'SAVING THE FILM HERITAGE'

The FIAF Summer School - a report by Clyde Jeavons

The 1992 FIAF Summer School - a revival of summer schools previously hosted by the film archive of the DDR under the direction of Wolfgang Klaue - took place from 14th June to 5th July at the J. Paul Getty Jr Conservation Centre, Berkhamsted, Hertfordshire, UK, under the auspices of the National Film Archive (now the NFTVA). This fulfilled a commitment (albeit one year later than planned) made by the former Curator of the NFA, David Francis, partly as an acknowledgment of the relatively advanced and comprehensive conservation facilities and operations established at the Archive's Berkhamsted site since 1987 thanks to the extraordinary and enlightened generosity of Paul Getty.

The aim of the Summer School was - as in its former guises - to provide an intensive training and awareness course for film archivists from all over the world having some (but not necessarily very much) experience of film handling and archival practices. The focus was, by design, mainly technical, with an emphasis on the preservation of moving images, but embracing also the history, philosophy and ethics of film archiving, together with guidance on basic activities such as acquisition, cataloguing, access to collections and programming.

The School was open to FIAF members (in the widest sense) as a first priority, with an emphatic eye on applicants from archives in developing countries or those with poor resources, but consideration was given also to suitable non-FIAF applicants in anticipation of there being spare vacancies - as, indeed, was the case at the time of the closing date. Thirty-two places were eventually made available, significantly more than the 25 originally envisaged, in response to the high demand and some very late applications. In the end, the School was over-subscribed, nevertheless, and a number of FIAF applicants had to be turned down. In most cases this was, regrettably, because their archives had failed to circulate the Summer School information in time (or at all), despite an eight-month application period. Looked at serendipitously, however, this failure to communicate did leave space for a welcome leavening of 'outsiders' on the course, including two from Africa, which would otherwise not have been represented.

There were, in all, 27 participants from twenty different FIAF archives and a further five from non-FIAF organisations*. [* A complete list of participants and their organisations follows at the end of this article.]

Twenty-two countries were represented and all the continents. Four of the participants were picked from the NFA staff itself, to double up as drivers, guides, nursemaids and paramedics. Notable among these was Kevin Patton, Senior Technical Selector at the NFTVA, who carried virtually the entire burden of the practical organisation and day-to-day running of the Summer School and whose contribution to its success and harmony remains inestimable.

The first logistical triumph of the Summer School was the arrival, from all the corners of the globe, of every single participant bar one in time for the Welcome Dinner held in the depths of the English countryside. (The exception was Kwaw Twumasi from Ghana, who arrived, against all economic odds, a few days later.) Credit (and then some) for this achievement is wholly down to Kathleen Dickson, Curator's Assistant at the NFTVA, who remained in dogged contact with all the participants and got them to their destination with the coolness and skill of an air traffic controller in a flight disaster movie. Kathleen also wisely compiled profiles of the participants to hand out to each course member, which proved to be an invaluable ice-breaking exercise.

The schedule for the Summer School was, it has to be admitted, a trifle packed. Fear of failure or breakdown, it would seem, led us to over-organise the timetable so that little was left to chance and every moment of the participants' day, be it work or recreation, was fully mapped out. With the hindsight of experience, we could undoubtedly have been more relaxed on this point and allowed more optional free time for our guests. But the fault was a positive one: the less confident of the visitors appreciated the security of never being at a loose end, and operational smoothness was never at risk.

The participants were all accommodated, on a single or sharing basis according to preference, in a quiet, remote, comfortable and very picturesque period guest house (the 'Old Jordans') run by liberal Quakers. Breakfast and optional evening meals were provided by the guest house, with the Archive taking care of all working lunches and most off-site meals. Despite its attractiveness and its many advantages, there was some prior anxiety about the remoteness of the 'Old Jordans' and its distance (half-an-hour's bus ride) from the Conservation Centre. These worries were rapidly dispelled by the favourable reaction of the participants, who quickly warmed to the exclusive, aesthetic and friendly atmosphere of their surroundings (and, as a result, to each other), discovered English pub culture at its best, bonded with their Quaker hosts (who developed the pleasant habit of laying on ad hoc, late-night barbecues), and appreciated the complete, geographical demarcation of work and leisure. Transportation difficulties were solved by having two mini-buses, chauffeured by Archive staff, permanently on call for local trips of any kind.

The Summer School course itself requires no detailed description here, being fundamentally the technical work of a film archive, from elementary film-handling to complex colour restoration. Suffice to say that it embraced a full range of lectures, training sessions, demonstrations, look-and-learn, hands-on practice, and course-related visits to other institutions - such as Kodak, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Pinewood Studios, Rank Film Laboratories, the Museum of the Moving Image (MOMI), the Bradford Museum of Photography, Film and Television, and the East Anglian Film Archive. The course was complemented by evening screenings of classic British films, social events, outings, and some opportunities for tourism and sightseeing - all arranged and subsidised by the Archive.

