Industry Partnership Concept

EMERGING MEDIA EXPLORATION

Erasmus+

Grant agreement no.: 2018-1-DE01-KA203-004282
Project Consortium: University Babelsberg KONRAD WOLF (Germany); Tampere University (Finland); Tampere University of Applied Sciences (Finland); University of Lincoln (United Kingdom); University of Central Lancashire (United Kingdom)

Industry Partnership Concept

Björn Stockleben, Film University Babelsberg KONRAD WOLF, Germany
Carita Forsgren, Tampere University of Applied Sciences, Finland
Martyn Thayne, University of Lincoln, United Kingdom
Sophie Tummescheit, Film University Babelsberg KONRAD WOLF, Germany;

What this document is about

This document summarises the consortium's experience with collaborations between student teams on BA and MA level and between industry partners university course settings. It does not cover research cooperations on PhD or staff level, as these are not within the scope of the EMEX project.

When creating industry partnerships, finding the common ground between the university, the company and the students regarding expected outputs and benefits, engagement and intensity is crucial. In general, universities and industry actors tend to have their distinct rhythms which are hard to synchronise. On one hand, this is especially true for small companies and agencies, who are usually accustomed to quickly-paced and focused work, while students work on cooperation projects beside other assignments during the study term. On the other hand, large corporations and public organisations sometimes need time to include such co-operation in their planning. Apart from structural differences, it is important to adjust mutual expectations. Students might hope for employment possibilities or license deals, or to simply network with interesting people from the industry. Companies might be searching for new ideas or new talent. The universities profit from being able to provide more authentic education, and opportunities for work on up-to-date topics. Partners should be ready to discuss mutual benefits and expectations right from the start, but should look for long-term benefits rather than short-term gains - in the experience of the EMEX partners, successful university-industry partnerships typically need some time to unfold.

This document addresses some of the key challenges and shows solutions that have been employed in practice. The recommendations are based both on the findings from interviews with industry and university protagonists and the practice of course implementation during the EMEX project.

Connecting with industry partners

The first step for any partnership is connecting. Where can universities find industry partners - or make themselves easier to find for companies? Networking is the key. Having information about partnership possibilities on a university website is fine and recommendable, but active, human-to-human networking is still an important tool for making any long-term connections. This has been proven to work for several of the EMEX project partners, for instance TAMK Art & Media.

How to network with industry partners?

- Attending conferences & fairs;
- Organising conferences, Symposiums & Workshops;
- Informal discussions, listening to people, discovering their needs;
- Formal interviews of industry experts, either by students or teachers;
- Joining industry associations;
- Taking advantage of the industry connections and opportunities made available via internal careers and employability services.

In some sense, networking resembles catching fish: You get the interest of the fish by going to the places where they assemble, then set your lure, and slowly reel the fish in.

When networking, the representative of a university should listen carefully to what companies currently need, and make projections and suggestions to them about their possible future requirements and how the university could contribute. Future needs are what matter to our students, and are the reason for this activity. By having discussions with industry professionals and researchers from other universities, it is possible to get a sense of likely future needs.

Meeting the industry needs

How can a university then meet the needs of the industry, either current or future? The most sensible way would be to have some flexibility in our curriculum. If we compare the curriculum to a high-speed train which cannot be stopped for the next decade, this means that we cannot pick up any potentially useful information from smaller stations which we hurtle through on our journey.

Flexibility in the curriculum means that the teaching staff should also be open to change. This is a delicate matter since, if the demand for change comes from external input, valued teachers can feel that their expertise is under attack. Within the EMEX project, workshops were created where teachers and industry professionals from several countries worked together, giving students a flexible but supportive framework to work on different kinds of media concepts. In this way, the expertise of all, including that of the students, was integrated together, and no-one's specific skill set was ignored.

