, television dramas and videogames. In this respect, film education is a subset of media education, and the two work best hand-in-hand.

In a more practical sense, film and media education are frequently connected in curriculum frameworks. This relationship is, again, something we explored with the member states, and the results can be found in the report.



# 2 terms of reference



## Scope of the research

The European Commission's definition of film literacy from the original tender specification was: 'the level of understanding of a film, the ability to be conscious and curious in the choice of films and the competence to critically watch a film and to analyse its content, cinematography and technical aspects'. Following conversations with the Steering Group, our revised definition is as follows:

'The level of understanding of a film, the ability to be conscious and curious in the choice of films; the competence to critically watch a film and to analyse its content, cinematography and technical aspects; and the ability to manipulate its language and technical resources in creative moving image production.'

The defined purpose behind film literacy is: 'for young people, to provide awareness and knowledge about our film heritage and increasing interest in these films and in recent European films, the ultimate goal being to build a long term audience for European films.' We would like to extend this purpose to encompass a universal entitlement on behalf of all citizens 'to be introduced to the fundamentals of the moving image, and to be able to master some of its language.'

From 2014 the MEDIA programme will be subsumed into Creative Europe, and the outcomes of this research project we hope will inform the shape of the media and film literacy dimensions of Creative Europe.

The Tender Specification requested 'a report mapping the current practices in film literacy in Europe...A European-scale experts' study which identifies and analyses film literacy provision in Europe – in formal and informal settings, and all age groups':

- + Film literacy and AV national policy; film industry; broadcasters
- + National Curricula: single subject or cross-curricular; learning objectives; film institutes and other organisations
- + Informal sector: film institutes, NGOs, grassroots groups
- + Role of film industry and media professionals in film literacy projects
- + Examples of good practice



# 3 methodology

## 3.1 Research team structure

The core research team consisted of a consortium of BFI, London University Institute of Education, and industry body Film Education. The three Research Directors were Mark Reid (BFI), Professor Andrew Burn (IoE), and Ian Wall (Film Education). The research programme was co-ordinated by Wendy Earle, and the core researchers were Michelle Cannon, Kate Domaille, and Caren Willig. We were very ably assisted by MA students Alice Guilluy and Alejandra de Leiva.

Our core research partners were drawn from Poland (PISF, the Polish Film Institute), Greece

(IOM, the Hellenic AudioVisual Institute), Portugal (University of the Algarve), Germany (Vision Kino), Italy (University of Roma Tre), Ireland (Irish Film Institute), Denmark (StationNext), Hungary (Hungarian Moving Image Media Education Association), Slovenia (Slovenian Film Institute), Netherlands (EYE, the Dutch Film Institute), and the Czech Republic (CR Film Education Board). We created an Experts' Group from this list: Vitor Reia-Batista; Simone Moraldi; Irene Andriopoulou; Sara Duve; and Laszlo Hartai. The project had a Steering Group based in the MEDIA Unit of the European Commission.

## 3.2 Online Survey

Our major research instrument was a series of questionnaires delivered by online survey tool Survey Monkey, that were created, trialled, and tested during January 2012. We consulted our research partners on its suitability and ease of use, and on the value of the data it produced. We invited the partners to look through the survey before we asked them to fill it in, so that they could familiarize themselves with it, and suggest any last minute changes.

The survey was structured into 5 parts: film literacy provision in formal education; in informal education; through the audio-visual industries; through cultural organizations; and professional development of film educators. We had an additional section, inviting participants to create case studies, one from each of the formal, informal, and audio-visual settings, with a set of questions to structure the completion of each case study.

The surveys were completed by our 11 partners, and 4 UK partners (one for each devolved nation), in February 2012, and by a further 20 partners, in June 2012. The surveys for each nation were corroborated by an additional correspondent. We received no information from partners in Bulgaria or Romania, but would be delighted to rectify that if we are approached following the publication of our full report.

The surveys were carried out in English, and we are grateful, as English people should always be, for the patience and linguistic facility shown by partners in using their non-native tongue.

One logistical complication lay in the number of countries with federal political structures: this makes it difficult to complete 'national', as in 'unified', pictures of provision, and of educational and cultural structures. We were able to complete 'jigsaw' national pictures for some of these nations (Germany; Belgium; Spain; UK).