Most of the course work and lectures were conducted by the NFTVA's technical staff, led by Henning Schou, Tony Cook, Jack Houshold and David Peterson, supplemented by other Archive and British Film Institute colleagues and - on an invited, goodwill basis - key practitioners in the film, television and video industries, such as producer David Puttnam and film historian and silent cinema expert Kevin Brownlow. Also at the invitation of the Archive, Wolfgang Klaue travelled from Berlin to represent FIAF and, in the light of his own Summer School experience, take part in the concluding de-briefing session with the participants and staff. Many of the lectures and formal proceedings were recorded on video by the Archive's own Video Club, led by Karen Sanders, and in addition, 1,600 still photographs were taken by another staff member, Don Geary*. [* All formal lectures and training papers, and some of the more general presentations, are being edited and transcribed into a dossier which, it is hoped, will eventually be made available to all FIAF member-archives, as well as to the participants themselves.]

A significant adjunct to the Summer School was the creation of a 25-minute training video, THE WORK OF A FILM ARCHIVE, part-sponsored by UNESCO and produced by Flashback Television Productions, which was presented to each of the participants. This introduction to the functions of a modern film archive, based on the practices of the JPGJ Conservation Centre, was noted in the last issue of the Bulletin, together with details of how to aquire copies.

Other adornments to the course, less vital but appreciated nonetheless, were a set of sweatshirts, T-shirts and coffee mugs given to each participant, bearing the motto of the 1992 Summer School, 'Saving the Film Heritage'; donations by various commercial companies of airline bags (from Kodak), briefcases (from Agfa), desk blotters, etc.; a tree-planting ceremony instigated (naturally) by the Israeli contingent; and a presentation of course-completion certificates to all who took part.

Before reflecting on the achievements or criticisms of the Berkhamsted Summer School, it is worth dwelling a little on the financial aspects, crucial as they must be to any future manifestations of this event and the form it may take.

After consultation with Wolfgang Klaue and Brigitte van der Elst, the course fee was set at $1,000 per head, to include all except personal expenses and fares. It was recognised that this would not come close to covering the cost of running the Summer School, and that even so it might be a figure beyond the reach of some of the very applicants the course was trying to attract. Efforts to help those who genuinely could not manage the course fee or their travel costs (or both) were generally successful - notably through the British Council or local funding sources, or, in extremis, FIAF and the NFTVA itself - but in the final analysis, the income from course fees became de facto a relatively lean credit item in the total budget.

After absorption by the NFTVA of staff salary costs and other on-site overheads, the gross expenditure on the Summer School was (at 1992 exchange rates) $105,000. With neither the BFI/NFTVA nor FIAF able to contribute more than modest emergency sums in direct cash terms, raising income against a budget of this scale became an exhausting, sometimes creative and occasionally desperate affair, and the final net deficit of $31,500 (balanced from BFI funds) must be seen as something of an achievement. Apart from the participants' fees and UNESCO's grant towards the training video, significant unconditional contributions came from Henderson's Laboratory, Soho Images (formerly Studio Film and Video Laboratory) and British Gas, all of whom deserve thanks; silver was recovered from junked nitrate film stock and sold; sales of sweatshirts recovered their cost; and, lifesavingly, a training grant of 12,000 ECUs (approximately $12,000) was awarded from the European Economic Community's MEDIA 95 project, LUMIERE, in recognition of the European component of the Summer School.

The conclusion, though, must be that - under what Wolfgang Klaue himself calls 'normal' financial conditions (i.e. without automatic subsidy) - no FIAF Summer School which is to be run on a generous, effective and professional level, even in an advanced archive, can be self-supporting and underwrite its less privileged members; and FIAF itself will inevitably need to play a more central role in helping the host archive to raise both funds and awareness in any future Summer School venture.

Caveats about the balance sheet apart, there is no doubt that the effort is worthwhile. The Berkhamsted undertaking, like its East European predecessors, was an unqualified success - both from a training point of view and in human and social terms. Significantly, the levels of harmony, pleasure and

motivation which such a course can engender were enjoyed as much by the hosts and their staff as by the participants; and the standard of comment and constructive criticism offered by the course members certainly indicated positive gain.

What, though, might be learned from this Nineties version Summer School? According to a slightly amused Klaue, the same things as emerged from his Summer Schools: the value of free time; the need to strike balances between theory and hands-on practice, philosophy and film-handling; whether or not to offer specialization to some participants, a broader range of (perhaps non-technical) topics to others... and so forth.