A prerequisite for successful industry collaborations is the adoption of authentic project-based learning approaches, e.g. responding to live industry briefs, to situate students in more professional modes of working. This form of project-based learning can help to embed emerging media literacies by engaging students in authentic challenges / problems. This can be considered a form of knowledge transfer where the industry partner can take advantage of the expertise and ingenuity of students to help them innovate, ideate and gather feedback/insights on their projects.

Partnership models

Several models should be available for different kinds of commitments for the partnerships.
An industry partner should feel free and not restricted by the partnership with the university. The universities and companies should ideally form friendly and mutually beneficial links, rather than being inextricably joined together.

The models of course vary according to the goals; each case and each partnership is different.

- **Benefits for students:** Situated learning, authentic feedback and mentorship, professional development and employability
- **Benefits for industry partners:** Innovation and ideation, knowledge transfer financial incentives, graduate employment and networking

Partner combinations

During the EMEX project and beyond, the consortium partners gathered experiences with different combinations of partners. In this chapter we discuss the up- and downsides of the different approaches.

Multiple partners - One partner per team
This setting usually creates a close relationship between partner and team. The teams can choose the brief that suits them most, which may increase engagement. Also, partner and team may assume a common identity towards the other teams and partners in the course. However, if a partner gets assigned an underperforming team, it may dissuade the partner from further collaborations. When working with new partners, it might be commendable to either also assign a tutor from the university side or hand-pick the teams. In this setting, the student teams have less common ground than in other settings, calling for individual project tutoring.

Multiple partners - One partner for multiple teams
This setting alleviates the problem of underperforming teams but sacrifices the individual connection. The teams will feel a certain competition and the partner might decide to bet their efforts on the most efficient team. On the other hand, teams working on the same briefing may profit from mutual exchange. The benefit of having a choice of partners is attractive to the students; however, the teachers should be ready to mitigate the problem that partners may appear differently attractive. Partners may get into a competitive situation.

One partner - multiple briefings

Having one partner offering multiple briefings combines the advantage of choice while eliminating the risk that a partner might not find a team. However the partner should be ready to let go of an unpopular brief. The common experience between the teams is limited, similar to the very first combination, so project tutoring has to be fairly individual. The partner might be overwhelmed by having to supervise multiple teams simultaneously.

One partner one briefing

In this setting, approaches and results can be very easily compared, with tutoring sessions held in the plenary meetings. Partner feedback may also be more centralised. Additional skill training can be offered for all teams, as all teams will need similar skills. However, as the students have no choice, the teams may expose different motivation towards the task, unless the briefing leaves enough room for interpretation.

Lincoln example - FairyGlam Hackathon

A 1-day interdisciplinary hackathon where a local toy company provided a design challenge for students: the brief was to develop concepts for digitising their various ranges of toys. The industry partner provided information about their company ethos, addressed recent innovations from their competitors and were available for feedback throughout the event. Students went through a series of ideation exercises, which culminated in them pitching their best ideas to the client at the end of the day. While there were some good ideas developed, these were not finalised, and it is unclear how the partner might explore them further in the future. Whilst this was a workshop that took place on campus, due to social distancing measures a hybrid approach for facilitating collaboration was implemented. There were 4 small teams of 5-6 students situated across three rooms, which were connected virtually via MS Teams. The teams were able to interact and chat in person, but digital whiteboards (concept board) were used to document and facilitate collaborative ideation. This project drew inspiration from a number of creative methods that were piloted by EMEX.

Frequent partners vs. one-time or first-time partners

Universities should aim to make a first-time partner into a regular partnership, but only one step at a time. The company should never feel too obliged to the university, as noted earlier.

Small companies work differently to big ones; a university has to take this into account. In a small company, money and thus the time of its workers, can be a bigger issue. However, if the partnership is presented as a free R&D service, a smaller company may well be interested. In a big company (such as a broadcasting or publishing company), organisational changes can be a disadvantage, when the person who originally started the partnership is replaced. Also, if the company structure is very hierarchical, any partnership and every related change will have to be approved by the very top management, which can make the process slow and bureaucratic.

