

Cultural Policy Curriculum Development & Mobility Support for Lecturers in Central and Eastern Europe

*Development Study for setting up the 'Cultural Policy Education Group' - CPEG
- an academic action consortium initiated by the European Cultural Foundation*

by **Corina Suteu**, Nantes, July 2004

MOTTO: 'Cultural policy does not yet exist as a clearly defined area of study with agreed research paradigms and methodologies. It rather comprises a loose articulation of work emerging from different disciplinary origins - from arts management, communication studies, urban studies, cultural studies, cultural economics - and is not yet able to readily identify how its different parts add up to a cohesive whole' (Tony Bennett, Colin Mercer: 'Recasting Cultural Policies - Improving Research and International Cooperation in Cultural Policies', 1996)

General Framework of the Study

This study aims to review (in a broad sense) the condition of cultural policy studies within higher education centres in Central and Eastern Europe. It especially intends to identify those centres which have a strong potential of development and at the same time affirm a need for international cooperation and improvement of their education contents. Also, the study suggests possible forms of partnership between the identified centres in view of an optimal use of the CPEG platform for the envisaged Mobility Support Scheme and the realisation of a working agenda for cultural policy curricula development in the CEE Region.

However, the scope of the study is purely oriented on operational issues and offering precise recommendations. The realised analytical work has been adapted rather to concrete practical aims than to theoretical scrutiny!

Countries Taken Into Consideration

Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Croatia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Macedonia, Moldova, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia

The total number of relevant centres reviewed in the countries listed above **was 38, out of which 26 were studied in-depth**, as these proved to be interesting in the given study framework (awarding an academic degree, looking back on existence of one or more years, showing explicit interest in cultural policy studies). All remaining institutions not taken into closer account for this paper were adult education- and/or vocational training centres (with no option to receive an MA or PhD university degree) or higher education programmes too recently founded for being taken into consideration.

The study also reviewed and assessed some higher education centres hosting cultural policy studies in Western Europe, as these institutions are very much relevant for the curriculum development and mentoring aspects envisaged for CPEG. The studied Western European institutions include:

Great Britain

- City University London/UK, Department of Arts Policy and Management
- Warwick University/UK, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies
- De Montford University, Leicester/UK, MA European Cultural Planning

Spain

- University of Barcelona/Spain, MA in Cultural Management and Cultural Policies
- Girona University/Spain, UNESCO Chair of Cultural Cooperation & Cultural Policies

Austria

- ICCM (International Centre for Culture and Management) Salzburg - University of Linz, MA in Arts Management - 'Leadership in Culture'

Finland

- University of Jyväskylä/ Finland, Cultural Policy Research and Training Unit

Belgium

- Free University Brussels, POLIS (MA in European Urban Cultures) joint MA with Tilburg, Manchester, Helsinki

Germany

- IKS (Institut für Kulturelle Infrastruktur Sachsen), Goerlitz/Germany/Poland

Number of Higher Education Centres dealing with Cultural Policy Studies identified per CEE country:

Bulgaria	5 identified
Czech Republic	1 identified
Croatia	1 identified
Estonia	2 identified
Hungary	4 identified
Latvia	2 identified
Lithuania	2 identified
Macedonia	1 identified
Moldova	1 identified
Poland	4 identified
Romania	1 identified
Serbia/Montenegro	1 identified
Slovakia	1 identified

Total: 26 identified

All CEE institutions reviewed for this study are listed in the annex of this paper. No institutions of higher education relevant for the studied field could be identified in Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Slovenia. Institutions in Russia, Ukraine and Belarus have not been taken into account yet (see remarks in concluding chapter!).

Key Issues and Questions:

The existing offer of cultural policy education in the CEE countries is not yet rich, but today we notice a strong tendency to develop cultural management studies in various training centres and universities in the region. To give some examples we have to mention that courses at the Timisoara Art University (established in collaboration with the University Paris VIII, France), the Bucharest University (Faculty of Philology), the Cluj University (established in collaboration with the IKS Goerlitz, Germany/Poland), the University of Ljubljana, the University of Prishtina, the University of Rijeka (Vjeron Katunaric, Professor at the Zagreb University designed a programme specifically focusing on cultural policies) and other programmes are about to be launched in 2004 or the coming years.

All CEE universities reviewed for this study very often relate cultural policy education to a part of their cultural management studies:

- The Baltic States (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) have developed very specific, strong scientifically oriented programmes focusing on cultural policy. The spread of universities interested in cultural policy matters is rather rich in Bulgaria (5 universities in 3 different cities) but almost non-existent in Romania: The ECUMEST programme has been closed and the MA in Cultural Administration and Cultural Policies offered by the SNSPA Bucharest survived only 2 years.
- Poland and Serbia have achieved a very high level of offering professional and comprehensive studies in cultural management and cultural policy, but the programmes in both countries are only connected to one city and one university (the Jagellonian University in Krakow and the University of Arts in Belgrade).
- Taking a look into how education programmes focus on different sectors of cultural activity (theatre, heritage, music, etc.) while taking into consideration the fact that cultural policy studies are related to broader cultural management programmes, we notice that the Baltic States focus on Music and Multimedia, Poland on Cultural Heritage, Slovakia and the Czech Republic on Theatre, while the rest of the countries are oriented towards a more generalist approach.
- National research efforts on cultural policy are a more relevant phenomenon in Croatia, Poland, the Baltic States and Bulgaria. The *Policies for Culture* Programme indeed increased awareness about the need to interlink regionally oriented research and cultural policy education. The Baltic States from the very beginning were privileged by their neighbourhood to the Scandinavian countries (Finland, Denmark, Sweden) that always have been very forward looking in setting up cultural management and policy studies. In addition, the countries of the former Yugoslavia as well as Poland and Bulgaria benefit from long standing institutions (IMO Zagreb, Culturelink, University of Arts Belgrade) and existing research infrastructures in the field of 'Culturology' that have been persisting during the communist period.
- In terms of linking issues of public administration, issues of art or cultural management, local cultural policies and comparative cultural policy

studies, Poland offers the most varied choice of institutions operating in the field (Jagellonian University Krakow, National Cultural Centre Krakow, Warsaw School of Economics, MISTIA School for Local Government, ICC Krakow as well as various Heritage Studies and well developed cultural policy frameworks focussing on heritage aspects). It is particularly Poland where specialised universities, education centres and academies (Economic Faculties, Public Administration Programmes, Art and Cultural Management Programmes, Heritage Programmes) - each programme in its own way - pay special attention to aspects of cultural policy. Polish institutions often regard cultural policy as essential part of public policies and public administration, but also relate policy issues to the design of cultural action at the independent level (NGOs) where it can have a purely managerial impact.