The experience did seem to us to answer two particular questions which have troubled earlier Summer Schools. Firstly, the inevitability on such a course of having participants with a wide divergence of archival qualifications, experience, knowledge and skills. The trick is not to worry about it: to pitch the course at a predetermined median level; dispense as much hard, basic information as possible; and give every participant full and equal attention. This way everyone will glean something useful from the course, and those who seek more will find it. It is not, as we discovered, just the rank-and-file archivist who needs or desires practical training. Even Klaue was surprised by the presence on the Berkhamsted course of the Head of an archive - but as she pointed out, it was one thing to be an administrator with paper-pushing skills, quite another to know the fundamentals of film preservation at first hand.

Secondly, the 'problem' of language. Again, the Berkhamsted 'solution' became simply a pragmatic one: to conduct the course in English, with no arrangements for formal translation, and to inform the participants in advance that this would be the case and some viable knowledge of English was desirable. It was felt that, apart from being prohibitively costly, any attempt at simultaneous translation, on a group basis or one-to-one, would fatally inhibit the intensity, pace and fluency of the course and compromise the instructors. The prognosis was judged to be a good one. Most of the non-Anglophone participants knew enough, or grasped enough, to get by, or caught up later by consultation with other course members or through their documentation. In the last resort, there were enough staff or colleagues on hand able to extemporise translations in French or Spanish. More importantly, the participants themselves agreed that the poly-methodological nature of the course rendered systematic translation impractical.

Given, then, that there is a proven, resurrected appetite for the FIAF Summer School, but that its financial imperatives

cannot be ignored nor the burden on whoever hosts it taken lightly, what is the best way forward? Three alternative models suggest themselves:

1. Continue to hold the Summer School at appropriate intervals in one suitably equipped archive, such as the NFTVA's JPGJ Conservation Centre at Berkhamsted. The advantages here are a definite willingness to do it; good facilities; experience; continuity. The organisational strain on the Archive, however, would mean hosting the event triennially at most. (Question: What is the optimum period between Summer Schools before FIAF runs out of fresh participants?)

2. Hold the Summer School at appropriate intervals in a selection of suitable archives, e.g. on a rotation basis. The advantages would be the possibility of holding the event more frequently; a sharing of the work burden; different approaches to training; a change of the host language from time to time.

3. Choose alternate archives, but share the organisation and work (and some of the cost?), i.e. attach experienced Summer School staff from other archives to the host archive; in other words, run the Summer School on an inter-archival basis.

It is for the FIAF Executive Committee and the membership to judge which (if any) of these is the most practical proposal. The best way to begin, perhaps, is to set up an advisory training group which might become the foundation for all of FIAF's training needs, the Summer School included, aimed at devising strategies for fund-raising, staff exchanges and international consultation.

And while we're at it, why Summer School...?

Clyde Jeavons
Curator, National Film and Television Archive, London, UK

[As well as those named in the article, profoundest thanks are due to the rest of the staff of the NFTVA - all of whom contributed directly or indirectly to the success of the 1992 Summer School - and in particular to Deputy Curator Anne Fleming]

Participants at the Berkhamsted Summer School

Anastassios Adamopoulos, Greek Film Archive, Athens

Gad Astar, Israel Film Archive, Jerusalem

Paul Betts, NFTVA, UK

Mark Bodner, North West Film Archive, Manchester, UK

Johann Boehm, Austrian Film Archive, Vienna

Ki-Up Cho, Korean Film Archive, Seoul

Sophie De Meyer, Royal Film Archive, Brussels

Serge Desaulniers, Quebec Cinémathèque, Montreal

Thuy Dung Dinh, Vietnam Film Institute, Hanoi

Nadine Dubois, Service des Archives du Film, Bois d'Arcy

Donald Frye, Library of Congress, Washington, USA

Martin Koerber, Stiftung Deutsche Kinemathek, Berlin

Marilyn Koolik, Steven Spielberg Jewish Film Archive, Jerusalem

Eric Loné, Service des Archives du Film, Bois d'Arcy

Atanacio Martinez Sanchez, Colombian Film Archive, Bogota

Vitor Martins, Portuguese Cinémathèque, Lisbon

Zuleide Flora de Medeiros, Brazilian Cinémathèque, São Paulo

Juan José Mugni, National Image Archive, Uruguay

Bill North, NFTVA, UK

Kevin Patton, NFTVA, UK

Jana Prikrylova, Czech Film Archive, Prague

Olavi Simila, Finnish Film Archive, Helsinki

Ardiouma Soma, FESPACO Cinémathèque, Burkina Faso

Maria Manuel Sousa, Portuguese Cinémathèque, Lisbon

Chris Swinbanks, National Film and Sound Archive, Canberra

Glenise Tompkins, NFTVA, UK

Dennis Tong, Hong Kong Film Archive

Kwaw Twumasi, National Archives of Ghana

Gerhard Ullmann, Munich Film Museum,

Maria Fernanda Valverde, Image Permanence Group, Mexico

Kenneth Weissman, Library of Congress, Washington, USA

Rudolf Worschech, Deutsches Filmmuseum, Frankfurt

What they said...