A major issue for one- or first-time partners is expectation management. The working cultures of universities and companies are vastly different; potential partners often initially think about university cooperation in the same way they would approach working with a contractor. They do not have a preconceived idea of the kind of output they could reasonably expect from students, nor can they estimate the time they would need to invest to enable the students to produce desirable results. Remember that traveling to the university costs the partner quite some time and that they might also not undertake this effort. (Briefing/Negotiation with a new partner: expectation of results, investment of time, usage of results, modes of communication and collaboration)

A university should avoid being too rigid with its collaboration models. The university should usually negotiate the means and intensity of engagement with the company while retaining direction of the didactic and methodical aspects of teaching, unless the partner also has experience in this area.

Developing Project Briefs

During the EMEX project, we found that there were rules of thumb, but not final recommendations regarding parameters such as abstract vs. concrete, open vs. confined, prototype vs. concept, long vs. short.
Keeping partners engaged in students' work throughout the process is beneficial. If the company merely gives the brief and then comes back for the result, is it a true partnership or rather a straight commission? The university should make it clear that they want a deeper engagement with the industry partner than simply having students do commissions.
For example, there have been cases within the EMEX consortium where a company has come asking for partnership with a university, giving a very specific commission and asking for a price estimate. When this estimate has been calculated and given, the company representative used it to bargain with

one of their regular contractors. Needless to say that this is against the spirit we seek in a collaboration.

In general, the following concepts may help to craft a good briefing:

- Creative vs. “mechanical” tasks - students do not learn that much from “mechanical” activities, but often companies tend to want exactly that from students;
- Offer the students the opportunity to do extra Research and Development (R&D) for the industry partner;
- Open solution space (company should not let them do anything they actually do themselves);
- Partners should be open to surprise;
- Students have to have enough freedom to come up with individual solutions;
- The university can help the company partner to shape the brief-

Once the briefing has been introduced to the students, it is advisable to leave room for questions and to let each team formulate a “letter of understanding” to the partner, where they rephrase the briefing in their own words to check whether the intentions of the partner have been captured accordingly.

Examples of project briefings

The two following summarised example briefings differ in one important aspect. While the briefing for “Unexpected Futures” has a purely thematic approach that leaves open the choice of technologies to be used, the “PIE” project has a predefined scope and specifies technologies to be used.
Both approaches try to provoke unusual ideas and solutions in different ways. In the brief of “Unexpected Futures”, the question of technologies is secondary, to avoid limiting possible ideas.
The PIE-Briefing calls for exploration and experimentation, and attempts to create a "project sandbox" for wild ideas.

Unexpected Futures
addresses the possible social, political, environmental and technological factors of the year 2050. The aim is to go beyond typical utopian and dystopian visions of the future that have become popularised within our media culture and leverage speculative design processes in response to the complex socio-economic, ecological and ethical challenges facing the world over the next 30 years.
Throughout this course you will be introduced to the key principles of speculative design and imagining possible, probable, plausible and preferable future(s).
You will participate in various ideation activities to help inform your future scenario, then develop design fiction prototypes and concept visualisations in response to these imagined scenarios.

For this project we would like you to target 'digital natives' 'millennials' and 'generation Z', using your prototypes to engage this audience in a reflective form of future gazing.
Speculative design seeks to raise awareness and debate of social issues by creating fictional scenarios that challenge assumptions, preconceptions and expectations about the role of design objects in everyday life.

The output should be a potential future scenario in the form of an experienceable concept visualisation, which makes the audience understand and feel the circumstances of the possible future that you have imagined.