In narrowing down our selection to those institutions that can be regarded to be suitable for a pilot initiative covering curriculum development, expert mobility and higher education cooperation in the field of cultural policy other relevant criteria were:

- If the institutions were officially assigned as UNESCO Chairs in Cultural Policy and Cultural Management, as this according to earlier evaluation studies undertaken by the author represents a good indicator of being ready for adaptation and safeguarding 'open' standards.
- The actual number of teaching personnel connected to a department of cultural management or a UNESCO Chair, as this represents an indicator about the degree of actual legitimacy and the importance of a department within a university or art academy and shows its strength and academic potential.
- If universities already had developed strong cooperation ties with other Western or Central European centres working in cultural management and policy, as institutions like the Estonian Academy of Music and its participation in Synaxis Baltica or the University of Belgrade and its joint degree programme with the University Lyon 2 and the Policy Institutes in Grenoble as well as the Jagellonian University and its collaboration with the Utrecht School of the Arts, the University of Arts Belgrade and the IKS Goerlitz or other network oriented programmes, were also considered to be more suitable for the planned activities.

Furthermore, the carried out analysis revealed that one could distinguish four different levels concerning the actual development status of cultural policy teaching content in higher education programmes of the studied area:

1. Baltic States: offer studies with a strong comparative dimension (on regional and overall European issues); modules are occasionally delivered in English; relations between cultural management and cultural policies as well as local policies are introduced by offering specific modules which focus on the important interaction between policy and the operational level;
2. Countries of the Former Yugoslavia (as far as relevant trends exist in Croatia, Macedonia, Kosovo, Serbia-Montenegro, Slovenia) as well as

- Poland and Hungary: cultural policy studies are integrated logically as part of art or cultural studies and cultural management programmes; they hold strong pools of professional excellency; (From this point of view Croatia and Slovenia are not yet offering specific programmes representing such trend with an actual structure, but IMO Croatia, the Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik, the University of Rijeka or the University of Ljubljana are offering short term courses on cultural policy related matters. We also have to stress that cultural policy research is very high developed in Croatia, Serbia and Poland.)
3. Bulgaria, Romania, Slovakia, Czech Republic: high interest for launching and developing new cultural policy programs, but uneven level of actual organisational sustainability and consistency in education offer; compared to the other countries Bulgaria is in a much better position, but the state of categorisation of methodologies, the number of qualified professors and trainers as well as the coherence of the offered higher education curricula is often unsatisfying.
 4. Moldova, Albania, Bosnia-Herzegovina: no relevant programme offering education in the studied field could be identified.

The Current Situation of Cultural Policy Studies

Introducing a typology of criteria influencing cultural policy studies in Europe:¹

The study identified two types of **core content criteria** that have direct impact on cultural policy studies within the universities concerned.

These are:

A. CONTEXT related Criteria

Different socio-economical and political factors that appeared in the last decade had essential impact on reshaping cultural policies and its priorities at European level

At national level:

- The decrease of state intervention in culture
- the emergence of the public/private logic
- the emergence of new cultural and artistic domains and the intersection between culture and industries, between culture and tourism, culture and leisure

At international level:

- The internationalisation of cultural action
- The development of cooperation
- The strengthening of networks

At the level of the 'cultural sector':

- The growing interdisciplinary approach in cultural and artistic activity
- The increasing role of mobility and co-production logics

¹ Identified typology is based on various studies and documents listed in the annexed bibliography!

The sum of these changes translates into a **growing need for:**

- **comparative studies in cultural policies**
- developing **a critical approach regarding** different European cultural policies on national levels
- considering the participation of different stakeholders in the process of policy making (**participatory policy making**)

For Central and Eastern Europe these observations are confirmed by the results of the inquiry carried out for the establishment of the Cultural Policy Education Group in spring 2004: 11 higher education centres that answered the CPEG questionnaire about curriculum development and mobility needs strongly advocate for all these aspects to be introduced in their curricula.

B. PROCESS related Criteria (measures applied at national level that influence public policies in general and cultural policies in particular):

- Decentralisation
- Privatisation
- EU - Enlargement (for the candidate countries)

Cultural policy studies therefore were urged to put more focus on:

- Public/private aspects (cultural administration, legislation of culture, funding)
- Area based aspects (local cultural policies; regional planning, urban regeneration aspects, etc.)
- Cross border cultural policies, cooperation policies

These categories are recurring in most cultural policy curricula reviewed for this study. Within the programmes each aspect shows up in different degrees of importance and is taught by using very diverse methodologies.

Based on the analytical work of the author 'clusters' of content orientation inherent to the examined cultural policy programmes have been identified. The identified focus areas - 'clusters' - correspond to teaching content in both Western and Eastern European curricula:

Three CLUSTERS of CONTENT Orientation:

CC 1/

- ❖ Cultural policies **as regarded at micro-level** (policies that have impact on the cultural organisation, cultural operators, cultural activity in a narrow sense and deal with all forms of arts and cultural animation/mediation/production)
- ❖ Cultural policies **as regarded at macro level** (fields of policy considering the arts, education, communication, (media, information industry))

sciences (scientific and industrial heritage, technologies), but also issues related to diversity, minorities, environment, etc.)