'Events such as this Summer School are another evidence of FIAF's vitality...Serge came back a new man!' (Robert Daudelin)

'The most important thing I have ever done professionally... (and) the best times I ever had.' (Serge Desaulniers)

'...a wonderful experience for me and one I shall never forget. Everyone wanted it to be a success and in turn it brought out the very best in them.' (Kevin Patton)

'The knowledge taught to our representative (Ardiouma Soma)... will be very useful to the setting up of our African film library.' (Filippe Sawadogo)

'...let's hope there will be projects in the future that might bring us together again.' (Martin Koerber)

'Wolfgang Klaue was quite surprised when he saw me, a director of an archive, on the course... Frankly, I think every director of a film archive could benefit from this most worthwhile learning experience... We "directors"... lose sight of what it is that we are so busy administering... I have come away with the most awesome new respect for the media that is sitting on my shelves.' (Marilyn Koolik)

'Nothing can replace interpersonal contact.' (Mark Bodner)

'The School brought home the truly international nature of this profession.' (Paul Betts)

'To baby-sit 32 kids is not an easy task...' (Dennis Tong)

'I found old experiences confirmed: we do not only communicate knowledge by these training courses. FIAF Summer Schools also have an important human and social effect... I do hope that this... method of training will be continued.' (Wolfgang Klaue)

----------000----------

NATIONAL FILM ARCHIVE
Curator Clyde Jeavons

BRITISH FILM INSTITUTE

FIAF SUMMER SCHOOL 1992

The next FIAF Summer School will take place over a three-week period from 14 June to 5 July 1992, and will be hosted and organised by the National Film Archive (London) at its modern J Paul Getty Jnr Conservation Centre in Berkhamsted, Herts., approximately 35 miles from Central London. This is a revival of the successful Summer Schools which were formerly held under the auspices of the DDR (East German) Film Archive.

The aim of the Summer School is to provide an intensive three-week training course for film archivists from all over the world who have some experience of film handling and archival practices. The focus of the course will be mainly technical, with an emphasis on the preservation of moving images, but will embrace also the history and philosophy of film archiving, as well as guidance on essential activities such as acquisition, cataloguing, access and programming.

There will be a total of 25 places available, at least half of which, it is hoped, will go to applicants from archives in developing countries or those with poor resources or lack of training, who are encouraged to apply. We expect that a number of these will require help with their travel, accommodation and course expenses, and both FIAF and the NFA are seeking substantial sponsorship funding for this purpose from such organisations as UNESCO and the British Council. Applicants needing financial assistance can and should approach the British Council office in their country, as well as other national sources. The fee for the three-week course is likely to be in the region of $875 (US dollars), possibly more, excluding international travel.

A detailed course programme has been worked out, including lectures, training sessions, demonstrations, course-related visits, social events, and some tourism and sight-seeing. A brief draft summary of the programme is enclosed, together with a list of proposed training/lecture subjects, an information sheet and an application form.

continued/...

British Film Institute
21 Stephen Street
London W1P 1PL

Telephone 071-255 1444
Telex 27624 BFILDNG
Facsimile 071-436 7950

Most of the expert staff of the NFA will be involved in the course training, supplemented by other British Film Institute staff and key practitioners in the film, television and video industries, who will give lectures and/or host visits to their own organisations.

The main venue for the Summer School, the JPGJ Conservation Centre, is an up-to-date film archiving complex set in attractive grounds which is ideal in size and ambience for a course of this kind. Its facilities, which are being studied and copied by other archives throughout the world, include large, purpose-built preservation storage facilities for tri-acetate film and video, laboratories for the repair, testing and printing of archival film, an off-air TV/video recording suite and telecine operation, engineering and administration units, and a stills photographic studio. By the summer of 1992, a further film/video storage vault and custom-designed paper and photo stores should have been added to the site.

Participants will be accommodated for the duration of the Summer School in a quiet and comfortable Guest House ('Old Jordans') located in the countryside near a neighbouring town, Beaconsfield, about half-an-hour's drive from the Conservation Centre. Commuting transport will be laid on every day, and there are convenient travel facilities for exploring the area and making visits to London. One of our endeavours will be to make every course member feel at home and well looked after, as well as passing on some of the excitement and the skills of motion picture preservation.

Applications are invited from, initially, FIAF members, using an application form. If there are more applicants than places available, a selection will be made by the NFA. If there are fewer FIAF applicants than places available, then we will seek qualified participants from a wider field. Don't panic if you fail to get into the Summer School in 1992. If we're successful and can raise the necessary funding, we hope it will be possible to repeat the School in subsequent years.