The outcomes of each national survey were compiled into a series of 'national pictures' of film literacy, which are appended to this report. In addition, we compiled a series of case studies of significant practice, again drawn from the online survey submissions. These include three significant 'transnational' programmes: the Cinematheque Francaise programme *Cinema cent ans de jeunesse*; Europa Cinemas; and the European Cultural Foundation's DocNext programme.

We commissioned specific reports on areas of film education that we felt merited more focused attention: the education activities of film heritage organisations; cinema-based education provision; and family-focused film education activity. We also listed film festivals with youth or education dimensions. All of these reports will be appended to the main, full report.

### 3.3 Seminar on initial findings

---

On 26 and 27 March 2012, we hosted a seminar for the Phase 1 partners, in London. Our day followed an agenda: to respond to our interim findings; to imagine an ‘ideal model’ of film education; to discuss barriers

to the creation of this ideal type; and to propose actions that might overcome these barriers, with a special emphasis on actions that might be taken by the European Commission.

### 3.4 Film Literacy Advisory Group

---

Out of the March seminar, we constituted the Experts’ Group and our Phase 1 research partners as a Film Literacy Advisory Group, and we now propose the formal adoption of this group, expanded to include other

partners from Phase 2, by the European Commission. The group has established an internal blog at: [filmliteracyadvisorygroup.wordpress.com](http://filmliteracyadvisorygroup.wordpress.com)

### 3.5 Supplementary Research

---

Two MA placements based at BFI in May and June worked on supplementary research outcomes – gathering and collating data on film festival education profiles, specific national and regional film literacy programmes, and some transnational

programmes, such as Europa Cinemas, the European Cultural Foundation’s DocNext programme, and the Cinematheque Francaise programme ‘*le Cinema cent ans de jeunesse*.’



A close-up photograph of two young girls with dark hair. The girl on the left is holding a black video camera, looking through the viewfinder. The girl on the right is leaning in, looking at the camera's LCD screen. They are both wearing floral patterned shirts. The background is blurred.

# 4 main findings

## 4.1 Why film education?

We summarised our findings in a series of ‘W’ questions, the *Why*, *What*, *Where* and *Who* of film education.

The responses from national representatives indicated a clear set of priorities. The highest priority in the formal curriculum (selected by most countries) was given to the development of film language and filmmaking skills, closely followed by the understanding of film as an art form, critical viewing, and other categories referring to the critical understanding and analysis of film texts. Middle-ranking categories (selected by approximately half respondents) included social and civic education, wider viewing, enjoyment, understanding of national and European film heritage, and access to world cinema. Lower-ranking categories (selected by approximately a third of respondents) included audience development and choice,

and access to and understanding of popular cinema.

In relation to the informal sector, the priorities were broadly similar, with the exception of skills of textual analysis (ranked bottom), audience development and choice, and enjoyment (ranked higher). These are to be expected, perhaps; more surprising was that social and civic participation was ranked lower, in the bottom third.

What is salient overall is the highest priority placed on understanding and appreciating film as an artform, when compared to other instrumental purposes behind film education. However, none of the categories in either sector were selected by fewer than 8 countries, suggesting that all categories should play a part in an ideal model of film education in Europe, appropriately weighted.

### Recommendation 1:

Develop a series of **models of film education** for Europe, that include appreciation of film as an art form, critical understanding, access to national heritage, world cinema and popular film, and creative film-making skills. We also recommend the adoption by EC of the revised definition of film education we use in this report:

**‘The level of understanding of a film, the ability to be conscious and curious in the choice of films; the competence to critically watch a film and to analyse its content, cinematography and technical aspects; and the ability to manipulate its language and technical resources in creative moving image production’**

### Recommendation 2:

The EC should support the institution of a **Film Literacy Advisory Group (FLAG)** to draft and circulate these models, and to advise on initiatives in the other recommendations.