CC 2/

- ❖ Public cultural policies (dealing with know-how on issues of public administration, implementation of policies, legislation, fiscal issues on national level, etc.)
- ❖ Participatory cultural policies (focusing on creativity in the cultural policy development cycle, inclusion of stakeholders in the design of cultural policies, processes of breaking through institutional concentration, the role of civil society cultural actors, etc.)

CC 3/

- ❖ Cultural policies regarding cultural sectors (theatre, heritage, music, fine arts, etc.) cultural industries and traditional arts (audiovisual versus theatre, publishing versus opera production, etc.)
- ❖ Cultural policies regarding general trends and priorities (see approach of the CoE/ERICarts 'Compendium on Cultural Policies' or different comparative methodologies)

The Specific Situation of Cultural Policy Studies in Central & Eastern Europe

The main question raised in this study is: What kind of proposal for action in the field is really relevant in the context of Central and Eastern European countries? In order to determine such a context relevant approach the study didn't only rely on the author's direct analytical work, but also on some more exhaustive studies on the topic (see bibliography).

First Conclusion:

In Central and Eastern Europe demands related directly to the universities are easy to identify. However, there are no reliable indicators or consistent assessment of required fields of professional competence in cultural policy that need to be provided by such studies: Which competences are missing and on what level? In which way can cultural policy studies serve the benefit of institutional, political and economical stakeholders in the concerned countries? Are cultural policy studies addressing mainly policy makers, cultural operators, public administrators or other target groups? Given the irregular, radically transitional and constantly reshaping cultural policy dynamics in the region understanding the actual institutional demand and answering these questions is crucial! Cultural policy studies in Central and Eastern Europe therefore should respond to:

- The most frequent mandates and missions cultural institutions located in these countries represent
- The most important responsibilities and tasks of cultural administrators
- Specific forms of organisation and positioning of different stakeholders within the cultural system

A study of the Buenos Aires Observatory and the University of Barcelona on the professional profiles of cultural personnel² points out that at decision making levels of cultural organisations 'competences required by the lower ranks are at the same time part of the competences needed for positions with more responsibilities'. Therefore, education demands to be identified and formalised for the benefit of the professional field shall cover high level as well as low-level management needs.

This conclusion is especially relevant for Eastern Europe. Cultural policy studies have to take into account what in fact are the required prototypical profiles at higher levels of decision-making which shall also include the needs of personnel at lower levels.

Second Conclusion:

The comparative higher education study '*Real-Time Systems, Reflections on Higher Education in the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia*', which the CHEPS (Centre for Higher Education Policy Studies) at the University of Twente in the Netherlands realised in collaboration with LOGO Vutum (Brno University of Technology) in 2003, stresses that 'the great divide (between East and West in terms of higher education systems) is between gradual system change (Western universities) and abrupt change (Eastern universities) (...) between *evolution* and *revolution*'³.

The study also reveals that Eastern European university systems lack more than Western institutions a 'within system steering capacity' (op. cit., pg. 227) and that the 'core academic staff is not appreciative of being steered'. Passing from a system of over-centralised authority into a new approach of delegating university authority is even more complicated in Central and Eastern Europe. Therefore, new disciplines like cultural policy studies have to be launched by a strongly recognised university authority in an important position at the hierarchical levels.

This aspect is relevant for this study as far as the selection process of appropriate universities also had to take into account the driving academic personality ideally to be involved and his/her 'will' to develop new cultural policy curricula as well as such personalities' actual readiness to set up sustainable international partnerships.

Third Conclusion:

This point can be summarised as follows: 'Almost certainly, despite their common experience of communism, universities in Central and Eastern Europe have less in common with each other than, for example, universities in Latin America'⁴.

This brings about the argument that maybe 'best practice'-examples have to be regarded each time as strictly related to their national context and cultural specificity - the actual content design of cultural policy studies in Macedonia and

² The study uses some of the 'criteria of demand' of a 'Study of professional profiles of the cultural personnel in Latin America and the Caribbean', realised in 2002 in the framework of Iberformat, as these aspects have been identified to be very relevant for the scope of this document. (Source: ENCATC Meeting, Turin, 2003).

³ File, Jon and Leo Goedegebuure, "Real-Time Systems, Reflection on Higher Education in Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia", pg. 227 ('New Rules of the game'), CHEPS 2003, Netherlands.

⁴ Scott, P. (2002), "Reflection on the Reform of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe", pg 137 in "On Real-Time Systems", pg. 236

Poland might be two very different matters. This should lead to a cautious approach to establish a 'global norm' of studies in cultural policies.

However, some general observations apply to all present and future cultural policy studies in the region:

- Researchers and policy makers agree that emphasis is to be put on 'change' and since recently that focus should be put mostly on the consequences that this 'change' had on redefining the role of cultural policy studies.

Accordingly, academics have to reflect upon:

- What is the role of these studies in the new economy?
- Are existing core values under threat?
- Who is in charge for this transition regarding the content of higher education on the subject? (op. cit. 238)

This brings about the crucial matters of authority and (academic) capacity to implement know-how and competence to develop tools applicable to each country while these tools also need to be adaptable to specific cultural policy frameworks functioning in Eastern and Central European contexts.

Fourth Conclusion:

There is a need to deal with significant inequalities in international distribution of research and training capabilities.⁵ Cultural policy research needs to assist higher education programmes of countries that are in a development or transition phase much more than this is currently the case.