Clyde Jeavons, Curator, NFA (London)

FIAF SUMMER SCHOOL 1992: DRAFT PROGRAMME SUMMARY

14 JUNE to 5 JULY 1992

DAY 1 (Sunday 14 June) Arrival of participants at 'Old Jordans' Guest House. Registration, welcome and dinner.

DAY 2 **J Paul Getty Jnr Conservation Centre: Briefing and Introduction**

Videos: 1. Health and Safety on site
2. Preservation Activities at NFA

Guided tour of JPGJCC

DAY 3 **JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: Introductory Lectures**

e.g. 1. History of NFA and FIAF
2. Film Restoration (+ screening)
3. History of Cinematography
4. Day-to-Day Running of the NFA
5. Health and Safety at the NFA

DAY 4 **British Film Institute & National Film Theatre**

Tour of BFI: Address by Director
Coach tour of London
Tour of NFT & screenings

DAY 5 **JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: Basic Film Handling**

All-day lecture and demo

DAY 6 **East Anglian Film Archive (Norwich)**

All-day trip to EAFA + talk + tour
Discussions on developing archives; MA Course in Film Studies, etc.

DAY 7 **NFA Gaydon + Stratford:**

All-day trip to

1. NFA nitrate storage site at Gaydon, Warwickshire
2. Stratford-on-Avon: Sightseeing

contd/...

DAY 8 (Sunday 21 June) Oxford

Guided tour of Oxford + sightseeing

DAY 9 JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: Film Lectures

Nitrate, acetate, polyester, colour, etc.

DAY 10 JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: Film Lectures

Survey of film structure, preparation, treatment, grading, printing, processing, technical selection, access, technical records, etc.

DAY 11 Technicolor + BBC

All-day trip to 1. Technicolor Laboratories
2. BBC Archives (Brentford)

DAYS 12, 13 & 16 JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: 'Look and Learn'

'Hands-on' participation in NFA preservation activities: methodology, exercises, etc.

Approx. half-day per technical department.

DAY 14 Pinewood/Elstree/tourism

All-day trip to 1. Pinewood & Elstree film studios
2. Windsor Castle: sightseeing

DAY 15 (Sunday 28 June) Bradford

All-day trip to Bradford Museum of Film and Photography. Tour and IMAX screenings.

DAY 16 (see above)

DAY 17 Kodak/National Sound Archive

All-day trip to 1. Kodak Training Centre, Hemel Hempstead (lectures)
2. NSA, London (lecture + tour)

contd/...

DAY 18 JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: NFA Activities (Berkhamsted)

Lectures on
1. Buildings and storage vaults
2. Administration
3. Computerisation
4. Video preservation
5. TV acquisition

DAY 19 British Film Institute: NFA Activities (London)

1. Cataloguing
2. Acquisitions
3. Access
4. Curatorial problems/staff training

NFT: Museum of the Moving Image

Visit to MOMI: guided tour
Screenings at NFT

DAY 20 **Beaconsfield: NFTS**

Visit to National Film and Television School: tour + lecture

JPG Jnr Conservation Centre: Talks

1. BKSTS
2. FIAF

+ Debates on Access/Preservation; relations with FIAF colleagues in developing countries
+ Debriefing and feedback from participants.

DAY 21 Sightseeing: Henley-on-Thames
Marlow
Waddesdon Manor

Farewell Ceremony/Dinner/Dance

DAY 22 (Sunday 5 July) Departure of participants

contd/...

Sample Notes

i) Breakfast and dinner will normally be taken at Old Jordans Guest House, and lunch at JPGJCC, except when trips make this impractical.

ii) All transport will be provided, including organised visits and sightseeing trips, but not for private trips to London, etc.

iii) Courses, lectures, etc, will normally be conducted in English, but translation will be provided where possible. It will help, however, if participants have some basic knowledge of English.

iv) Participants are advised to bring sufficient money with them for their personal needs (shopping, drinks, private trips, etc).

v) Some sharing of rooms at the Guest House will be necessary.

vi) This draft programme/itinerary is subject to alteration and should be taken as exemplary only.

FIAF SUMMER SCHOOL 1992

Draft List of Proposed Training/Lecture Subjects

1. History of NFA, FIAF and Film Archiving Movement
2. Basic Film Structure and Film Handling
3. Cellulose Nitrate and its Preservation
4. Cellulose Acetate and its Preservation
5. Polyester
6. Basic Film Processing Theory
7. Colour Film Preservation
8. Colour Film Duplication
9. Film Storage Conditions
10. Preservation Principles and Rules
11. Air Conditioning in Film Storage Vaults
12. Types of Film Stock in Current Use
13. Film Treatments
14. Step Printers/Continuous Printers/Optical Printers
15. Health & Safety in the NFA
16. The Work of the NFA
17. Polymer Degradation
18. Film Examination
19. Technical Selection
20. Cataloguing
21. Viewing Service Access
22. Donor Access
23. Production Library Service
24. Selection and Acquisition of Films and TV programmes

continued/...