## 4.2 What strategies are in place?

The strongest models of provision are those with national strategies jointly devised/endorsed by both Culture and Education ministries, with strong industry support, and we found few examples of this. Only **Northern Ireland** appears to have a fully integrated national film education strategy. The Scandinavian countries are generally

strong. The **Norwegian Film Institute** (NFI – Norsk Filminstitut) has been coordinating a national film education strategy for several years and has published two online film websites around it. In **Finland**, although there is no overall film strategy, there are several agencies and non-governmental-organisations highly active in the promotion

of film education. And in **Denmark and Sweden**, each respective Film Institute has its own 'national strategy.'

Elsewhere, **France** has strategies for national delivery, while others were currently devising strategies (**UK, Czech Republic, Ireland**). Other nations have strategic approaches, without there being a national delivery plan: The **Netherlands and Poland** have a high degree of national co-ordination between a range of agencies; **Greece** has statements amounting to 'national awareness' of the value and opportunities around film literacy; **Germany** has secured agreement amongst a range of federal agencies to a 'statement of

competences' in film literacy. **Croatia**: The Ministry of Science, Education and Sport of the Republic of Croatia, and also the Croatian audiovisual Centre (HAVC) have a national film education strategy.

We found this question raised further ones: what is the value of a national strategy? Who should own it? How should its impact be measured and evaluated? Members of the Advisory Group were clear that where film education is under threat, or marginalized, a national strategy, owned by education as well as cultural ministries, is a good way of protecting and promoting film literacy.

### Recommendation 3:

We found a range of valuable strategic policies and instruments which we believe member states would benefit from examining and learning from. We propose a '**Translation Fund**' which supports national agencies in adapting strategic approaches from other, similar nations and territories, and supports professional development and exchange of key workers in those agencies in meeting and learning from colleagues in other countries.

#### AN IDEAL MODEL OF FILM EDUCATION

After surveying the 30 countries included in this report, we are able to make some judgements on the factors that support, and the features which characterise, strong national models of film education provision.

Typically in those countries the ecology of film education will feature a **high degree of co-ordination across sectors** (education and culture agencies in government; NGOs; film and broadcast agencies) supported by a **national strategic plan**. There will be a range of purposes behind film education, covering industrial concerns (adventurous audiences; a skilled workforce), but fundamentally underpinned by an **entitlement on behalf of all people** to become 'literate' in the moving image. These purposes will be explicit, shared, and valued by all participants in the culture, with little special pleading or claims to priority treatment.

It is likely that a strong film education ecology is part of a **wider culture in film**, that supports education and access to film for a range of people – children, older people, diverse and marginal groups – and public funding of film culture will follow this commitment.

Learners, and learning, in informal education will be **valued as highly** as in formal settings, and recognised as operating differently. There will be a commitment to having provision in all sectors **robustly and independently evaluated**; providers, even at a national level, will have a clear commitment to improving their provision.

These countries will feature **high levels of participation** in film education, in activities that are **sustained across a period of time**, with **measured and recorded outcomes**. Funding responsibilities will be distributed across public, commercial, education and cultural sectors, and delivered around a shared national plan.

The film education workforce, from trained film teachers, to teachers of other subjects with an interest in film, to support workers in schools, and then workers in the informal sector (freelance educators, youth and community workers, cultural workers) will have recognisable and funded **professional development opportunities** that support them from entry level to expert status, and with **accreditation** to validate their development.



## 4.3 Where does film education happen?

### 4.3.1 IN THE SCHOOL CURRICULUM

This question is of central concern to European policy, and to member states, since it is the one area over which they have direct control over provision for all (future) citizens. The curriculum is the single most effective instrument for delivering an ‘entitlement model’ of film literacy for all. The findings indicate where in the curriculum film education is located; what form it takes; whether it is an option for some students or an entitlement for all students (and at which level); what kind of participation or take-up is known or can be estimated; and what national recording of attainment takes place.

In relation to curriculum location, the results are unsurprising. Film education is most likely to be integrated into other subjects (a model which our respondents felt weakened specialist delivery at best, and at worst concealed what little production work was found) – and this model applied across all age phases. The second most common model was for film education to be an optional subject, though this mostly applied in middle and high school phases; or for it to be an optional part of media education, which was more evenly distributed across the age phases. The least common model was for film education to be a discrete subject in the core curriculum, which was only found in one country at primary level, two at middle level, and four at high school level.