Professor Emil Orzechowski, who founded the Department of Cultural Management at the Faculty of Management and Marketing of the Jagellonian University Krakow in 1999, pointed out in 2003 that his programmes in cultural management would be 'lost' if what he calls 'friendly collaborations' in terms of providing documents, teaching staff and possibilities to do research would not have been offered by some Western Universities (e.g. Oxford, Uppsala, Edinburgh).⁶

At the same time Patrick Boylan of the City University London stresses that the international higher education market is more and more liberalising.⁷ Therefore, there is an increasingly serious competition for teaching contents going on all over the world.

Given that cultural policies are 'inescapably normative' (op. cit. Bennett/Mercer, pg. 8) a different observation which is however closely related to this statement on global competition concerns the fact that cultural policy studies in Central and Eastern Europe because of this fact are even more likely to be constructed around the driving idea of defending a country's own cultural heritage against

⁵ See Mercer, C. and Tony Bennett, 'Recasting cultural policies' at www.powerofculture.nl/uk/archive/commentary/bennet.html

⁶ Orzechowski, Emil, keynote speech, ENCATC General Assembly in Turin-Serralunga, 2003.

⁷ Boylan, P, 'The implications of current moves towards the globalisation of standards for university level qualifications', in www.city.ac.uk/ictop/boylan-delhi.html.

other, more dominant cultures (cp. the definition of Polish cultural policy frameworks in the 'Compendium'⁸).

For Central and Eastern Europe it is therefore crucial to establish cultural policy studies that support exchange and balance between 'information rich' and 'information poor' – countries. It is also essential to ensure that cultural policy studies represent a key interface between education policies and cultural policies. At the same time it is important to consider learning tools that provide 'applicable skills and transferable capacities', not only traditional academic knowledge.

Fifth and last Conclusion:

The last observation can be illustrated as follows: 'As it is, cultural policies in Europe revolve around outdated notions with few links to contemporary (...) considerations. The basis of cultural policies today seems to consist mainly of rumours from Brussels. (...) Also, European cultural policies will need to formulate a strong response against a one-dimensional, neo-liberal understanding of culture driven by success and profit.'⁹

For Central and Eastern European countries the risk to design cultural policies according to assumptions brought back from Brussels or a purely neo-liberal logic is even greater when we once more consider aspects of 'abrupt socio-economic change' we referred to in the Second Conclusion. The actual set-up of cultural policy studies hence is very much relevant for the approach future graduates will find to challenges around them. The structure of a study programme determines how they understand, integrate and translate pending questions into their role of ideally not only representing actors passively reacting to external change but becoming public players who find meaning in providing for an active change of paradigms which is not exclusively in line with standards supporting economical growth but also softer indicators like quality of life, etc.

⁸ www.culturalpolicies.net/profiles/poland-1.html

⁹ Rauning, G. and Therese Kaufman, 'Anticipating European cultural policies' at www.eipcp.net/policies/text/part1.htm.

CEE Academic Centres for Cultural Policy Studies recommended for participation in the Cultural Policy Education Group

According to the various above mentioned criteria and taking into account various findings of the review on cultural policy studies offered by the universities, the author suggests a selection of 8 (10) Cultural Policy Programmes from Central and Eastern Europe and 2 (4) Western European universities which should be part of a CPEG core group of universities that are ready to engage in partnership on curricula development, to participate in a mobility support scheme for lecturers and cultural policy experts and to initiate academic exchange on the matter in a broad sense.

1/ Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia (MA in Cultural Management - since 1999 as well as Media and Culture Management – since 2000)

Both courses include cultural policy studies and deal with public policy aspects as well as legal and administrative aspects and international standards (in the Media MA). The course is very much practice oriented. Relations between policymaking and practice are very strongly emphasised.

Supportive Arguments:

- Brings together cultural policy aspects of audiovisual and traditional arts
- Given the broad aspects covered by cultural policy studies (planning, law, economics, theory of culture, etc.) this programme shows a good potential for further developing a module of cultural policy
- International collaboration with IKS Goerlitz, UNESCO, ENCATC Member
- Hosted by an academy that uniquely deals with cultural aspects.

Contact: Ivars Berzins, Director

Duration of study programme: 2 years

Number of teaching staff: precise indication pending

Available online at: www.latfilma.lv/lka/

2/ Vilnius Academy of Fine Arts, Vilnius Lithuania (MA in Cultural Management and Cultural Policy)

This programme is specifically oriented on cultural management and policy. The programme is strongly oriented on opening up to international networks and to further develop regional exchange in the Baltic region (SYNTAXIS Baltica – Platform for students of cultural management and cultural policies in the Baltic region, Infobalt - League of Multimedia Arts)

Supportive Arguments:

- Very strong UNESCO Chair for Cultural Policies and Management
- ENCATC Member
- International members on scientific board
- Precise focus on local and international aspects of cultural cooperation policies, strategic policy design, management and public policy.

Contact: Gabriele Zaidyte

Duration of study programme: 2 years

Number of teaching staff: 26

Available online at: <http://unesco.vda.lt/>

**3/ Estonian Academy of Music - EMA, Tallinn, Estonia
(MA in Cultural Management)**

This programme covers a very rich range of issues that reaches from cultural policy at national, local and European level to strategic planning, cultural theory, legislation for the arts, etc.

A stronger emphasised, more coherent cultural policy module might contribute to better integrate and link various topics already dealt with in the programme curriculum. The formulation of the mission of the course indicates a focus on developing students' capacities in the field of elaborating strategic visions and policy making.

Supportive Arguments:

- International group of students, come from Estonia and other Nordic countries
- High number of teaching staff
- Teaching languages are Estonian and English
- Seems to be a very well established academic organisation with high reputation

Contact: Peep Laasmann, Director

Duration of study programme: 2 years

Number of teaching staff: 161

Available online at: www.ema.edu.ee/eng/main_frame.html

**4/ Jagellonian University, Faculty of Management and Social
Communication - School of Cultural Management, Krakow, Poland
(BA and MA in Cultural Management, Postgraduate Diploma,
'Ambassador' Programme)**

This programme represents one of the most complete studies in cultural management and cultural policy studies in Eastern Europe. Strong emphasis is put on following a 'holistic' approach by dealing mainly with theoretical aspects of the cultural environment, development of strategic visions and cross-linking sociological, economical and marketing theory approaches. The programmes provide a specific teaching module on comparative cultural policy models. The 'Ambassador' programme organises direct presentations of ambassadors on the cultural policies followed in their home countries. At the same time, the approach of the teaching programme is somewhat conservative and based on what we previously described as sense of following the preservation of national values against 'dominant' cultures from abroad.