25. Programming from Archive Collections

26. Legal Deposit of Films and TV

27. Copyright

28. The Work of FIAF

29. Computerisation of Records

30. Curatorial Problems

31. Video Preservation and Storage

32. Specialist Archive Buildings and their specifications

33. The Work of the British Film Institute

34. The Work of the National Film Theatre

35. Staff Training

36. The Story of a Film Restoration Project

FIAF SUMMER SCHOOL 1992

Debrief & Feedback from Participants
Friday 3 July 1992

Present: All Summer School participants
Clyde Jeavons
Anne Fleming
Henning Schou
Wolfgang Klaue

In attendance: Kathleen Dickson

CJ asked for general comments on the level and content of the course.

Marilyn Koolik said the first information received about the Summer School suggested it would be very technical, which is very useful for those coming from non-technical archvies. However she felt the course had beenw eighted too much towards technical aspects - more time should have been spent on the non-technical side and on discussing philosophy and ethics. The most interesting thing for her had been David Puttnam's talk.

CJ agreed that there could have been more of that kind of thing, and thought perhaps the non-technical stuff should have been scheduled earlier in the course.

Gad Astar said he thought the balance was good, but thought some of the lectures were on a level most people did not understand.

CJ said this was certainly true of the sound lecture, but perhaps also in other areas. We had assumed we would be attracting more people with that standard of technical knowledge already. David Peterson's talk was very good on basic film handling - we should have had more on that level.

Maria Valverde thought the technical material was not too basic, but suggested participants should have been able to read about the subjects beforehand.

Chris Swinbanks thought it might be worth having two different levels: one more basic for developing archives and people new to archiving, and a higher level for more experienced people.

Nadine Dubois suggested lectures could have been held in the mornings, followed by Look and Learn sessions in the afternoons to bring the two closer together.

Martin Koerber agreed that theory and practice should have been closer together and thought there should have been more practical lectures. He felt the level should not be lower but perhaps there should be several different levels. He did not agree that there should have been more non-technical material, since one can do things like cataloguing in one's own archive but technical training requires facilities some people do not have in their own country.

Ken Weissman had also wanted to learn more about non-technical aspects and was therefore a little disappointed. It was however comforting to know that they were doing the right things and having similar problems, etc. The personal benefit he had derived was in being able to interact with other members of the group. He thought the idea of having different levels was a good one.

CJ asked whether participants would now return to their own archives and feel sad at what they have got, having seen what could be achieved?

Maria Valverde said no, it was useful to see how far removed you are from this. The NFA is a model archive.

Wolfgang Klaue agreed that although some archives might be discouraged by visiting such as advanced organisation, it at least gives you a model to strive towards. You have to think about what you can do under your own conditions.

CJ said it was very important for everyone to write a report back later on their experiences.

At the moment there are no black film archives in FIAF - it was very important that the two African participants were there.

Kwaw Twumasi thought that part of the problem was simply a lock of awareness of such things as FIAF.

CJ said it had been suggested that a consultancy system ought to be set up for people wanting to develop or set up archives to call on. At the moment there is no machinery within FIAF to do this. However, there are more and more archivists who are retired or semi-retired, whose expertise can be used - this should perhaps be taken advantage of more, with FIAF as co-ordinator. However, there is a limit to what we can do - none of us is a training archive. Longer periods of training on attachments are certainly more productive if finance is available. In the short term, we have to close down for three weeks and people go away not fully trained.

Ken Weissman said that the Library of Congress takes on students during the summer as interns, who receive training for three months and then go off and do something else. These summer placements could be offered to other archivists instead if this could be worked out. Anyone interested should write to Ken.

CJ added that the NFA would not normally turn down any other archivist who wants to come and do on-the-job training if they were prepared to do it for nothing. The ideal would be to have a central training archive and part of the policy of the European grouping of FIAF members was to try to establish a training laboratory in Europe. This needs setting up, however, and we have to decide where to put it, etc.

HS added that these also need to be multilingual. This is one of the problems encountered in the Preservation Commission.

CJ asked whether participants would have liked more philosophy and ethics on the course?

Mark Bodner said yes, there should be more discussion on this.

Marilyn Koolik thought more filmmakers could be brought in to talk about whether their inspiration is from old cinema, for example. CJ said part of the problem with filmmakers is that they are hard to get hold of, for example, Sir Richard Attenborough was too busy making CHAPLIN to come and talk about it. We would however try to fit in more of these kinds of talks next time.