In terms of curriculum clustering and embedding, many models are in evidence. Most common is still the association of film literacy with literacy and mother tongue education (eg **UK, Ireland, Germany, Norway, Sweden**). However, it is increasingly common for countries to specify a general programme of media education, into which film education is integrated, and this is the case, for example, in **Netherlands, Hungary, Cyprus, Finland, France, Malta, Croatia, Slovakia and Switzerland** (though in some of these cases, it is an optional component).

Less common combinations were with history (**Latvia**), ICT (**Iceland** – though also with mother tongue literacy); and the arts (**Italy and The Netherlands**).

In terms of take-up, participation and entitlement, a significant finding is that in most countries, no reliable statistics are available. We asked respondents to make a best guess, so these estimates should be treated with caution; and they do not indicate the quality or quantity of film education received. At the very least they indicate that no country offers film education as an entitlement subject across all age phases; and that the proportions of school children who receive any kind of film education vary wildly from a majority of the school population to almost none at all. The highest figures are **Denmark (81%), Ireland (80%), and Sweden (75%)**. Middle-ranking estimates included **Malta (60%); Belgium (50%)** and the **Czech Republic (40%)**. Substantial minorities of the population were indicated by **England (25%), France, Germany, Hungary, Northern Ireland and Scotland, Luxembourg, and Slovenia** (all 10%). Those estimating 5% or less included **Netherlands, Switzerland, Spain, Austria and Lithuania**. These figures take no account of the depth or quality of engagement: where a majority of children receive some film education, it may just be a handful of lessons or a single visit to the cinema.

In formal education, then, the general pattern is of patchy and sometimes weak provision: no full core entitlement; few countries where a majority of the school populations receive film education; much evidence of provision weakened by absorption into other subjects or cross-curricular distribution; almost no national records of attainment or progression, except where film education becomes a formal examination subject in high schools in some countries. On the positive side, there is good evidence of specialist provision in some countries, especially in the upper years of secondary schooling. Also, there is evidence that, where film education is strongly-represented within media education programmes, it can benefit from coherent conceptual frameworks and specialist attention to creative production work.

**Recommendation 4:**

Member states should be encouraged to provide **core programmes of film education**, at both primary and secondary levels; **to provide annual figures** of take-up in optional film education; and to provide **data on attainment** and progression. EC might support individual member states with **research funding to determine levels and quality** of take up and engagement

**Recommendation 5:**

The EC should consider how to enable guidance on how to make available effective curriculum models, levels of minimum provision, and appropriate pedagogies, relating them to mother tongue provision, arts education, and new media/ICT.

## 4.3.2

## AFTER SCHOOL

We found few examples of nationally co-ordinated after-school film education activity. Film clubs are offered in several countries. In **England** (with off-shoots in Northern Ireland and Wales), FilmClub runs a network of some 7,500 after-school film clubs, with a well resourced website, and access to free DVDs via provider LoveFilm. Also in England, provider Cineclub offers film-making and film watching activity after school in a number of areas around London, the south-east, and in Wales. **Luxembourg, Malta** and **Slovakia** have national film club programmes; while in **Denmark**, DABUF (Danish Children's Film Club) hold film clubs.

In **France, UK** and **Czech Republic** there are networks of film societies, providing access to world and heritage cinema for adults, and then there are small, ad hoc programmes offered by individual cinemas (in Athens, Cine Philip; in Dublin, from the IFI; in Wales, the Chapter Young Film Academy). MovieZone in **The Netherlands** is an online network for young people to access film, and share experiences – available in school, after school, and outside school.

In a number of other countries, clubs are offered at regional or local levels: **Finland, Iceland, Spain, Belgium, Sweden**. In a small number of countries, no provision exists as yet: **Lithuania, Croatia, Estonia**.

Where after-school provision exists, it rarely offers an integrated combination of critical understanding, cultural access, and creative practice. Provision is much more likely to focus on one, not all, of these elements. One exception is *le Cinéma: cent ans de jeunesse*, run by the Cinémathèque Française. It involves partners from 7 different countries, 6 in Europe, in an innovative approach to film aesthetics, with a strong professional development component. It has been running for 17 years and we believe is an exemplar of transnational 'translated' film culture. We would like to see it developed further as a model, with EC support.