Supportive Arguments:

- The widely recognised capacities of the leading professor and the strong, well established character of the discipline within the Jagellonian University
- 40 visiting professors, total teaching staff of 70 lecturers

- International cooperation with other universities: IKS Goerlitz, Utrecht, Belgrade
- ENCATC Member (staff member Malgorzata Sternal is Vice-President of ENCATC)
- The variety of cultural policy related subjects and the wide experience the institution can capitalise on are important factors of good cooperation with other higher education institutions

Contact: Emil Orzechowski, Director

Duration of study programme: MA - 2 years

Number of teaching staff: 70

Available online at: <http://gemini.miks.uj.edu.pl>

**5/ University of Arts Belgrade, Serbia
(Postgraduate Study Programme (MA) in 'Studies of Inter-culturalism, Cultural Management and Cultural Policies in the Balkans' - in cooperation with the University Lyon 2, IEP Grenoble, Observatoire des Politiques Culturelles Grenoble)**

Taking into consideration its strong international related academic composition (international group of students, system of joint diploma, international teaching staff and lecturing staff from the SEE region) this university meets all requirements for occupying a leading position in cultural policy studies.

Professor Milena Dragicevic Sestic (Rector of the University of Arts, author of many books on the subject and MA Coordinator) is one of the most important scholars and experts on cultural management and cultural policy related issues and has broad European and pan-European expertise. The MA in Cultural Management of the UA Belgrade was the first programme established in Europe in 1970!

Supportive Arguments:

- Innovative approach and forward looking, open, methodology in cultural policy studies
- UNESCO Chair for Cultural Policies and Management
- International teaching staff
- Strong international reputation of the programme coordinator
- Strong international orientation of course content
- ENCATC Member

Contact: Milena Dragicevic Sestic, Coordinator

Duration of study programme: 2 years

Number of teaching staff: precise indication pending

Available online at: www.arts.bg.ac.yu

**6/ Eötvös Lorand University – ELTE, Budapest, Hungary
(Cultural and Arts Management Programme - MA)**

This course offers modules on public cultural policy, comparative cultural policy and reform of the system of cultural institutions as well as on education and

training programs of the EU. It is very traditionally oriented in describing the existing situation but has a solid academic forward looking and pragmatic oriented approach.

Supportive Arguments:

- Course approach is international, interdisciplinary and cross-sector oriented
- Aspects of public administration in culture, comparative cultural policies and 'change' in management addressed in the course are proof for a proactive education methodology
- Course comprises very good medium number of 25 teaching staff sufficiently covering the taught subjects

Contact: Istvan Klinghammer, Director

Duration of study programme: 2-year programme and 1-year programme (certificate)

Number of teaching staff: 25

Available online at: www.elte.hu/en/

7/ South West University - SWU, Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria (MA in Cultural Studies, MA in Cultural Management)

This department has been established only recently, but the European dimension, ideas to develop a scientific network ('Balcanica Humanitas') and its will for academic exchange on cultural studies in a broad sense are very strong. The course director affirms this position in the CPEG inquiry: 'Cultural policy education is gaining more and more importance with the increasing need for comparative methods of study'. The director also stresses the importance of a comparative dimension of cultural policy studies on European level and education on EU policies in the cultural domain.

Supportive Arguments:

- Open approach, European orientation
- Comparative approach to cultural policy studies and awareness about their importance
- Emerging capacity to launch distinct cultural policy studies despite predominantly focusing on cultural management studies until now
- Very comprehensive and complete response to CPEG inquiry

Contact: Tatiana Stoichkova, Coordinator

Duration of study programme: 1-year programme (MA)

Number of teaching staff: 18

Available online at: www.swu.bg/eng/faculty/ffa

8/ Sofia University - Department of Cultural Studies, Bulgaria (launch of MA in Cultural Management in 2005)

This university already offers a course in cultural policy within the MA on Contemporary Arts.

Supportive Arguments:

- Strong commitment by academic key actors of the field in Bulgaria (Alexander Kiossev, Rayna Gavrilova, Yuri Vulkovski, Dessi Gavrilova, Krassimira Teneva)
- Links with networks of the Central European University Budapest

Contact: Alexander Kiossev

Duration of study programme: to be determined

Number of teaching staff: to be determined

Proposed Partner Universities and Institutions from Western Europe

- City University London, Department of Cultural Policy and Management, UK
- Warwick University, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, Coventry, UK
- University of Girona, Division of Cultural Policy and Intercultural Dialogue, Spain
- Observatoire des Politiques Culturelles - Institut des Etudes Politiques Grenoble, France
- ENCATC, Brussels

For the pilot and set up phase of the Cultural Policy Education Group, partnership at European level should not go beyond 10 members! In addition individual experts could be involved on an independent consulting basis.

For additional CEE universities to become CPEG Members in the future several options of choice emerged:

- Pedagogical University of Tallinn, Estonia
UNESCO Chair of Urban Studies since 2001; programme currently in development; high interest for cultural policy studies
- Institute of International Cultural Relations – IMO, Zagreb, Croatia
long standing research and expertise in the field; possibly could join in partnership with University Zagreb (Faculty of Philosophy – Vjeron Katunaric, and Political Sciences – Sanjin Dragojevic), Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik, Rijeka University

Conclusions and Recommendations

During the set up phase of the CPEG initiative it is imperative to define and clarify the following aspects:

1. What exactly CPEG will provide according to the five conclusions on cultural policy studies in Central and Eastern Europe listed above.
2. If CPEG wants to strengthen existing education possibilities and the Group will offer better academic means and competence where programmes already exist or the initiative will focus on giving incentive support where cultural policy education possibilities are completely missing.
3. If CPEG will reinforce regional cooperation between existing programmes or will launch new cooperation links and partnerships.