Needed competencies include creative minds, collaboration skills and an interest to push boundaries and think about the future. This project will require multimodal design skills and the ability to tell a compelling story, although any media practice skills will be useful in response to this brief.
Skills/competencies acquired: Speculative design, international collaboration skills, future research, pitching competences; technical fluency, visioning skills, futuristic prototyping.
Depending on the needs of the project, your tutors will provide guidance on appropriate production methods. The amount and effort in actual asset production should be measured according to the goal of creating a speculative design prototype, not a full and final product.

Personal Interactive Experience (PIE)
The aim is to create an immersive visual story that builds on and reacts to the user's personality and behaviour. At the beginning of the course, you will pick your individual challenge and we support you with knowledge on design, storytelling, coding and sensor tech.
What Experience is worth participating in a pure digital environment and how can we help as a creator to immerse the participants deeply in the story? The goal is to create a visual story with the user as one protagonist. Think about ways to personalise the experience by using one or more of the following data:

- Imitation or translation of head and hand movement
- Gaze tracking
- AI-learning based on user behaviour/movement
- Biometric measurements (heartbeat, blood pressure, skin conductivity, brainwaves, etc.)
- Your Netflix data

We want to work with and for real people. The project team will recruit a small panel of users and additionally, you will have access to a small number of artists and tech experts to interview.

You can respond to the challenge by telling us what you want from this Workshop.
If you want to participate because you wish to find new ways to express your creative mind, that's totally fine. If you have a project in mind and you think it is fits into the PIE concept, great!

Depending on the skills of the students, we will aim at least for an interactive visual mockup or a working prototype for final demonstration of the project. Depending on the needs of the project, different means for audiovisual production and interactive sensor technology can be provided, along with expert guidance on their usage.
The amount and effort in actual asset production should be measured according to the goal of creating a prototype rather than a full and final product.

Possible Roles of Industry Partners

So far, we have been talking about industry as partners in project-based learning courses, providing briefings and support and taking part throughout the course. However, there are many forms of lower-level integration of industry partners, which are useful in getting to know new partners or when working with partners who cannot commit to supporting a full course.

- **“Challenge” / Briefing Partner**
  The industry partner defines a challenge or briefing for the students. Minimum involvement is their presence at the kick-off and the final pitch, though some kind of continuous engagement and a mid-pitch event are recommended.
- **Expert Interview Partners for Students**
  Sometimes it is more exciting for both students and industry experts to share knowledge in the form of an interview. It is important to have the students prepare interviews thoroughly and do prior background research on relevant issues. In this way, the conversation is likely to be deeper than in the usual Q&A session at the end of a guest lecture. In the VR & Virtual Production course, the EMEX consortium assigned two experts to each of the six project teams with the task of preparing, conducting and summarising two expert interviews.
- **User Interview Partners for Students**
  Industry partners can also take the role of prospective users, e.g. when students are prototyping new media production tools. The students should receive basic training on user experience interviews in order to conduct such interviews.

- **Industry Lecturers**
  Invited guest lectures are a common and easy way to integrate industry partners. It is advisable to brief the lecturers on the whole theme of the course and to give a personal contextualisation before and after the lecture. Sometimes, when a person is known to be very busy, a panel interview or the aforementioned expert interview by students may be a more appropriate approach.
- **Expert Industry Mentor for teams**
  Experts from the industry agree to act as mentors for the teams. Mentoring can take different forms, e.g. dedicated feedback sessions or frequent mail exchange. The mentor may be working for the briefing partner or be independent. FBKW has had some good experience by keeping both roles separate, though both ways can lead a conflict of interests.
- **Expert Feedback in Pitching sessions**
  During pitching sessions, experts give feedback after each presentation or in dedicated feedback sessions in online breakout-rooms.
- **Industry Professionals as Co-creators**
  Co-creation between students and professionals is difficult because of the complex IPR situation. The terms of such a collaboration should be laid out clearly, especially to the students, before the start of the collaboration. We suggest getting legal advice if co-creation is anticipated. In many cases, a mentoring approach is the better alternative.