### 4.3.3

### OUTSIDE SCHOOL

Only one country, **France**, has a formally structured national programme of film education for young people outside school. Elsewhere, the organisations which provide film education outside school, and beyond school age, are fairly evenly spread across cinemas and film festivals, adult colleges, film societies, galleries and museums, film archive centres and a variety of community spaces. In the majority of countries, this provision is linked to national programmes (eg **Cyprus, Poland, Italy, UK, the Netherlands, Finland, Iceland**). In others, it is more dependent on local initiatives (eg **Estonia, Latvia, Slovakia,**

**Hungary**). Film education in the informal sector would however benefit from more substantial and sustained professional development: for youth and community workers, for freelance film professionals working in education; and for adult educators. We address this need in Recommendation 12.

The greatest challenges in film education provision outside the formal curriculum seem to be faced by the new member states. The recommendations will reflect this finding.

### Recommendation 6:

[The EC should consider ways of funding outreach schemes, on a 'translation' model, in the new member states, modelled by successful providers of informal film education in Europe.](#)

We address specific pictures of cinema-based provision, and film heritage education, in the Appendices to the full report.

## 4.4

## Who provides film education? Who receives it?

### 4.4.1

### PROVIDERS

In most countries, the Ministry of Education has some role to play, though as indicated above, provision here ranges from relatively strong and coherent models such as **Hungary's** to models where film education is represented tokenistically if at all.

Other providers which appear to be effective are film institutes such as those in **Sweden, Denmark, Norway, France** and the **UK**, though an important feature of successful work there is seen to be co-ordination with other networks and with a national strategy. These networks include the other kinds of provider: jointly-funded organisations such as **Germany's** Vision Kino, societies and associations such as **Finland's** Mediakasvatusseura, film festivals such as those provided by **Belgium's** Brussels-Wallonia Federation, or the children's film festivals in Thessaloniki and Cyprus. We found examples of film festivals aimed

at young people (**BUSTER** in **Denmark**; 5 festivals in **UK**; Olympia International Film Festival for Children and Young People in Pyrgos, **Greece**), and the One World Festival for young people in Czech Republic has a strong film element. [See the full report for a list of film festivals with a child or youth focus]

We gathered many examples of film education projects that focus on both making, and critically engaging with film. Film camps are popular (**StationNext** in **Denmark**; **Czech Republic**; **Hungary**; and in **Poland** at the Studio of Educational films and Programmes in Lodz). We have also noted the benefits of transnational projects and their potential to cascade creative practices at regional and national level. **Cinema En Curs** in **Catalunya, Spain** has established numerous film making workshops based on the *Cinema cent ans de jeunesse* programme referenced earlier.



## PROVIDERS

In many countries, the film industry supports film education initiatives such as film museum work, study days, festival programmes or free screenings. The majority of such support was directed at schools, with some provision in some countries for children and families. The least provision was for adult learners, with the exception of cinema screenings, and a couple of public service broadcasters.

The major national cinema-based education programmes are in **France**, **Germany** (VisionKino), **UK** (Film Education), and **Denmark** (organized by the DFI), and there are smaller cinema education programmes around arthouse cinemas in **Poland** (but not nationally co-ordinated), and single cinemas or Cinematheques in most countries. **Slovenia** has a network of 25 arthouse cinemas offering education programmes.

Film archives in **Greece** (National Film Archive, and Thessaloniki Film Museum), **Poland** (Filmoteka Szkolna), **UK** (Northern Ireland, Scotland, BFI, regional archives) offer education screenings and events. Those in **France**, **UK** and **Hungary** offer online access to archive film and education resources. (See the Appendix in the full report for a fuller picture of film education provision through film archive organisations.)

A problem perceived by our expert panel was the accessibility of film archives, both for easy viewing by schools and other groups, and for more creative work such as re-editing, which raised considerable copyright and IP questions.

### Recommendation 7:

Member states should promote partnerships between the film industry, education agencies, and government departments. Such partnerships should seek to ensure a return in educational benefit from any investment of public money in film production. Support should include the provision of materials to enhance learning, and in particular: access to production materials (including production rushes); involvement of industry talent at events; and waiving of screening fees in a non-theatrical exhibition context.