Wolfgang Klaue said that the Schools held in Berlin covered all aspects of archiving work, including cataloguing, etc, though they had not had any filmmakers. Complaints had been made then that it was too broad-based and as a result of these previous comments it had been decided to make this Summer School a technical school.

Martin Koerber suggested there should have been more discussion of the problems the NFA is experiencing. On the very first day they had been shown the training video and told how great the NFA is. There should have been more discussion about what is wrong with the NFA rather than promoting it as such a good place, as the problems are common to all archives.

CJ said the point of the video was to show how you do it, not to show the problems. However, it is a good point that we should talk about the problems as well.

CJ said we could not afford to have interpreters to help overcome language problems. Some understanding of English had been asked for on the application form, but had language been a problem?

Atanacio said he had preferred to stay in Look and Learn rather than going to the lectures because of his problems with English. Maria Manuel Sousa had also found it difficult to understand sometimes, especially the technical terms used.

Wolfgang Klaue said there had been similar problems in Berlin although the course was advertised as being in English. Translations in French had been provided and had been helpful for participants who didn't speak English well enough, but this was of course an additional cost.

CJ felt that some lecturers had not adapted their talks to the fact that they were speaking to non-English speakers.

CJ asked whether participants felt there had been too many trips and visits planned?

Most people were happy with the trips and visits. However, Ken felt that a completely free day or weekend should have been scheduled in the middle of the course for people to re-charge.

Gad Astar would have liked to hear more about the use of computers. Not just in record-keeping, but in the actual process of grading or tinting, etc.

Martin Koerber wished to praise Martin Coffill for his Look and Learn session, which he thought was one of the best prepared. There should perhaps have been discussion about the films screened afterwards though, particularly if they had been restorations. HS suggested such a discussion could be tied in with ethics as well.

CJ asked if participants would have liked more films, more visual material?

There were no strong feelings on this.

Kwaw thought credit should be given for the standard of food served at the Conservation Centre and at Old Jordans.

Marilyn said, on behalf of all participants, that they really appreciated the efforts made in arranging this course and, in spite of the comments, everyone was going away more knowledgeable. They appreciated all the concern and patience of the staff - this really did contribute to a good time and a good feeling on the course. They had been made most welcome.

CJ asked if Old Jordans had been OK as accommodation in spite of being in the middle of nowhere?

Everyone felt this had been quite acceptable.

CJ said in conclusion that the main problem we have had, and are going to have if we do this again, is the cost. Although the NFA is in a sense a government-funded archive, we cannot get extra money for this kind of event. Through the participants, this must be raised seriously in FIAF - how to run a course like this without charging everyone a rate most archives simply cannot afford. FIAF, through whatever powers it has, must find the money for such an event. FIAF had not contributed any money to the Summer School.

* * * * * *

FIAF SUMMER SCHOOL 1992

Notes of a Debriefing Meeting held on Friday 11 September 1992 at 2.30pm, at Berkhamsted

Present:	Clyde Jeavons (Chair)	Don Geary
	Melinda Arthur	Jack Houshold
	Tony Cook	Kevin Patton
	Kathleen Dickson	David Peterson
	Anne Fleming	Henning Schou

CJ formally thanked everyone present for their individual contributions, and for bringing all the staff together in such an effective way. HS said thanks were also due to DG and his wife for the photographic services.

1. INCOME & EXPENDITURE

An interim breakdown of the income and expenditure for the Summer School was tabled. CJ hoped to present the final budget breakdown to FIAF as much that needs to be said involves money.

TC pointed out that there were also hidden costs, such as KP's salary, production losses, etc. It was agreed, however, only to include the above-the-line costs in the breakdown. All in all we seem to have incurred a deficit of about £21,000.

CJ said it had been disheartening that we received nothing from the BFI, but he would try to press WS on this again. Also, the only real help received from FIAF was the $2,000 from Anna-Lena Wibom at the Swedish Film Institute to help the Vietnamese participant.

Some wages and overtime payments appeared on the Nominal Ledger which should have been taken from the salaries budget. KD would speak to Martin Page about this.

2. BALANCE OF SCHEDULE

CJ thought there probably ought to have been a weekend off in the middle - this was an important observation made by a number of the participants. DG thought more time in the lunch break for participants to go shopping, to the bank, etc, might also have been needed. A little more free time would be built in to any subsequent Summer School.

HS thought the suggestion of having theory in the morning and practical exercises in the afternoon was a good one. CJ agreed there should be slightly less talking and more hands-on sessions.

It was also thought the course could be split into two strands, though these should come together again at certain points so that participants were not divided too much. HS suggested specialist classes in specific subjects, followed by a workshop on that topic for those who are interested.

3. OUTINGS/VISITS

DG thought a lot of participants had found the BBC visit rather hard going. KP said part of the problem was that they had been tired from the Technicolor visit that morning. This trip could perhaps be cut out, and Anne Hanford could be asked to come and give a talk instead.