4. If CPEG member universities will exclusively come from Central and Eastern Europe or also Western European institutions will be invited to benefit from its services
5. How to establish a form of university partnership between the members that takes into account general needs, but also respects differences, specificities and a potentially unequal spread of the level of competence each institution member of the pilot scheme will show.

Feasibility Study – Setting Up the Cultural Policy Education Group

As a conclusion of all points made before, the following aspects need to be stressed in view of launching the pilot phase of university cooperation envisaged for the CPEG structure:

Aspects of Regional Cooperation

The author is of the opinion that in the start-up phase universities from Central European countries (as listed to be subject of this study) and universities from the former Soviet countries (Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, Moldova and other regions except the new EU members in the Baltic region) for the moment should not be grouped together in the CPEG initiative. For two reasons we believe that it would be risky for the initial outcome of the Group to mix the different development agendas of universities in the CEE region and the countries of the former Soviet Union:

- a) In most academic disciplines taught at CEE universities the methodological and pedagogical approach of the former Soviet dominion as well as the spirit of domination during the decades under Soviet rule is still very much remembered. Thinking about the envisaged open academic exchange envisaged for CPEG this fact might turn out to be a reason for potential non-academic tensions, which could become an obstacle to a fruitful cooperation among equal member institutions in an early phase of the project.

After a more comprehensive research of existing potential, especially universities from Russia should however be undoubtedly included as the Group gradually follows its organic development and extension to more universities. Right from the beginning Russian universities should become active members of the wider platform connected to CPEG and observing experts from Russia should be invited to participate in the Group's meetings in the initial phase. These observers can be involved to individually provide specific documents on issues related to cultural policy and education in their home regions.

- b) A second reason is a significant discrepancy between competencies required for cultural policy development in Russia and neighbourhood countries (except the Baltic States) and similar processes in the CEE countries. This observation is based on the author's practical experience during the implementation of the ECUMEST Master Programme in Dijon but also on the outcome of the 'Salzburg Seminar' on 'Cultural Institutions in Transition' (2001-2004) or the Council of Europe expert reviews in Russia (2000-2004): The speed of innovations evolving in cultural management, which on one hand is connected to a very slow institutional restructuring and regional reorganisation in Russia and changes occurring at a much quicker and different pace in CEE countries at the other, is fundamentally different. Central and Eastern Europe is currently quickly advancing towards a new cultural policy logic which includes the development of an independent institutional cultural sector and successfully mixing private and public action in culture in some countries. In CEE countries higher education for cultural policy hence is designed according to these new realities.

This makes Russia and other former Soviet countries a 'specific focus area' of the CPEG initiative. A future inclusion of universities from these regions will require a high degree of awareness about their present cultural challenges as well as their actually slower rhythm of change and eventually can be realised together with experienced partners like UNESCO, Council of Europe, ENCATC, etc.

Aspects of Academic Cooperation

For the sensitive start up phase of the initiative the study recommends to exclusively include academic institutions from CEE that actually deliver or plan to offer full university degrees. It can be assumed that their activities will be the most efficient in the long run. This recommendation is also motivated by strong tendencies on European level towards bringing together education policies and cultural policies. Universities are the key to such a joint venture.

The study also observed that countries like Croatia, Romania, Macedonia or Slovenia, although carrying a good level of professional expertise in cultural policy, so far have not developed higher education programmes in the field. These countries either have institutions which are in the initial phase of setting something up (Rjeka, Timisoara, Bucharest, Ljubljana) or they have important and recognised research units dealing with the topic (IMO Zagreb, Culturelink). A specific way how to include these countries in the CPEG pilot phase hence could be considered. Membership of institutions from these regions however should be realised on a level which is different from that of countries where strong universities already developed education programmes on cultural management and cultural policies (Poland, Bulgaria, the Baltic States, Serbia).

Based on these recommendations the CPEG platform could develop along 3 main long-term **FIELDS OF ACTION** which combine:

- **MOBILITY:**
(exchange of lecturers, identification and research of existing documentation and information capacities, mentoring scheme)
- **CURRICULLUM DEVELOPMENT:**
(facilitating the elaboration and development of common syllabus patterns, more transparent processes of curriculum design for CEE higher education in cultural policy)
- **E-CONTENT:**
(electronic cultural policy tool kit, cultural policy online course, CPEG online forum (info bulletin, website), all disseminated on broad level in CEE and other target regions)

Based on these Fields of Action CPEG should evolve along the following 2 short- and medium term **ACTION LINES**:

- **Strengthen and (structurally!) 'harmonise' existing education offer** by capitalising on the universities selected by this study, their education potential and academic capacities.
- **Offering expertise and mentoring to universities setting up new programmes** by accompanying them in curriculum development, etc. (Croatia, Macedonia, Romania, Slovenia, etc.).

It is important to indicate that these fields of operation and the suggested action lines would **also be of benefit to cultural policy studies in Western Europe**. However, in Western Europe national resources provided are much more extensive and funding mobility, information and documentation on the topic are considered to be much more important than this is currently the case in CEE countries.

It is also important to stress that action envisaged for CPEG at CEE level could link to the pro-active and continuous networking efforts of ENCATC. The means this platform has available for setting up mobility schemes, curriculum development action or online education tools remain very limited when taking into account the actual needs expressed by ENCATC members but also the network's main goal, which is to annually bring together as many training centres as possible and provide them with focused and updated information on cultural management and cultural policy education matters. From this point of view CPEG can become a strong and important content providing partner of ENCATC.