### Recommendation 8:

EC should provide guidelines on the use of material from national and regional film archives' clearance for classroom use, including guidance on licensing and copyright clearance.

## 4.4.2

## RECIPIENTS

In addition to young people and schools, we asked about specialised provision for senior citizens, local communities, cinephiles, and families. Predictably, schools and universities were best catered for with published resources, online support and cinema screenings; while senior citizens were least well catered for, with little provision other

than screenings. We commissioned a fuller outline of provision for families, as we were conscious that this is an area of wider cultural education in which there is exciting practice (in Reggio Emilia, for example. See the Appendix in the full report for our report on film education for families.)

### Recommendation 9:

Consideration should be given to supporting education programmes for both families, and for wider adult communities, focusing on diverse, migrant, and older people, by funding 'translations' of such programmes from one territory to another.

## 4.5 What support is provided?

### 4.5.1

#### FILM EDUCATION RESOURCES

In 14 countries we found provision of film education resources, usually to support film education in schools, offered at a national level. In some (eg **France, Sweden, Poland, Italy, Hungary, Scotland, Austria**) these resources were mandated to some degree by national education ministries. Other countries (eg **Czech Republic, Greece, Germany, Estonia**) published nationally mandated guidelines on approaches and standards for film education in the formal sector. **Spain and Belgium** have regionally-approved resources or guidelines. **Latvia** and **Switzerland** seem to have neither national guidelines nor resources.

In the informal sector, we found it most likely that resources were made available on local,

ad hoc, or project-based cases. We found few examples of nationally available resources for the informal sector - FilmClub in **UK** has a website which reaches one in three after-school settings, and MovieZone in the **Netherlands** has national scope.

The issue here is as much to do with the quality and take-up of resources, as with the provision itself, and neither was within the scope of this study. However, the successful models of national provision on the one hand and local provision on the other, where allied to providers of proven effectiveness, offer the basis for a recommendation.

#### Recommendation 10:

The EC should sponsor, in tandem with the industry, a European bank of exemplar online resources, for a wide range of audiences and education settings, translated from good practice across the EU.

### 4.5.2

#### TEACHER/EDUCATOR TRAINING

We found nationwide training programmes for teachers only in **Poland** (through Filmoteka Szkolna), **UK** (in Northern Ireland; in the mid 2000s in England) and **Hungary** and **Finland**. Several countries have national in-service programmes with opt-in provision: eg **France, Iceland, Malta, Austria**. Otherwise, training for education professionals in film literacy is optional, ad hoc, and locally or regionally co-ordinated – and then not by education ministries.

As with media education more generally, the issue is with the lack of film education provision in initial teacher education, the patchiness of in-service provision to follow it up, and the more serious lack of systematic training for educators in the informal sector. Thirteen countries offer HE accreditation at Master's level as part of their in-service provision, which in principle can improve quality and status.

#### Recommendation 11:

Member states should be encouraged to incorporate a film education component within initial teacher education programmes.

#### Recommendation 12:

The EC should provide online guidance on best practice in in-service training provision across the EU.

#### Recommendation 13:

The EC should investigate models for the collaborative provision of accredited training at M-level, for the widest range of film educators, using existing collaborative HE structures.

## 4.6 How is film education funded?

---

As 80% of film education provision in this sector comes from the national film agency, where one exists, the majority of funding comes from national government followed by regional government. However, there are many variations and individual country observations.

The issues in the provision and distribution of funding seem to be threefold, though the various national complexities will be addressed in the full report. Firstly, the degree of funding is an issue: in general, film education seems to be poorly-funded, though reliable figures are hard to obtain. Film education is given 'just enough money to not do enough.' Secondly, how funding is directed

in relation to agreed national or regional priorities is an issue. Government funding, for example, is directed in some countries by education ministries, in others by culture ministries, and sometimes by both, thus re-inforcing the need for coherent, single, national strategies, with alliances of major partners including the film industry.

Finally, these figures represent support for tangible projects, events and resources, rather than revenue costs for staff in schools. A clearer picture of total funding in the film education sector is only possible where the allocation of resource made through the school system is included.

### **Recommendation 14:**

The EC should sponsor research into levels of funding for film education, and funding in relation to outcomes, in order to provide guidance on minimum provision, models of joint funding, and strategies for effective direction of financial resources.