The Pinewood visit was considered to be excellent.

It was also agreed that the visit to the Bradford Museum could be dropped, particularly as this involved a long coach trip each way.

4. COURSE CONTENT

CJ thought the balance was more or less right for a technical-style course, as had been planned for, with some elements of other aspects of film archiving added in, but it was generally felt the other elements should have been introduced earlier.

CJ suggested the visit to Stephen Street could be combined with the talks by Stephen Street staff.

5. MIX OF PARTICIPANTS

CJ thought there had been a remarkably good mix, though this may not be typical. Only one participant had not really joined in properly.

A lot of archives had not signalled the Summer School to their staff: we could have had even more applications than was the case.

CJ would make the point to FIAF that part of the attraction is getting a mix of different kinds and different levels of people, rather than aiming at technicians only, for example. Those with greater experience had been able to help others on the course. It was also felt that the numbers were about right.

6. LANGUAGE PROBLEMS

It was thought problematic to have interpreters as they cannot speak at the same time as the lecturer. KP said visual aids and just watching people as they work helped with these difficulties.

CJ wondered if it was worth having the additional strain and cost of translation? TC pointed out that we could still only offer a small range of languages so this would still mean having some kind of limitation on the languages applicants were expected to have.

CJ thought it would be helpful to have a summary or précis of the lecture available which participants could read at their leisure. Another factor is the speed at which the lecture is given, but also the kind of language used, eg idioms should be avoided.

7. ACCOMMODATION

Everyone seemed to be satisfied with the accommodation at Old Jordans, although one or two had mentioned that they could not go shopping in the evening, for example. As long as some longer lunch breaks are allowed this could be overcome. KP added that the participants had enjoyed being able to get totally away from the Archive in the evening.

8. TRANSPORT

These arrangements had also gone well. KP thought the coach company used had been excellent.

9. OTHER COMMENTS

The selection of free gifts given to participants (mugs, sweatshirts and photographs) was considered about right.

TC asked what was happening with the video shot by the Video Club. DG explained that Karen was having a rest from this before doing the editing. TC suggested the whole lot could be transferred to VHS in the meantime, and properly catalogued. Ultimately Karen would be asked to edit the material into a short video to be sent to the participants, perhaps as a Christmas present. TC added that the Machine Room had originally offered to make copies free, but may lose interest - TC would mention this again at his forthcoming meeting with them.

TC still had a box of 'The Work of a Film Archive' tapes in his office which could be sent to some lecturers, major sponsors, regional archives, etc - AF would make a list and TC a list from Berkhamsted of people who should receive a copy.

HS said we should also decide what kind of (official) photographic record will be kept. CJ suggested a "selection committee" could be arranged to make this decision.

10. PARTICIPANTS' COMMENTS

Marilyn Koolik would have liked the course to be less technical but, as said above, it was thought the balance was about right for a technical course.

It was thought the David Puttnam-style talk, although excellent and well-received, could have been more about the use of archival material. Perhaps a practitioner such as Jerry Kuehl could be asked to give a talk of this kind.

CJ thought it interesting that some participants carried a brief to solicit consultancy for their own burgeoning archives. It was felt that FIAF was the correct "clearing-house" for such approaches in the first instance.

Mark Bodner would have liked an introductory session where everyone could have said something about themselves. It was felt this was an embarrassing and awkward procedure and that it was better for people to get to know each other informally. AF added that KD had produced an immensely useful profile of all participants which could have been given out at the start.

Mark had also said that not enough time was devoted to video technology. It had been a conscious decision not to spend much time on this, but it was interesting to see the comment made. It was felt we should add access generally to the course as well as video technology.

Dennis Tong had also made some specific comments, eg that it was important to have a proper, air-conditioned lecture room. CJ agreed it had been a bit of a squash in the Chandelier Room. TC said it had been known in advance this would be a problem and everything possible had been done to make it better. The only solution would be a temporary building which would of course mean a substantial extra cost.

Dennis had also suggested that film archive management should have been covered. CJ felt this was implicit in the course, but is perhaps something FIAF should offer; it was not really appropriate for the Summer School as it is not useful for everyone.

On the question of how often the Summer School should take place, TC thought there were three points to consider: organisation, cost and loss of production. It should now be much easier to organise another, and as long as we break even it is irrelevant how much it costs - the only real question is therefore loss of production.

It was agreed that the NFA could perhaps hold a Summer School every three years. If different archives took on the role of host this could be every two years. There was also no reason why this could not be co-operative between several different archives at a time.

CJ undertook to produce a dossier-style report which would incorporate many of the observations made by staff and participants, and which would serve as a means of reporting to FIAF and, possibly, as a basis for an article in the FIAF Bulletin.

* * * * * * * *