Sometimes, the role of the industry partner may change during the project, depending on how engaged they become. Some partners prefer to participate in giving the brief and final feedback, others become very engaged and effectively take on the role of mentors during student team meetings.

Models for integrating the partnerships into courses

Collaboration can take different forms and durations, from a single workshop to a multi-term project. The following modes show some typical options:

- **Project Presentation**
  In this case, industry partners are not involved in the process at all but just join the presentation of the course results.
- **Day workshop**
  A day workshop usually combines input from the partner with collaborative workshop sessions and final presentation of ideas. It can be used as a first step to find possible themes for further collaborations.
- **Design Sprint Week**
  The EMEX consortium tried several workshops of 4-5 days, using variations of the Design Sprint methodology. This kind of short-term engagement has the advantage that usually the results exceed the expectations of both students and partners; it is often underestimated how much can be achieved in 5 days of focused work.

- **Term project - low contact (brief, mid-pitch, final pitch)**
  A basic collaboration project usually involves the three milestones of brief, mid-pitch and final pitch. The mid-pitch is important, as the students need feedback about whether they are on track to fulfil the briefing as expected by the partner. The project structure of the Demola[1] Network foresees an additional oral "no-slide pitch" one week after the briefing, which gives an early orientation for both sides and provides an opportunity for the intervention of the project partner if necessary.
- **Term project - intense contact (involving additional sessions, lectures, mentoring or interviews)**
  Depending on their engagement, project partners can be further integrated into the course in the aforementioned ways. In the context of EMEX, this applied mostly to the strategic partners RBB and YLE (both public broadcasters), where we collaborated with their dedicated innovation departments.
- **Partner visits and working on the partner's premises**
  A visit to the partner's premises is often valued by the students and usually improves the understanding for the partner's needs. In addition, more experts might be available for a short input if they do not have to travel to the university. Working at the partner's premises is usually not feasible or might be confined to day workshops when talking about student teams. Individual students however might continue working on their particular project e.g. as part of an internship.

It can sometimes happen that the industry partner becomes very engaged with the concept or demo that the student team is creating. While this is generally a good thing, the university side should ensure that this does not become micro-management on the part of the industry partner. If the partner wants to have a say regarding every detail, it can become very stressful got the students and lead to students quitting the team due to the stress of continual demands for changes.

[1] https://www.demola.net/

Pitching and Feedback

These are the general rules that were applied when planning pitching sessions in the EMEX project:

- Pitches should be on the point and short (industry partners have no time to waste and are there to engage with the students);
- During pitching sessions, teachers should moderate, but not comment on or defend student work;
- If the student pitch goes very off-topic right from the start, the teacher can (and probably should) intervene to suggest a better working method -> it is a learning situation for the students, after all;
- Allow room for actual conversation, ideally for 1:1 communication;
- Written feedback from teachers and other teams can be captured and forwarded to the team while they are answering questions from the industry partner;
- Pitches work well both online and offline. Interim online pitches might be easier to arrange with industry partners; A timer can be used for the benefit of the students, so the pitches will not go over the allotted time.

As an alternative to classic pitching as a sequence of presentation, the Spring 2021 EMEX pitching and feedback session was organised as a form of exhibition on the Gathertown platform[2]. At the beginning, all attendants listened to a short introduction and elevator pitches of each project. Then they had 45 minutes to swarm out and visit the separate exhibition rooms of each project. Each team provided access to prototypes, videos and documentation in the room, and team members were present. The discussions that started were surprisingly deep and engaging, with some people listening while browsing the resources while others becoming more intensely involved in the discussion. At the end, the attendants stayed in a dedicated socialising area to continue discussions or to network. Both students and professionals found this experience refreshing and insightful.

[2] https://www.gather.town/

Legal framework

Intellectual property legislation differs from country to country and the EMEX consortium cannot give any detailed legal advice on how to handle IPR issues in student-industry collaborations. However, we point out some frequent challenges and possible general solutions that have to be adapted to local legislation.