5 recommendations

**Recommendation 1:**

Draft a model of film education for Europe, including appreciation of film as an art form, critical understanding, access to national heritage, world cinema and popular film, and creative film-making skills. We also recommend the adoption by EC of the revised definition of film education we use in this report:

‘The level of understanding of a film, the ability to be conscious and curious in the choice of films; the competence to critically watch a film and to analyse its content, cinematography and technical aspects; and the ability to manipulate its language and technical resources in creative moving image production’

**Recommendation 2:**

The EC should support the institution of a film literacy advisory group (flag) to draft such a model, and to advise on initiatives in the other recommendations.

**Recommendation 3:**

We found a range of valuable strategic policies and instruments which we believe member states would benefit from examining and learning from. We propose a ‘translation fund’ which supports national agencies in adapting strategic approaches from other, similar nations and territories, and supports professional development of key workers in those agencies in meeting and learning from colleagues in other countries.

**Recommendation 4:**

Member states should ensure that core programmes of media education, with a robust film education element, are provided at both primary and secondary levels; to provide annual figures of take-up in optional film education; and to provide data on attainment and progression.

**Recommendation 5:**

The EC should provide guidance on effective curriculum models levels of minimum provision, and appropriate pedagogies, relating them to mother tongue provision, arts education, and new media/ICT

**Recommendation 6:**

The EC should consider funding outreach schemes to the new member states, modelled by successful providers of informal film education in Europe.

**Recommendation 7:**

Member states should promote partnerships between the film industry, education agencies, and government departments. Such partnerships should seek to ensure a return in educational benefit from any investment of public money in film production. Support should include the provision of materials to enhance learning, and in particular: access to production materials (including production rushes); involvement of industry talent at events; and waiving of screening fees in a non-theatrical exhibition context.

**Recommendation 8:**

The EC should provide guidelines on the use of material from national and regional film archives’ clearance for classroom use, including guidance on licensing and copyright clearance.

**Recommendation 9:**

Consideration should be given to supporting education programmes for wider adult communities, focusing on diverse, migrant, and older people, maybe by funding ‘translations’ of such programmes from one territory to another

**Recommendation 10:**

The EC should sponsor, in tandem with the industry, a European bank of exemplar online resources drawn from good practice across the EU.

**Recommendation 11:**

Member states should incorporate media education, with a robust film education component, within initial teacher education programmes.

**Recommendation 12:**

The EC should provide online guidance on best practice in in-service provision across the EU.

**Recommendation 13:**

The EC should investigate collaborative models for the collaborative provision of accredited training at m-level, eg in association with the Erasmus Mundus programme.

**Recommendation 14:**

The EC should sponsor research into levels of funding for media education and film education, in order to provide guidance on minimum provision, models of joint funding, and strategies for effective direction of financial resources.