Practical Proposals for implementing Fields of Action

For Action Field 'Mobility' in 2004:

A pilot group of selected CPEG universities that expressed their need for mobility (only those that have answered the CPEG inquiry and thereby showed a pro-active attitude towards indicating actual requirements and will to participate, which is essential during pilot phase of any programme) should be offered the following benefits:

- Possibility to invite a lecturer for teaching in the framework of their cultural policy module. CPEG could provide a list of lecturers and subjects these lecturers teach on. Information can be based on *Policies for Culture* database. Should a university invite someone else, taught subjects and CV of the lecturer should be provided to enhance the existing database. Lecturers should be requested to send in reports at the end of their mission which should describe impressions about the visited course, the level of students, their own mission achievements, evaluation criteria, etc. This will help CPEG to better evaluate the actual potential of each university, both content and logistic wise. Missions should last 3 days max.
- Possibility for programme chairs or professors at the respective department to travel to Amsterdam or other cities in Europe to do research on cultural policy documentation at the Boekman Foundation or similar institutions. Cultural policy course coordinators often point out a lack of information and being cut off from up to date documents on cultural policy matters. At the end of such missions, each travelling professor shall provide a report on actual findings, new bibliographical sources identified in the actual area of interest, a brief comment on still missing aspects, which sources he/she found especially insightful and rich, etc. Mission should last 5 days max.
- Possibility to invite an expert from anywhere in Europe, who is either coordinator/director of a cultural policy and cultural management course or a specialised researcher and scholar, to assist with the ongoing development of a cultural policy module by the inviting university. Such a support scheme can also help to assess the already existing education offer and shall enrich it with new content, new information sources, new lecturers, etc. In addition, external experts could also be invited to attend specific curriculum development meetings taking place at the respective institution, which could bring in different feedback and stimulate a broader methodological approach. Experts realising such missions would be provided from the list of identified universities described in this study and need to be chosen according to their availability to do such jobs. At the end of the mission the travelling experts should provide a report indicating the tasks fulfilled. Such reports would provide better knowledge about various developmental aspects of existing academic programmes. (Reports should be handed in within a week after finishing mobility assignments!) Mission should last between 3 to 5 days.

For Action Field 'Mobility' in 2005:

The scheme shall be officially launched at the beginning of 2005. A comprehensive inquiry on its outcome will be realised with lecturers, scholars, experts and universities that benefited from the scheme in 2005. This shall serve to adapt the three types of mobility support to the institutional capacities of the universities, to the general CPEG objectives and to achieving optimum benefits for the targeted cultural policy studies, if necessary.

In addition, other beneficiaries can be included (beyond those universities that became CPEG members in 2004). The mobility scheme will try to be as process-oriented as possible and shall support the two other CPEG 'fields of action' (curriculum development and e-content).

To be done:

- a letter describing all three mobility support proposals shall be sent to all potential beneficiaries in October 2004
- proposals will be discussed at first CPEG meeting
- deadline for first applications will be some time in early 2005, selection of first visits shall follow soon after; mobility continues to be funded for both parts of the university year in 2005
- after summer 2005: the assessment inquiry will be launched, responded and analysed until late autumn 2005
- end of 2005 into 2006: other universities could be included as potential beneficiaries as CPEG invites new members or existing members decide to include other mobility beneficiaries
- after analysing the results of the mobility scheme assessment, changes in the design of the three proposals for CPEG mobility support might occur

For Action Field 'Curriculum Development' in 2004:

A group of three CEE academics and/or individual experts together with an external cultural policy scholar (e.g. Colin Mercer) will prepare the rationale for a first meeting of the Group in December. The Group shall be jointly coordinated by a specially assigned expert and the ECF.

The aim of the rationale to be developed is to propose how to set up a common 'architecture' for cultural policy syllabi and to determine how to develop a more transparent and coherent way in providing and assessing cultural policy education content. One potential model to be referred to could be for example the one developed for the ICOM syllabus for higher education in museum management (see ICOM/ICOMOS/UNESCO!).

The first CPEG meeting in December 2004 will be an ideal opportunity to present and discuss the proposal with the group of invited CEE universities identified to be part of CPEG and to assess possibilities and potential of such a common education architecture. As likely outcome the December meeting will propose to set up a pilot group of universities which agree to realise an exercise of 'tuning'

their higher education modules in the field of cultural policy. Such an exercise will provide for a better understanding of the specificities of each CPEG university involved as well as it will show general and detailed specificities of content delivery applied at these universities. The 'tuning exercise' will be totally in line with criteria set in the Bologna Process and the application of the European Credit Transfer System. Its outcome will provide very useful information on specific issues of modular training and university cooperation in cultural policy education for or a wider beneficiary group including ENCATC members, UNESCO higher education projects, etc. This 'tuning exercise' will be launched, developed, implemented and assessed throughout 2005 and 2006. Its results could be broadly disseminated and used by different interest groups such as ENCATC members, etc.

To be done:

- October 2004: selected universities will be informed and invited to express their interest for participating in such a project
 - November 2004: CPEG experts and coordination will work on organising and planning the agenda for the first meeting
 - CPEG coordinators will contact selected universities
 - UNESCO will be informed
 - ENCATC could be actively involved via its secretariat, presidency and executive committee to comment the proposal
 - December 2004: first meeting
 - after the meeting: fine tuning of CPEG and further development work
 - 2005/2006: elaborating planning to set up transferable modular training in cultural policies with active and focused involvement of the selected universities
-

For Action Field 'E-Content' in 2004:

According to the analysis undertaken for this study we propose that the suggested 'tuning exercise' and the mobility scheme until 2006 shall also be accompanied by a multifunctional and multifaceted on-line education tool on cultural policy. Such an e-content education device shall make use of the manifold professional competences each of the member universities of the pilot scheme has already accumulated in its institution. CPEG thereby could become an important content provider in cultural policy distant- and e-learning for all Group members and its wider network but also for interested ENCATC members, etc. A 'virtual' course in cultural policies with CEE focus and CEE university partnership could be set up accordingly.