- The university cannot guarantee any particular results. It only guarantees the quality of teaching.
- How can universities counsel their own students in these legal questions? Often the students are not aware of their rights, much less into how to license them to third parties.
- Students' right to their own work: generally, students own their work if no other agreement is explicitly made with them .
- Background work brought in by project partners.
- The problem of co-creation: If staff from the partner company takes part in the ideation and concepting process, boundaries blur and it becomes difficult to clearly attribute rights to either party. This has either to be considered right from the start of the collaboration or should be avoided.
- Level of Creativity: When is actual IPR created in a student project? Mere ideas cannot be protected and in the field of film & TV, the threshold for protecting e.g., a TV format is usually too high to be reached within the scope of a term project.
- A university and its students must not compete with industry.

In general it is good practice to use one of the following approaches for handling IPR issues in industry partnerships:

- Leave all IP rights with the students and leave it up to them. They may use it to found a start-up or license it directly to the industry partner. In this case it is important to provide individual guidance on IPR issues. E.g., Film University Babelsberg does this via its start-up service and Tampere universities have a common facility called Y-Campus, which supports interdisciplinary idea development and start-up creation.
- Bundle rights at university level and license them to partners in an agreement between the partners and the university. This is the usual case for film productions at Film University Babelsberg, as IPR chains in media productions can be very complex and often involve dozens of actors. In this case, the university should be very careful when giving any contractual guarantees upfront, as it cannot guarantee any particular outcome when it comes to student work. There may be also additional legal implications.
- Let the partnering company buy all the rights directly from the students, facilitated by the university. However, universities should be vary of providing contracts for deals between third parties. A good practice in

Finland is to have dedicated entrepreneurship centres to facilitate those partnerships, such as Demola[3] or HUBS[4].

- In the case of mere ideation or high level concept development, there may be no formal necessity nor possibility to sell IPR rights. While, in the absence of further bilateral agreements, the partner company could simply take the idea and develop it further on its own, it is a good practice here to offer the student a project-based contract for participation in the team that implements the idea. This often applies in the realm of TV/web format development, where the threshold for IPR protection is very hard to rise above during a university course. The best protection for ideas are sustainable partnerships which build mutual trust.

Recommendations on IPR handling

We strongly recommend seeking legal advice from your university's IPR department and/or external IPR experts. IPR law and the legal status of student course work differs from country to country, so no general advice may be given here. The material provided here was developed by Film University, but is provided without any warranty for fitness for purpose.

[3] https://www.demola.net/
[4] https://hubs.fi/en/frontpage/

ANNEX I IPR Checklist

This checklist may help to identify possible IPR issues at the outset of a new project/course. Answer these questions in order to prepare for the discussion of IPR issues with an expert. If you have difficulties answering one or more questions, pay extra attention as it might render IPR handling more difficult or impossible.

- Will the students create IPR-relevant assets during the project?
  Mere ideas cannot be protected and concrete concepts need to meet a certain threshold of detailedness and originality to be protectable. Check what might be formally protected by IPR laws and where you have to make extra agreements with the respective company.
- Which students will be part of the project?
  It is important to outline who will be part of the project and who not. This is especially important if you teach a course with multiple teams who start off together or work in changing group constellations. Also, students should be aware that involving students outside the course to help them have to be explicitly considered in possible contracts.
- Will there be documentation about all people involved and their contributions?
- Will further people join the project after it has started?
  Sometimes projects grow larger than expected. Students should agree how to deal with this.
- Who of the involved people create IPR-relevant assets (e.g. text, film, photo, audio, visual design, sound design, software development)?
- Is the project clearly described, so that the students' contributions can be related directly to the project?
- Did all students sign an appropriate standard contract (if available and customary at your university)?
- Have they completed the contract form and appendices?
- Will the assets produced in the project be stored in a unified place, accessible to the respective right holders (university/students/partner company)?
  In the case of software development, a revision-proof system should be used and regular backups should be used.
- Will the students use any IPR-relevant assets from third parties?
  Consider the license terms of open source software libraries and tools. Also consider any material and information the industry partner provides and pre-existing IPR of the university.
- How will revenues/recoupment be shared?
- Have the students been informed about and have they consented to the aims of the project, of a possible external project partner and the agreed terms of the handling of IPR issues?