Country	Respondent's Name	Role
AUSTRIA	Gerhardt Ordnung	FilmABC Institut für angewandte Medienbildung und Filmvermittlung (Institute for applied media literacy and film education)
	Alejandro Bachmann	Head of Education, Austrian Film Museum
BELGIUM	Harveng Gérard	Project leader, Conseil supérieur de l'Éducation aux médias,(Higher Council for Media Education), Belgium (Brussels - Wallonia Federation);
	Elise Van Beurden	Co-ordination educational departement, Jekino Education and Distribution, Belgium
CROATIA	Ivana Jakobovi Alpeza,	Head of Education Film Programme, “Kids Meet Art”
CYPRUS	Berangere Blondeau	International Children's Film Festival of Cyprus: ICFFCY
CZECH REPUBLIC	Pavel Bednarik,	Independent film professional, National Film Archive (Narodni filmovy archiv) Prague;
	Additional comments and endorsement: Petr Platenik	Independent educator and journalist
DENMARK	Ulrik Krapper	CEO, Station Next
	Endorsement: Martin Brandt Pedersen,	Danish Film Institut
ESTONIA	Anu Krabo	Project Manager, Tallinn University Baltic Film and Media School
FINLAND	Marjo Kovanen	Producer, Koulukino (School Cinema)
	Rauna Rahja	Coordinator, Mediakasvatusseura (Finnish Society on Media Education)
FRANCE	Loïc Joffredo	CLEMI - Centre de liaison de l'enseignement et des médias d'information
	Pierre Laporte / Patrick Laudet Pierre Forni	Ministère de l'éducation nationale, de la jeunesse et de la vie associative Centre national du cinéma et de l'Image animée (CNC), Chef du département de l'éducation artistique
GERMANY	Sarah Duve	Managing Director VISION KINO
	Additional comments and endorsement: Prof. Dr. Markus Köster,	Leiter des LWL-Medienzentrums für Westfalen
GREECE	Irene Andriopoulou,	Media Researcher – Media & Film Literacy Consultant
	Additional comments: Menis Theodoridis	Film director and media education specialist
HUNGARY	László Hartai	Chairman of the Hungarian Moving Picture and Media Education Association
	Anette Hilbert	Lecturer, Department of Film, King Sigismund College and Foreign Relations Officer, Hungarian Moving Picture and Media Education Association
ICELAND	Additional commentary: Dr. Imre Szijártó	Head of the MA on Film Pedagogy, Eszterházy Károly University
	Guðni Olgeirsson & Þórunn Jóna Hauksdóttir	Advisors, Dept of Education, Ministry of Education, Science and Culture
ITALY	Laufey Guðjónsdóttir	Director, Icelandic Film Centre
	Simone Moraldi	Coordinamento Universitario per la Didattica del Cinema e dell'Audiovisivo nei Nuovi Licei Artistici, Di.Co.Spe. - Dipartimento Comunicazione e Spettacolo, Università degli Studi, Roma Tre
LATVIA	Endorsed by: Alessandra Guarino	Fondazione Centro Sperimentale di Cinematografia – Scuola Nazionale di Cinema, Roma
	Zanda D di a	International Relations, National Film Centre of Latvia
LITHUANIA	Goda Sosnovskiene	Head of Education Programmes at Cinema Center SKALVIJA (Vilnius) NGO Image Culture Studio (Vilnius)
LUXEMBOURG	Anne Schroeder	Film Producer and Head of Educational department, Centre National de l'audiovisuel (CAN). Union Luxembourgeoise des Producteurs de l'Audiovisuel (ULPA)
MALTA	Mario Azzopardi	Director - Directorate for Lifelong Learning Ministry of Education and Employment
NORWAY	Øystein Gilje	Post-doctoral student, University of Oslo
POLAND	Agata Sotomska,	Education Project Co-ordinator, Polish Film Institute (PISF) ,
	Endorsement: Arkadiusz Walczak	Director of the Warsaw Centre for Educational and Social Innovations and Trainings (WCIES).
PORTUGAL	Mirian Tavares & Vítor Reia-Baptista	CIAC (Research Centre in Arts and Communication) and Universidade do Algarve
	Additional comments and endorsement: Manuel Pinto,	Communication & Society Research Centre Universidade do Minho
REPUBLIC OF IRELAND	Alicia McGivern	Irish Film Institute
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Natasa Slavikova	Independent expert, EU Media Literacy Working Group; Director General of Department of Media, Audiovisual and Copyright, Slovak Republic Ministry of Culture from 2007 to 2012
	Lubica Bizikova	School Education Expert, National Institute for Education, EU Media Literacy Working Group
SLOVENIA	Jelka Sterrgel Petra Slatinšek	Slovenian Film Institute, Kinodvar Cinema
SPAIN	Cristina Tresserras Nacho Andarias	OETI – European Observatory on Children's Television, Catalunya; President of Fundación Proyecta
SWEDEN	Per Eriksson	Programme Officer Children & Youth, Swedish Film Institute
SWITZERLAND	Dr. Jan Sahli	Lecturer Film Studies, University of Zurich – cineducation.ch
THE NETHERLANDS	Victoria Breugem	Head of Education, EYE Film Institute Netherlands;
	Endorsed by: Eeke Wervers,	Senior projectleider, Cultuurnetwerk Nederland
UK	Mark Reid	Head of Education British Film Institute
	Bernard McCloskey, Tom Barrance, Scott Donaldson,	Head of Education, Northern Ireland Screen Media Education Wales Creative Scotland