In 2004 a 'generic virtual tool-kit' on cultural policy will be developed by ECF and chosen experts (one on content, one on NTIC technical solutions). The first CPEG meeting in December will also allow for the presentation of the planned Tool Kit and the invitation of the CPEG universities to directly get involved with the development of this product. The advantages of developing such a tool in the long run are:

- Capitalising on the development of cultural policy education content and the results of CPEG activity supported by the initiative's mobility and curriculum development scheme
- Providing an 'open' accessible learning tool, tailor made to specific needs and outcomes CPEG as well as one or several of the other academic partners suggest
- Each university provides its area of special expertise to be included to the e-learning tool and shares knowledge with other partners who can be freely invited to contribute to the contents of the tool kit.
- Given that Europe is still in a very experimental phase of developing and applying e-learning contents, online teaching and e-based knowledge management the proposed tool kit will support the targeted academic communities to deal with IT tools in a more natural and competent way and turn the use of such tools to their real benefit
- This tool could achieve high competitive advantages on the European higher education market. Pre-negotiated package deals might be offered to feed into institutions like ACRONIM, CPRO, the Compendium, the LAB for Cultural Cooperation, OTM, etc.

To be done

- Prepare a first tool kit proposal to be presented during the first CPEG meeting in December
 - 2005: gradually develop tool kit and the universities' specific input, setting up the 'virtual course'
-
-

Corina Suteu is Head of Cultural Management Programmes at the Institute of Technology and Human Development in Nantes (France) and former Director of the Masters Degree in European Cultural Management of the Dijon Business School. She initiated the first MA in European cultural management focusing on countries from the CEE region - the ECUMEST programme. She is president of the ECUMEST Association (www.ecumest.ro) - a long-standing partner organisation of the European Cultural Foundation (*Policies for Culture Programme*) - and an accounted expert in higher education concerning issues of cultural management and cultural policies, especially in the CEE countries.

Bibliography:

- Boylan, P, 'The implications of current moves towards the globalisation of standards for university level qualifications' at www.city.ac.uk/ictop/boylan-delhi.html .
- File, Jon and Goedegebuure, L., 'Real-Time Systems, Reflection on Higher Education in Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland and Slovenia', CHEPS 2003, The Netherlands.
- Mercer, C. and Bennett, T., 'Recasting cultural policies' at www.powerofculture.nl/uk/archive/commentary/bennet.html
- Orzechowski, Emil, Keynote speech, ENCATC General Assembly in Turin - Serralunga, 2003.
- Rauning, G. and Kaufmann T., 'Anticipating European cultural policies' at www.eipcp.net/policies/text/part1.htm .
- Scott, P., 'Reflection on the Reform of Higher Education in Central and Eastern Europe', 2002.
-

ANNEX

List of 38 universities in countries of Central and Eastern Europe studied for this development paper. 26 study programmes have been reviewed in depth (in italics!):

Bulgaria: 6

1. Interspace Media Art Centre / Sofia
2. *South West University Neofit Rilski / Blagoevgrad*
3. *Sofia University, Department of Cultural Studies / Sofia*
4. *Paisii Hilendarski University, Department of Ethnology & Sociology / Plovdiv*
5. *New Bulgarian University / Sofia*
6. *Varna Free University / Varna*

Croatia: 5

1. *IMO / Zagreb*
2. Centre for Drama Arts / Zagreb
3. Faculty of Political Sciences / Zagreb
4. University of Rijeka (BA in Cultural Studies-starting 2004) / Rijeka
5. Inter-University Centre Dubrovnik (annual seminar in cultural policy since 2003) / Dubrovnik

Czech Republic: 2

1. *JAMU (Janacek Academy of Music and Performing Arts) / Brno*
2. Tomas Bata University / Zlin

Estonia: 2

1. *EMA (Estonian academy of Music)-participation in the Synaxis Baltica programme of academies for cultural management and cultural policy of the Baltic Sea countries / Tallinn*
2. *Tallinn Pedagogical University (UNESCO Chair of Urban Studies) / Tallinn*

Hungary: 6

1. Cassus College of Arts and Arts Management
2. *Eötvös Lorand University (ELTE) / Budapest*
3. *Lajos Kossuth University / Debrecen*
4. University of Pécs
5. *University of Szeghed*
6. *CEU (Central European University) / Budapest*

Latvia: 2

1. *Latvian Academy of Culture / Riga*
2. *Riga Dom Choir School*

Lithuania: 2

1. *LCATC Lithuanian Cultural Administrators Training Centre / Vilnius*
2. *Vilnius Academy of Fine Arts*

Macedonia: 2

1. PAC Multimedia / Skopje
2. *St. Cyril and Methodius University / Skopje*

Moldova: 1

1. *Free International University / Chisinau*

Poland: 5

1. ICC (International Cultural Centre) / Krakow
2. *Jagellonian University / Krakow*
3. *MISTIA (Malopolska Institute of Local Government and Administration) / Krakow*
4. *NCC, National Cultural Centre / Warsaw*
5. *SGH, Warsaw School of Economics / Warsaw*

Romania: 3

1. CTCAMC (Centre for training, continuing education and management in culture) / Bucharest
2. Timisoara University, Faculty of Fine Arts, MA in Cultural Policies, in partnership with University Paris VIII, started 2004
3. *Sibiu University BA in cultural management (started 1999)*

Serbia/Montenegro: 1

1. *University of Arts, Belgrade*
MA in Intercultural Mediation in the Balkans, with Lyon 2 and IEP Grenoble

Slovakia: 1

1. *VSMU - Academy of Music and Dramatic Arts / Bratislava*
-