Erasmus+

Grant agreement no.: 2018-1-DE01-KA203-004282
Project Consortium: University Babelsberg KONRAD WOLF (Germany); Tampere University (Finland); Tampere University of Applied Sciences (Finland); University of Lincoln (United Kingdom); University of Central Lancashire (United Kingdom)

ANNEX II Industry Partnerships Concepts in the EMEX courses

Spring 2019 - Frontiers of Interactive and Participative TV

Industry Partner/Experts	Role
RBB	Lead industry partner who introduced both a technology (a TV apps authoring system) for usage by the students and provided a briefing to work on in the course.
YLE	Expert partner to give feedback on the final presentations.

Autumn 2019 - Transnational Workshop on Interactive Audience Experiences

Industry Partner/Experts	Role
RBB	Briefing partner, expert feedback during online preparation phase, expert feedback at final presentation of intensive week
YLE	Briefing partner, team consultations during the intensive week, expert feedback at final presentation of intensive week
Trent Pancy, Actor, Writer, Producer	Moderation of the kick-off event
Mika Rahkonen, Head of Strategy / YLE	Keynote at course kick-off, Participant to a matchmaking events between students and industry experts
Esa Kling, Head of TV Product Development / Telia	Keynote at course kick-off, Participant to a matchmaking events between students and industry experts
Heikki Huttunen, Associate Professor / Tampere University	Keynote at course kick-off, Participant to a matchmaking events between students and industry experts
Eeva Jäntti, Executive Producer / Arilyn	Keynote at course kick-off, Participant to a matchmaking events between students and industry experts
Paula Luomanen & Mika Tolvanen, United Screens	Keynote at course kick-off, Participant to a matchmaking events between students and industry experts

Spring 2020 - Virtual Production: Visioning Course

Industry Partner/Experts	Role
RBB	Briefing partner, expert feedback during final presentation
YLE	Briefing partner, expert feedback during final presentation
Sönke Kirchhof, CEO, INVR.SPACE GmbH	Expert and interview partner for student groups, feedback during final presentation
Tim Deussen, CEO, Studio Deussen	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Oliver Pidancet, Project engineer at innovation projects, RBB	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Mikko Karsisto, CEO, Keho Interactive	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Christian Möller, Immersive Cinematographer, Film University KONRAD WOLF	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Robert Zapke, VFX Supervisor, CinechromatixX	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Olli-Pekka Salli, Innovation Coach, YLE	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Ilmari Huttu-Hiltunen, CEO, Rakka creative	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Jukka Holm, Researcher, TAMK	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Paul Long, Creative Director, Metro-Boulot-Dodo	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Matthias Leitner, Author, Bayrischer Rundfunk	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Eva Deinert, Editor, Bayrischer Rundfunk	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Stefan Domke, Editor, WDR	Expert and interview partner for student groups
Thomas Hallet, Editor, WDR	Expert and interview partner for student groups

Autumn 2020 - Virtual Production: Common Spaces – Ideas in Transit

Industry Partner/Experts	Role
RBB	Briefing partner, expert feedback during online preparation phase, expert feedback at final presentation
YLE	Briefing partner, expert feedback at final presentation of intensive week

Spring 2021 - Trending Emerging Media Application Areas

Industry Partner/Experts	Role
RBB	Briefing partner, feedback at final presentation
Michela Pnacekova, XR Creator / Producer / PhD Student at York University	Key-note speaker mid-term event, feedback during final event